

AD-A236 330



1

TECHNICAL REPORT

For The

Cargo Movement Operations System (CMOS)

Training Log (Recurring)

DTIC
SELECTE
JUN 05 1991
S D

24 May 1991

Prepared under

Contract Number F11624-88-D-0001/6K12
CDRL #A004-106e

Prepared for

Standard Systems Center (SSC)
Deputy Chief of Staff for Acquisition
Cargo Movement Operations System Division
Gunter AFB, AL 36114

UNCLASSIFIED
EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC
DOWNGRADING AND
DECLASSIFICATION

Prepared by

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)
5 Eagle Center, Suite 2,
O'Fallon, IL 62269

91-00925



91 5 31 016

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Section I	
Introduction	ii
Summary	ii
Conclusion	ii
Section II	
Results	iii



DTIC	
AD-A 223 445	
Dist	
Avail	
Dist	Avail
A-1	

SECTION I.

INTRODUCTION.

The purpose of this technical report is to provide a Training Log (Recurring) for Program Office information and use. This log details our efforts in assisting the MAJCOM Training Team with the development and implementation of pertinent CMOS training packages.

SUMMARY. Not Used.

CONCLUSION. Not Used.

SECTION II.

RESULTS.

Our fifth input is presented in the attached report.

CMOS TRAINING LOG

Introduction: As in previous months, the last 30 days have been filled with new ideas and developments. With each new version of CMOS software, we have been able to enhance the accuracy and clarity of the training packages. Although some of our recommended changes have been cosmetic, a great many more have been made to correspond with the modifications in the applications software. For example, Air Force transporters have a valid need to generate a continuation sheet for a Government Bill of Lading when there are more than ten Transportation Control Numbers. We noted a problem in this area and promptly notified the Program Office. As a result, the deficiency was corrected and a future problem for system users was averted. In essence, what we have found is that using the training packages in a hands-on mode helps to improve both the quality of these products, as well as the condition of the applications software.

Week of 15 - 19 APR 91: We continued to make positive recommendations to the training packages. These suggestions were incorporated to improve quality and to enhance preparations for upcoming visits to Tyndall AFB, Florida and Maxwell AFB, Alabama. Plans called for us to evaluate the effectiveness of these packages during visits to the aforementioned bases. Two of our team members were scheduled to be involved in this evaluation process. In short, they planned to meet Program Office personnel at Tyndall and Maxwell and to assist them in a detailed appraisal of the training methodology used at these two installations.

Week of 22 - 26 APR 91: Our first recommendations to the training packages were provided to the Program Office on 19 April. The Program Office elected to "field test" these packages at Maxwell AFB, Alabama during the week of 22 April. This test was the first review of the packages by a unit-level activity. During this period, two members of our SETA team accompanied Program Office personnel on their visit to Maxwell. In a nutshell, they evaluated the overall accuracy and effectiveness of the CMOS training packages. What they found at Maxwell was the following: (1) Because of manpower constraints, particularly in the freight sections, a designated number of personnel could not be dedicated to the training effort; (2) Maxwell personnel had to be trained on an unscheduled basis. Although this approach was less than ideal, it still proved to be beneficial for most of the system users. From our perspective, the field-level transporters seem to be comfortable with using the training packages. By the end of the week, most of them felt that

given a little more time and training, they could use CMOS to process cargo in a timely and effective fashion.

Week of 29 APR - 3 MAY 91: Members of our team, as well as Program Office personnel, were scheduled to travel to Tyndall AFB on 29 April. Purpose of this visit was to train user personnel and to evaluate the effectiveness of the CMOS training packages. This trip was subsequently delayed to permit a comparison with a new release of applications software. The bottom line was that the Program Office wanted to ensure the procedures contained in the training packages were in full agreement with all recent changes to system software. We were asked to assist in this informal comparative analysis. During the analysis process, we assisted with the testing and debugging of software. In addition, we were asked to review the on-line help screens and, if appropriate, to make recommendations on ways to improve these capabilities. We provided our inputs to appropriate parties. Overall, our comments dealt with inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and unclear subject matter. By the end of the week, we had completed all assigned tasks.

Week of 6 - 10 MAY 91: We updated pertinent areas of the training packages and provided the Program Office with a new version on 10 May. By the end of this week, plans called for us to travel to Tyndall AFB on 20 May. Our purpose, once again, will be to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the training packages. Due to the size of the Tyndall operation and the number of individuals to be trained at that location, our evaluation and assistance may be spread over a two week period. The final decision on the length of our temporary duty will be determined during the latter part of the first week at Tyndall. A major determining factor will be the number of dedicated trainees that the Tyndall managers can provide for the familiarization process.

Conclusion: Based on the users' reactions at Maxwell AFB, as well as inputs from the Program Office, the CMOS training packages are proving to be a viable entity for the implementation process. We will continue to evaluate these materials with the intent of improving and validating their content. The Tyndall trip will provide us with yet another yardstick for measuring their accuracy and quality.