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JAEC in Training Transformation

Training Transformation

Anticipating, Evaluating, and Guiding Development

Areas of Interest/Influence

- T2 Integration
- T2 Metrics Development
- Block Assessments
- TC AoA Implementation
- T2 Adaptive Planning Integration
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Developing Metrics for Block Assessments

- Training Transformation (T2) I-Plan established Block Assessments as the primary mechanism for assessing joint training capabilities and T2 integration and management.

- Purpose of the Block Assessment
  - Complete a coordinated assessment T2
  - Recommend strategic and programmatic changes to T2 and other related joint training
  - Provide feedback concerning how best to assure that forces are trained to provide the needed operational capabilities, now and in the future
Feedback drawn from multiple levels:
- Observations of Training Effectiveness
- “Tactical,” Lessons Learned
- Operational Indicators of Mission Effectiveness
Developing an Analytical Assessment Approach

• Block Assessment will be conducted by experts on two separate panels:
  – Training Assessment Panel
    • Individual Training Assessment Team
    • Collective Training Assessment Team
    • Integration between Individual and Collective Training
  – Management Assessment Panel

• Each Panel will conduct an assessment on their respective piece of T2 by developing metrics in collaboration with the offices primarily responsible for Joint Training
Block Assessment Metrics Development

• Block Assessment is not designed to be an inspection of training organizations
  – Metric development is collaborative process
  – Metrics for the Block Assessment will focus on how the training organizations measure their own production

• Feedback from the Block Assessment will help organizations develop better metrics, and ultimately lead them to better meet operational needs

• Feedback will also provide feedback on current initiatives to Joint Training Leadership in the Department
Metrics Development

- Individual and Collective Team working groups developed initial set of metrics
  - Teams are composed of JAEC personnel and key players from JNTC, JKDDC, OSD, Joint Staff, and the Services
  - Focused on assessing effectiveness of organizations, plan to incorporate more efficiency measures in FY 07

- Assessment success depends on level of collaboration between JAEC and the training organizations
Program Assessment Rating Tool
Assessment Approach

• Program Assessment Rating Tool is run by OMB
  − Approx 20% of all Federal programs are assessed each year
  − Central to Budget and Performance Integration (BPI); focus on results
  − 2005 cycle includes “DoD Training and Education Program,” a $7B slice of the budget consisting mainly of Budget Activity #3
  − Exclusions: Recruiting (assessed last year) and some specific functions such as Base Support

• PART has a different focus than other JAEC activities: not “T2”

The Assessment
• For a good evaluation, a program must use performance to:
  − Manage
  − Justify resources
  − Continually improve efficiency

• Requires measures, baselines, and goals
  − Responses must be based on evidence, not impressions
  − OMB is looking for performance, not process
PART – The Solution

• PART process
  - OSD Director Readiness and Training assigned JAEC to coordinate inputs
  - Expertise lies with Services

• PART emphasizes outcome and efficiency metrics; most DoD Training and Education activities use output metrics
  - ITRR is familiar to PART Team, but it’s based on output measures
  - Monitoring Status of Forces brief (for Dr. Chu) has output, outcome, and efficiency measures, but not all that PART needs

• PART measures (tentative as of draft deadline)
  - Number of people that complete specified programs (output)
  - % of COCOM staff positions filled by Joint educated personnel (outcome)
  - Cost per student for specified programs (efficiency)

• The hammer: pressure to adjust program budget based on its PART rating
**Balanced Scorecard (BSC)**

- **USD(P&R) conducts a quarterly BSC**
  - JAEC is analyzing the product (Individuals and Units) provided to COCOMs
  - Core question: Are COCOMs receiving Staff Officers and Units that are ready to function in the joint operational environment they will face?

- **Analytic approach**
  - Focus is on the training, education and experience provided before arrival at the COCOM
  - Coordinating with JS J1, J7, MPP and Services to identify the *correct* Individual metrics
  - Valid data is the key, but difficult to come by; many different aspects to these metrics
Current COCOM Individual Metrics Tree

- **COCOM Staff Training**
  - **Quantity**
    - Total Number of COCOM Joint Billets Filled
    - Total Number of COCOM Critical Billets Filled
  - **Quality**
    - To Be Developed
  - **Responsiveness**
    - JPME-2 Throughput - Percent of JPME-2 School quotas filled
    - JPME-2 Graduates Assigned to Joint Billets
Current COCOM Unit Metrics Tree

In Development

Leverage Block Assessment