



Department of Defense

Military Manpower Training Report

FY 1996

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19980527 026

MAY 1995



Department of Defense

Military Manpower Training Report

FY 1996

Prepared by

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense
(Personnel & Readiness)
Department of the Army
Department of the Navy
Department of the Air Force

MAY 1995

FY 1996 MILITARY MANPOWER TRAINING REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	
Training Requirements and Manpower Requirements.....	1
Definition of "Individual Training and Education"	1
FY 1996 Military Manpower Training Report and the FY 1996 Budget	2
Definitions of Major Training Categories	3
Determining Training Requirements and Training Load	4
Accuracy in Projecting Training Loads	5
Training Load Request by Component and Category	6
CHAPTER II - TRAINING PATTERNS	
General Description	9
Officer Training Patterns.....	10
Enlisted Training Patterns	12
CHAPTER III - RECRUIT TRAINING AND ARMY ONE-STATION UNIT TRAINING	
General Description	14
Recruit Training Loads	14
Recruit Training	15
Rationale for Recruit Training	16
Active Duty Input	17
Reserve Component Input	18
Course Length and Course Content	18
Attrition in Recruit Training	20
Army One-Station Unit Training	20

CHAPTER IV - OFFICER ACQUISITION TRAINING

General Description	23
ROTC and Health Professions Acquisition Programs	23
Officer Requirements and Structuring the Officer Acquisition Program	24
Service Academies	25
ROTC Programs	26
Off-Campus Commissioning Programs	28
Officer Candidate Schools (OCS)	29
Other Enlisted Commissioning Programs	31
Health Professions Acquisition Programs	32

CHAPTER V - SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING

General Description	33
Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)	35
Skill Progression Training (Enlisted)	39
Initial Skill Training (Officer)	41
Skill Progression Training (Officer)	43
Functional Training (Officer and Enlisted)	44

CHAPTER VI - FLIGHT TRAINING

General Description	47
Undergraduate Pilot Training	48
Undergraduate Navigator Training	53
Other Flight Training	55
Determination of Requirements for Rated Officers	57
Rated Officer Inventory Projections	57
Training Rate Adjustments	58
Determination of Training Loads	58

CHAPTER VII - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

General Description	59
Career Officer Professional Schools	61
Intermediate Service Schools	62
Senior Service Colleges	63
Enlisted Leadership Training	64
Graduate Education Fully Funded, Full Time	66
Other Full Time Education Programs	68
Health Professions Education	69

CHAPTER VIII - TRAINING MANPOWER

General Description	71
Trainees and Students	71
Manpower in Support of Training	73
Training Manpower Detailed by Service and Type of Training	77

CHAPTER IX - TRAINING MANAGEMENT AND FUNDING

General Description	79
Management of Individual Training	79
Staff Responsibilities	79
Training Commands	80
Training Funding and Costs	81

APPENDICES

A	Determining Training Requirements.....	A-1
B	Selected Major Courses/Skill Areas Trained in Other Services	B-1
C	Individual Training Workload and Training Staff at Major Locations by Training Category, FY 1995	C-1
D	Summary of Total Funding for Individual Training and Education by Service and Appropriation, FY 1994-1997	D-1
E	O&M Funding for Training and Education by Category by Service	E-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Military Manpower Training Report (MMTR) recommends student loads for each category of individual institutional training for each active and reserve component of the Armed Forces. The FY 1996 Military Manpower Training Report specifically supports the Department of Defense request for authorization of military student training loads for each component, active and reserve, of each Service for Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997. Data elements for this report are compiled and submitted by the Services. Many calculations in this report are affected by rounding. The Department's requested training loads are listed below:

TABLE 1. Requested Training Load

	FY96	FY97
Active Components		
Army	53,655	57,907
Navy	43,043	43,064
Marine Corps	22,529	23,582
Air Force	26,385	28,759
Subtotal	145,612	153,312
Reserve Components		
Army Reserve	10,645	10,777
Army National Guard	10,713	10,591
Naval Reserve	1,195	1,057
Marine Corps Reserve	3,550	3,661
Air Force Reserve	3,492	3,477
Air National Guard	3,355	3,286
Subtotal	32,950	32,849
Total	178,562	186,161

The requested load is derived from the President's Budget for FY 1996 and is consistent with the Department of Defense request for authorization of military manpower strengths, active and reserve. Military student load authorizations enacted by Congress are subject to adjustments, as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, to be consistent with Service component end strengths authorized by Congress.

Definitions and Explanation of Training Load

This report discusses individual training and education within the Department of Defense provided by Military Service training and education institutions. Individual training and education, for purposes of this report, is divided into six categories:

- Recruit Training, given to enlisted entrants who have not had previous military service.
- One-Station Unit Training (OSUT), an Army program that combines Recruit Training and initial Specialized Skill Training into a single course.
- Officer Acquisition Training, which leads to a commission in one of the Services.
- Specialized Skill Training, which prepares military personnel for specific jobs in the Military Services.
- Flight Training, which prepares prospective pilots and navigators for an initial operational assignment.
- Professional Development Education, relating to the advanced professional duties of military personnel or to advanced academic disciplines to meet Service requirements.

"Training load" is the average number of students and trainees participating in formal institutional training and education courses during the fiscal year.

Training loads are derived from the need to replace losses in each skill required in the military force structure. Losses, through separations, promotions and other causes, are projected at various points in the future and compared to the projected inventory of trained personnel. The difference between the requirement in each skill and the inventory becomes the demand for newly trained personnel. A phased input of students to the training establishments is then scheduled so that trained personnel, in each skill area and skill level, are available at the proper time to replace the losses. The resulting workload is the basis of the training load addressed in this report.

The training load of each component is the measure of the amount of training planned for members of that component, although some of the training will be done by other Services, in DoD schools or, in some cases, by institutions outside the Department of Defense. The training of members of the Reserve Components included in the report is the formal school training provided by the active training establishment to individual members of the Reserve Components while they are on active duty for training. This is primarily training provided to non-prior service personnel entering the Reserve Components.

An Overview of Training Load

For FY 1996 total requested DoD training load is 178,562. About 82 percent of this training load is for members of the active forces. The remaining 18 percent is training for members of the Reserve Components on active duty at training establishments operated by the Active Components. Whenever possible, Reserve Component personnel attend the same classes and are provided the same instruction as Active Force personnel.

Table 2 displays the distribution of total Active Force and Reserve Component load attributable to each of the major categories of training in FY 1996 and FY 1997.

TABLE 2. Distribution of Training Load

	FY96	FY97
Training Category		
Recruit Training	35,782	37,621
One-Station Unit Training (Army)	9,576	10,559
Officer Acquisition Training	18,689	18,604
Specialized Skill Training	97,874	102,526
Flight Training	4,034	4,113
Professional Development Education	12,607	12,738
Total	178,562	186,161

In terms of training load, the largest categories of training load are Specialized Skill Training and Recruit Training, both of which, along with the Army One-Station Unit Training, are strongly influenced by the number of enlisted non-prior service accessions. Specialized Skill Training is the largest training category for FY 1996 with 55 percent of the Active Force load and 56 percent of the Reserve Component load.

Table 3 divides the requested training load for FY 1996 and FY 1997 into two parts: (1) accession-related training which provides civilian entrants with the initial skills needed to perform the duties of their first military occupations; and (2) other training that is conducted to prepare members for more specialized duties in later stages of their military careers.

For FY 1996, training related to new accessions amounts to about 66 percent of all training programmed for the Active Forces. For the Reserve Components, the percentage is 84. The load dedicated to accession-related requirements highlights the priority the military services place on training new military members. Detailed information on each category of training is provided in Chapters III through VII of this report.

TABLE 3. Accession-Related Training
(Thousands of Loads)

	FY96		FY97	
	Active	Reserve	Active	Reserve
Accession Related Load				
Recruit	28.4	7.3	30.4	7.3
One-Station Unit Training	6.5	3.0	7.4	3.2
Officer Acquisition	15.5	3.2	15.6	3.0
Initial Skill (Off & Enl)	42.8	13.7	45.9	13.7
Undergraduate Flight	3.1	0.3	3.2	0.3
Subtotal	96.4	27.5	102.5	27.5
Other Training Load				
Other Specialized Skill	36.7	4.7	38.2	4.7
Other Flight	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.1
Professional Development	12.0	0.6	12.1	0.6
Subtotal	49.3	5.4	50.8	5.4
Total Load	145.6	33.0	153.3	32.8
Accession Related Load as a Percent of Total Load	66%	84%	67%	84%

Manpower In Support of Individual Training

Individual training requires manpower to conduct and support instruction, manage military schools and training centers, maintain training bases, and provide support to students, military staff members and their dependents. Chapter VIII of this report provides information about the military and civilian manpower needed for individual training. Manpower in support of individual training for FY 1996 and FY 1997 is shown by Service in the following table.

NOTE: All individual training categories are included. The manpower includes instructors, instructional support, school/training center administration, student supervision and direct training support.

TABLE 4. DoD Manpower in Support of Individual Training
(End Strength, Thousands)

	FY96			FY97		
	MIL	CIV	Total	MIL	CIV	Total
Army	30	20	50	30	18	48
Navy	24	8	31	21	7	28
Marine Corps	11	1	12	11	2	12
Air Force	18	10	28	18	10	28
Total	82	39	122	80	37	117

TABLE 5. DoD Manpower in Support of Individual Training by Function
(End Strength, Thousands)

	FY96			FY97		
	MIL	CIV	Total	MIL	CIV	Total
Conduct of Individual Training	60	13	73	58	13	71
Operating Support	21	25	46	20	23	43
Training Headquarters	1	1	3	1	1	3
Total	82	39	122	80	37	117

Funding for Individual Training

The funds required to support training for FY 1996 total \$13.9 billion. This includes pay and allowances for the students and trainees undergoing training, pay and allowances of military and civilian personnel in support of training, operations and maintenance costs, and training-related procurement and construction. Table 6 displays total training costs.

**TABLE 6. Funding of Individual Training
(All Appropriations) by Service**
(Millions)

	<u>FY96</u>	<u>FY97</u>
Army	\$5,614	\$5,600
Navy	3,676	3,777
Marine Corps	1,444	1,438
Air Force	3,173	3,240
Total	\$13,907	\$14,055

Table 7 shows the funding for each of the major categories of training and for related support.

TABLE 7. Funding of Individual Training (All Appropriations)
By Category
(Millions)

	<u>FY96</u>	<u>FY97</u>
Recruit Training	\$1,045	\$1,081
Officer Acquisition Training	529	537
Specialized Skill Training	4,409	4,434
Flight Training	2,017	2,126
Professional Development Education	896	905
Army One-Station Unit Training	240	253
Direct Training Support	561	540
Training Base Support	2,937	2,883
Training Management Headquarters	139	137
Reserve Component Pay and Allowance	1,134	1,158
Total	\$13,907	\$14,055

Funding estimates are based on data contained in DoD's Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). The MMTR is consistent with resource estimates in the

President's Budget, the justification material submitted to the Congress, the FYDP and internal DoD management documents. Several tables throughout this report provide for comparisons between current budget year estimates and prior year actual funding. Since OSD and the Military Services change resource management accounts from year to year, this report recompiles previously reported training funding using the most current set of accounts. Further detail on training funding is provided in Chapter IX and Appendices D and E of this report.

Congress has expressed a specific interest in the Operations and Maintenance appropriations for individual training and education. Appendix E provides further details of the Operations and Maintenance Overview.

Trends in Individual Training

This section provides information on the five-year trend of individual training load, workload, manpower and funding. Two years of actual data are provided to compare with the current and two budget year estimates. Table 8 shows the FY 1993 to FY 1997 trend in training load for each Active and Reserve Component.

TABLE 8. Active and Reserve Training Load Trends by Service
(Thousands of Loads)

	Actual		Estimates		
	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Active Components					
Army	50.9	48.9	52.5	53.7	57.9
Navy	48.8	43.5	41.7	43.0	43.1
Marine Corps	17.0	18.2	22.0	22.5	23.6
Air Force	27.9	23.8	26.3	26.4	28.8
Subtotal	144.6	134.4	142.5	145.6	153.3
Reserve Components					
Army National Guard	8.9	8.9	10.5	10.7	10.6
Army Reserve	9.0	7.3	10.8	10.6	10.8
Naval Reserve	1.2	1.2	.9	1.2	1.1
Marine Corps Reserve	2.3	2.4	2.7	3.6	3.7
Air National Guard	2.4	2.4	3.5	3.4	3.3
Air Reserve	2.9	2.7	3.6	3.5	3.5
Subtotal	26.8	25.0	32.2	33.0	32.8
Total	171.3	159.4	174.6	178.6	186.2

Training workload accounts for all students trained by the Service Training Commands. This includes DoD military students, civilians, foreign students and students from other U.S. government agencies. Table 9 shows training workload trends for each Service, FY 1993 through FY 1997.

TABLE 9. Training Workload Trends
(Thousands of Loads)

	Actual		Estimates		
	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Army	72	67	77	78	81
Navy	46	46	44	46	46
Marine Corps	17	17	20	21	22
Air Force	34	32	37	37	39
Total	169	163	178	182	188

The following two tables demonstrate the Department's emphasis on improving training efficiencies. Although total training workload increased by 12 percent from FY 1994 to FY 1996, there has been a 9 percent reduction in manpower and an 1 percent reduction in funding over this period.

TABLE 10. Manpower Trends in Support of Training
(Combined Military and Civilian End Strengths, Thousands)

	Actual		Estimates		
	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Army	59	55	54	50	48
Navy	40	36	26	31	28
Marine Corps	14	13	12	12	12
Air Force	30	30	28	28	28
Total	143	134	121	122	117

TABLE 11. Individual Training Funding Trends
(All Appropriations, Billions)

	Actual		Estimates		
	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Army	5.5	5.1	5.4	5.6	5.6
Navy	4.4	4.5	4.0	3.7	3.8
Marine Corps	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4
Air Force	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.2
Total	14.4	14.1	13.8	13.9	14.1

The Necessity for Individual Training

The primary objective of individual training is to provide the operational forces with personnel who are adequately trained to assume jobs in both Active and Reserve military units. One of the cornerstones of readiness is the conduct of effective individual training at Service Training Institutions. Unlike in past wars, we may not be able to count on extended periods of mobilization and training in response to future conflicts. Maintaining excellence in our individual training at Service Training Institutions during peacetime results in a military force ready to respond in a national emergency.

INTRODUCTION

Training Requirements and Manpower Requirements

Requirements for training and education of military personnel are derived ultimately from national security objectives. The Military Manpower Training Report (MMTR), the Report of the Secretary of Defense to the Congress on the FY 1996 Budget, and the Defense Manpower Requirements Report, describe the progression from national security objectives to training load requirements. The Report of the Secretary of Defense explains the relationship between the threat and the forces designed to cope with the threat. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report describes the requirement for trained manpower to man the forces. Using this trained manpower requirement as its starting point, the Military Manpower Training Report details the amount of training needed, describing the "training demand" in terms of student loads. The Congress then authorizes loads for each component and category of the armed forces. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report and the Military Manpower Training Report are mutually supportive; however, the data in the two reports are not interchangeable or directly comparable. The principal reason for this difference is that the main focus of the Defense Manpower Requirements Report is upon requested strength on the last day of fiscal years (that is, end strength), whereas the main focus of the Military Manpower Training Report is upon requested student loads, a concept more comparable to average strength, or man-years, than to end strength.

Definition of "Individual Training and Education"

This report addresses the "individual training and education" activities of the Department of Defense; that is, the training of individual military members in formal courses conducted by organizations whose primary mission is training. This training is different from training activities conducted by operational units incidental to their primary combat, combat support, or combat service support missions. Training conducted within operational units (including the training of crews and teams) is not included in the training loads discussed in this report. In certain categories of training, on-the-job training (OJT) in units substitutes to some extent for all or part of formal course training requirements. OJT is also not included in the training loads discussed in this report.

The purpose of individual training is to give individual service members the skills and knowledge that will qualify them to perform effectively as members of operational military organizations. "Individual training" includes formal military and technical training and professional education conducted under centralized control, generally under the supervision of a Service Training Command or similar organization. The trainees and students undergoing the training and education addressed in the MMTR include Active Force members and Reserve Component members:

- Active Force trainees and students include officers, enlisted personnel, and Service academy cadets and midshipmen.
- Reserve Component trainees and students include officers and enlisted members on active duty for training in formal school courses.

Some civilian students attend training in programs such as the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) prior to their entry into a Service. These programs are also discussed in the report. However, training load authorizations are requested only for training and education of personnel while they are in active military status.

In general, the training discussed in this report is conducted under Major Defense Program VIII, "Training, Medical and Other General Personnel Activities," as presented in the Defense budget. Exceptions to these general rules are pointed out, where appropriate, in the body of the report.

Personnel undergoing individual training and education are classified for manpower accounting purposes as trainees, students, or cadets. The exceptions are: (1) personnel undergoing training while on temporary duty or temporary additional duty away from their unit of assignment, or (2) personnel being trained while enroute to new stations as transients. The term "trainees" is generally used for all enlisted personnel in Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training. "Cadets" (or "midshipmen" in the case of the Naval Academy) are members being educated at one of the Service academies. All others receiving individual training and education are identified as "students." The distinction is not important for the purposes of this report, and the term "student" will be used where appropriate to describe members of all three classifications as well as temporary duty and transient personnel being trained.

FY 1996 Military Manpower Training Report and the FY 1996 Budget

It is important to emphasize that this MMTR, while consistent with the Department of Defense Budget for FY 1996, differs in structure from the budget justification. Budget justifications are focused on explaining how, by who, and why money is to be spent. Budgets for training and their justifications, therefore, are prepared by the Service conducting the training programs. As a result, each Service must justify and obtain funds to train personnel from other Services in addition to its own personnel.

By contrast, the MMTR details and justifies the authorization request for training loads of the components of the parent Service whose members are undergoing the training. For example, Navy personnel being trained by the Air Force are treated in the MMTR as part of the Navy military student training load since they are being trained to fill Navy requirements. However, in O&M budget justification documents, Navy students attending Air Force schools are included in the Air Force training workload tables that justify Air Force training resources. This report contains summary tables of the manpower and funding required by the Services to conduct training based on estimated workloads.

Definitions of Major Training Categories

The portion of this report that discusses training loads in detail is organized into five chapters (Chapters III through VII), each of which addresses one of the major categories of training. These major categories are briefly defined below. Each chapter will more fully describe the training category and its sub-categories, the requested training loads, and the training methodology.

Recruit Training includes the introductory physical conditioning, basic military training, and indoctrination given to all new enlisted entrants in each of the Services.

One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) is an Army training program that meets the training objectives of both Recruit and Specialized Skill Training in certain skills through a single course conducted by a single training unit. Because it includes elements of two categories of training, it is treated separately in this report.

Officer Acquisition Training, sometimes called pre-commissioning training, includes all types of education and training leading to a commission in one of the Services. Examples are programs of the Service academies and Officer Candidate/Training Schools. Students not in active military status, such as Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets, are excluded from requested loads in this report.

Specialized Skill Training provides officer and enlisted personnel with initial job qualification skills or new or higher levels of skill in their current military specialty or functional area. This category includes Army Advanced Individual Training and Navy Apprenticeship Training. Certain flight-related training, such as training of air traffic controllers, aircraft mechanics, and Air Force survival training, is reported under Specialized Skill Training. Officer acquisition programs are not included in Specialized Skill Training. The Marine Corps Combat Training (MCCT) phase of the Marine Battle Skills Training has been included in this category since FY 1989.

Flight Training provides the individual flying skills needed by pilots, navigators, and naval flight officers. The undergraduate flight training programs culminate in an officer or an Army warrant officer receiving "wings" and being categorized as a "designated" or "rated" officer. The undergraduate programs do not include formal advanced flight

training programs. Training conducted by Service advanced flight training organizations is beyond the scope of this report.

Professional Development Education includes educational courses conducted at the higher-level Service Schools or at civilian institutions to broaden the outlook and knowledge of senior military personnel or to impart knowledge in advanced academic disciplines to meet Service requirements. Training of this type is required to prepare individuals for progressively more demanding assignments, particularly for higher command and staff positions. Programs include undergraduate and graduate education as well as courses not leading to a degree.

Training for senior non-commissioned officers, which has a broad professional content, is included in Professional Development Education rather than in Specialized Skill Training. Training of junior and middle-grade officers and non-commissioned officers includes specific branch or job-specific training rather than broad, common skills. Designation of this training varies by Service: for example, Navy Leadership Training, which is given to all grades of petty officers, is included in Specialized Skill Training. Non-commissioned officer training for more junior personnel conducted by the other Services is also included in Specialized Skill Training.

Determining Training Requirements and Training Load

The amount and type of training to be conducted in the Department of Defense is the product of a series of calculations that is described in Appendix A to this report.

In brief, the process begins with the determination of the requirement for military personnel with specific skills to fill positions in the approved or projected force. The requirement for trained manpower must then be measured against the available inventory of trained personnel projected at various points in the future.

This comparison, made for each military skill and skill level, establishes the need for training personnel to fill current and projected skill shortages. The requirement for the training of personnel to maintain the skill inventory becomes part of the workload of the Service training establishments. It is measured in terms of the average military training student load, or "training load." The training load for a given period is a measure of the amount of training to be accomplished. It is also a basis for establishing the requirement for resources (manpower, funds, materiel, and facilities) needed to support the training to be conducted by a Service.

Conceptually, the training load for a given period is the average student strength for the period, roughly equal to man-years. The total training load is the sum of the loads for all the individual courses. Training loads for individual courses are determined by the following factors:

1. The length of the training course

2. The desired number of graduates, or output, of the course.
3. The number of entrants, or inputs, into the course required to obtain the desired output. This, in turn, depends on the pattern of attrition, or failures of entrants to graduate, for the course.

The training load is computed by the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{Entrants} + \text{Graduates}}{2} \times \text{Course Length}^{1/} = \text{Load}$$

^{1/}Training time is expressed as a fraction of a year

This is the basic method for computing the training loads discussed in this report. However, if attrition does not occur at a uniform rate (as is frequently the case) and the rate and phasing of that attrition can be specified, more complex formulas and computer routines are used to estimate training loads.

Accuracy in Projecting Training Loads

The law requires that training load authorizations be requested well in advance of the period when the training is actually conducted. This statutory requirement implies the capability to predict future training loads with precision. In actuality, while loads for some long lead-time programs, such as the Service Academies, can be predicted with considerable accuracy, there are many uncertainties in projecting training loads. Some of the causes of uncertainty are:

1. Unanticipated changes in end strength levels and force structure, requiring adjustment of the skill inventory and the mix of courses in the training load.
2. Unpredictability of individual decisions to enlist, re-enlist, or retire. These factors may lead to unanticipated changes in the skill inventory, requiring changes in the composition or size of training loads, or to shifts of portions of the training load from one fiscal period to the following period.
3. Changes in attrition rates and patterns, causing unprogrammed fluctuations in training rates and loads.

By forecasting training needs as far as possible into the future and continuously reviewing and adjusting training inputs and loads, the Services adapt the training system to changing conditions. The MMTR represents a "snapshot" of the Services' training objectives early in their budget cycles. Extended projections based on that snapshot are subject to change. Adjustments are inevitable -- in fact, necessary -- for good management.

Training Load Request by Component and Category

The following two tables display by category the requested training loads for FY 1996 and FY 1997. The loads for each period are shown by component and by each of the major categories of training.

TABLE I-1. Military Training Student Loads, Fiscal Year 1996
by Component and Major Training Category

	One-Station		Officer		Specialized		Prof. Dev.	Total
	Recruit	Unit Training	Acquisition Training	Skill Training	Flight Training	Education		
Active Forces								
Army	7,463	6,536	4,870	30,288	716	3,782	53,655	
Navy	9,128	0	5,682	24,949	1,154	2,130	43,043	
Marine Corps	8,284	0	523	11,434	490	1,798	22,529	
Air Force	3,571	0	4,460	12,804	1,261	4,289	26,385	
Subtotal	28,446	6,536	15,535	79,475	3,621	11,999	145,612	
Reserve Components								
Army National Guard	2,581	2,125	73	5,691	164	79	10,713	
Army Reserve	2,549	915	1,357	5,712	41	71	10,645	
Naval Reserve	506	0	16	644	0	29	1,195	
Marine Corps Reserve	1,124	0	145	2,228	0	53	3,550	
Air Force Reserve	231	0	1,563	1,511	71	116	3,492	
Air National Guard	345	0	0	2,613	137	260	3,355	
Subtotal	7,336	3,040	3,154	18,399	413	608	32,950	
Total	35,782	9,576	18,689	97,874	4,034	12,607	178,562	

TABLE I-2. Military Training Student Loads, Fiscal Year 1997
by Component and Major Training Category

	One-Station		Officer		Specialized		Prof. Dev.	Total
	Recruit Training	Unit Training	Acquisition Training	Skill Training	Flight Training	Education		
Active Forces								
Army	8,805	7,378	4,882	32,286	691	3,865	57,907	
Navy	9,145	0	5,646	24,920	1,200	2,153	43,064	
Marine Corps	8,271	0	523	12,494	488	1,806	23,582	
Air Force	4,136	0	4,562	14,421	1,350	4,290	28,759	
Subtotal	30,357	7,378	15,613	84,121	3,729	12,114	153,312	
Reserve Components								
Army National Guard	2,361	2,218	74	5,692	157	89	10,591	
Army Reserve	2,774	963	1,170	5,761	31	78	10,777	
Naval Reserve	375	0	15	638	0	29	1,057	
Marine Corps Reserve	1,178	0	169	2,261	0	53	3,661	
Air Force Reserve	231	0	1,563	1,496	71	116	3,477	
Air National Guard	345	0	0	2,557	125	259	3,286	
Subtotal	7,264	3,181	2,991	18,405	384	624	32,849	
Total	37,621	10,559	18,604	102,526	4,113	12,738	186,161	

TRAINING PATTERNS

General Description

The development of Service members through formal training, education, and practical experience generally follows a common pattern. New Service members (or, in the case of some Officer Acquisition Training, prospective Service members) first receive training designed to develop the basic attributes of the members of their Service. In most cases, a graduate of the initial training is then taught the skills required for a military job at the lowest skill level. Service members who do not remain beyond their initial enlistments or obligated terms of service do not, in most cases, receive additional formal training. Those who remain, the career members, will further develop their military knowledge and technical skills through experience in military jobs augmented with training or education needed to prepare them for more responsible positions. During their terms of service, military personnel are also encouraged, as their military assignments may permit, to improve themselves through off-duty and voluntary education programs. This combination of job experience, training and education is essential to the development of a military force that is capable of carrying out the national security mission.

Enlisted personnel usually work in relatively specialized skill fields, whereas the duties of officers, particularly those in the career force, call for broader expertise. For these reasons, the training and education patterns of officers and enlisted personnel differ and will be discussed separately in the following sections of this chapter.

In addition to training members of the active forces, the Service training establishments also train members of the Reserve Components. Reserve Component training, as part of individual training and education, involves Reservists and Guardsmen who are on active duty for formal school training. It does not include training of Reserve Component members provided under the following circumstances:

- Training received by individuals while on extended active duty serving with an active component (this training is included in active force aggregates);
- On-the-job training (OJT) or other individual training conducted by Reserve units;
- Training received while on annual active duty for training, except if provided through courses conducted by the active training establishment;

- Training received while the individual is not in an active military status. (As a minor exception, some Reserve and Guard technicians attend military schools in Civil Service status.)

Training of members of the Reserve Components will comprise 18 percent of all individual training and education in FY 1996 and FY 1997.

Officer Training Patterns

Each Service has developed career patterns to prepare its officers to assume progressively higher command and staff responsibilities. These career patterns are composed of operational assignments during which the officers learn their profession through experience and periodic individual training and education. This provides them with the knowledge and skills needed for progressively more demanding follow-on assignments.

Officer training and education can be divided into three types. First, each Service maintains a progressive system of professional military education. This education is related more to the increasing responsibilities associated with career progression and promotion than to the individual's current assignment or specialty. The primary topics are the study of officership and the command and staff knowledge required of all professional military officers. The second type of education and training includes the many skill-producing courses that enable the officer to perform immediately upon assignment to a specialized or functional area. These courses vary in length from a few days to several months. They present, for the most part, strictly job-oriented training and are often orientation or refresher courses. Third, the Services provide selected officers with advanced academic education, either in-house or at civilian institutions, to meet specific requirements for officers educated in technical, scientific, engineering, and managerial fields. Officers also participate in a variety of other educational programs, many on a part-time basis, usually with the student sharing in the cost.

Training and education for career officers involves one or more of the types of training and education described above and follows the general patterns outlined in the next paragraphs. The patterns vary among the Services to some extent, and not all officers will participate in all of the schooling described. The number of officers participating in schooling becomes progressively smaller, and participation more selective and demanding, as officers move through their careers.

Generally, non-career officers (those who are expected to serve only an initial tour of active duty) receive training only at the entry level. In some cases, lengthy skill-oriented training (such as pilot training) results in a commensurably longer active duty obligation.

Entry Level Training. Initial officer training is Service-oriented and intended to prepare officers for duties at the lowest operational level, i.e., company, squadron, or ship. Newly commissioned Army officers will attend a basic course conducted by the particular branch of the Army, such as infantry, armor or artillery. Navy ensigns are usually assigned to school training based on their warfare specialty. All newly commissioned Marine officers attend the Basic School. A newly commissioned officer in the Air Force may go to Flight Training or training in a technical specialty.

Career Training. After some operational experience, the career officer requires further professional military education to prepare for service at the next level; for example, as a unit commander or a headquarters staff officer. In the Army this entails a return to branch school for more advanced training. Navy officers at this stage in their careers may attend a school in a specialty appropriate to their future assignments. A Marine Corps officer would normally attend the Amphibious Warfare School. An Air Force officer could be selected for the Squadron Officer School.

To satisfy Service requirements and as a further step in professional development, some officers are selected for participation in an advanced academic educational program at a civilian institution or at one of the two Service technical institutes, the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air Force Institute of Technology.

Intermediate Service Schools. As officers progress (between six and sixteen years of service, depending on Service criteria) they are ready for the next level of professional military education. These schools prepare officers for command and staff responsibilities in preparation for assuming higher responsibilities. Officers are competitively selected to attend each Service's program. The Armed Forces Staff College, a joint school, is also conducted at this level.

Senior Service Colleges. Little technical training is provided after the intermediate years. The final level of professional military education is that of the Senior Service Schools (the war colleges) for which attendance is highly selective. The Army, Navy, and Air Force each has a war college. In addition, there is the National Defense University, consisting of the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Capstone Course for general officers. Officers graduating from the Senior Service Schools have the academic foundation required for command and staff positions at the highest level. The different curricula of these schools reflect the different missions of the Services. In some instances Reserve officers are able to attend Senior Service Schools in residence. The schools also offer a non-resident course that consists of correspondence studies and resident phases.

Enlisted Training Patterns

Recruit Training introduces new enlistees to military life. Following this indoctrination, they will follow one of three possible avenues dictated by their respective component's requirements:

1. Initial Skill Training that prepares the enlistee for an initial duty assignment;
2. Direct assignment to first duty unit based on skill already acquired in civilian life;
or
3. Direct assignment to first duty unit for on-the-job training (OJT).

The Army One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) program is a variation of the first of these three avenues, since it combines Recruit and Initial Skill Training into a single course, followed by assignment to an operational unit.

The expected distribution of Active Recruit Training graduates for FY 1996 is shown in the following table.

**TABLE II-1. Disposition of Active Recruit Training Graduates
FY96**

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
To Initial Skill Training	99%	59%	95%	96.62%
To Duty Assignment (Civilian-Acquired Skill)	1%	N/A	1%	0.04%
To Duty Assignment (On-The-Job-Training)	0%	41%	4%	3.34%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

As the table indicates, most enlisted personnel receive formal Initial Skill Training to provide them with a basic military skill. This combination of Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training (or Army One-Station Unit Training) turns civilians into Service members qualified to fill positions in Active or Reserve units.

During their initial enlistment, personnel normally receive no further formal skill training but gain experience through on-the-job training in the work environment. The major exception is Navy training, conducted by fleet training centers in such shipboard duties as fire fighting.

After reenlistment, individuals may be selected for attendance at a journeyman-level course in their specific occupational area. This training emphasizes the appropriate military applications for the skills being taught. Most enlisted personnel are given the opportunity to attend Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) professional development training programs that prepare them for increased supervisory and leadership responsibilities.

Enlisted personnel attend regularly programmed specialized courses when circumstances require it: for example, where new equipment or systems are introduced into a Service, and senior level enlisted personnel need to be formally trained in operation and maintenance techniques. Selected Active and Reserve senior enlisted personnel attend schools, such as the Army's Sergeants Major Academy and Air Force's Senior NCO Academy, which are on the NCO level, similar in purpose to the Intermediate and Senior Service Schools in the officer education system.

III

RECRUIT TRAINING AND ARMY ONE-STATION UNIT TRAINING

General Description

Recruit Training is the basic indoctrination training given to enlisted personnel upon their initial entry into military service. Recruit Training provides an orderly transition from civilian to military life, instruction in the required basic skills, and motivation to become dedicated and productive. Training in each of the Services emphasizes discipline, military rules, social conduct, physical conditioning and development of self-confidence. Beyond these common objectives, Recruit Training in each Service is designed to meet the particular training requirements of that Service that reflect the Service's mission. Graduates of Recruit Training have the basic knowledge and skills required to qualify them, after formal or on-the-job training in a particular skill, for service in an operational unit of the parent Service.

Army One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) is unique in that it combines Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training in certain skills into a single course conducted by a single training unit at a single training installation. OSUT therefore includes elements of two major training categories; consequently, it is treated separately at the end of this chapter. OSUT training loads are not included within the Recruit Training loads displayed in this chapter.

Recruit Training Loads

The training loads for FY 1991 through FY 1997 for each component of each Military Service are shown in Table III-1 on the following page. Note that the trend has been down over this period, caused by reductions in force structure. Increases from FY 1995 to FY 1997 are needed to sustain the new force structure levels and support enlisted career force planning.

TABLE III-1. Recruit Training Load Trends

Service							
Component	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Army							
Active	7,049	7,690	6,730	5,583	6,366	7,463	8,805
Reserve	2,590	3,024	2,523	2,094	2,656	2,549	2,774
Natl Guard	2,531	2,432	1,999	1,970	2,557	2,581	2,361
Navy							
Active	10,419	8,997	10,769	9,025	8,503	9,128	9,145
Reserve	854	459	449	415	202	506	375
Marine Corps							
Active	7,092	6,185	6,547	5,965	7,695	8,284	8,271
Reserve	1,639	1,085	1,070	1,113	1,001	1,124	1,178
Air Force							
Active	3,856	3,884	3,650	3,409	3,628	3,571	4,136
Reserve	203	158	103	88	231	231	231
Natl Guard	360	381	298	263	345	345	345
Total							
Active	28,416	26,756	27,696	23,982	26,192	28,446	30,357
Res/Gd	8,177	7,539	6,442	5,943	6,992	7,336	7,264
Total	36,593	34,295	34,138	29,925	33,184	35,782	37,621

NOTE: In this table and in all subsequent tables in this report, training loads for the years prior to and including FY 1994 data are actual, FY 1995 and subsequent year data are estimates.

Table III-1 above does not include Army One-Station Unit Training loads.

Recruit Training

The following table displays the average Recruit Training loads for each year from FY 1994 to FY 1997 and, for FY 1996 and FY 1997, the number of entrants (input) and number of graduates (output). Data are shown separately for each component of each Service.

TABLE III-2. Recruit Training Input, Output, and Load

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	5,583	6,366	49,197	45,205	7,463	58,203	52,955	8,805
Reserve	2,094	2,656	16,467	15,381	2,549	18,135	16,541	2,774
Natl Guard	1,970	2,557	16,642	15,617	2,581	15,110	14,413	2,361
Navy								
Active	9,025	8,503	53,674	48,843	9,128	53,770	48,931	9,145
Reserve	415	202	2,976	2,708	506	2,208	2,009	375
Marine Corps								
Active	5,965	7,695	35,436	32,630	8,284	36,932	31,343	8,271
Reserve	1,113	1,001	6,090	5,314	1,124	6,380	5,564	1,178
Air Force								
Active	3,409	3,628	31,000	28,520	3,571	36,000	32,940	4,136
Reserve	88	231	2,001	1,853	231	2,001	1,853	231
Natl Guard	263	345	3,000	2,758	345	3,000	2,758	345
DoD								
Active	23,982	26,192	169,307	155,198	28,446	184,905	166,169	30,357
Res/Gd Tot	5,943	6,992	47,176	43,631	7,336	46,834	43,138	7,264
Total	29,925	33,184	216,483	198,829	35,782	231,739	209,307	37,621

The Services' training syllabi are essentially the same for men and women, but women generally receive less training in combat-oriented skills.

Rationale for Recruit Training

The underlying philosophy of Recruit Training is that the demands of military service are fundamentally different from those of civilian life. Military service requires a high level of discipline and physical fitness, a homogeneous outlook, and an ability to live and work as part of a highly structured organization. There are few parallels in civilian society to the demands of military service. Each recruit, therefore, must be transformed into a member of the military team in order to function effectively in the military environment. The attitudes, habits, and basic skills formed in Recruit Training are the foundation of a cohesive military organization. Later training provides the skills and knowledge needed for specific jobs; Recruit Training shapes civilian entrants into dedicated members of their Military Services with the potential for further development.

The major determinants of Recruit Training loads are the total number of people entering service who must receive Recruit Training (input), the length of the training course, and projected patterns of attrition. Course length and attrition are discussed later in this chapter. The following two sections discuss inputs: (1) inputs of active duty personnel, and (2) inputs of members of the Reserve Components on active duty for initial training.

Active Duty Input

The annual recruiting objective for active duty enlistees without prior military service is a function of the following factors:

1. Current trained enlisted strengths.
2. Number of enlisted personnel currently in training.
3. Projected enlisted losses through separations or other reasons, e.g., desertion, death, acceptance of a commission, retirement, etc.
4. Projected prior-service enlistments, i.e., the return from civilian life of former Service members.
5. The projected requirement for trained enlisted personnel.

"Trained strength" is the number of personnel required to fill "structure" spaces, i.e., positions in military organizations that require specific grades and skills, and individual "pipeline" spaces, such as transients en route between assignments. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report contains a full discussion of how military manpower requirements are determined. The projected trained strength requirement is compared with the projected trained strength inventory to forecast future skill and strength imbalances. Future shortages that are not expected to be satisfied, either by prior service enlistees or Service members currently in skill training courses, determine the training output needed to man the force with trained personnel. To determine the necessary input to achieve this output, allowance must be made for the number of students entering a course of instruction who fail to complete it. The total input requirement is increased to compensate for expected attrition losses.

Training organizations attempt to manage inputs to achieve the most efficient use of training staff personnel and training facilities. However, the phasing of inputs may at times be varied in order to take advantage of the best recruiting periods for maintaining quality and quantity.

Historically, the highest accessions occur in June through September and in January, a reflection of the civilian academic calendar. Enlistments increase (1) shortly after high school graduation, (2) when peers return to school in the fall, and (3) after the results of the first term of college academic work are announced.

The Services must be able to accept most prospective enlistees when they are ready to enter service. Requiring enlistees to enter military service in phase with requirements and on an even flow-basis would result in the loss of many potential enlistees to other sources of employment. Accepting enlistees as they become available, however, requires a training structure capable of accommodating surges of enlistments.

Reserve Component Input

Persons enlisting in the National Guard and Reserve forces without active duty experience require the same Recruit Training as active duty enlistees, and for the same reasons. Recruit Training loads for the Reserve Components are based on the same factors as active force loads. Guard and Reserve trainees, while in Recruit Training, are mingled with active duty trainees in units so that their training is identical.

Reserve Component recruits form a significant part of the workload of the active Recruit Training establishment. Recruit Training for the Reserve and Guard will account for 21 percent of all DoD Recruit Training in FY 1996 and 19 percent in FY 1997. Reserve Component training accounts for 32 percent of all Army One-Station Unit Training programmed in the Department of Defense for FY 1996 and 30 percent in FY 1997.

Planning considerations for Reserve Component personnel are essentially similar to those for the active force. Detailed phasing of this training is complicated, however, by the additional consideration of civilian employment or school commitments for these personnel. For this reason, a pool of personnel who have enlisted but who have not yet attended initial training is normal. This backlog is kept within a reasonable size.

Course Length and Course Content

Enlisted training loads depend not only upon the numbers of entrants but also on the extent of skills required of entering enlisted personnel. Enlisted personnel attain those skills in Recruit Training and in Specialized Skill Training. Recruit Training course lengths are determined in part by how much of the required training is to be provided during the Recruit Training phase and how much is to be deferred to later training. Because of differences in their missions, the Services take somewhat different approaches in establishing the content and length of their Recruit Training courses.

Recruit Training in each of the Services covers four areas: (1) some in-processing and testing; (2) introduction into Service life; (3) instruction in military courtesy, discipline, and hygiene; and (4) fundamental military-related training involving physical fitness, military drill, and self-defense. In addition, each Service provides training in military skills that should be possessed by most members of that Service. The degree to which these Service-wide skills exist differs among the Services. This factor accounts for most of the differences in course content and, therefore, course length.

Length of the standard Recruit Training course in each Service is shown in the following table.

**TABLE III-3. Recruit Training Course Length
(Weeks)**

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY96	7.9	9.3	11.0	6.3
FY97	7.9	9.3	11.0	6.3

NOTE: Chart reflects average weeks of training. Actual course time may vary by a few days depending upon service requirements and training location.

Army and Marine Corps Recruit Training differ from the Air Force and Navy programs because all recruits are given intensive physical conditioning and instruction in basic ground combat skills, including the use of individual weapons. The Army and Marine Corps train all enlisted personnel to achieve a basic level of qualification in ground combat skills during their Recruit Training program.

The Air Force is able to accomplish Recruit Training in just over six weeks because the curriculum concentrates on military indoctrination subjects. Relatively little training in Service-wide occupational skills is provided, since there are few common occupational skills needed by all Air Force enlisted personnel. In addition to indoctrinating recruits to military life, the Navy course includes phases designed to prepare them for conditions in a fleet environment and common duties found on board ships.

The average length of time spent in recruit status in any of the Services may be longer than the standard course lengths discussed above. Some recruits fall behind their peers due to medical problems. Others require remedial training. A recruit may be sent to a special training unit or recycled to a following class to repeat a portion of the course.

Enlisted members of the Reserve Components without prior service receive the same basic qualification training as active service members. Each non-prior service enlistee in the Reserve Components undergoes, as a minimum, the equivalent of twelve weeks of active duty training. This is accomplished by sending the enlistee through Recruit Training and, in most cases, on to Initial Skill Training. Many Army Guardsmen and Reservists are provided initial military training in certain occupational skills through One-Station Unit Training.

A split training option is available to the members of the Reserve Components. This program normally separates Recruit Training from Specialized Skill Training. This option is limited to enlisted entrants who cannot attend all their required training in one block due to educational or occupational commitments. The Reserve member attends unit drills after completing Recruit Training and normally returns to active duty within one year to complete Initial Skill Training.

Attrition in Recruit Training

A final factor in the computation of loads is the projection of the rate and timing of attrition. Recruits may fail to complete training for medical reasons, inability to absorb the instruction, lack of motivation, disciplinary problems, or a variety of administrative causes, such as discharge for fraudulent enlistment or family hardship.

The table below shows projected attrition losses.

TABLE III-4. Recruit Training Attrition Projections
(Active and Reserve Combined)

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY96	8.4%	13.0%	14.0%	8.5%
FY97	7.6%	13.0%	14.0%	8.5%

The timing of attrition varies from situation to situation. In the case of slow learners or individuals who have difficulty in adjusting to military life, trainees usually are reentered or given special instruction. Those who do not respond adequately may not become attrition losses until late in the course.

Army One-Station Unit Training

The Army's One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) program combines Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training for certain skills into a single continuous course. Consequently, this report treats OSUT separately rather than arbitrarily breaking it into two segments.

OSUT loads for FY 1991 through FY 1997 are shown in the following tables.

TABLE III-5. OSUT Training Load

Service Component	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Army							
Active	6,401	4,939	5,640	5,575	6,375	6,536	7,378
Reserve	1,184	1,117	897	575	791	915	963
Natl Guard	2,873	2,340	2,058	1,874	1,797	2,125	2,218
Total	10,458	8,396	8,595	8,024	8,963	9,576	10,559

TABLE III-6. OSUT Training Input, Output, and Load

Service Component	FY96			FY97		
	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army						
Active	25,524	22,033	6,536	28,588	25,098	7,378
Reserve	4,113	3,572	915	4,132	3,895	963
Natl Guard	10,512	9,149	2,125	10,471	9,823	2,218
Total	40,149	34,754	9,576	43,191	38,816	10,559

Approximately 43 percent of Army Active and Reserve Component entrants are trained under OSUT.

In FY 1996 and FY 1997 there will be 56 different OSUT courses for five major skill areas described in Table III-7. In general, OSUT requires less training time than the separate Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training courses that it replaces. Table III-7 shows training time for OSUT occupational skill areas.

TABLE III-7. OSUT Training Time
(Weeks)

Skill Area	Training Time
Infantry a/	12.3
Artillery	15.2
Armor	14.0
Engineer	13.0
Military Police	16.0

a/ Fighting Vehicle Infantryman soldiers require an additional 2 weeks of training (not included in above) for heavy vehicle track qualifications.

The time required to complete Recruit Training and the Initial Skill Training in separate courses for these skills would be about 4 weeks longer, including the time required to move the trainee from one training organization to another. The shorter OSUT course lengths provide a significant saving in trainee man-years and, consequently, in trainee pay, allowances, and support costs.

IV

OFFICER ACQUISITION TRAINING

General Description

Officer Acquisition Training consists of training and education programs leading to a commission in one of the Military Services. These programs fulfill the need both for junior officer entrants into the career force and for non-career junior officers in the force structure. Officer Acquisition Training programs produce officers for both the active forces and the Reserve Components.

ROTC and Health Professions Acquisition Programs

The total training loads in Table IV-2 on the following page do not include two types of Officer Acquisition Training: the Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) programs and the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship program. Students who make up the training loads discussed in this report are either members of the active forces or members of the Reserve Components being trained on active duty by the active establishments. ROTC and Health Professions Scholarship students are not in active military status, but features of the programs are discussed in this chapter to provide a complete account of Officer Acquisition Training. The following table shows the number of participants in these programs in the period FY 1993 through FY 1996.

TABLE IV-1. Average Enrollees, Senior ROTC

	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96
Service				
Army	37,375	39,175	42,889	42,378
Navy	5,800	6,163	6,163	6,163
Air Force	10,593	10,454	11,049	11,808
Total	53,768	55,792	60,101	60,349

TABLE IV-2. Total Officer Acquisition Training Load

Service		FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Component								
Army								
Active		5,053	5,005	4,877	5,593	4,999	4,870	4,882
Reserve		1,272	1,273	551	112	1,269	1,357	1,170
Natl Guard		90	60	45	34	86	73	74
Navy								
Active		6,222	6,192	5,839	5,839	5,807	5,682	5,646
Reserve		15	16	15	15	16	16	15
Marine Corps								
Active		404	425	509	504	537	523	523
Reserve		113	169	112	140	144	145	169
Air Force								
Active		6,148	4,629	4,579	4,485	4,497	4,460	4,562
Reserve		15	1,259	1,433	1,654	1,560	1,563	1,563
Natl Guard		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total								
Active		17,827	16,251	15,804	16,421	15,840	15,535	15,613
Res/Gd		1,505	2,777	2,156	1,955	3,075	3,154	2,991
Total		19,332	19,028	17,960	18,376	18,915	18,689	18,604

Officer Requirements and Structuring the Officer Acquisition Program

Requirements for new officers, like requirements for new enlisted personnel, are a product of the need for officers in the projected force as compared to the projected future inventory of officers. Properly functioning programs fill the gross requirements for officer entrants for any given year and provide an even flow of sufficient new officers to each Service to avoid the emergence of unmanageable shortages and overages by age and grade in the future. Each of the Services uses a mix of sources for new officers.

Officer Acquisition Training may be divided into six separate programs:

- Service Academies
- ROTC
- Officer Candidate Schools
- Off-Campus Commissioning Programs
- Other Enlisted Commissioning Programs
- Health Professions Acquisition Programs

Each of these programs have different characteristics. The Service Academies and ROTC programs, for example, provide a stable input of officers, but require long lead-times before changes in output can be made. Officer candidate programs, on the other hand, can quickly respond to increased or decreased requirements for officers. The Services exploit these differences in planning and executing their officer procurement programs. In addition to these practical considerations, having a variety of officer commissioning sources opens officership opportunities to a wider segment of the population.

Service Academies

The mission of each of the Service Academies (United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Air Force Academy) is to meet a portion of the long-range requirement for career military officers. They provide instruction and experience to cadets or midshipmen so that they graduate with the knowledge and character essential to leadership and with the motivation to become career officers. Cadets and midshipmen receive a rigorous four-year undergraduate college education that includes a technically oriented core curriculum regardless of major. Successful completion of the specified academic, leadership and military requirements entitles the graduate to a Bachelor of Science degree and a Regular commission in one of the Military Services. Up to one-sixth of each year's Naval Academy graduates may be commissioned in the Marine Corps.

The Service Academies are distinctive in that their curricula are specifically designed to prepare young men and women for duty as professional officers. The total curriculum at each Academy is designed to develop the qualities of character, intellect, and physical competence needed by the officer who may, in the course of a full career, be called upon to perform duties ranging from leading a small combat unit to advising the highest government councils. The curricula, which include the sciences, the humanities, and military and physical training, form the basis for further professional development or, when required, graduate education.

The enrollment of each of the Service Academies is established by law. This fact establishes stable training loads for the Academies. Training load data for the Service Academies are shown in Table IV-3.

TABLE IV-3. Training Input, Output and Load, Service Academies

	FY94	FY95		FY96			FY97	
	Load	Load	Input	Grads	Load	Input	Grads	Load
Service								
Army	4,203	4,140	3,945	3,944	4,031	3,896	3,892	3,982
Navy	4,087	4,025	1,172	970	3,946	1,171	933	3,904
Air Force	4,081	3,980	1,249	911	3,960	1,120	800	3,960
Total	12,371	12,145	6,366	5,825	11,937	6,187	5,625	11,846

Each of the Military Departments sponsors an Academy preparatory school. Marine Corps and Coast Guard personnel attend the Navy school. The mission of these schools is to provide approximately one year of intensive instruction and guidance to selected enlisted personnel in preparation for entry to the Service Academies. Students compete for nominations by the Secretaries of the Military Departments and from other sources. The Naval Academy Preparatory School also provides instruction to candidates for the Marine Corps Enlisted Commissioning Education Program during the summer months. Training load data for the Academy preparatory schools is shown in Table IV-4.

TABLE IV-4. Training Input, Output, and Load, Academy Preparatory Schools

	FY94	FY95		FY96			FY97	
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Service								
Army	204	258	300	300	258	300	300	258
Navy	140	163	250	200	163	250	200	163
Marine Corps	2	3	5	3	3	5	3	3
Air Force	198	198	220	176	198	220	176	198
Total	544	622	775	679	622	775	679	622

ROTC Programs

ROTC is a long lead-time program that is the single largest source of officers for the Armed Forces. Like the Service Academies, ROTC is used to provide a relatively constant input of officers for active duty. The program is currently conducted at over five hundred civilian colleges and universities throughout the nation. The Army, Navy, and Air Force each sponsor an ROTC program. Up to one-sixth of the Navy ROTC graduates may be commissioned into the Marine Corps. In addition to conventional

recruiting and advertising methods, scholarships and subsistence allowances are used to attract qualified students. Scholarships are awarded to young men and women who exhibit potential ability as officers and have interests in fields of projected Service needs.

There are both scholarship and non-scholarship, as well as two-year and four-year, ROTC programs. The curriculum of each program is tailored to the needs of the individual Services. For example, the Navy teaches the basics of ship navigation, while the Army teaches the fundamentals of ground combat and the Air Force provides basic instruction in aerospace history and doctrine. Each of the programs includes instruction in leadership, military customs and military history, and each program provides prospective officers with a gradual transition from the civilian environment to the military environment. Each ROTC program consists of a series of regularly scheduled academic classes throughout the school year combined with mandatory summer camps or cruises that are designed to give the student realistic military experience and a first-hand view of military life.

The ROTC scholarship continues to be an important incentive to attract exceptionally qualified individuals to ROTC. The rising cost of education makes the scholarship even more attractive. The Navy will fund an average of 4,580 scholarships in FY 1996, the Army 10,753 and the Air Force 5,619.

Reduced force structure requires fewer officers and the ROTC Program is being downsized accordingly. The Army now has 317 host institutions and the Air Force has 143. The Navy, however, has expanded from 53 to 57 host institutions.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the ROTC program is not included in Service training loads because the students are not in an active military status. The following table shows the three Service ROTC programs for FY 1996 and FY 1997.

TABLE IV-5. Senior ROTC Programs

	Beginning Enrollments	Graduates	Average Enrollments	Average Number of Scholarship Enrollees
FY96				
Army	44,675	4,200	42,889	10,753
Navy	5,925	1,204	6,163	4,580
Air Force	11,734	1,500	11,049	5,619
Total	62,334	6,904	60,101	20,952
FY97				
Army	44,271	4,200	42,378	11,099
Navy	5,925	1,204	6,163	4,580
Air Force	12,580	1,800	11,808	5,833
Total	62,776	7,204	60,349	21,512

Off-Campus Commissioning Programs

The only Officer Acquisition Training program off the college campus is the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class (PLC). This program provides for enlistment as a Marine Corps Reservist while the student is still an undergraduate. All PLC training takes place in the summer. For freshmen and sophomores, PLC consists of two six-week training sessions at the Marine Corps Officer Candidate School in Quantico, Virginia. Juniors attend one ten-week session.

Students participating in this program attend either one or two summer training sessions, depending upon when during their college career they were enrolled. The objective of the program is to indoctrinate, motivate and train the enrollees by providing instruction in basic military subjects, leadership and physical conditioning. PLC students are commissioned when their college degrees are conferred. Newly commissioned Marine Corps officers then attend The Basic School at Quantico, Virginia.

The training loads in Table IV-6 are based only on the time spent in summer training.

**TABLE IV-6. Training Input, Output and Load
Off-Campus Commissioning Programs**

Service Component	FY94 Load	FY95 Load	FY96 Input	FY96 Output	FY96 Load	FY97 Input	FY97 Output	FY97 Load
Marine Corps Reserve	140	144	1,300	1,090	145	1,506	1,191	169

Officer Candidate Schools (OCS)

Each of the Military Services operates an Officer Candidate School. The Air Force school is entitled Officer Training School (OTS).

Enlisted members can use this route to "rise from the ranks." The existence of OCS and the other enlisted commissioning programs covered in the next section is a significant advancement incentive to ambitious and promising enlisted personnel.

The four Services offer direct entry into OCS to selected college graduates without previous enlisted service. Some college students in highly specialized academic disciplines, such as engineering and physical sciences, cannot afford the time required to participate in ROTC. The OCS program commissions well-qualified college students who desire to become officers after graduation.

The following tables show length and load data for Officer Candidate Schools.

**TABLE IV-7. Course Length in Weeks
Officer Candidate School**

Army OCS	Navy OCS	Marine Corps OCS	Air Force OTS
6	16	10	14

TABLE IV-8. Training Input, Output, and Load, Officer Candidate Schools

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96			FY97		
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	228	285	1,577	1,453	230	1,567	1,475	230
Reserve	2	34	830	818	44	830	818	44
Natl Guard	18	42	366	350	45	366	354	45
Navy								
Active	105	143	366	329	87	391	352	93
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps								
Active	54	86	435	336	72	435	336	72
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force								
Active	185	227	842	715	210	1,248	1,060	312
Reserve	9	21	96	82	24	96	82	24
Natl Guard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DoD								
Active	572	741	3,220	2,833	599	3,641	3,223	707
Res/Gd Tot	29	97	1,292	1,250	113	1,292	1,254	113
Total	601	838	4,512	4,083	712	4,933	4,477	820

Other Enlisted Commissioning Programs

The Services each have enlisted commissioning programs in addition to Officer Candidate Schools. The purposes of these programs are: (1) to provide a source of officers in specific skills with an expected high rate of retention; (2) to provide an avenue whereby enlisted personnel with proven qualifications can augment the commissioned ranks; and (3) to provide a measure of motivation to enlisted personnel. The Navy's Enlisted Commissioning Programs now number five. A similar program, the Marine Enlisted Commissioning Education Program, has been expanded to offer degrees in technical and liberal arts academic disciplines. Students in the USAF Airman Education and Commissioning Program (AECM) major in engineering and computer science, physical science, or selected health care professions, with matriculation up to three years. The average academic time spent in the program is about 30 months. In the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force, participants attend the Officer Candidate School of their Service before they are commissioned. Like OCS/OTS, these education programs carry an active duty service requirement. In FY 1988 the Army began reporting the warrant officer certification program in this category. While the other Services' participants are all on active duty, the Army's program also includes members of the Reserve and National Guard.

During FY 1986 the Navy instituted the Officer Sea and Air Mariner (OSAM) Program that provides officer accessions directly into the Naval Reserve. The program covers all phases of training from Officer Candidate School to specific training in a designated warfare specialty. Training is completed after approximately two years and individuals are released from active duty to complete a four-year drilling obligation with the Selected Reserve.

The following table displays load data for these programs. All participants are members of the active forces.

**TABLE IV-9. Training Input, Output, and Load
Other Enlisted Commissioning Programs**

Service	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army	183	240	1,424	1,254	221	1,416	1,354	232
Navy	1,522	1,492	999	892	1,502	1,003	896	1,501
Marine Corps	448	448	155	140	448	155	140	448
Air Force	21	92	35	35	92	35	35	92
Total	2,174	2,272	2,613	2,321	2,263	2,609	2,425	2,273

Health Professions Acquisition Programs

This subcategory may be conveniently divided into two parts, the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program and the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Program.

The Health Professions Scholarship Program was established in 1972 by Public Law 92-426. Participants are selected from among students or those accepted for enrollment in recognized health professions schools. Participants are commissioned in grade O-1 in the Reserve of their parent Service, but except for a short period of annual active duty, are not in active status. They are, therefore, not included in the training loads of their Services. Upon graduation, participants must serve obligated tours of duty, the length of which depends on the length of their participation in the program.

Service data for FY 1996 and FY 1997 are shown in Table IV-10.

TABLE IV-10. Health Professions Acquisition Program, Scholarships Awarded, and Graduates.

<u>Service</u>	<u>Scholarships</u>	<u>Graduates</u>
FY96		
Army	1,253	326
Navy	1,350	421
Air Force	1,260	328
Total	3,863	1,075
FY97		
Army	1,273	325
Navy	1,350	421
Air Force	1,260	328
Total	3,883	1,074

SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING

General Description

Specialized Skill Training provides officer and enlisted personnel with skills and knowledge needed to perform specific jobs. Each Service has established a job structure that makes it possible to carry out assigned missions. Each Service's mission is supported by an established job structure and each position within that job structure has been analyzed to determine the skill it requires. Specialized Skill Training provides these required skills to the proper number of individuals in a phased manner so that each vacancy in the structure can be filled promptly with a qualified replacement.

Specialized Skill Training, as used in this report, is defined as:

Initial, progression and functional training for both officer and enlisted personnel. Specialized Skill Training includes such programs as Army Advanced Individual Training, Navy Apprenticeship Training and Marine Combat Training. This training category also includes aviation-related ground training and initial enlisted leadership training other than that carried in Professional Development Education.

Army One-Station Unit Training (OSUT) provides Army personnel with job-related training in a number of skills. However, since OSUT is conducted as one course that combines Recruit and Specialized Skill Training, it is treated separately in this report (see Chapter III). OSUT loads are not included in the Specialized Skill Training loads in this chapter.

Specialized Skill Training loads for Active personnel will increase 683, or 1 percent, between FY 1995 and FY 1996 and increase 4,646, or 6 percent, between FY 1996 and FY 1997. Reserve Components training loads will basically remain constant. They will decrease about 0.1 percent from FY 1995 to FY 1996 and will increase about 0.03 percent from FY 1996 to FY 1997. Reserve and Guard officers and enlisted personnel beyond the initial entry stage are also trained by the Active establishment. DoD wide, the requirement to improve the technical skills of career personnel to keep pace with new equipment acquisition and modifications to the existing inventory will continue into the foreseeable future. This is reflected in the estimated Specialized Skill Training load.

Specialized Skill Training loads for FY 1991 through FY 1997 are as shown in Table V-1.

TABLE V-1. Specialized Skill Training Load

Service Component	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Army a/							
Active	32,103	31,697	30,424	28,250	30,251	30,288	32,286
Reserve	6,036	5,070	4,961	4,409	5,998	5,712	5,761
Natl Guard	6,309	5,485	4,540	4,731	5,803	5,691	5,692
Navy							
Active	36,763	31,721	28,391	25,353	24,202	24,949	24,920
Reserve	1,213	1,058	676	757	693	644	638
Marine Corps							
Active	9,046	8,138	8,004	9,702	11,505	11,434	12,494
Reserve	1,145	1,245	1,052	1,061	1,539	2,228	2,261
Air Force							
Active	10,833	11,144	11,376	10,245	12,834	12,804	14,421
Reserve	537	1,110	1,181	884	1,620	1,511	1,496
Natl Guard	1,470	2,152	1,680	1,802	2,762	2,613	2,557
Total							
Active	88,745	82,700	78,195	73,550	78,792	79,475	84,121
Res/Gd	16,710	16,120	14,090	13,644	18,415	18,399	18,405
Total	105,455	98,820	92,285	87,194	97,207	97,874	102,526

a/ Army One-Station Unit Training load is not included.

As in the other types of training covered in this report, the demand placed on the training establishment for individuals is determined by comparing projected requirements for each skill area and skill level with the projected future inventory of trained service members.

When anticipated losses are deducted from the current inventory, shortages in various skill areas are revealed. These shortages, except for those that can be satisfied through on-the-job training, or, in a few cases, through lateral entry of individuals who already possess needed job skills from civilian life, create a demand for a phased output of trained replacement personnel. Also, estimates are made of the proportion of students in each training course who will fail to complete the course. These course

attrition factors determine the inputs necessary to achieve the desired course outputs. Inputs, outputs, attrition patterns, and course lengths determine the training loads. These factors are discussed for each sub-category of Specialized Skill Training in the remainder of this chapter.

One of the challenges facing the Reserve Components is matching an individual's occupational specialty to a specific billet. A majority of the specialties or ratings require formal school training prior to designation. Since limited availability for active duty prevents members of the Selected Reserve from attending many formal schools, initial skill training programs are being developed to train prior-service Reservists in selected occupational specialties using combinations of two-week formal schools, on-the-job training, correspondence courses, mobile training teams and civilian vocational technical courses.

Specialized Skill Training is the most diverse of the major categories of individual training. In the interest of clarity, the full category has been divided into five sub-categories. Two are concerned with initial skill training, one for officers, the other for enlisted personnel. Two others cover more advanced training, again divided by officer and enlisted. The last category covers both officer and enlisted training that conveys required knowledge or skills without changing the student's primary skill or skill level.

Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)

Initial Skill Training (Enlisted) includes all formal training normally given immediately after Recruit Training and leading toward the award of a military occupational specialty or rating at the lowest skill level. Successful completion of the training qualifies the enlisted member to take a position in the job structure of the Service and to progress to the journeyman level through job experience. Army One-Station Unit Training satisfies this same purpose but, because it combines skill training with recruit training in a single course, it is treated separately in this report.

The great majority of Service recruits are drawn from the least skilled segment of the population. Most recruits are under age 21 and have little civilian job experience. In addition, some civilian specialties are not in demand in the military job structure, and many of the most important military skills have no civilian counterpart. Consequently, only a small number of people enter the Service with a skill that can be used with little or no additional training. Enlistees must be trained in a technical skill before they can become productive. Some skills can be acquired through experience and on-the-job training. The vast majority, however, are most effectively and efficiently learned through formal courses. In some situations -- for example, on board ship or in remote locations -- the opportunity for on-the-job training is limited.

Load data for Initial Skill Training (Enlisted) are displayed in Table V-2. The classification of this training is determined by its purpose, rather than by whether entrants attend immediately after Recruit Training. Thus, some prior-service students and cross-trainees from other skill areas are reflected in these data.

**TABLE V-2. Training Input, Output, and Load
Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96			FY97		
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	10,014	10,793	55,508	52,250	12,070	61,054	57,381	13,160
Reserve	2,659	3,906	19,713	19,276	3,679	20,234	19,479	3,774
Natl Guard	2,781	3,776	18,971	18,439	3,827	19,325	18,902	3,889
Navy								
Active	11,137	10,030	82,933	81,199	10,837	82,848	81,178	10,837
Reserve	472	367	3,163	2,915	397	3,161	2,914	397
Marine Corps								
Active	5,037	6,029	36,807	36,098	5,943	36,192	35,373	6,444
Reserve	664	891	10,278	10,108	1,514	10,280	10,109	1,515
Air Force								
Active	7,252	9,082	35,269	34,425	9,109	41,944	41,034	10,703
Reserve	699	1,283	5,433	4,555	1,195	5,380	4,511	1,183
Natl Guard	1,360	2,139	8,905	7,871	2,011	8,729	7,717	1,972
DoD								
Active	33,440	35,934	210,517	203,972	37,959	222,038	214,966	41,144
Res/Gd Tot	8,635	12,362	66,463	63,164	12,623	67,109	63,632	12,730
Total	42,075	48,296	276,980	267,136	50,582	289,147	278,598	53,874

New mission requirements and technological change have resulted in consolidating or splitting skill areas and extensive modification of existing training programs. For instance, the introduction of word processors and microcomputers into Air Force personnel, administration and resource management offices has increased the percentage of new accessions requiring formal training for these skills.

Reserve trainees graduating from Recruit Training proceed to Initial Skill Training in their occupational specialty. This may consist of a course in a Service school or Advanced Individual Training at an Army training center. If a course in the proper skill is not available, the trainee may be assigned to on-the-job training in an active duty unit for training status. The actual length of active duty training, in comparison with the statutory twelve weeks minimum, varies from twelve weeks to twelve months, depending on the occupational specialties involved. To accommodate the Reserve Component member, a split-training program allows completion of initial entry training in two training segments in a two-year period.

The variety of skills required in the four Services dictates a large number of courses for enlisted personnel in Initial Skill Training, as shown in the following table.

**TABLE V-3. Number of Courses,
Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)**

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY96	250	207	209	234

Course lengths vary widely based on the complexity of the subject matter. For example, the Air Force course for cytotechnology specialists is 52 weeks long; but the course for packing specialist is only three weeks long. Table V-4 shows the average course lengths for the Services' Enlisted Initial Skill Training.

**TABLE V-4. Average Course Length,
Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)
(Academic Days in Training)**

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY96	52	49	87	52

Initial Skill courses include general skills, intelligence, cryptography and health service training. Some of these courses (for example, nuclear reactor specialist or electronics technician) are highly technical. Others involve less complex skills -- cook, clerk-typist, and vehicle driver. A sampling of high-volume courses is shown in the Table V-5.

**TABLE V-5. Initial Skill Training Courses
with High Student Flow**

FY96	Student Input	Course Length (Weeks)
Army /a		
Medical Specialist	7,904	10.0
Food Service Specialist	4,836	8.0
Motor Transport Operator	4,190	5.0
Automated Logistics Specialist	4,122	11.0
Light Wheeled Vehicle Mechanic	3,840	10.0
Unit Supply Specialist	3,799	6.0
Petroleum Supply Specialist	3,749	9.0
Administrative Specialist	3,555	5.0
Signal Support Systems Specialist	2,907	17.0
Multi-Channel Transmission Sys O&M	1,598	13.0
Navy		
Apprentice Training	23,480	2.7
Engineering Common Core	8,096	2.7
Hospital Corpsman, Basic	4,063	14.0
Basic Enlisted Submarine	2,430	4.7
Avionics Technician Class A	2,275	27.7
Nuclear Fld C 1 A Sch Machinist Mat	1,928	13.3
Mess Management Specialist Class A	1,831	6.7
Engineering Mechanical Core	1,693	3.4
Builders Class A	1,612	12.7
Aviation Machinist Mate Class A	1,536	7.4
Marine Corps		
Marine Combat Training (MCT)	8,134	3.4
Basic Infantryman	7,650	3.4
Rifleman	5,448	5.0
Motor Vehicle Operator	2,723	6.0
Field Radio Operator (FROC)	2,329	7.9
Basic Electronics (BEC)	1,447	11.0
Automotive Organizational Maint.	1,312	12.4
Air Force		
Ground Combat (Security)	2,002	4.6
Law Enforcement Apprentice	1,802	6.4
Ground Combat LE	1,724	4.6
Security Apprentice (M60)	1,268	6.6
Comm Comp Sys Opr Apr	987	14.0
Mecidal Service Apprentice	924	13.4
Security Apprentice	919	6.6
Supply Management Apprentice	850	3.0
IM Apprentice Course	722	4.6
Fire Protection Apprentice	658	13.6

a/ Army student input and course length is for Skill Progression Training

The final determinant of training loads is the anticipated rate of attrition. Attrition rates must be estimated for each course. A routine course may have low attrition while attrition may run high in complex technical courses. Unlike Recruit Training, students who fail Initial Skill Training are not discharged but re-trained in other, less difficult skills. The average anticipated attrition rates are shown below.

**TABLE V-6. Average Attrition Rates,
Initial Skill Training (Enlisted)**

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY96	4.5%	3.0%	4.2%	6.2%
FY97	4.3%	3.0%	4.2%	6.2%

Skill Progression Training (Enlisted)

This sub-category covers skill training received by enlisted personnel after Initial Skill Training. Through this training the student gains the knowledge to perform at higher skill levels or in a supervisory position. Skill Progression Training is most frequently given after Service members have gained experience through actual work in their specialty. In some cases, however, training in a relatively narrow subject area as an immediate follow-on to Initial Skill Training is included in Skill Progression Training.

Training load data for Skill Progression Training (Enlisted) are shown in Table V-7.

**TABLE V-7. Training Input, Output, and Load
Skill Progression Training (Enlisted)**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	8,331	8,320	48,517	46,412	7,226	60,169	54,788	8,082
Reserve	285	800	3,447	3,494	860	3,423	3,347	858
Natl Guard	433	614	3,113	3,086	613	3,154	3,017	610
Navy								
Active	8,151	7,379	57,934	57,601	7,510	57,422	57,117	7,455
Reserve	87	122	1,138	1,147	49	1,128	1,125	42
Marine Corps								
Active	1,637	2,365	15,628	15,538	2,308	18,000	17,909	2,871
Reserve	95	210	2,284	2,261	268	2,288	2,265	269
Air Force								
Active	1,710	2,127	26,507	26,767	2,067	27,147	27,413	2,119
Reserve	129	260	3,332	3,315	245	3,305	3,287	242
Natl Guard	277	472	5,859	5,804	445	5,753	5,699	437
DoD								
Active	19,829	20,191	148,586	146,318	19,111	162,738	157,227	20,527
Res/Gd Tot	1,306	2,478	19,173	19,107	2,480	19,051	18,740	2,458
Total	21,135	22,669	167,759	165,425	21,591	181,789	175,967	22,985

The requirement for Skill Progression Training arises from the fact that training in a skill at entry level and subsequent experience do not, in many cases, fully qualify service members to do the more advanced jobs in their field. Several factors may contribute, singly or in combination, to a need for additional formal training:

1. The introduction of new equipment.
2. The need to produce a higher degree of skill in a sub-specialty.
3. The need to impart a broader base of knowledge to qualify an individual for supervisory responsibility.
4. The requirement for refresher training to bring the Service member up to date on the latest information and techniques in a skill.

As in all other types of training, the primary need is to have trained individuals available to replace losses as they occur. Planning future training in this sub-category follows the same general pattern as for Initial Skill Training. Some additional complications,

however, are introduced by the fact that members eligible for schooling are frequently serving overseas or on board ship, rather than flowing from the Recruit Training pipeline. This situation requires that personnel receive the training when they are available, preferably between duty assignments, rather than when they might more easily be accommodated for formal school training. Reserve Component personnel have similar difficulties because of civilian employer commitments.

The following table displays course data for Skill Progression Training for each of the Services.

TABLE V-8. Courses, Course Length, and Projected Attrition, Skill Progression Training (Enlisted)

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
Number of Courses	477	2,143	441	378
Average Course Length (Academic Days)	41	45	57	18
Projected Attrition	3.6%	1.0%	1.1%	3.3%

The Air Force's average days in training is low compared to the other Services because of the heavy use of short courses. The large number of Navy courses is a reflection of the many Navy occupational subspecialties.

Initial Skill Training (Officer)

As a general rule, Officer Acquisition Training is oriented toward the broad educational background and general military training that is considered necessary for all officers entering a Service. Most newly commissioned officers require further training for the specific type of duty they will be performing in their first duty assignment. Initial Skill Training for officers is, therefore, analogous to Initial Skill Training for enlisted personnel. Both provide the job-oriented training which, added to military fundamentals learned earlier, prepares the individual for taking a place in the job structure.

Load data for Initial Skill Training (Officer) are displayed in Table V-9.

**TABLE V-9. Training Input, Output, and Load
Initial Skill Training (Officer)**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	1,859	2,216	7,168	7,158	2,021	7,203	7,022	2,017
Reserve	589	559	2,576	2,763	473	2,557	2,521	433
Natl Guard	450	522	1,692	1,851	446	1,660	1,650	408
Navy								
Active	768	724	4,080	4,070	788	4,080	4,070	788
Reserve	5	5	203	201	5	203	201	5
Marine Corps								
Active	724	901	2,721	2,711	902	2,700	2,690	899
Reserve	3	12	122	120	12	122	120	12
Air Force								
Active	729	1,079	4,539	4,527	1,081	4,462	4,450	1,062
Reserve	18	31	214	194	30	212	192	29
Natl Guard	78	99	528	516	100	521	509	98
DoD								
Active	4,080	4,920	18,508	18,466	4,792	18,445	18,232	4,766
Res/Gd Tot	1,143	1,228	5,335	5,645	1,066	5,275	5,193	985
Total	5,223	6,148	23,843	24,111	5,858	23,720	23,425	5,751

With minor exceptions, all newly commissioned Army officers attend officer basic courses at their branch schools -- Infantry officers at the Infantry School, Engineer officers at the Engineer School, and so forth. These courses average 12 weeks in length and officers attend before reporting to their first assigned unit. In addition, certain officers are selected to attend follow-on skill or functional training courses for more specialized assignments.

All submarine and nuclear officers and most Surface Navy officers go to Initial Skill Training. The Navy provides 32 courses for officers in Initial Skill Training, with an average course length of 65 days.

All newly commissioned Marine Corps officers attend a basic course for general orientation and training. In addition, most Marine Corps officers attend one of the 50 Initial Skill Training courses sponsored by the Corps. They may also participate in courses conducted by the Navy or other Services. Such courses average 107 days in length and are related to specific officer positions.

The Air Force conducts 36 Initial Skill Training courses for officers with an average length of 57 days. About 88 percent of newly commissioned officers attend these courses, some immediately after commissioning and others after spending some time at their first duty assignment.

Skill Progression Training (Officer)

Skill Progression Training for officers is, in general, aimed at officers with several years of practical experience and provides them knowledge needed to assume more advanced responsibilities. For example, the Army provides advanced courses that are structured to prepare the students for battalion and brigade staff duties in addition to command responsibilities at the company and battery level. Data for Skill Progression Training (Officer) are displayed in the following table.

**TABLE V-10. Training Input, Output, and Load
Skill Progression Training (Officer)**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96			FY97		
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	2,185	2,482	10,761	10,698	2,568	10,632	10,654	2,555
Reserve	607	270	3,854	3,914	211	3,835	3,848	215
Natl Guard	788	481	2,728	2,865	369	2,724	2,754	357
Navy								
Active	650	748	4,521	4,162	760	4,483	4,127	755
Reserve	83	72	420	420	72	418	418	72
Marine Corps								
Active	237	296	2,320	2,307	293	2,293	2,280	291
Reserve	3	10	235	231	11	236	232	11
Air Force								
Active	425	405	10,274	10,476	410	10,109	10,306	401
Reserve	32	35	679	676	34	675	672	34
Natl Guard	71	37	834	830	35	821	697	32
DoD								
Active	3,497	3,931	27,876	27,643	4,031	27,517	27,367	4,002
Res/Gd Tot	1,584	905	8,750	8,936	732	8,709	8,621	721
Total	5,081	4,836	36,626	36,579	4,763	36,226	35,988	4,723

The Army conducts 199 courses averaging 45 days in length. The Navy maintains 111 courses averaging 57 days in length. Navy courses cover a variety of specialized

duties that are typically performed by officers with several years of service; for example, aviation maintenance officer course and nuclear propulsion plant course.

Both the Marine Corps and the Air Force conduct broad courses for officers at about the same level as the Army's advanced courses; however, as these are Service-wide and uniform in content, they are carried in Professional Development Education in this report. Within Skill Progression Training, Marine Corps officers attend 208 courses, averaging 48 days in length. They also utilize the course offerings of the other Services. The Air Force has 177 courses, averaging 11 academic days each, which train officers in new duties required by their prospective assignments.

Attrition from the Skill Progression courses for officers is significantly lower than for enlisted or initial skill officer training. Attrition of less than one to two percent is typical of such courses.

The Air National Guard (ANG) also conducts specialized skill progression training in several aviation disciplines at ANG installations. Air Force facilities cannot be used for this training due to constrained training time available for the reservist, geographic dispersion of units, availability of training equipment and location of training areas.

Functional Training (Officer and Enlisted)

Functional Training is an "all other" sub-category covering those types of required training that do not fit neatly into the definitions of the other sub-categories. On the whole, Functional Training is in subject areas that cut across the scope of military occupational specialties and provides additional required skills without changing the student's primary specialty or skill level. Both officers and enlisted personnel participate in Functional Training. Load data for Functional Training are shown in Table V-11.

**TABLE V-11. Training Input, Output, and Load
Functional Training (Officer and Enlisted)**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	5,861	6,440	76,871	71,708	6,403	76,879	71,173	6,472
Reserve	269	463	9,442	8,445	489	9,381	8,372	481
Natl Guard	279	410	5,194	4,805	436	4,967	4,603	428
Navy								
Active	4,647	5,321	305,315	300,098	5,054	307,267	302,015	5,085
Reserve	110	127	14,419	14,302	121	14,512	14,394	122
Marine Corps								
Active	2,067	1,914	30,359	29,221	1,988	30,409	29,272	1,989
Reserve	296	416	6,996	6,734	423	7,480	7,198	454
Air Force								
Active	129	141	5,490	5,370	137	5,383	5,347	136
Reserve	6	11	278	276	7	288	287	8
Natl Guard	16	15	835	826	22	707	703	18
DoD								
Active	12,704	13,816	418,035	406,397	13,582	419,938	407,807	13,682
Res/Gd Tot	976	1,442	37,164	35,388	1,498	37,335	35,557	1,511
Total	13,680	15,258	455,199	441,785	15,080	457,273	443,364	15,193

Army Functional Training includes the airborne, ranger, and special forces qualification courses, many specialized NCO supervision courses, language training, and a number of courses related to specialized equipment, e.g., Satellite Communication Operation and Maintenance.

Navy Functional Training differs from that of the other Services because of the very high input to a large number of very short courses. Most of the training is conducted while the ship is in port and includes the following types of activity:

1. Shore training for shipboard teams (firefighting, damage control, anti-submarine warfare, and so forth).
2. Short basic or refresher courses at fleet training centers in the operation of equipment or systems (TOMAHAWK operations and maintenance, SH-60B system familiarization, and 50 cal. machine gun operations).
3. Shipboard in-port training assistance (combat systems, advanced acoustic analysis and command excellence seminar mobile training teams).

4. Pre-commissioning training for newly formed crews of ships under construction (damage control, Combat Information Center team training and radar navigation team training).

Marine Corps functional training provides skills necessary to perform a specific mission outside of the normal primary occupational specialty. Examples of functional training courses taught at Marine institutions are Marine Corps Security Guard, Scout-Sniper, Range Officer, Drill Instructor, and Cold Weather Survival.

Most Air Force Functional Training is survival training related to various environments: water, arctic, jungle, or tropic. These courses train air crews skills needed for long-term combat survival and survival in chemically, biologically, and radiologically contaminated environments.

The following table provides course data for Functional Training.

TABLE V-12. Courses, Course Length, Functional Training

	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
FY96 Number of Courses	1,597	1,790	90	8
Average Course Length (Training Days)	16	5	19	32
FY97 Number of Courses	1,729	1,790	90	8
Average Course Length	17	5	19	32

VI

FLIGHT TRAINING

General Description

Flight Training programs provide basic flying skills required prior to operational assignment of pilots, navigators, and naval flight officers. Most of the training in this category is undergraduate flight training. At the conclusion of this training, a graduate is awarded "wings" and is classified as a "designated" or "rated" officer. Flight Training includes programs for pilots of all Services, navigators in the Air Force, and naval flight officers in the Navy and Marine Corps. Pilot training may be in jet or propeller-driven fixed-wing aircraft, or in helicopters. Some related advanced flight training, such as Army instructor pilot training, is also included in Flight Training. Enlisted programs in aviation related subjects (for example, in air traffic control) and Air Force survival training are in Specialized Skill Training. Marine Corps enlisted navigator training is included in Flight Training.

Beginning in FY 1986, the Navy opened flight training to a limited number of reservists to fill critical billets as Naval Flight Officers. The students enter the pipeline on extended active duty and are trained at the Aviation Officers Candidate School (AOCS) with their active duty counterparts. After completing all formal specific aircraft training, they are released from active duty to receive their proficiency training with a Naval Air Reserve squadron. The proficiency or operational training is not included in the training loads of this report.

Generally, Reserve Component participation in Flight Training is relatively minor, since most aviator requirements in Reserve units are filled by experienced aviators who join after extended service in the active components.

Flight Training loads, by Service and component, for Fiscal Years 1991 through 1997 are shown in Table VI-1.

TABLE VI-1. Total Flight Training Load

Service							
Component	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Army							
Active	1,008	860	762	745	764	716	691
Reserve	71	64	61	47	48	41	31
Natl Guard	327	246	183	180	162	164	157
Navy							
Active	1,542	1,461	1,553	1,046	1,085	1,154	1,200
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps							
Active	504	545	495	548	493	490	488
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force							
Active	1,678	1,312	806	819	996	1,261	1,350
Reserve	52	61	33	25	78	71	71
Natl Guard	186	204	185	174	155	137	125
Total							
Active	4,732	4,178	3,616	3,158	3,338	3,621	3,729
Res/Gd	636	575	462	426	443	413	384
Total	5,368	4,753	4,078	3,584	3,781	4,034	4,113

For purposes of clarity, the following discussion of aviation training is divided into three sections -- Undergraduate Pilot Training, Navigator Training and All Other Flight Training.

Undergraduate Pilot Training

Undergraduate Pilot Training qualifies students to perform the flight duties and to assume the responsibilities of military pilots. Air Force courses include sufficient flying training to allow the student to attain proficiency in the general class of aircraft flown in future assignments. Flying training is augmented by flight-related ground training and simulator training. The Army uses a large number of warrant officer pilots. Enlisted entrants undergo warrant officer candidate training before entering flight phases of training and receive their warrants upon graduation from flight training. Some Army flight training students are already commissioned officers or warrant officers upon entry.

Training data for FY 1994 through FY 1997 are displayed in the following table.

**TABLE VI-2. Training Input, Output, and Load
Undergraduate Pilot Training**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96			FY97		
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	524	493	2,025	2,057	481	1,995	2,005	470
Reserve	22	38	138	149	34	108	109	26
Natl Guard	105	84	441	423	102	441	441	103
Navy								
Active	709	740	684	517	784	698	559	820
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps								
Active	467	453	374	316	450	372	307	448
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force								
Active	535	540	812	542	675	949	620	739
Reserve	19	60	19	47	48	78	41	46
Natl Guard	147	119	98	93	100	97	79	87
DoD								
Active	2,235	2,226	3,895	3,432	2,390	4,014	3,491	2,477
Res/Gd Tot	293	301	696	712	284	724	670	262
Total	2,528	2,527	4,591	4,144	2,674	4,738	4,161	2,739

Load data for each Service for undergraduate helicopter pilot training are shown in Table VI-3.

**TABLE VI-3. Training Input, Output, and Load
Undergraduate Helicopter Pilot Training**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96			FY97		
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	524	493	2,025	2,057	481	1,995	2,005	470
Reserve	22	38	138	149	34	108	109	26
Natl Guard	105	84	441	423	102	441	441	103
Navy								
Active	244	225	219	184	225	238	184	236
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marine Corps								
Active	224	224	209	181	224	209	176	224
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Air Force								
Active	0	11	50	50	23	40	40	14
Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Natl Guard	0	1	2	2	1	2	2	1
DoD								
Active	992	953	2,503	2,472	953	2,482	2,405	944
Res/Gd Tot	127	123	581	574	137	551	552	130
Total	1,119	1,076	3,084	3,046	1,090	3,033	2,957	1,074

The following table shows FY 1996 programmed course length and projected attrition rates for the Army undergraduate helicopter pilot training program.

**TABLE VI-4. Course Length and Attrition Rates, Army
Undergraduate Helicopter Pilot Training**

	Commissioned Officer Candidates	Warrant Officer Candidates
Course Length (Weeks)	43.3/45.3 *	6 *
Attrition Rate	1.3%	1.5%

*UHPT consists of dual track training in either the UH-1H or the OH-58 A/C. The OH-58 track is two weeks longer in duration.

The Army course is six weeks longer for warrant officer candidates than for commissioned officers since the course also serves as a warrant officer candidate school.

Navy Undergraduate Pilot Training begins with a common core of basic ground training and primary flight training and then diverges according to whether the student is to be qualified in jet aircraft, propeller aircraft or helicopters. The basic ground phase, or aviation pre-flight indoctrination, is six weeks in length for officer students and 14 weeks for aviation officer candidates. This phase also serves as an officer training period for the latter group.

The following table shows FY 1996 course length in weeks, attrition rates, and type of aircraft used for training for each phase of the syllabus.

Table VI-5. Course Phasing, Navy/Marine Corps Undergraduate Pilot Training

Course/Phase	Course Length	Attrition Rate		Type Aircraft
		Navy	USMC	
Commisioned Officer				
Aviation Pre-Flight Indoctrination	6.0	3.0%	1.9%	None
Primary Flight Training (Jet, Prop, Helo)	22.0	9.0%	8.9%	T-34C
Strike Training (Jet)				
Intermediate	22.8	5.0%	6.4%	T-2C
Advanced	24.8	5.0%	2.2%	TA-4J
T45TS Advanced	40.0	5.0%	5.0%	T45A
Maritime Training (Prop)				
Intermediate	5.2	1.0%	N/A	T-34C
Advanced	20.2	2.0%	N/A	T-44A
E-2/C-2 Training				
Intermediate	13.4	2.0%	2.0%	T-44A
Advanced	22.6	9.0%	12.0%	T-2C
Helicopter Training				
Intermediate	5.2	1.0%	2.4%	T-34C
Advanced	21.4	3.5%	2.3%	TH-57

Because of the task requirements which dictate variations in course content, the standard Undergraduate Pilot Training course is as short as 55 weeks for an officer student qualifying in helicopters or as long as 82 weeks for an aviation officer candidate qualifying in jets. Actual course duration may be longer because of unforeseen circumstances such as major aircraft groundings, fuel shortages or inclement weather.

The following table displays load data for Navy and Marine Corps Undergraduate Pilot Training. All participants are in the active force.

**TABLE VI-6. Training Input, Output, and Load
Navy/Marine Corps Undergraduate Jet Pilot Training**

Service	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Navy								
Jet	282	294	248	157	334	243	193	356
Prop	183	221	217	176	225	217	182	228
Helo	244	225	219	184	225	238	184	236
Total	709	740	684	517	784	698	559	820
Marine Corps								
Jet	212	193	132	106	192	130	103	191
Prop	31	36	33	29	34	33	28	33
Helo	224	224	209	181	224	209	176	224
Total	467	453	374	316	450	372	307	448

The final program of Undergraduate Pilot Training is training of Air Force fixed-wing jet pilots. Air Force helicopter pilots are trained in the Army program. The majority of Air Force fixed-wing pilots are trained in the all-jet USAF Undergraduate Pilot Training program. The standard course length is 52 weeks. Forecast attrition for FY 1996 and FY 1997 is 15 percent, not including flight screening programs.

In addition, approximately 90 Air Force pilots will be trained annually in the EURO-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT) program. ENJJPT is a cooperative undergraduate pilot and pilot instructor training program that began operation on 1 October 1981 at Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas. Nations involved in the program are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. ENJJPT is based on the principles of proportionate sharing of program costs and proportionate instructor pilot manning. Forecast attrition for the program is 12 percent and the course length is 56 weeks.

Load data for both standard Air Force pilot training and ENJJPT are shown in Table VI-7.

**TABLE VI-7. Training Input, Output, and Load
Air Force Undergraduate Jet Pilot Training**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97		Load	
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input		Output
Air Force								
Active	535	529	762	492	652	909	580	725
Reserve	19	60	19	47	48	78	41	46
Natl Guard	147	118	96	91	99	95	77	86
Total	701	707	877	630	799	1,082	698	857

At the conclusion of Undergraduate Pilot Training, the new pilot is qualified in trainer aircraft but requires additional training in operational aircraft units and employment tactics.

Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training (SUPT)

USAF Air Education and Training Command is in transition from generalized Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) to Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training (SUPT). The course is similar and equal in duration to UPT except students split into tracks at the completion of the T-37 phase (Phase II.) Students in the Bomber - Fighter Track fly the T-38 in Phase III. Students in the Airlift - Tanker Track fly the T-1A in Phase III. Finally, students going to helicopters enter Undergraduate Helicopter Training with the Army during Phase III. Reese Air Force Base (AFB) converted to SUPT for FY 94 classes.

Undergraduate Navigator Training

The Navy trains Navy and Marine Corps personnel to become Naval Flight Officers. The Air Force trains its personnel as navigators. The duties of Naval Flight Officers and Air Force navigators are not precisely the same because of mission differences, but at the undergraduate level they are sufficiently similar that they are referred to collectively in this report as "navigators" (the Army does not train or use navigators).

The Undergraduate Naval Flight Officer (NFO) training program is a building block training program. Training commences with Aviation Pre-flight Indoctrination (six weeks) during which the student learns the aeronautical and physiological aspects of flight. After completing this phase, the student enters the Basic phase. This 15-week course provides the student with the basic skills and knowledge needed to safely navigate, communicate, manage aircraft systems, and to learn two-plane formation maneuvers. Successful completion of Basic qualifies students for entrance into

Interservice Undergraduate Navigation Training (22 weeks) conducted at Randolph AFB, Texas (described in a later paragraph), or the Navy Intermediate Phase. The Intermediate Phase (13 weeks) expands the knowledge gained in Basic and requires higher skill and performance standards. Practical flight skills are developed in the ID-23 Computerized Navigation/Communications Training Device; the 2B37 T-34C Simulator; the 2F101 T-2 Simulator; the T-2B aircraft for jet acclimatization and high speed navigation; the T-47A aircraft for jet instrument navigation; and the T-34C aircraft for formation visual navigation, instrument navigation, and advanced performance maneuvers. After successful attainment of the performance standards, the students proceed to one of the following advanced specialized Naval Flight Officer Training phases: Radar Intercept Officer (RIO) (19 weeks), Tactical Navigation (TN) (15 weeks), Overwater Jet Navigation (OJN) (19 weeks), and Airborne Tactical Data Systems (ATDS) (15 weeks).

The advanced segment of Undergraduate Navigator Training for Naval Flight Officers destined for the multi-engine land base community is now managed by the Naval Air Training Unit (NAVAIRTU) at Randolph AFB. Navigator candidates receive 320 hours of academic instruction, 78 hours of simulator training, and 80 hours of flight instruction in the T-43 aircraft during 23 weeks of training. This training provides sufficient skills and knowledge so that further training for the newly rated navigator can be limited to flight training in operational aircraft and training in employment of applicable weapons systems.

The Air Force program consists of a 17-week basic course that includes 266 hours of academic instruction, 35 hours of flight simulator training, 27.5 hours of actual flight instruction in the T-43 aircraft, and 2.5 hours in the T-37 aircraft. After the core course, students will attend one of three follow-on courses: Systems Officer (SO); Navigator (NAV); or Electronic Warfare Officer (EWO). The SO course provides 250 academic hours, 64 simulator hours, 19.5 T-37 hours, and 26 T-43 hours. The NAV trainee receives 300 academic hours, 68 simulator hours, and 88 T-43 hours. EWO provides 431 academic hours, 63 simulator hours, and 28 T-43 hours.

After graduation, navigators require additional training in operational aircraft and employment techniques. Training load data for Undergraduate Navigator Training are displayed in Table VI-8.

**TABLE VI-8. Training Input, Output, and Load
Undergraduate Navigator Training**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97		Load	
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input		Output
Navy								
Active	272	319	381	297	344	387	311	354
Marine Corps								
Active	81	40	39	30	40	39	30	40
Air Force								
Active	28	199	1,217	1,110	320	1,333	1,287	374
Reserve	1	4	41	33	10	44	44	13
Natl Guard	19	25	73	74	25	76	75	25
DoD								
Active	381	558	1,637	1,437	704	1,759	1,628	768
Res/Gd Tot	20	29	114	107	35	120	119	38
Total	401	587	1,751	1,544	739	1,879	1,747	806

Other Flight Training

This category covers miscellaneous types of flight training, including flight familiarization and other flight programs which were not previously included in undergraduate pilot or navigator training. Load data are displayed in Table VI-9.

The Army includes courses for instructor pilots and specific pilot qualification courses in various aircraft in this category. Most of the courses are short, in the range of two to seven weeks.

The Navy Other Flight Training workload is composed mainly of instructor ground school training courses. Prospective instructors are taught unique techniques employed in the training of flight students. These courses are the Flight Instructor Training Course (FITC) and the Academic Instructor Training School (AITS). Jet transition training for designated aviators not qualified in jet aircraft is also included in this category, as are indoctrination flights for U. S. Naval Academy and NROTC midshipmen.

The Air Force conducts a separate 25-day flight screening program for all candidates of specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training.

**TABLE VI-9. Training Input, Output, and Load
Other Flight Training**

Service Component	FY94 Load	FY95 Load	FY96 Input	FY96 Output	FY96 Load	FY97 Input	FY97 Output	FY97 Load
Army								
Active	221	271	1,553	1,445	235	1,481	1,342	221
Reserve	25	10	92	92	7	72	72	5
Natl Guard	75	78	428	433	62	369	376	54
Navy								
Active	65	26	602	602	26	602	602	26
Air Force								
Active	256	257	1,712	1,590	266	1,593	1,498	237
Reserve	5	14	85	78	13	83	77	12
Natl Guard	8	11	146	133	12	156	143	13
DoD								
Active	542	554	3,867	3,637	527	3,676	3,442	484
Res/Gd Tot	113	113	751	736	94	680	668	84
Total	655	667	4,618	4,373	621	4,356	4,110	568

NOTE: Other Flight Training consists of Flight Familiarization Training, Advanced Flight Training and Other Flight Training.

The balance of the Air Force Other Flight Training workload is limited largely to instructor courses for pilots and navigators. Additionally, the Air Education and Training Command conducts some specialized courses. Included among these are Fixed Wing Qualification, Banked Pilot Requalification, and Medical Officers Training.

In each of the Services, graduates of undergraduate pilot and undergraduate navigator training receive supplementary training in the specific aircraft they will be flying on operational missions. Emphasis is placed on crew training and performance under conditions that would be encountered in combat. In the Army, most of this training is provided as part of normal unit training by the operational unit to which the new pilot is assigned. In the other Services, this additional training is provided by Navy or Marine fleet readiness squadrons, Marine combat crew readiness training squadrons, and Air Force combat crew training squadrons. As an exception, centrally conducted Army advanced flight training loads are included within Other Flight Training loads. However, most such training is classified as "crew and unit training" by the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force and is not included in the loads of this report.

Determination of Requirements for Rated Officers

Flight Training rates are developed by comparing projections of future requirements for rated officers with projections of the future status of inventories of both Reserve and Active duty rated officers. Consideration is given to the need to have sufficient active duty aviators on hand, in appropriate grades. Requirements for rated officers include both the numbers needed to man the force in peacetime and the additional increment needed to sustain the force when war breaks out. For analytical purposes, aviator requirements are divided into two parts: unit and individuals. Requirements for aviators for each of these categories are computed to meet both peacetime needs and wartime mobilization needs.

Unit requirements represent the number of rated officers needed to carry out operational, training and management activities for programmed units. Each such authorized position (that is, military space or billet) requires a rated officer as an incumbent in order to carry out the functions of the job, either because the job involves flying duties i.e., "operational flying" positions as defined for purposes of the Aviation Career Incentive Act of 1974, or requires flying experience. Other positions that may be occupied by rated officers for career broadening or similar purposes, but that do not require rated officer incumbents for accomplishing the duties, are not included. Unit requirements have three subcomponents: force, training, and supervision.

- Force requirements are the positions required to man and operate the Services' aircraft. The number of force positions is a product of established crew ratios (the number of crews per aircraft), which take into account workload (flying hour) and readiness factors and the amount of mission flying and unit flight training that is necessary.
- Training positions include the flyers who are conducting formal flight training.
- The supervision component is made up of officer positions entailing actual supervision of flying and flight-related activities and the performance of staff jobs that require the expertise of a rated officer. These positions are continuously scrutinized by the services to assure that rated requirements are valid.

Individual requirements include the transients, students and other individuals needed to make it possible to provide for reasonable manning of positions in units.

Rated Officer Inventory Projections

Projecting rated officer inventories into the future must be based on historical experience, current judgment and an appraisal of how the officers will react to conditions in the future (for example: pay, morale, state of the civilian economy, civilian airline hiring plans and family satisfaction with service life). These estimates are projected for at least five years in the future. Comparisons of total force inventories of rated officers are then made against the computed total force requirements, and

training rates for the entire five-year period are adjusted. This process is repeated each year so that adjustments can be made in training rates based on changes in requirements and/or updated inventory projections. This continuing process of adjustment is necessary to insure that the correct number of trained rated officers will be available in the future without large and expensive fluctuations in training rates.

Training Rate Adjustments

When a comparison of requirements and inventories discloses a shortage or overage of projected rated officers, training rates are adjusted upward or downward in order to bring the program back into balance. For example, if projected FY 1997 pilot requirements exceed projected inventories by 500, an increase in training rates (that is, output or production) of pilots of 100 per year starting in FY 1993 may be appropriate. Inputs into the training program would start in FY 1993 in order to obtain the first increase in desired output in FY 1994. This re-evaluation process is repeated at least once each year, with adjustments made as necessary to avoid wide fluctuations in loads.

Determination of Training Loads

The process described above, through continuous updating of the comparison between projected rated officer requirements and inventories, leads to a requirement for phased output from the flight training establishment. The desired annual output, considering the anticipated attrition rates and the planned course lengths, as discussed in the preceding sections on the various types of flight training, establishes the size of the input necessary to achieve the target output. Training loads are then calculated using these factors to determine the average number of students to be on hand during the training year. For FY 1996 and FY 1997, the currently recommended loads are those displayed previously in this chapter.

VII

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

General Description

The purpose of Professional Development Education is to provide training and education to career military personnel to prepare them to perform increasingly complex responsibilities as they progress in their military careers. Where Specialized Skill Training is directed toward specific job skills, Professional Development Education is concerned with broader professional development goals in such subjects as leadership and management, military science, engineering and medicine. Professional Development Education is conducted at both military and civilian institutions. This category includes senior enlisted leadership training in recognition of the broad professional content of these courses, as opposed to the narrower skill-oriented training typical of most enlisted training programs. Most of the programs in this category are for officer professional development.

Education in the military is fundamental to the development of military officers, enabling them to become fully qualified to perform duties of high responsibility in both war and peace. In most non-military professions, growth in ability and knowledge is gained through experience. In the military, opportunities for full practice of the profession are limited to wartime, and even those officers with combat experience have not had the opportunity for thorough exercise of warfare decision skills at their current rank and responsibility. The military school system serves partially to fill this shortfall by educating military officers in the skills and knowledge needed to perform their duties in a variety of locales and situations, both in peacetime and wartime.

Training loads for FY 1991 through FY 1997 are as shown in Table VII-1. The total loads in the table show a considerable disparity among the Services in amounts of Professional Development Education. These disparities are more apparent than real, and are related mainly to somewhat different ways of categorizing Service education and training programs.

The first three subcategories of Professional Development Education are officer professional military development programs. These programs are at three levels: career, intermediate and senior. In addition to regular courses for Active Force officers, most schools in this category present non-resident courses and short seminars. Large numbers of Reserve Component officers and other military students are provided instruction through correspondence courses.

TABLE VII-1. Professional Development Education Training Loads

Service		FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Component								
Army								
Active		2,760	2,746	2,419	3,188	3,700	3,782	3,865
Reserve		58	65	50	66	87	71	78
Natl Guard		67	58	56	72	92	79	89
Navy								
Active		1,938	2,484	2,240	2,200	2,148	2,130	2,153
Reserve		341	26	21	24	29	29	29
Marine Corps								
Active		1,187	1,380	1,468	1,516	1,767	1,798	1,806
Reserve		48	35	69	86	52	53	53
Air Force								
Active		3,290	5,667	7,490	4,853	4,320	4,289	4,290
Reserve		43	89	163	97	117	116	116
Natl Guard		43	209	286	194	263	260	259
Total								
Active		9,175	12,277	13,617	11,757	11,935	11,999	12,114
Res/Gd		600	482	645	539	640	608	624
Total		9,775	12,759	14,262	12,296	12,575	12,607	12,738

Professional Military Education (PME) is the systematic and comprehensive process of developing the skills, knowledge, and military judgment required to deal with the increasingly complex responsibilities associated with the duties and responsibilities of higher grades. In contrast to specific job or billet-related skills, PME is the life-long study of the profession of arms within the framework of military operations. PME is acquired through structured self-study, professional reading, symposia, formal schools attendance and experiences gained in duty assignments. The purpose of PME is to assist all Service members in fulfilling their personal goals and responsibilities for achieving operational competence.

Career Officer Professional Schools

The Marine Corps and Air Force conduct career officer professional courses for officers with some experience in operational units. These courses are Service-wide in scope and are, therefore, carried in this report under Professional Development Education. The Army and Navy conduct courses that are at a similar level, but are oriented toward specific skills, e.g., the Navy's Surface Warfare Officer's Course, or somewhat broader skills within a specific part of the Service, e.g., the Army's Armor Officer Advanced Course. The Army and Navy courses, because of their specialization, are treated in this report as part of Specialized Skill Training.

The Marine Corps Amphibious Warfare School prepares captains for duties in battalion or squadron command or on regimental level staffs. The course length is 39 weeks. The Air Force Squadron Officer School is an 8-week primary level course designed for captains to improve their professional competence and inspire their dedication to the profession of arms.

The training load data associated with these Marine and Air Force courses are displayed in Table VII-2.

TABLE VII-2. Training Input, Output, and Load
Career Officer Professional Schools

Service Component	FY94		FY95		FY96		FY97	
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Marine Corps								
Active	188	194	299	299	194	298	298	194
Reserve	9	12	214	214	12	214	214	12
Air Force								
Active	311	393	3,048	3,048	393	3,048	3,048	393
Reserve	7	17	130	130	17	130	130	17
Natl Guard	8	17	130	130	17	130	130	17
DoD								
Active	499	587	3,347	3,347	587	3,346	3,346	587
Res/Gd Tot	24	43	474	474	46	474	474	46
Total	523	630	3,821	3,821	633	3,820	3,820	633

Intermediate Service Schools

Each of the Services maintains a Command and Staff College. In addition, the Navy is executive agent for the Armed Forces Staff College, a joint institution for students from all Services sponsored by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. While there are differences in approach and curriculum based on the requirements of the parent Service, each of the courses is designed to prepare officers for command and staff duties in all echelons of their parent Services and in joint or allied commands. A relatively small number of officers from each Service attends one of the Command and Staff Colleges of the other Services and a few attend Allied schools at the same level. Attendance at the Intermediate Service Schools is on a select basis. The following table lists the Command and Staff Colleges and their respective course length in weeks.

TABLE VII-3. Intermediate Service Schools

Schools	Location	Course Length
Armed Forces Staff College	Norfolk, VA	12
Army Command And General Staff College	Fort Leavenworth, KA	39
College of Naval Command and Staff	Newport, RI	44
Marine Corps Command and Staff College	Quantico, VA	40
Air Command and Staff College	Montgomery, AL	43

Another school categorized as an Intermediate Service School for purposes of this report is the Defense Systems Management College at Fort Belvoir, Virginia. This is a joint school that conducts a primary 20-week course in program management concepts and methods with the major purpose of preparing selected military officers and DoD civilian personnel for assignments in program or project management.

Load data for military personnel attending Intermediate Service Schools is shown in the following table.

**TABLE VII-4. Training Input, Output, and Load
Intermediate Service Schools**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97		Load	
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Input	Output		
Army								
Active	746	735	854	863	700	854	854	693
Reserve	18	18	52	51	14	52	52	14
Natl Guard	20	20	34	34	16	34	34	16
Navy								
Active	204	205	1,407	1,377	211	1,407	1,377	211
Reserve	7	9	41	41	9	41	41	9
Marine Corps								
Active	136	182	351	351	182	351	351	182
Reserve	8	8	176	176	8	176	176	8
Air Force								
Active	320	328	394	394	328	394	394	328
Reserve	8	8	10	10	8	10	10	8
Natl Guard	6	6	7	7	6	7	7	6
DoD								
Active	1,406	1,450	3,006	2,985	1,421	3,006	2,976	1,414
Res/Gd Tot	67	69	320	319	61	320	320	61
Total	1,473	1,519	3,326	3,304	1,482	3,326	3,296	1,475

Senior Service Colleges

Each of the services maintains a Senior Service School or "War College." In addition, there is the National Defense University, consisting of two joint Senior Service Schools, The National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Students from all four Services attend these colleges. Senior Service College attendance is highly selective and students are chosen by Service selection boards from among the most promising officers in the lieutenant colonel/colonel, commander/captain grades.

The common purpose of these Senior Service Colleges is to prepare students for senior command and staff positions at the highest levels in the national security establishment and the allied command structure. The unifying focus is the study of national goals and national security policy. Each of the Service colleges, while concentrating on the employment of the parent Service in the defense mission, also includes the study of the employment of the forces of other Services.

All of the colleges integrate the study of the economic, scientific, political, sociological and other factors into the consideration of national security issues. The Industrial College of the Armed Forces, in its approach to national security issues, emphasizes the use and management of national resources. The length of the principal courses at the Senior Service College is 10 months. Most colleges also conduct shorter special-purpose seminar-type courses, some particularly designed for Reserve Component officers. Use of these short courses is greatest in the Navy.

Load data for the Senior Service Colleges are shown in the following table.

**TABLE VII-5. Training Input, Output, and Load
Senior Service Colleges**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96			FY97		
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	303	309	991	989	313	991	989	312
Reserve	22	26	330	330	25	330	330	25
Natl Guard	20	29	251	245	31	254	251	34
Navy								
Active	96	84	99	99	89	99	99	89
Reserve	8	9	10	10	9	10	10	9
Marine Corps								
Active	49	86	375	375	86	376	376	87
Reserve	4	5	138	138	6	138	138	6
Air Force								
Active	276	272	542	542	273	542	542	273
Reserve	7	7	49	49	7	49	49	7
Natl Guard	7	7	49	49	7	49	49	7
DoD								
Active	724	751	2,007	2,005	761	2,008	2,006	761
Res/Gd Tot	68	83	827	821	85	830	827	88
Total	792	834	2,834	2,826	846	2,838	2,833	849

Enlisted Leadership Training

Courses included in this category are designed to provide selected senior enlisted personnel the skills and knowledge needed to assume the responsibilities of the highest non-commissioned officer grades. These courses are the culmination of formal enlisted training and are, for enlisted personnel, analogous to the officer courses discussed in the preceding sections. In addition to such subjects as methods of leadership, human relations, discipline and training, and the administration and employment of military organizations,

these higher level schools provide senior non-commissioned officers a broader perspective of the role and functions of their Services. Schools, locations and course length in weeks are shown in Table VII-6.

TABLE VII-6. Enlisted Leadership Training Courses

Schools	Location	Course Length
Army: Sergeants Major Academy	Fort Bliss, TX	40
Navy: Senior Enlisted Academy	Newport, RI	9
Marine Corps: Senior Level	Quantico, VA	1
Staff NCO Academy (Career Course)	Quantico, VA	7
	Camp Lejeune, NC	7
	Okinawa, JA	7
	El Toro, CA	7
Staff NCO Academy (Advanced Course)	El Toro, CA	8
	Camp Lejeune, NC	8
	Quantico, VA	8
Sergeant Course	Quantico, VA	5
	Camp Lejeune, NC	5
	Okinawa, JA	5
	El Toro, CA	5
	Twentynine Palms, CA	5
	Hawaii	5
Air Force:		
AF Senior NCO Academy	Gunter Annex, AL	7
NCO Academies	15 Worldwide	6
AF Airman Leadership School	78 Worldwide	4

Other enlisted leadership training for more junior noncommissioned officers is carried in Specialized Skill Training. This includes command sponsored NCO academies, for example. This training tends to be more skill related for specific types of specialized leadership responsibilities. The senior enlisted leadership training carried in this chapter is more properly thought of as Professional Development Education in a broader sense. All four Military Services now sponsor Senior Enlisted Leadership Academies. In addition the Air National Guard conducts Professional Military Education courses at McGhee-Tyson Air Base, Knoxville, TN. These courses include Leadership School, NCO Academy, Academy of Military Science and Professional Continuing Education. Army National Guard NCOs are trained in the Reserve Component Non-commissioned Officers Education System (RCNCOES), attending courses at the appropriate level of training at State Military Academies or National Guard Bureau Regional NCO Schools.

Training loads for enlisted leadership training are shown in Table VII-7.

**TABLE VII-7. Training Input, Output, and Load
Enlisted Leadership Training**

Service Component	FY94	FY95	FY96			FY97		
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	330	457	600	314	366	600	571	468
Reserve	26	43	50	29	32	50	48	39
Natl Guard	32	43	50	29	32	50	48	39
Navy								
Active	49	47	265	265	47	265	265	47
Reserve	4	2	10	10	2	10	10	2
Marine Corps								
Active	902	1,042	8,416	8,379	1,043	8,416	8,379	1,043
Reserve	65	27	729	729	27	731	731	27
Air Force								
Active	2,384	2,055	19,807	19,597	2,023	19,750	19,684	2,024
Reserve	47	52	463	460	51	462	459	51
Natl Guard	147	202	1,879	1,869	199	1,869	1,860	198
DoD								
Active	3,665	3,601	29,088	28,555	3,479	29,031	28,899	3,582
Res/Gd Tot	321	369	3,181	3,126	343	3,172	3,156	356
Total	3,986	3,970	32,269	31,681	3,822	32,203	32,055	3,938

Graduate Education Fully Funded, Full Time

The Department of Defense needs military officers with specialized advanced knowledge which, in some cases, is attainable only through graduate education. Under the program established by Section 2004 of Title 10 United States Code and described in this section, military officers pursue graduate education on a fully funded, full-time basis. A minimum service payback obligation of three years for the first year of schooling and one year for each year after the first is required of all officers entering the program. Services establish maximum pay back periods.

The following table displays training loads data for these graduate education programs. All participants are members of the Active Forces.

**TABLE VII-8. Training Input, Output, and Load
Graduate Education, Fully Funded, Full Time**

	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input		Output
Service								
Army	956	1,011	586	604	1,031	586	579	1,007
Navy	1,349	1,325	685	741	1,307	691	744	1,330
Marine Corps	129	125	84	83	147	87	81	151
Air Force	1,030	717	469	469	717	469	469	717
Total	3,464	3,178	1,824	1,897	3,202	1,833	1,873	3,205

Officer graduate students attend either a civilian educational institution or one of the two Service institutions, the Naval Postgraduate School or the Air Force Institute of Technology, depending upon where the required education can best be obtained. Curricula in the two Service institutions emphasize military unique courses, such as in logistics management or intelligence operations, and military applications in all other courses. While these schools are primarily used by the parent Services (including Marine Corps use of the Naval Postgraduate School), they also educate some students from other Services. The following table displays student loads for these two schools.

TABLE VII-9. Graduate Education Load at Service Institutions

	Actuals		Estimates	
	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Naval Postgraduate School				
Army	93	100	100	100
Navy	1,158	1,120	1,102	1,125
Marine Corps	114	119	134	133
Air Force	35	35	35	35
Total	1,400	1,374	1,371	1,393
Air Force Institute of Technology				
Army	3	10	10	10
Navy	1	0	0	0
Marine Corps	1	1	4	5
Air Force	500	500	500	500
Total	505	511	514	515

Requirements for graduate-degreed officers depend upon the number of "validated billets," that is, military positions that have been determined to require an incumbent with graduate level education in the applicable academic discipline. The Services examine the duty prerequisites for each billet

nominated for validation and determine if the job does, in fact, require an officer with an advanced degree. Requirements for graduate legal education are determined separately.

Other Full Time Education Programs

In addition to the Professional Development Education programs already described there are a variety of other full-time programs tailored to meet the particular needs of the Services. (Health Professions Education programs are briefly discussed in a separate section at the end of this chapter).

Several programs have been designed to permit selected individuals an opportunity to work toward associate, baccalaureate or advanced degrees. These programs benefit the Services in several important ways: they increase the technical qualifications of the individuals in the program; they improve the general educational levels of Service personnel; and they provide career retention and recruiting incentives to outstanding personnel. In addition, to the extent possible, personnel in advanced education programs are later used to satisfy validated requirements and hence reduce the required student load in graduate education for validated billets.

The degree completion programs are managed by the individual Military Departments and each has its own selection criteria. Generally, individuals are not selected for a program unless the education will enhance their professional development and be of use to the Military Department. All of the programs require an active service obligation payback from the individual.

Short course education provides the Military Services with needed skills in a wide variety of scientific, administrative and other fields. These programs are selected to train personnel in job-oriented skills that can best be acquired through abbreviated courses. Accounting, traffic management and aviation safety are examples of skills involved. Some of this training is conducted in DoD schools, some at civilian institutions.

**TABLE VII-10. Training Input, Output and Load
Other Full Time Education Programs**

Service Component	FY94 Load	FY95 Load	FY96		FY97		Load	
			Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Army								
Active	395	364	729	734	314	729	729	310
Navy								
Active	158	151	3,215	3,215	140	3,213	3,213	140
Reserve	5	9	800	800	9	800	800	9
Marine Corps								
Active	112	138	98	90	146	98	96	149
Air Force								
Active	492	515	9,111	9,111	515	9,111	9,111	515
Reserve	28	33	912	912	33	912	912	33
Natl Guard	26	31	590	590	31	590	590	31
DoD								
Active	1,157	1,168	13,153	13,150	1,115	13,151	13,149	1,114
Res/Gd Tot	59	73	2,302	2,302	73	2,302	2,302	73
Total	1,216	1,241	15,455	15,452	1,188	15,453	15,451	1,187

Health Professions Education

This subcategory is made up of a wide variety of courses for personnel of all health professions; physicians, dentists, nurses, medical administrators, and so forth. The majority of the courses offered are conducted in military facilities and vary in length from a few days to a full year. Some training is conducted at civilian medical institutions and, in the case of the Army, includes some advanced degree programs. The purpose of Health Professions Education is to expand the skills of military medical personnel and to provide them timely information on the latest techniques in their fields. In this category, the Army and Navy provide long-term training. The Air Force relies on short courses. Educational programs connected with the acquisition of health professionals is carried in this report under Officer Acquisition Training. The following table shows load data for Health Professions Education Programs.

**TABLE VII-11. Training Input, Output and Load
Health Profession Education**

	FY94	FY95	FY96		FY97			
	Load	Load	Input	Output	Load	Input	Output	Load
Service								
Army	458	824	796	735	1,058	792	755	1,075
Navy	344	336	297	301	336	306	291	336
Air Force	40	40	1,920	1,920	40	1,920	1,920	40
Total	842	1,200	3,013	2,956	1,434	3,018	2,966	1,451

VIII

TRAINING MANPOWER

General Description

Manpower associated with the individual training mission in the Department of Defense can be divided into two parts: (1) trainees and students being trained, and (2) military and civilian manpower conducting and supporting the training. These two different classes of manpower are discussed and explained in this chapter.

Trainees and Students

Manpower undergoing training in the Defense training establishment is defined and quantified in three different ways, each of which serves a somewhat different purpose with regard to manpower accounting and resource allocation.

1. Training Loads. These are the "military training student loads" and were detailed in Chapters III through VII of this report. They represent the average number of military trainees, students and cadets of each Service and component in training during a given fiscal year and are subject to annual congressional authorization. Training loads include all military manpower of a given Service or component who are undergoing individual training in a centralized school or training center, regardless of whether the training is conducted by the parent Service, one of the other Services, a DoD school, or by an agency or institution outside the Department of Defense, such as a civilian college or university. Training loads also include all military personnel in training regardless of their assignment status. Some trainees and students are assigned in a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) status to the training activity. Others are attending training in a temporary duty (TDY) or temporary additional duty (TAD) status while remaining assigned to their parent units. Still others are attending training while in transit from one permanent assignment to another.

Since training loads are an annual average and most courses are much shorter than a year in length, the actual number of students and trainees who enter training, and the number who graduate, is considerably greater than the training load. For example, the total programmed training load for Recruit Training in FY 1996 is 35,782 yet about 217,000 persons will enter Recruit Training and about 199,000 will graduate.

2. Training Workloads. The total number of trainees and students undergoing training within DoD includes some trainees and students of foreign nations, DoD civilian employees, and members of other departments and agencies of the U.S. Government, notably the Coast Guard. In addition, many U.S. military students and

trainees are trained by a Service other than their own. Consequently, the average number of students being trained by a given Service, or its training workload, usually differs from its training load. For example, the Marine Corps has a programmed Flight Training load of 490 in FY 1996. However, since the training is conducted by other Services, its Flight Training workload is zero. On the other hand, because the Navy trains many personnel from other Services and Coast Guard, foreign students as well as most of its own students, the Navy's Specialized Skill Training workload is higher than its training load.

Training workload, in conjunction with other applicable considerations, is the major determinant of the resources (manpower, funds, material and facilities) required to conduct training. It, rather than training load, is appropriately used in considering the allocation of resources to a Service or a training activity. Table VIII-1 displays the programmed training workloads for each of the Services in FY 1996 and 1997.

TABLE VIII-1. Training Workloads
(Thousands)

FY96	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
Category				
Recruit	12.6	9.6	9.4	4.1
Officer Acquisition	4.9	4.6	0.3	6.1
Specialized Skill	47.7	26.9	10.1	19.3
Flight	1.1	2.0	0.0	1.8
Prof. Dev. Educ.	2.0	2.7	1.5	5.2
OSUT	9.6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	77.8	45.8	21.4	36.6
FY97				
Recruit	13.9	9.5	9.4	4.7
Officer Acquisition	4.8	4.5	0.3	6.2
Specialized Skill	48.9	26.9	10.2	21.0
Flight	1.0	2.0	0.0	1.9
Prof. Dev. Educ.	2.2	2.7	1.5	5.2
OSUT	10.6	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	81.5	45.6	21.5	39.0

3. Students, Trainees, and Cadets. In the Individuals accounts of the Defense Manpower Requirements Report, military manpower is included for each Service as "Trainees and Students" and (except for the Marine Corps) "Cadets". Conceptually, this manpower represents the number of military trainees, students, cadets and midshipmen programmed to be assigned (PCS as opposed to TDY/TAD) for training on the last day of a given fiscal year. Student, trainee and cadet manpower is similar to training load in that both represent military members of the reporting

Service in training status. Nevertheless, there are substantial differences in the way the amount of manpower in these two manpower aggregations is calculated, with the result that the totals are seldom the same. The major reasons for these differences are:

- Training loads are man-years in training status, whereas trainees, students, and cadets are end strengths, or numbers in training on the last day of the fiscal year. Trainee, student, and cadet numbers are thus affected by the seasonality of enlistment patterns, as described in Chapter III, while the element of seasonality is leveled out in training loads.
- Training loads include students attending training in a temporary duty (TDY or TAD) status as well as those attending en route training in a PCS status. In the Defense Manpower Requirements Report, TDY and TAD students are carried in the categories of their parent units.

Training loads are a more accurate measure of the amount of training that is needed to meet military requirements than are the categorizations trainees, students and cadets.

Manpower in Support of Training

Military and civilian manpower is required to accomplish the individual training mission. This manpower performs all the other tasks necessary to conduct and support individual training conducted in training institutions, i.e., it conducts and supports instruction, operates training bases and facilities, maintains training equipment, produces training aids, provides personal and community services to students, trainees, and other military members, plans and manages training.

ROTC students are not military members in an active duty status and are not included in military manpower training loads. However, ROTC Basic Camp loads are included in the Army Recruit training loads because recruit training instructors and staff support and conduct that training. To be consistent with this treatment of ROTC students, manpower supporting the primary ROTC programs at colleges and universities is not included in Tables VIII-2 through VIII-5.

The following tables summarize manpower in support of training in three general functions: Conduct of Individual Training, Training Base Operating Support, and Management Headquarters. Conduct of Individual Training includes the following types of manpower: instructors, instructional support, school/training center staffs, student supervisors and direct training support such as training aids and literature, audiovisual resources and instructional systems development.

**TABLE VIII-2. DoD Manpower in Support of Training,
Conduct of Individual Training
(End Strength, Thousands)**

	FY93		FY94		FY95		FY96		FY97	
	MIL	CIV								
Army	24.6	5.5	23.0	5.9	23.7	5.9	21.1	5.7	21.1	5.6
Navy	24.6	2.9	21.8	2.9	13.7	2.9	19.6	2.8	17.9	2.7
Marine Corps	9.2	0.3	8.1	0.3	8.1	0.2	8.1	0.2	8.1	0.2
Air Force	11.6	3.5	11.1	3.5	11.5	3.8	11.0	4.3	11.2	4.3
Total	70.0	12.2	64.0	12.7	57.0	12.7	59.8	13.0	58.3	12.9

**TABLE VIII-3. DoD Manpower in Support of Training,
Base Operating Support
(End Strength, Thousands)**

	FY93		FY94		FY95		FY96		FY97	
	MIL	CIV								
Army	11.5	15.9	10.0	15.1	8.8	14.9	8.5	13.5	8.5	11.9
Navy	6.2	5.7	5.3	5.7	3.7	5.2	3.8	4.7	2.9	4.4
Marine Corps	3.2	1.6	2.8	1.6	2.7	1.2	2.7	1.3	2.7	1.3
Air Force	7.7	6.4	7.5	6.5	6.6	5.3	6.5	5.3	6.2	5.1
Total	28.6	29.6	25.6	28.8	21.7	26.5	21.5	24.8	20.3	22.7

**TABLE VIII-4. DoD Manpower in Support of Training,
Management Headquarters
(End Strength, Thousands)**

	FY93		FY94		FY95		FY96		FY97	
	MIL	CIV								
Army	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.6
Navy	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.4
Marine Corps	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Air Force	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.4
Total	1.3	1.6	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.4

**TABLE VIII-5. DoD Manpower in Support of Training,
All Functions
(End Strength, Thousands)**

	FY93		FY94		FY95		FY96		FY97	
	MIL	CIV								
Army	36.5	22.1	33.4	21.6	32.8	21.4	29.8	19.7	29.8	18.2
Navy	31.1	9.1	27.2	9.1	17.5	8.4	23.5	7.9	20.9	7.5
Marine Corps	12.4	1.9	10.8	1.9	10.8	1.4	10.8	1.5	10.8	1.5
Air Force	19.9	10.3	19.5	10.4	18.9	9.5	18.3	10.0	18.2	9.9
Total	99.9	43.4	90.9	43.0	80.0	40.8	82.4	39.1	79.7	37.0

The Services' estimates of training attributable manpower include some staff and support manpower that do not contribute to the production of student output and loads. This manpower is reported as training resources in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) because they belong to organizations and units with a primary mission of training. The majority of the non-training attributable manpower is that portion of Base Operating Support (BOS) needed to support non-training tenant activities at training installations.

Table VIII-6 shows changes in total military and civilian manpower in support of training between FY 1980 and FY 1997.

**TABLE VIII-6. Manpower in Support of Training,
DoD Total, by General Function**
(End Strength, Thousands)

	FY80			FY96			FY97			Percent Change Total Manpower	
	MIL	CIV	TOT	MIL	CIV	TOT	MIL	CIV	TOT	FY96/80	FY97/96
Conduct of Individual Training	76	16	92	60	13	73	58	13	71	-20.7%	-2.2%
Operating Support	35	29	65	21	25	46	20	23	43	-28.4%	-6.9%
Training Headquarters	2	2	4	1	1	3	1	1	3	-28.3%	-0.5%
Total	113	47	160	82	39	122	80	37	117	-24.0%	-3.9%

As Table VIII-6 shows, the total military and civilian manpower in support of training has decreased 24 percent between FY 1980 and FY 1996 and 3.9 percent from FY 1996 to FY 1997. The decrease occurred in all areas supporting training.

As shown in Tables VIII-7 and VIII-8, training workloads will be 24.4 percent lower in FY 1996 than in FY 1980 and 3.4 percent higher in FY 1996 than in FY 1997.

TABLE VIII-7. Training Workload Trends
(Thousands)

	FY80	FY96	FY97	Percent Change	
				FY96/80	FY97/96
Army	105.0	77.8	81.5	-25.9%	4.7%
Navy	70.0	45.8	45.6	-34.6%	-0.3%
Marine Corps	18.0	21.4	21.5	18.7%	0.8%
Air Force	47.0	36.6	39.0	-22.2%	6.8%
Total	240.0	181.5	187.7	-24.4%	3.4%

TABLE VIII-8. Training Manpower and Training Workload Trends
(Thousands)

	FY80	FY96	FY97	Percent Change	
				FY96/80	FY97/96
Manpower in Support of Training	160	122	117	-24.0%	-3.9%
Training Workloads	240.0	181.5	187.7	-24.4%	3.4%

Training Manpower Detailed by Service and Type of Training

Table VIII-9 shows the manpower required to support FY 1996 and FY 1997 training workloads by Service and training activity.

As was noted early in this chapter, training workloads, in conjunction with other factors, are the determinants of the resources required to conduct training. The workload/resource relationship is not a simple one, but depends upon the nature of training and training support involved. For example, Flight Training normally requires a great deal of support manpower for aircraft maintenance and weapons training requires close instructor supervision for safety considerations.

TABLE VIII-9. Training Manpower by Service and Type of Training*
(Thousands)

FY96	Army		Navy		Marine Corps		Air Force		Total	
	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV
Recruit	2.2	0.1	0.8	0.1	2.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	5.7	0.2
Officer Acquisition	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.6	2.6
Specialized Skill	14.0	3.7	14.6	0.6	5.3	0.2	6.1	1.7	40.0	6.2
Flight	0.8	0.3	3.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	2.1	1.1	5.8	1.7
Professional Development	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.0	1.5	0.5	2.9	2.1
Army One-Station Unit	2.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.1
Direct Support	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.4	3.6	2.2
Base Support	5.5	12.0	3.7	4.5	2.7	1.2	6.0	4.9	17.8	22.6
Management Headquarters	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.4	1.2	1.4
Total	29.8	19.7	23.5	7.9	10.8	1.5	18.3	10.0	82.4	39.1

**TABLE VIII-9. (Con't) Training Manpower by Service
and Type of Training***
(Thousands)

FY97	Army		Navy		Marine Corps		Air Force		Total	
	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV	MIL	CIV
Recruit	2.2	0.1	0.9	0.1	2.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	5.8	0.2
Officer Acquisition	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.9	0.9	2.6	2.7
Specialized Skill	14.0	3.7	12.8	0.6	5.3	0.2	6.2	1.7	38.3	6.1
Flight	0.8	0.3	2.9	0.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.1	5.9	1.7
Professional Development	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.0	1.5	0.6	2.9	2.1
Army One-Station Unit	2.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.1
Direct Support	3.0	1.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.4	3.6	2.1
Base Support	5.5	10.6	2.9	4.1	2.7	1.3	5.6	4.7	16.6	20.7
Management Headquarters	0.3	0.6	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.4	1.2	1.4
Total	29.8	18.2	20.9	7.5	10.8	1.5	18.2	9.9	79.7	37.0

* The Service estimates of training manpower include some staff and support manpower that does not contribute directly to the production of student output and loads but are reported as training resources in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) because they belong to larger organizations with a primary training mission.

Manpower data in the six categories of training, i.e., Recruit through One-Station Unit Training, includes instructors, school/training center staffs and student supervisors. Direct training support includes such tasks as training aids and literature, audiovisual resources, and instructional systems development.

IX

TRAINING MANAGEMENT AND FUNDING

General Description

Chapters III through VII of this report described and explained the military training student loads requested for each military component. These student loads represent patterns and levels of training effort which require manpower and other resources. The purpose of this chapter is to describe and explain the resources (other than manpower, which was discussed in Chapter VIII), funding and costs associated with the conduct of individual training.

In considering training resources, it is important to distinguish between the training loads required by a Service but conducted in part outside the Service, and the workloads representing training conducted by the Service. As discussed in the previous chapter, the workloads, which represent training conducted by a Service, are the basis for resource requirements (manpower, material, facilities and funds) needed to conduct and support the training that the Service executes.

Management of Individual Training

Detailed management of individual training is carried out by the four Military Services. Each of the Services, except the Marine Corps, has a training commander immediately subordinate to the Service chief who is responsible for most of the individual training conducted within that Service. Some training is managed directly by the Service headquarters. However, the most prevalent pattern of control is through a training command headquarters that manages most Service military schools, training centers and other training facilities.

Staff Responsibilities

Within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), staff responsibility for individual training and education policies rests with the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), with a strong influence over the allocation and use of resources being exercised by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller). These two offices work closely together in the staff supervision of DoD individual training and education. The OSD role is generally one of policy formulation, allocation of resources, **overview** of Service training programs and coordination among the Services.

Within each Service headquarters, with exception of the Marine Corps, a principal staff officer has responsibility for individual training. Other staff members may have primary responsibility for certain types of training, for example, a Service Surgeon General for professional medical training. Other staff members have collateral responsibilities for the allocation of manpower and funds to the training function.

Primary responsibility on the Army staff for individual training rests with the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans and his subordinate, the Director of Training. Within the Navy, the principal staff officer is the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower, Personnel, and Training. The Deputy Commander for Training and Education acts as the principal training advisor to the Commandant of Marine Corps, through the Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command (MCCDC). Within the Air Force, the Director of Personnel Programs, under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, has staff responsibility for individual training.

Training Commands

Each Service has a command headquarters that manages most of the individual training conducted by that Service:

- The Army's principal training command is Headquarters, Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), located at Fort Monroe, Virginia. TRADOC's control is exercised through training installations and school commanders throughout the United States.
- The Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET), headquartered in Pensacola, Florida, exercises control, through subordinate functional commanders, of education and training conducted in training centers, schools, and programs throughout the Navy.
- For the Air Force, Headquarters, Air Education and Training Command at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, directly controls individual training centers and units.
- For the Marine Corps, the Deputy Commander for Training and Education, Quantico, Virginia, also functions as the Commander, Marine Corps Schools and exercises command, operational control, technical direction, and/or coordination for all Marine Corps formal schools and training centers.

The Service-wide training commands are not responsible for all individual training and education conducted. As already noted, the Surgeons General are responsible for most health professional and medical technical training. Other examples include the Service Academies, which are under the direct supervision of the respective Service Chiefs.

The Services' training command commanders and the Marine Corps Deputy Commander for Education and Training are also the senior members of the Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO). The ITRO was formed in 1972 to facilitate cooperative training efforts among the Services. The committees and working groups of the organization perform the detailed analysis which becomes the basis for decisions on the feasibility of consolidation of training courses or other cooperative arrangements. A listing of major joint training efforts is provided in Appendix B.

Training Funding and Costs

The training costs addressed in this section include funding in the President's Budget for FY 1996 and FY 1997 requested for individual military training and education. Depreciation costs of training facilities and equipment are not included, although training investment costs estimated for FY 1996 and FY 1997, such as procurement and construction costs, are included. The report uses the data in the DoD's Future Year Defense Program (FYDP) as the basis for all estimates of the manpower and funds devoted to training and education.

The costs in this chapter include funding for military pay and allowances for assigned trainees and students, pay and allowances of military and civilian personnel in support of training, base operating costs, training related activities, training investment costs for construction and procurement, and overhead costs for training administration and command. Certain costs for activities at training installations support non-training missions (such as base operating support for non-training activities on training bases). These non-training costs are embedded in Program 8 and, therefore, are included in the costs shown in the tables in this chapter.

For a given Service, the requirement for funding for training arises from two factors. First is the need to fund the pay and allowances of its own military training student loads, regardless of where or by whom the students are trained. Second, the need to provide for the level of individual training and education effort necessary to meet the Service's commitments to accomplish training for its own and other students.

For comparability, the funding requests associated with ROTC and other non-load training programs are deleted from the following tables. Hence, the tables report FY 1996 and FY 1997 funding estimates that relate to the requested FY 1996 and FY 1997 training loads.

Special caution should be exercised in using these costs for comparisons among Services. Differences in missions among the Services, differing operating and training conditions, and differences in the mix of Service training programs degrade the soundness of comparisons based on aggregated data such as these.

Table IX-1 shows Army funding for individual training by category.

TABLE IX-1. Army Funding of Individual Training
(Millions)

	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Recruit Training	\$299.3	\$287.3	\$280.1	\$302.3	\$335.5
Officer Acquisition Training	140.5	137.5	140.6	140.2	143.6
Specialized Skill Training	1,631.8	1,427.6	1,569.6	1,601.1	1,595.4
Flight Training	423.3	376.5	471.1	439.6	414.6
Professional Development Education	321.4	298.9	326.3	310.1	320.4
Army One-Station Unit Training	244.0	236.0	229.9	240.0	252.6
Direct Training Support	406.2	374.3	296.0	326.7	315.5
Training Base Support	1,396.4	1,430.1	1,380.1	1,481.8	1,433.1
Training Management Headquarters	66.3	53.8	39.1	43.7	42.8
Reserve Pay & Allowance	582.0	527.0	713.0	728.5	746.9
Total	\$5,511.1	\$5,149.0	\$5,445.8	\$5,614.0	\$5,600.4

Funding for individual training is shown each year in Program 8 of the FYDP. A portion of the resources under Program 8 are not directly related to individual training. The Services sometimes include costs in Program 8 which support other training and activities in addition to individual institutional training. These costs are related to audiovisual support, training developments, base operations, real property maintenance, and headquarters management type activities.

Within Program 8, for example, the Army funds the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). This command is responsible for Army-wide requirements for audiovisual and visually based instructional materials used for training individuals or units of the Army as a whole. Training Development activities, under TRADOC, produce resident and non-resident training programs and materials to meet the needs of the Army in the field as well as individual training at the Training Centers and Schools. TRADOC also funds combat development activities. The management of HQ, TRADOC is funded by Program 8 as is the real property maintenance (RPMA) and base operations (BASOPS) of all those posts designated as TRADOC installations. Although TRADOC installations may have tenants from other major commands, the RPMA and BASOPS are funded in Program 8.

Tables IX-2 and IX-3 show Navy and Marine Corps funding for individual training by category.

TABLE IX-2. Navy Funding of Individual Training
(Millions)

	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Recruit Training	\$518.2	\$539.0	\$384.2	\$273.7	\$261.8
Officer Acquisition Training	195.4	200.8	204.3	202.0	206.5
Specialized Skill Training	1,625.2	1,560.9	1,372.3	1,380.6	1,421.9
Flight Training	1,005.6	1,006.1	920.2	926.4	1,024.7
Professional Development Education	259.3	251.3	227.7	216.1	224.1
Direct Training Support	112.3	103.5	107.7	113.4	104.4
Training Base Support	657.1	745.7	716.6	502.8	475.7
Training Management Headquarters	37.8	30.2	22.7	20.3	20.2
Reserve Pay & Allowance	38.0	40.0	32.0	41.1	37.3
Total	\$4,448.8	\$4,477.5	\$3,987.6	\$3,676.4	\$3,776.6

TABLE IX-3. Marine Corps Funding of Individual Training
(Millions)

	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Recruit Training	\$302.9	\$277.6	\$297.9	\$317.8	\$322.2
Officer Acquisition Training	16.5	18.4	15.0	15.3	16.0
Specialized Skill Training	588.6	554.4	562.0	615.0	600.3
Flight Training	74.2	71.3	58.4	58.9	56.8
Professional Development Education	69.0	68.2	67.2	67.1	66.6
Direct Training Support	40.4	56.4	60.9	64.4	66.2
Training Base Support	200.3	177.1	180.7	198.3	196.5
Training Management Headquarters	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4
Reserve Pay & Allowance	32.0	70.0	81.0	106.7	112.8
Total	\$1,324.3	\$1,293.6	\$1,323.5	\$1,443.8	\$1,438.0

Table IX-4 shows Air Force funding for individual training by category.

TABLE IX-4. Air Force Funding of Individual Training
(Millions)

	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97
Recruit Training	\$158.4	\$142.0	\$142.8	\$150.7	\$161.8
Officer Acquisition Training	154.1	164.2	168.9	171.4	170.7
Specialized Skill Training	671.6	745.0	754.7	812.6	816.8
Flight Training	770.5	582.6	527.9	592.5	629.8
Professional Development Education	289.1	299.9	301.8	302.6	294.2
Direct Training Support	51.4	70.3	71.7	56.9	54.2
Training Base Support	780.8	881.2	720.8	753.8	778.1
Training Management Headquarters	75.7	74.6	72.9	74.8	73.2
Reserve Pay & Allowance	192.0	186.0	262.0	257.4	260.6
Total	\$3,143.6	\$3,145.7	\$3,023.6	\$3,172.7	\$3,239.5

The funding tables in this chapter include student and trainee pay and allowances as well as pay and allowances for the staff and support manpower for each Service's training schools. This can produce significant distortions in the use of these aggregates for assessing training efficiency, e.g., in the Marine Corps, significant loads are trained by Army and Navy schools. Appendix D shows a distribution of funds for individual training by Service and appropriation. Funding of individual training for the four military Services is shown in Table IX-5.

**TABLE IX-5. Funding of Individual Training
by Service and Type of Training**
(Millions)

FY96	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force	Total
Recruit	\$302.3	\$273.7	\$317.8	\$150.7	\$1,044.6
Officer Acquisition	140.2	202.0	15.3	171.4	528.8
Specialized Skill	1,601.1	1,380.6	615.0	812.6	4,409.2
Flight	439.6	926.4	58.9	592.5	2,017.4
Professional Development	310.1	216.1	67.1	302.6	896.0
Army One-Station Unit	240.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	240.0
Direct Training Support	326.7	113.4	64.4	56.9	561.5
Base Training Support	1,481.8	502.8	198.3	753.8	2,936.6
Training Management Headquarters	43.7	20.3	0.4	74.8	139.2
Reserve Pay & Allowance	728.5	41.1	106.7	257.4	1,133.7
Total	\$5,614.0	\$3,676.4	\$1,443.8	\$3,172.7	\$13,907.1

**TABLE IX-5. (Con't) Funding of Individual Training
by Service and Type of Training**
(Millions)

FY97	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force	Total
Recruit	\$335.5	\$261.8	\$322.2	\$161.8	\$1,081.3
Officer Acquisition	143.6	206.5	16.0	170.7	536.8
Specialized Skill	1,595.4	1,421.9	600.3	816.8	4,434.4
Flight	414.6	1,024.7	56.8	629.8	2,125.9
Professional Development	320.4	224.1	66.6	294.2	905.3
Army One-Station Unit	252.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	252.6
Direct Training Support	315.5	104.4	66.2	54.2	540.3
Base Training Support	1,433.1	475.7	196.5	778.1	2,883.4
Training Management Headquarters	42.8	20.2	0.4	73.2	136.6
Reserve Pay & Allowance	746.9	37.3	112.8	260.6	1,157.6
Total	\$5,600.4	\$3,776.6	\$1,438.0	\$3,239.5	\$14,054.4

Funding estimates in this chapter include substantial segments of cost which are not normally sensitive to significant shifts (up to fifteen percent) in training load. These include certain command, base, facility, and equipment costs. These "fixed" costs need to be considered in program and budget adjustments because, within a reasonable range of output, they remain approximately the same and do not vary as the training load varies. They change, instead, with decisions to change the manner of accomplishing training, most often through training investment decisions or base realignments and closures.

There are often substantial year-to-year fluctuations in funding for fixed costs. These costs are termed "fixed", not because they do not change from year to year, but because their changes characteristically are not "variable" with changes in workloads from period to period. Funding of these costs reflects significant increases for years in which there are major procurements such as simulators, aircraft, or construction in support of training.

Fixed cost has important implications on funding adjustments for changes in the level of activity or size of a training program. If training funds are to be adequate for the needs of a reduced program, they must be reduced by a smaller proportion than the program loads in order to account for fixed costs. By the same token, program increases, within reasonable capacity limits, may not require a proportional increase in total program funding.

APPENDIX A

DETERMINING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

The following overview of the methodology for assessing and calculating training requirements is provided as a framework for understanding. As noted, details in calculation may differ to some extent among the Services and among the training categories.

Requirements

All training is accomplished to satisfy the need for personnel with certain types and levels of skills to man the approved or projected force. The Services, over the years, have developed detailed, systematic methods of determining the manpower needed to man and support the forces. The Defense Manpower Requirements Report discusses this process. From these force requirements for manpower the need for trained personnel with specific skills can then be derived. For example, a given force structure establishes the number of trained enlisted personnel needed. The number of authorized positions within that force structure for radar technicians establishes the basic requirement for trained personnel with that skill. This process is repeated periodically for all skills and skill levels for each Service, for both officer and enlisted skills. The total of all personnel in all skills needed to perform all the jobs in the force at a point in time represents the total requirement for trained manpower projected for that date.

Inventory Projections

The requirements identified through this process must be measured against the available assets, in terms of trained personnel on hand in each skill and skill level. From this asset base, estimates are made of how many trained personnel will be available at various points of time in the future. These estimates take into account probable rates of change to the current inventory -- through reenlistment, promotion, discharge, death, retirement, or other causes. These estimates are based on the best historical information available, tempered by judgment of how in the future personnel policies, the state of the economy, behavioral patterns, and other factors (many of them difficult to predict) will affect the probabilities that a trained individual will remain in the Service. A comparison of skill requirements and skill inventory projections, over time, establishes the extent of shortage or surplus likely to exist in each skill area by month and year. Adjusting the inventory may entail retraining personnel who are in surplus skills, but to a much greater degree, adjustment is likely to require the training of new accessions at entry level in shortage skill areas. The process places a demand on the personnel management and training establishments continually to analyze information

about attrition as it occurs, by skill and skill level, in order to produce the right number of trained personnel with the proper skills needed to restore and maintain the balance of the skill inventory. The workload thus placed on the training establishment is detailed by graduates needed from courses of various lengths and is measured in terms of average student load, or "training load."

Average Training Loads

Resources (manpower, money, and material) needed for any particular category of training vary with the number of students undergoing training at any given time. Facilities must be constructed and maintained to accommodate these students in training. The training establishment must maintain a sufficient staff of qualified instructors to conduct instruction for the "load" of students. Students and Trainees, as described in the "Individuals" chapter of the Defense Manpower Requirements Report, must be programmed to account for the fact that these personnel are in formal school training and are not available for duty with operational units. All of these personnel must be paid, housed, and supported. The basis for establishing these resource requirements is the "average training load."

The aggregate training load of courses of instruction within a given training category or sub-category is computed in accordance with the following formula, except as noted:

$$\frac{\text{Entrants} + \text{Graduates}}{2} \times \text{Course Length}^{1/} = \text{Load}$$

^{1/} Training time is expressed as a fraction of a year

Training load data is calculated by class and aggregated by course and training category. Fractions of carryover classes conducted during the year are included as though they were separate classes. However, individuals remaining in class at the end of a period are not counted as graduates, nor are individuals already in a class at the beginning of a period counted as entrants except for purposes of computing training loads for these fractions of courses.

The training load for a category or sub-category of training (e.g., Specialized Skill Training or Functional Training within that category) is the sum of the loads computed for all classes of courses within the category or sub-category. This formula is also used at the course level or training category level when detailed estimates by class are not available.

This method of computation implies "straight-line" attrition, that is, net class attrition occurs at a constant rate during a course. More detailed methods to calculate the impact of attrition for computation of load are used when better information is available. This is particularly true for high cost courses such as within flight training programs.

Since attrition varies for different training programs and is not always spread uniformly throughout the length of a course of training, determining training loads becomes a complex problem in estimation. This process of estimation involves two related factors.

First, across the spectrum of training programs that are within the scope of this report, attrition varies from nearly zero to as high as 25 to 30 percent. Most officer Professional Development Education programs have practically no attrition. For FY 1996 and 1997, the Services estimate that about 8 percent of new recruits on a DoD wide basis will not complete Recruit Training because they will not have the mental or physical qualifications, or the motivation, for military life. Attrition rates in Specialized Skill Training vary widely, with the longer and more demanding courses tending to have higher losses. Pilot training is near the top of the scale in attrition. The higher rate of losses is based on lack of aptitude or motivation for flying, accidents and similar causes which are intensified in this type of training. While historical data provide a basis for projecting attrition rates for all types of training there is a considerable possibility for error based on variance in such factors as student quality and motivation.

A second necessary step in evaluating the effect of attrition is to estimate the phasing of attrition for each training program. In some courses, attrition tends to be higher in the early stages of a course when those less skilled or lacking motivation are discovered. In other courses, the bulk of attrition may occur toward the end of the course. The patterns of losses vary widely among types of training and over time. The complexities of the attrition variable make it necessary for the Services to use computer simulations in their training load calculations which take into account the rates and time-phasing of attrition.

An additional variation is introduced into the conceptual process of forecasting requirements and planning training loads as described above by the seasonal and cyclical nature of new accessions to the Services. Inputs to many of the more stable training programs -- Professional Development Education, Flight Training, the Service Academies, and the most advanced portions of Specialized Skill Training -- are readily predictable. Inputs to the training programs which are dependent on new accessions (Recruit Training and Initial Skill Training for graduates of Recruit Training) are considerably more volatile. The volume of inputs to these types of training depends on such intangibles as job opportunities in the civilian economy and the decisions of young people to enlist, delay enlisting, or not enlist. Moreover, enlistments are seasonal in nature, following a long-term pattern of "good" and "bad" recruiting months, where phased requirements may move independently of these seasonal patterns. As a result, training loads for the initial active duty training programs are generally based on a compromise involving the timing of predicted enlistments and the capacity of the training base as well as when the new personnel are needed to fill vacancies in the job structure. Most of the courses in these programs are relatively short, and program adjustments can readily be made.

**APPENDIX B
SELECTED MAJOR COURSES/SKILL AREAS
TRAINED IN OTHER SERVICES**

Sponsoring Service	Major Interservice Course/ Skill Area	Participating Services
Army	Construction Equipment Operator	Marine Corps
Army	Airborne	Navy Marine Corps Air Force
Army	Artillery	Marine Corps
Army	Armor	Marine Corps
Army	Explosive Ordnance Disposal	Navy Air Force Marine Corps
Army	Joint Tactical Communications Systems Systems (TRI-TAC)	Navy Air Force Marine Corps
Army	Stinger/Redeye Missile	Navy Air Force Marine Corps
Army	Satellite Communications Fundamentals	Navy Air Force Marine Corps
Army	Tracked Vehicle Repair	Marine Corps Air Force
Army	Correctional Specialist	Navy
Army	Postal Operations	Navy Air Force
Army	Biomedical Equipment Specialist (Basic and Advanced)	Navy Coast Guard
Army	Behavioral Science Specialist	Air Force Marine Corps
Army	Medical Laboratory Specialist (Basic)	Navy Coast Guard
Army	Psychiatric Specialist	Navy

Sponsoring Service	Major Interservice Course/ Skill Area	Participating Services
Army	Veterinary Specialist (Basic)	Air Force Marine Corps
Army	Laser Microwave Hazards	Navy Air Force
Army	Tropical Medicine	Air Force
Army	Respiratory Specialist	Navy
Army	Occupational Therapy Specialist	Air Force
Army	Advanced Digital Theory	Navy
Navy	Aviation Maintenance	Marine Corps
Navy	Flight Training	Marine Corps Coast Guard
Navy	Cryptologic Courses	Army Marine Corps Air Force
Navy	Diving	Army Marine Corps Air Force Coast Guard
Navy	Musician	Army Marine Corps
Navy	Underwater Explosive Ordinance Disposal	Army Marine Corps Air Force
Navy	Cryptographic Maintenance	Marine Corps Air Force Coast Guard Army
Navy	Teletype Maintenance	Marine Corps
Navy	Joint and Combined Planning and Operations	Army Marine Corps Air Force Coast Guard
Navy	Military Justice	Marine Corps Coast Guard

Sponsoring Service	Major Interservice Course/ Skill Area	Participating Services
Navy	Shipboard Firefighting	Marine Corps Coast Guard
Navy	Corrosion Control	Coast Guard
Navy	Damage Control	Coast Guard
Navy	Supply Support	Marine Corps
Navy	Underwater Construction	Army
Navy	Survive, Evade, Resist, Escape (SERE), Code of Conduct	Marine Corps
Navy	Causeway Barge Ferry Training	Army
Navy	Water Survival Training	Air Force Marine Corps
Marine Corps	Assembler Language IBM S/360	Air Force Navy
Marine Corps	COBOL Programming IBM S/360 (OS)	Navy
Marine Corps	FORTTRAN Programming IBM 360	Air Force
Marine Corps	Data Management IBM S/360 (OS)	Air Force
Marine Corps	System Programmer	Navy
Marine Corps	FORTTRAN Programming Special	Navy
Air Force	Navigator Training	Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Tempest (Cryptologic Courses)	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Cryptologic Equipment Maintenance	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Precision Measurement Training	Army Marine Corps
Air Force	Chainwork Maintenance Training	Army Navy
Air Force	Aircraft Repair	Army

Sponsoring Service	Major Interservice Course/ Skill Area	Participating Services
Air Force	Weather Training	Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Military Dog Handler	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Law Enforcement	Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Fire Protection Specialist	Army Marine Corps
Air Force	Automatic Cryogenic Rectifier (ACR) Operator Course	Army Navy
Air Force	Air Intelligence Training	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Broadcast TV Systems	Army Navy
Air Force	Mark IV Transtem System O/M	Marine Corps
Air Force	Calibration	Army
Air Force	Undergraduate Space Training	Army Navy
Air Force	Joint Space Fundamentals	Army Marine Corps
Air Force	Cryptoanalysis	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Imagery Production	Marine Corps
Air Force	Criticomm/Maintenance Courses	Army Navy
Air Force	Graphic Specialist	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Visual Information	Army Marine Corps
Air Force	Cable and Antenna Installation and Maintenance	Army Navy

Sponsoring Service	Major Interservice Course/ Skill Area	Participating Services
Air Force	Telephone and Data Circuit	Army
Air Force	Depot Maintenance	Navy
Air Force	Traffic Management and Accident Investigation	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	AF Senior NCO Academy	Army Navy Marine Corps
Air Force	Joint Space Intelligence Operations Course	Army Navy

APPENDIX C

**INDIVIDUAL TRAINING WORKLOAD AND TRAINING STAFF
AT MAJOR LOCATIONS BY TRAINING CATEGORY
FY 1996**

A. Recruit Training

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Army			
Fort Jackson, SC	5,857	1,027	15
Fort Knox, KY	1,758	387	19
Fort Sill, OK	1,521	287	0
Fort Leonard Wood, MO	3,944	589	31
Navy			
Great Lakes, IL	9,634	877	9
Marine Corps			
Parris Island, SC	4,098	1,155	6
San Diego, CA	5,310	1,123	2
Air Force			
Lackland Air Force Base, TX	3,409	306	58

Note 1: For all tables in Appendix C, Training Staff End Strength (E/S) includes instructors, school staff training center staff, and student supervisors. Manpower for training support, management headquarters, and base operating support is not included.

Note 2: Marine Corps Includes ROTC Basic Camp workload for all categories.

B. Officer Acquisition Training

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Army			
West Point, NY (USMA)	3,756	575	84
Fort Monmouth, NJ (Prep School)	175	12	18
Ft. Benning, GA (OCS)	143	34	2
Navy			
Annapolis, MD	3,966	347	299
Newport, RI	430	31	27
Pensacola, FL	87	31	2
Marine Corps			
OCS, Quantico	254	188	2
Air Force			
Colorado Springs, CO			
Air Force Academy	4,000	857	776
Air Force Academy Prep School	198	32	7
Maxwell AFB, AL (OTS)	234	76	14

C. Specialized Skill Training

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Army			
Aberdeen Proving Ground	2,836	721	182
Fort Benning, GA	2,807	1,985	177
Fort Bliss, TX	1,207	844	148
Fort Devens, MA	666	0	0
Fort Eustis, VA	1,728	723	222
Fort Gordon, GA	4,343	1,054	217
Fort Huachuca, AZ (a)	1,311	1,057	137
Fort Jackson, SC	2,826	374	6
SSI, Fort Jackson, SC	0	450	82
Chap Sch, Fort Jackson, SC	142	61	19
Fort Knox, KY	1,420	2,262	229
Fort Leavenworth, KS	530	91	3
Fort Lee, VA	3,697	789	329
Fort Leonard Wood, MO	1,832	1,057	123
Fort McClellan, AL	755	348	75
Fort Rucker, AL	832	240	82
Fort Sill, OK	1,602	890	107
Monterey, CA (DLI)	2,970	184	501
Lackland AFB, TX (b)	0	25	0
Redstone, Arsenal, AL	1,750	551	183
Navy			
Athens, GA	199	43	12
Bangor, WA	295	358	30
Bethesda, MD (Medical)	198	64	0
Charleston, SC	395	528	0
Dam Neck, VA	959	679	0
Great Lakes, IL	4,266	1,150	53
Great Lakes, IL (Medical)	617	128	0
Groton, CT	1,231	583	10
Groton, CT (Medical)	59	23	0
Gulfport, MS	501	74	13
Indian Head, MD	181	68	0
Jacksonville, FL	281	130	0
Kings Bay, GA	367	290	23
Little Creek, VA	419	154	7
Mayport, FL	131	112	0
Memphis, TN	2,705	861	170
Meridian, MS	539	80	11
Newport, RI	624	311	9
Norfolk, VA	1,176	926	75
Orlando, FL	2,402	524	8
Panama City, FL	156	210	4
Pearl Harbor, HI	178	201	6

C. Specialized Skill Training

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Navy (continued)			
Pensacola, FL	1,212	671	52
Pensacola, FL (Medical)	80	7	0
Port Hueneme, CA	339	83	17
Portsmouth, VA (Medical)	214	59	0
San Diego, CA	3,296	2,251	120
San Diego, CA (Medical)	815	149	0
San Francisco, CA	176	50	0
Schenectady, NY	678	727	0
Whidbey Island, WA	418	167	2
Marine Corps			
MCCDC, Quantico, VA	1,559	890	24
MCB, Camp Lejune, NC	4,443	1,487	53
MCRD, PI, SC	225	329	0
MCLB, Albany, GA	103	49	1
MCRD, San Diego, CA	193	238	0
MCAGCC, 29 Palms, CA	1,250	1,277	84
MCB, Camp Pendleton, CA	510	791	8
Air Force			
Fairchild AFB, WA	1,408	212	2
Goodfellow AFB, TX	1,408	706	113
Keesler AFB, MS	3,017	1,476	572
Lackland AFB, TX	3,049	306	58
Lowry AFB, CO (c)	743	939	213
Sheppard AFB, TX	3,085	866	415
Sheppard AFB, TX (Medical)	1,529	487	65
Brooks AFB, TX	469	149	29
Eielson AFB, AK	15	7	0
Randolph AFB, TX	300	276	23
Tyndall AFB, FL	5	17	0
Vandenberg AFB, CA (d)	4		

- (a) Fort Huachuca includes AMSCO 321731, 321733 and 321734. ATTRS reflects Fort Devens' workload separately. All manpower carried under Fort Huachuca's UIC.
- (b) Instructor assigned to training facilities of another service.
- (c) Lowry AFB closed in Apr 94.
- (d) Technical Training courses transferred from Peterson Field in Aug 94. Training staff end-strength not available

D. Flight Training

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Army			
Fort Rucker, AL			
Undergraduate	672	428	170
Advance/Graduate	394	428	92
Navy			
Corpus Christi, TX	286	164	56
Kingsville, TX	114	93	81
Meridian, MS	182	136	23
Pensacola, FL	746	169	116
Whiting Field, FL	528	258	30
Air Force (a)			
Columbus AFB, MS	178	251	22
Fort Rucker, AL	2	10	0
Lackland AFB, TX (b)	23	15	1
Laughlin AFB, TX	180	233	541
Randolph AFB, TX (c)	287	612	127
Reese AFB, TX	179	229	25
Sheppard AFB, TX	228	144	31
Vance AFB, OK	173	227	25
Fairchild AFB, WA	217	228	2
Eielson AFB, AK	20	7	0

- (a) Air Force figures do not include any Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals (IFF) numbers.
- (b) Training includes flight screening and Security Assistance Training Program (SATP) course at Hondo
- (c) Includes Academy Pilot Introductory Program

E. Professional Development Education

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Army			
Carlisle Barracks, PA	252	53	40
Fort Bliss, TX	842	149	20
Fort Leavenworth, KS	1,186	132	80
Fort McNair, DC	537	21	81
Navy			
Monterey, CA	1,709	97	408
Newport, RI	3,911	116	32
Norfolk, VA	281	51	12
Marine Corps			
MCCDC, Quantico	657	141	32
MCB, CamLej, NC (SNCO)	308	50	0
MCAS, E Toro CA (NCO)	278	48	0
MCB, Camp Butler JA	122	32	0
MCAS, Kaneohe Bay	20	15	0
Air Force (a)			
Noncommissioned Officer Academies			
Barksdale AFB, LA	126	24	
Tyndall AFB, FL	86	18	
McGuire AFB, NJ	86	18	
March AFB, CA	24	19	
Peterson AFB, CO	64	17	
Keesler AFB, MS	92	20	
Lackland AFB, TX	92	20	
Goodfellow AFB, TX	53	12	
Kirtland AFB, NM	59	14	
Robbins AFB, GA	43	10	
Kadena AFB, AK	78	14	
Wheeler Army Air Field, HI	34	5	
Elmendorf AFB, AK	58	12	
Ramstein Air Base, GE	97	23	
RAF Upwood, UK	111	16	
Airman Leadership School			
Barksdale AFB, LA	18	4	
Beal AFB, CA	6	4	
Cannon AFB, NJ	17	6	
Castle AFB, CA	12	4	
Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ	12	4	
Dyess AFB, TX	12	4	
Ellsworth AFB, SD	19	6	

E. Professional Development Education (continued)

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Air Force			
Airman Leadership School			
F. E. Warren AFB, WY	8	4	
Fairchild AFB, WA	16	4	
Grand Forks AFB, ND	16	4	
Griffiss AFB, NY	12	4	
Holloman AFB, NM	18	6	
K. I. Sawyer AFB, MI	8	3	
Langley AFB, VA	17	6	
Loring AFB, ME	4		(b)
Luke AFB, AZ	10	6	
MacDill AFB, FL	16	4	
McConnel AFB, KS	6	3	
Minot AFB, ND	11	5	
Moody AFB, GA	12	4	
Mountain Home AFB, ID	11	6	
Nellis AFB, NV	18	6	
Offutt AFB, NE	12	6	
Pope AFB, NC	11	4	
Seymour Johnson AFB, NC	18	6	
Shaw AFB, SC	19	6	
Tyndall AFB, FL	11	5	
Whiteman AFB, MO	11	4	
Altus AFB, OK	9	4	
Andrews AFB, MD	19	3	
Charleston AFB, SC	9	4	
Dover AFB, DE	8	3	
Hurlburt Field, FL	8	4	
Kirtland AFB, NM	8	3	
Little Rock AFB, AR	10	4	
Malmstrom AFB, MT	10	4	
March AFB, CA	8	3	
McGuire AFB, NJ	10	4	
Plattsburgh AFB, NY	8	3	
Scott AFB, IL	9	3	
Travis AFB, CA	13	6	
Columbus AFB, MS	4	3	
Goodfellow AFB, TX	6	3	
Keesler AFB, MS	19	6	
Lackland AFB, TX	16	4	
Laughlin AFB, TX	6	3	
Randolph AFB, TX	10	4	
Reese AFB, TX	5	2	

E. Professional Development Education (continued)

Facility	Workload	Training Staff E/S	
		Military	Civilian
Air Force			
Airman Leadership School			
Sheppard AFB, TX	11	3	
Edwards AFB, CA	12	3	
Eglin AFB, FL	20	6	
Hanscom AFB, MA	6	2	
Hill AFB, UT	12	4	
Kelly AFB, TX	10	3	
McChord AFB, WA	11	4	
McClellan AFB, CA	11	3	
Robins AFB, GA	7	2	
Tinker/Vance AFB, OK	12	6	
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH	9	4	
Patrick AFB, FL	10	4	
Peterson AFB, CO	18	4	
Vandenberg AFB, CA	9	3	
Bolling AFB, DC	13	4	
Fort Meade, MD	8	3	
Maxwell AFB, AL	7	4	
USAF Academy, CO	8	3	
Aviano Air Base, IT	18	4	
Incirlik AFB, TU	8	3	
RAF Lakenheath, UK	11	5	
RAF Mildenhall, UK	6	3 (b)	
Ramstein Air Base, GE	18	4	
Spangdahlem Air Base, GE	11	4	
Anderson Air Base, GE	8	3	
Elmendorf AFB, AK	28	8	
Kadena AFB, JA	28	7	
Misawa AFB, JA	13	4	
Wheeler Army Air Field, HI	12	3	
Yokata Air Base, JA	12	4	
Other Professional Development Education			
Gunter Air Force Station, AL	244	95	93
Maxwell AFB, AL	950	813	270
Wright Patterson AFB, OH	996	263	303

(a) Air Force - the current manpower standard does not authorize civilians at the NCO Academies or the Airman Leadership Schools.

(b) Air Force - indicates base on closure list. Airman Leadership Schools at these locations have reduced operations or are no longer operational.

APPENDIX D
Summary of Total Funding Individual Training and
and Education by Service and Appropriation, FY96-FY97
(\$ Millions)

Appropriation	FY96	FY97
Army		
Operation and Maintenance	\$2,061.4	\$2,115.4
Military Personnel	2,557.8	2,573.9
Reserve Personnel	363.1	376.7
National Guard Personnel	365.4	370.2
Aircraft Procurement	53.7	41.1
Missile Procurement	2.4	2.4
Weapons Procurement	7.6	8.0
Other Procurement	52.0	41.9
Military Construction	150.7	70.9
Total Army	\$5,614.0	\$5,600.4
Navy		
Operation and Maintenance	\$1,043.3	\$1,075.1
Military Personnel	2,132.7	2,137.3
Reserve Personnel	41.1	37.3
Aircraft Procurement	393.9	468.4
Other Procurement	49.4	58.5
Military Construction	16.0	0.0
Total Navy	\$3,676.4	\$3,776.6
Marine Corps		
Operation and Maintenance	\$209.3	\$203.7
Military Personnel	1,123.4	1,115.3
Reserve Personnel	106.7	112.8
Other Procurement	0.9	1.0
Military Construction	3.5	5.2
Total Marine Corps	\$1,443.8	\$1,438.0
Air Force		
Operation and Maintenance	\$1,213.6	\$1,243.9
Military Personnel	1,634.1	1,656.0
Reserve Personnel	131.3	134.0
National Guard Personnel	126.1	126.6
Aircraft Procurement	25.2	27.0
Other Procurement	14.8	10.7
Military Construction	26.5	39.2
Research & Development	1.1	2.0
Total Air Force	\$3,172.7	\$3,239.5
Total	\$13,907.1	\$14,054.4

APPENDIX E

O&M FUNDING for TRAINING AND EDUCATION BY CATEGORY BY SERVICE (\$ in Millions)

	FY 96 Estimate	FY 97 Estimate
<u>Recruit Training</u>		
Army ^{1/}	28.2	31.4
Navy	4.7	5.0
Marine Corps	7.3	7.7
Air Force	3.9	3.9
Total	44.1	48.0
<u>Specialized Skill Training</u>		
Army	236.8	245.5
Navy	212.1	211.2
Marine Corps	25.1	21.7
Air Force	204.5	198.1
Defense Health Program	84.7	86.0
Total	763.2	762.5
<u>Professional Development</u>		
Army	69.0	80.8
Navy	61.2	67.1
Marine Corps	5.8	6.0
Air Force	78.7	72.7
Defense Health Program	1.8	1.8
Total	216.5	228.4
<u>Officer Acquisition</u>		
Army	58.3	61.9
Navy	66.8	68.7
Marine Corps	0.2	0.2
Air Force	49.2	50.7
Defense Health Program	129.4	138.1
Total	303.9	319.6
<u>Senior ROTC ^{2/}</u>		
Army	109.8	113.5
Navy	64.8	69.0
Air Force	39.2	40.9
Total	213.8	223.4

^{1/} Includes Army One Station Unit Training (OSUT)

^{2/} O&M funding for ROTC is NOT included in MMTR compilations; ROTC students are NOT included in military end strength.

**APPENDIX E
(Con't)**

	FY 96 Estimate	FY 97 Estimate
<u>Flight Training</u>		
Army	218.5	218.1
Navy	273.0	296.7
Marine Corps	0.2	0.2
Air Force	337.0	355.0
Total	828.7	870.0
<u>Training Support</u>^{3/}		
Army	375.5	374.8
Navy	125.2	119.8
Marine Corps	75.0	76.7
Air Force	65.1	64.2
Total	640.8	635.5
<u>Base Support</u>^{3/}		
Army	1,278.8	1,306.6
Navy	528.5	521.8
Marine Corps	136.3	136.9
Air Force	637.1	661.8
Total	2,580.7	2,627.1

^{3/} O&M funding in these categories also includes support to unit training activities, environmental compliance programs, and other personnel activities that are NOT included in MMTR compilations.