UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

ADB951157

NEW LIMITATION CHANGE

TO

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

FROM

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative/Operational Use; AUG 1952. Other requests shall be referred to Army Adjutants General Officer, Washington, DC 20310.

AUTHORITY

AGO, DoDD 5200.20, Nov 1979

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN DELIMITED
AND CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE
UNDER DOD DIRECTIVE 5200.20 AND
NO RESTRICTIONS ARE IMPOSED UPON
ITS USE AND DISCLOSURE.

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE;
DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED.

AD B951157

[redacted]

RESEARCH NOTES

Number 52-46

UNANNOUNCED

Aug[redacted]52

(12) 25

(6)

PILOT STUDY TO AID IN THE DESIGNING OF RESEARCH ON THE OFFICER CANDIDATE TRAINING PROGRAM.

PJ-3407-01.

(14) AGO-PRS-RESEARCH NOTE-52-46

DDC FILE COPY

[redacted]

79 11 07 123

PERSONNEL RESEARCH SECTION

PR AND P BR, AGO 003 650

PILOT STUDY TO AID IN THE DESIGNING OF RESEARCH ON THE OFFICER CANDIDATE TRAINING PROGRAM

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Objective Method	
PROBLEMS OF THE OFFICER CANDIDATE TRAINING PROGRAM	2
Operational problems within the OCTP Policy problems affecting OCTP operations	4
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	6
ANTICIPATED RESEARCH PROBLEMS	8
APPENDIXES: OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SEVERAL SCHOOLS	
A The Engineer Officer Candidate School, Fort Belvoir, Virginia	11
B The Field Artillery Officer Candidate School, Fort Sill, Oklahoma	13
C The Armored Officer Candidate Department, Fort Knox, Kentucky	15
D The Signal Corps Officer Candidate Department, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey	16
E The Infantry Officer Candidate School, Fort Benning, Georgia	18
F The Ordnance Officer Candidate School, Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md.	20
G The Antiaircraft and Guided Missiles Branch Officer Candidate School, Fort Bliss, Texas	22
H The Army Officer Candidate School, The Army General School, Fort Riley, Kansas	25

Accession For
By
Dist
Dist

Research Note No. 52-46

PILOT STUDY TO AID IN THE DESIGNING OF RESEARCH ON THE OFFICER CANDIDATE TRAINING PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

OBJECTIVE

In planning research to be conducted at the several branch material officer candidate schools established as part of the expansion of the officer candidate training program, the advantages of close contact with the schools readily became apparent. It was evident that differences in policies, personnel, local conditions, and demands of particular arms or services could create marked differences in selection problems for the separate schools. Even if external factors had no effect upon the operations of the schools, it would be desirable to have some basis for evaluating both the problems of the particular schools and the data to be obtained from them.

It was considered necessary to determine areas in which research would be most effective, beyond routine evaluations of current and proposed selection instruments, through close coordination with the schools.

The specific objective of the project was, then, to gain a thorough understanding of the current practical and operational problems met by the officer candidate schools in matters of selection and evaluation. It was anticipated that this information would serve as a basis for the planning and development of further research, and in many ways would facilitate the actual conduct of that research.

METHOD

Visits were made to each of the branch material officer candidate schools which were in operation as of 1 January 1952. In the course of these visits, which were conducted quite informally, particular emphasis was placed upon each of the following topics.

Methods of evaluating candidates. Procedures employed in obtaining tactical officers' evaluations and rankings, fellow-candidates' evaluations and rankings, composite tactical measures, etc., were discussed in detail with members of the Operations staffs and with Tactical personnel. Particular stress was placed upon the general philosophy and principles of evaluation. Whenever requested, detailed recommendations were made to the staffs, outlining in operational terms such evaluation principles as objectivity, independence of raters and rating areas, rating generalizations to be avoided ("halo" factors), economy of rating and recording effort, etc. While avoiding overt comparisons of schools, information about methods found to be operationally satisfactory and desirable was disseminated.

At the Engineer School, PRS representatives served informally as consultants during the initial formulation and later revision of the tactical evaluation program. At the Signal School, a member of PRS assisted the staff in the construction of an evaluation program.

Total operation of the school. The overall operation of the officer candidate school itself, and its relation to the arm or service center of which it is a part, was investigated in detail. Attention was paid to the manner in which the candidate school was integrated into the operations of the training effort at the post, the relationship of tactical and academic areas, the position of the school in the training and administrative chain of command. For example, considerable variability was found in the extent to which individual OCS's could exercise influence over academic instruction, and the stress placed upon academics as a portion of the total candidate training program.

Problems of selection. Personnel at all echelons were interviewed with reference to their concepts of the principal selection problems. Tactical and other operating personnel were encouraged to discuss personality and background factors in need of further attention, while personnel officers offered their observations of administrative and procedural problems which were within the realm of the selection research area.

Anticipated research activities. At schools sufficiently well established to have interest in such details at the time of the visit, the nature of anticipated research (biographical information blank validations, evaluations of all predictor and criterion measures) was discussed in sufficient detail to prepare the school personnel for the kinds of demands which cooperation in the research program would place upon them. In all such cases, willingness to participate in research activities was expressed. Preliminary agreements were made, and in some cases provisions were made for data collection.

PROBLEMS OF THE OFFICER CANDIDATE TRAINING PROGRAM

This Research Note presents and discusses the information obtained through these interviews. Information general to the schools follows in the text of the Research Note; information on the operational characteristics of specific schools is presented in the Appendix.

OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS WITHIN THE OCTP

Eligibility requirements. Sentiment exists in several of the schools for increasing the minimum entrance age requirement. Discussion with school personnel suggest that immaturity, rather than age, is the basic problem; moreover, evidence available fails to substantiate any appreciable relationship between success and age per se.

Many of the arguments raised in favor of an increase in minimum age are based upon an appraisal of the maturity level of many of the unsuccessful candidates. The arguments stress such characteristics as lack of self confidence, timidity, lack of force or aggressiveness, inability to accept responsibility, etc. While many of the comments received appear to be peripheral, there is sufficient consistency to suggest the need for investigating these characteristics when instruments are considered for revision.

Pretraining. "Insufficient military background" is offered as a reason for the relief of many candidates, and has stimulated interest in a minimum-term-of-service prerequisite. This problem is involved with many others, however, including the desirability of reinstating a Leaders Course, or similar training period, as a prerequisite for OCS enrollment. It has been suggested that, with classes composed exclusively of officer candidates, a Leaders Course could probably serve both as an adequate screen for OCS, and as a very desirable medium for preliminary leadership training. Its use in this way would also serve effectively to increase prior service standards, without effecting changes in present requirements. Present Army policy seriously limits planning for pretraining programs.

Classification and assignment. Concern has been expressed for differences in branch requirements, and for the problems of assigning to each school the selected applicants who are best suited for that branch. It has not yet been possible to evaluate the classification and assignment procedures incorporated in the revised regulations (SR 350-350-20, 25 Sep 51), because of processing lag and the large backlog of candidates to whom assignment committments were made under earlier procedures. However, it is already evident that some modifications in methods of assigning quotas are desirable, to effect an optimal assignment program. Allocation of school quotas in accordance with branch distributions within commands seems a first logical change in current procedures.

Administrative attrition. Some schools have experienced a heavy resignation rate very early in training, and many candidates submit resignations even before classes are formally enrolled. Some of the better supported reasons offered for these early resignations include quota-padding and misclassification. It has been suggested that much of the attrition due to these sources could be alleviated (1) through publicity, and (2) through the introduction of another interview stage in the processing program.

It is felt in many of the schools that quotas should be permissive, and not obligatory; that the commands should be placed under no obligation to fill them by securing "hand-cuffed volunteers," but should be supported in their efforts to secure the best talent for officer training.

Interest has also been expressed in the addition of a pre-enrollment interview, to be conducted before a candidate leaves his last duty station for OCS. The purpose would be to provide each candidate with an opportunity to resign before assignment, and to secure a statement which would preclude early resignation if assignment is accepted.

Academic attrition. For the most part, attrition due to academic factors is low, and presents no major problem. There is evidence to suggest, however, that in all of the schools the major source of academic difficulty may be related to deficiency in arithmetic or basic mathematics. The magnitude of the problem is not confined to statistics on attrition; while arithmetic deficiency is a factor in many academic failures, many more candidates who are otherwise able to complete the training with a satisfactory average grade, fail in courses with arithmetic content. The problem should be viewed in terms of the value of officer candidate training as a whole. The implication of the present situation is that, while many candidates are successfully completing their courses, they are nevertheless leaving the schools insufficiently trained in certain areas. However, arithmetic deficiency can be considered a problem of training rather than selection, since many candidates with arithmetic deficiencies possess the ability to become arithmetically proficient.

Personnel. Manpower utilization is a common problem, and all schools suffer from inadequate pools of good tactical officers, and from insufficient clerical assistance. First steps toward solution of manpower problems could be taken by the schools, however, in revising internal procedures to effect optimal utilization of available personnel.

Together with the need for an opportunity to select tactical officers goes the desirability for selecting, training, and informing members of the Interview Boards.

POLICY PROBLEMS AFFECTING OCT" OPERATIONS

Present operation of the Officer Candidate Training Program, and any anticipated changes in operation, must be considered in relation to overall Army problems. Certain of the modifications which have been proposed by the schools, and others which would seem to have considerable benefit for the training program, cannot be readily adjusted to the broader training and manpower programs within the Army as a whole.

The single, most limiting problem handicapping the development of an independently satisfactory officer candidate program is the present term of enlistment. The bulk of the manpower pool, enlisted or inducted, is obligated for approximately two years; the Army is faced with the problem of creating a selection and training program which is compatible with this limitation.

Even as presently conducted, the officer candidate program obligates a successful candidate to a longer term of service. In the unusual case, in which a candidate proceeds directly from basic training to OCS with no processing delays, at the completion of his 18 months of obligated commissioned service he will already have exceeded his original enlistment term by two or three months. While this can be considered a very minor sacrifice in return for the several advantages and opportunities implicit in a commission, it is emphasized that an unusual case is being considered. It illustrates that under optimal circumstances, the officer training program completely fills present enlistment obligations; and the recently discharged officer must still complete a five year reserve committment.

Obviously, any factor which serves to delay the date of graduation from OCS handicaps the Army in its efforts to "sell" the program. Leaders Course, special preliminary training, higher age and term-of-service eligibility requirements, increased periods of candidate training, etc., would all serve to place the officer candidate program in an unfavorable position as it seeks to encourage applications. Undoubtedly, many desirable applicants, when faced with the necessity of extending enlistment contracts in order to engage in the program, decide instead to "sweat out" their current enlistment terms -- especially if they realize that opportunities exist for direct appointments after they are discharged.

It has been suggested that the 18-month post-graduate requirement be reduced or eliminated, in the interests of encouraging applications and developing a well trained office reserve pool. Present Army policy regards the OCS as a device to meet immediate active duty officer needs, however, and the 18-month tour is considered to be a minimum return for the training investment.

Assuming that adequate publicity and local encouragement can offset these disadvantages, and encourage applications from the high potential group, the problems of higher eligibility standards must then be considered in relation to the characteristics of the overall manpower pool. What are the age, education, length of service, and aptitude area distributions in the present and potential pools, and to what extent could OCS requirements be met if present standards are adjusted? Aside from the inherent difficulty in estimating answers to these questions, two problems arise: One is the desirability of maintaining favorable selection ratios. The other is a reminder that OCS competes with CIC, ASA, airborne, scientific and technical training, and other high priority programs in obtaining superior personnel.

Opposed to the Army's desire to minimize the time required to train officers, and the limitations which this imposes upon selection standards, is the everpresent pressure to reduce attrition. There is, of course, no explicit intention to accomplish higher rate of output through a compromise with present graduation standards; but there is considerable evidence to suggest that attrition can be materially reduced without reducing the quality of candidates and graduates.

However, the total effect of the many external pressures bearing upon the schools suggests the need for some reexamination of missions and responsibilities. The little evidence that is now available suggests that the schools are doing an outstanding job in training those whom they graduate; this is encouraging both for the schools and for the appraisal of the quality of selection. However, there exists in many of the schools a tendency to place a great deal of emphasis on requirements or characteristics which are difficult to attain, under present manpower conditions and under present Army policy.

For example, in the past, candidates have been relieved for "insufficient military background," although the schools may feel that they are otherwise qualified, and likely to make good officers after a little more experience has been acquired. Obviously, under present operating conditions (which emphasize the need for obtaining candidates, whenever possible, directly from basic training) there is little opportunity for many candidates to acquire a great deal of "military background." As long as present application and selection conditions prevail, this places an additional burden on the schools, and a challenge as well. If attrition cannot be reduced by increasing certain eligibility requirements, the schools must make an additional effort to provide a great deal of the "military background" which is deemed desirable, and to cultivate other characteristics which, under ideal conditions, would be brought to them by the candidates themselves.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

A high rate of attrition continues to be one of the principal concerns of the schools, and of those responsible for establishment of policies; it motivates continued interest in improvement in selection. Leadership deficiency is given as the major source of attrition, and is listed as the cause in about 50% of the reliefs. There are many factors to be considered in interpreting attrition figures, however.

Even under optimal conditions of selection, attrition would probably continue at a reasonably high rate. Greater reductions could be accomplished through administrative adjustments--and in a shorter period of time--than are likely to be effected through major improvements in selection validities. Schools are presently receiving candidates who are unqualified, ineligible, and even unwilling to attend OCS. Selection instruments (particularly the officer candidate interview and the evaluation report) are probably not being used, in all cases, in accordance with the conditions specified for them. There is reason to believe that the purpose, importance, and needs of the officer candidate training program are not adequately understood by all the persons who are implicitly involved in the selection process.

The overall impression is that, by enlisting the informed cooperation of the Army as a whole, the lot of the officer candidate schools could be greatly improved, with a consequent gain in efficiency and economy. This suggests the need for broader publicity; close interaction of schools, commands, and screening installations; and some kind of overall control to secure compliance with policies and intentions.

Within the schools themselves, stated reasons for relief cannot always be accepted uncritically. The regulations provide a limited number of justifications for relief, and the schools are obliged to adhere to them, at least topically. Especially in cases of resignation, underlying causes are not always determined. The problem could be more easily attacked, at least from a research point of view, if school commanders were authorized to relieve deficient, unqualified, or unwilling candidates, stating the cause without reference to stereotypes. Such a provision should be supplemented by educating the faculty boards in informal interview methods which would better serve to uncover predictable reasons for failure and disagreement.

Insofar as attrition categories can be validly identified, they can serve as very satisfactory targets of selection research.

Another source of concern, not always apparent to the schools themselves, is the programs of evaluation. In some cases, the evaluation program seems to have been developed for its sake alone, without an understanding of the purpose it is to serve, or of the information to be gained from it. The problem is particularly acute at the level of the tactical officer, who in every case is a major cog in the program. In too many cases, there is reason to believe that the tactical officers do not understand their evaluation tasks, and consequently perform them mechanically. There is always the danger that the system is "manipulated" in some way, defeating the intended objectivity. The problem is accentuated in some cases through the use of complex procedures whose justification is not apparent or appreciated at the operating levels.

Some interest has been expressed in a standardized evaluation procedure. While this would constitute a highly desirable research goal, it is predicated upon research which would seek to determine, first, if the leadership or tactical requirements of all branches are sufficiently similar to justify standardized programs. In the meantime, simplification of evaluation procedures within the schools, and thorough instruction of the evaluators themselves, should provide more reliable school criteria, and greater evaluative efficiency.

Two questions are necessarily left unanswered in this survey. No effort was made, in this project, to discover problems beyond the schools themselves; and it is impossible, at this time, to evaluate the effects of recent changes in the regulations governing the OCS program.

The value of the officer candidate schools, the adequacy of their determinations of who will and will not graduate, and the whole problem of selection and training standards cannot be determined until follow-up investigations have been conducted. This study was concerned only with problems affecting the schools themselves, but these cannot be realistically divorced from the consideration of the OCS product. At the present time, the Infantry school is conducting an informal, but reasonably extensive follow-up investigation of its own, and first results are complimentary to the training program.

The principal effect of the recent changes in OCS regulations should be in the direction of improved school assignment. Together with some adjustments in eligibility requirements (e.g., civilians may no longer volunteer specifically for OCS training), this is likely to make an observable difference in the candidate populations within each school. For this reason, it is well to withhold judgment based solely upon observations of candidates admitted to the program prior to the regulation changes.

While these regulations provide a means for assignment of selected candidates to specific schools (and procedures for determining quotas have recently been adjusted to facilitate the assignment program), differential assignment provides a challenging area for research. The problem will be explored in the course of research already anticipated. The attitudes of school personnel suggest that the differences between the schools are largely confined to academic curricula; there is a fairly common feeling that the leadership training problems are essentially the same. If this is true, and if it can be shown that the leadership requirements of the branches (as well as the schools) are essentially the same, it will probably be necessary to approach differential assignment via the cognitive area.

One major conclusion which can be drawn from this pilot investigation is that the selection of candidates is not the sole problem of the officer candidate training program. Insofar as the selection program is interpreted as one aspect of a broader effort to improve officer procurement and training, an additional contribution can be made by enlisting the interest of agencies which can investigate other aspects. Improved selection cannot, in itself, eliminate attrition, improve evaluation and curricula programs, or enhance the over-all value of training.

ANTICIPATED RESEARCH PROBLEMS

As information was gathered in the course of conducting the pilot project, plans for some research projects were formulated, and detailed plans were made for collection of data from several sources. Some research problems clearly provided for, and others which can be investigated through analysis of data which will be obtained, are listed below:

A. Differential ~~predictability~~ predictive effectiveness of biographical information blanks and other instruments (including the classification battery).

B. Development of a "best biographical information blank" (To be investigated in part in PJ 3407-06) from OCB-3, OCB-4, OCB-5, and OCB-6.

C. Determination of optimal weights of members of the selection composite (biographical information blank, officer candidate interview, officer candidate evaluation), either for overall selection or for differential selection. (To be investigated in part in PJ 3407-06).

D. Determination of predictable areas of criterion variance not presently predicted by selection instruments. What additional instrument forms can be developed?

E. Determination of predictive significance of specific background and eligibility factors, such as age, education, length of military service, etc. With the size and breadth of the sample to be obtained in PJ 3407-05, a fairly definitive answer should be possible.

F. Determination of adequacy of present school assignment factors (Branch classification weights, quota allocations).

G. Determination of an optimal operational criterion for evaluation of selection validity, which will circumvent restriction in range and pre-selection problems.

PERSONNEL

Program Coordinator: Lindsay R. Harmon
Project Director (Acting): Marshall N. Reyman
Research Associate: Jack A. Parrish

COLLECTION OF DATA: September 1951 - January 1952

PREPARATION OF RESEARCH NOTE: 15 March 1952

APPENDIXES

OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SEVERAL SCHOOLS

While the branch material officer candidate schools have a fairly common mode of operation and organization, each is unique when examined in detail. These differences are likely to be revealed in the course of the studies to be conducted in PR 3407. In the interests of interpreting the later studies to be conducted in this program, and to provide explicit definitions of variables within each school, a discussion of each of the following schools is presented here.1/

Appendix	School
A	The Engineer Officer Candidate School, Fort Belvoir, Virginia
B	The Field Artillery Officer Candidate School, Fort Sill, Oklahoma
C	The Armored Officer Candidate Department, Fort Knox, Kentucky
D	The Signal Corps Officer Candidate Department, Fort Monmouth, N. J.
E	The Infantry Officer Candidate School, Fort Benning, Georgia
F	The Ordnance Officer Candidate School, Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md.
G	The Antiaircraft and Guided Missiles Branch Officer Candidate School, Fort Bliss, Texas
H	The Army Officer Candidate School, The Army General School, Fort Riley, Kansas

1/ Details in this section were corrected as of 15 Jan 52. Changes in input figures, organization, and evaluation procedures can be made, of course, at anytime.

APPENDIX A

THE ENGINEER OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL, FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA

1. Input: 53 candidates per week.

2. Tactical organization: Each class of 53 candidates constitutes a platoon of two sections, to which two Tactical Officers are assigned. Three platoons constitute a company, and platoons are rotated among the companies at specified periods in their training, so that each company will contain a platoon at each level of training: Advanced, Intermediate, and Initial.

3. School organization: The tactical organization is under the direction of the Commandant of the Officers Candidate School, responsible for housekeeping and administration, leadership evaluation, and active leadership instruction. Academic instruction is conducted by the various departments within the Engineer School.

4. General policies: Faculty Boards are convened at specified periods to review candidates at the end of each level of training. Appearance before a board is determined by composite score (a measure of performance in all phases of training), or upon the recommendation of the Tactical Officers. Squad are reorganized after each board session to maintain squad size.

5. Leadership evaluation: Candidates are ranked and rated by fellow candidates and by tactical personnel, during the 5th, 12th, 18th, and 21st weeks of training. During the 6th week, all evaluations are conducted at the squad level; all other evaluations are concerned with platoons as a whole.

   a. Fellow candidates determine a leadership order of merit, by an alternate nomination procedure. Before the order of merit has been established, a brief statement of the characteristics of each squad member is written. Candidates are ordered in accordance with their average rank on each fellow candidates roster; written ratings are evaluated qualitatively by tactical and board personnel.

   b. The two Tactical Officers cooperatively determine an order of merit for the candidates in their platoon, also by alternate nomination procedure.

c. An over-all order of merit is obtained by weighting the Tactical Officers' and average Fellow Candidates' rankings 5 and 4, respectively. For end-of-course reporting, these measures and a practical-exercise Leadership test are weighted 5,4, and 1, respectively.

d. While subject to change, the weighting of all elements in the final graduation composite score at the time of preparation of this report is 5,4, and 1 respectively for Leadership, academic, and physical efficiency.

APPENDIX B

THE FIELD ARTILLERY OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL, FORT SILL, OKLAHOMA

1. Input: 120-140 candidates every two weeks.

2. Tactical Organization: Each class is organized as a Field Artillery Battery, consisting of two platoons of two sections each. The Battery Commander functions as Senior Tactical Officer, assisted by one tactical officer for each of the two platoons.

3. School Organization: Essentially the same as at the Engineer School, except that certain housekeeping functions are performed directly by the Artillery Center.

4. General policies: Faculty boards are convened when necessary to review the records of deficient candidates. As a general rule, however, relief of candidates is accomplished through voluntary resignation. The two tactical officers within a battery are rotated between the platoons at infrequent intervals. Enlisted drill instructors, with the nominal status of officers, assist the tactical officers in command instruction, and have considerable disciplinary authority. Both the enlisted instructors and senior candidates nearing graduation assist in the evaluation of candidates by filing reports of observation.

5. Leadership evaluation: Periods of evaluation vary according to the measure being employed; for the most part, only the 12th week provides a thorough interim measure.

   a. Tactical Officers make weekly ratings on each of ten traits, and these are summarized every four weeks. Platoon standing is determined directly from averages of these ratings, The Battery Commander, in conference with the tactical officers, determines a class standing, or battery standing, by integrating the two platoon rankings. Tactical officers have, as guides, reports of observation of particular incidents, and rating forms used in grading practical exercises.

   b. Candidates rank the members of their platoons, and prepare written comments, every 6 weeks. The candidate rankings have no explicit weight, however, and are used only for the information of tactical and board personnel.

   c. Demerit standings are determined separately for each period of four weeks. Those who acquire in excess of 150% of the class average of demerits are placed on probation; those who exceed 200% of the class average are recommended for dismissal.

d. Physical efficiency is included under a miscellaneous area within the academic curriculum; it is not recorded as part of the academic total, but is used as a screening device. Candidates must score 211 on the first test, and 248 on remaining tests; failures are recommended for relief.

e. Academics, tactical rankings, and demerits are weighted 70,25, and 5 in determining over-all standing.

APPENDIX C

THE ARMORED OFFICER CANDIDATE DEPARTMENT, FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY

1. Input: 100 candidates every two weeks.

2. Tactical Organization: Each class is considered a company, consisting of two platoons, with eight squads in each platoon. One tactical officer is assigned to each platoon. Except for small squad size, organization conforms to an Infantry company T/O.

3. School Organization: Essentially the same as at the Engineer school.

4. General policies: When visited, the Armored OCS was in a stage of initial development, having received its first class only three weeks previously. Its evaluation procedures, summarized below, were somewhat indefinite, and involved some duplication of effort and replication of forms. No definite weights had been established. At the request of the school, several recommendations were made, based upon principles of rating objectivity and economy. Considerable emphasis is placed upon physical proficiency.

5. Leadership evaluation:

   a. Tactical officers' weekly observation ratings. Numerical ratings, on a scale from 0 to 100, are made each week on each of ten traits; in making these the tactical officer has, as guide, reports of observation and a weekly observation work sheet to which daily observations are posted. From these weekly ratings, platoon standings are determined at the end of each four-week period. The company commander utilizes these ratings in determining standings within the class as a whole.

   b. Candidates rankings are prepared in the 7th, 12th, and 18th weeks. Candidates prepare written comments on each member of the platoon, and these are used qualitatively to provide information both about the candidates rated, and those doing the rating. Candidates also rank the members of their platoons, from which a platoon standing is determined. At the time the school was visited, the procedure for accomplishing the rankings was not specified in detail.

   c. Every four weeks, the company officers determine a Class Adaptability Standing based upon the tactical officer's ratings, demerits, and physical efficiency tests. In practice, this adaptability standing is a non-standardized reflection of the tactical officer's ratings.

APPENDIX D

THE SIGNAL CORPS OFFICER CANDIDATE DEPARTMENT, FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY

1. Input: 70 candidates every two weeks.

2. Tactical Organization: Classes are organized into sections of 35 candidates, to each of which a tactical officer is assigned. Each section in turn consists of three squads. Six sections constitute a company, and all companies are organized under one battalion headquarters.

3. School Organization: The Officer Candidate Department is an integral and reasonably autonomous organization under the Signal School. The Commandant of the Department is responsible for all aspects of training, evaluation, and housekeeping. Evaluation and tactical training is a function of the battalion organization; and an Academic Department, under the Commandant, conducts academic training specifically for officer candidates.

4. General policies: The Signal Corps OCD has an intergrated program of evaluation in which each measure, academic or tactical, is alloted a specific portion of a total of 1000 weights. All measures within the department are converted and reported in Army standard scores, for convenience in comparison, weighting, and summation.

   Boards are convened for each class in the 8th, 16th, and final week of training. Appearance before the board is determined by low general performance, or by pronounced weakness in either of the two major areas.

5. Leadership evaluation: The school evaluation program is geared to provide a summary of over-all performance at three periods during training, corresponding with the meeting of the faculty board.

   a. Candidate Squad Ranking. During the 3d, 6th, 14th, and 20th weeks, candidates rank the members of their squads using an alternate nomination procedure and a specified criterion for judgment. The procedure is essentially that specified for the Student Leadership Evaluation Report, PRT 827, constructed for use in Leaders Course.

   b. Candidate Section Ranking: In the 7th, 15th, and 21st weeks, members of the section are ranked by dividing the members of each squad into top, bottom, and middle thirds, and then ranking these squad-sized groups separately into top, bottom, and middle thirds.

c. Tactical Officer's observations and rankings: Each week, the tactical officer assigns a numerical rating in each of three trait-areas. These ratings are based upon daily entries in a field rating form, which serve to accumulate notations; and upon reports of observation which supplement these daily entries.

d. Tactical Officer's ratings, squad rankings, section rankings, physical efficiency tests, and demerits are weighted 21,8,8, 8, and 5 respectively. This total tactical or leadership score is equally weighted with total academic grade in the final composite.

APPENDIX E

THE INFANTRY OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL, FORT BENNING, GEORGIA

1. Input: 200 candidates each week.

2. Tactical Organization: Each class constitutes a company of four platoons, each platoon consisting of two sections of two squads each. One tactical officer is assigned to each platoon. The class-companies are organized into battalions under the Third Student Regiment, and administrative organization directly under The Infantry Center.

3. School Organization: As of January, 1952, the Officer Candidate School was a coordinated activity of three equal-echelon organizations. The Third Student Regiment, a permanent part of the Infantry Center, performed all housekeeping and administrative functions, and provided the tactical organization; candidates, tactical officers, and administrative personnel were assigned to this unit. The Director of Officer Candidates, with a separate staff, under The Infantry School, was specifically responsible for evaluation. Academic instruction was a function of the Academic Departments of the Infantry School.

   An anticipated reorganization, likely to be effected early in 1952, would detach the regiment from the Infantry Center, and reassign it under the Infantry School. The Commanding Officer of the regiment would become the nominal head of the Officer Candidate School, with the Director of Officer Candidates functioning as his assistant.

4. General policies: The Director of Officer Candidates, or (under the proposed reorganization) the Assistant for Evaluation, is responsible for the aspects of the Officer Candidate School which are of interest to PRS. Development and administration of the program of evaluation, board activities, etc., are functions of his office. Boards are convened in the 7th, 13th, and 18th weeks to consider candidates with deficient records, and to review some cases of resignation. Resignations and reliefs for purely a administrative reasons are not placed before the board. As a general practice, no efforts are made to prevent the resignations of those candidates who have resolved to forego an Infantry commission.

5. Leadership evaluation: The program of evaluation was recently revised, substituting present ranking procedures for a more cumbersome, multi-trait rating procedure. The present alternate nomination procedures were favorably received by personnel at all levels.

a. Candidate rankings: Candidates rank the members of their squad, by alternate nomination, in the 5th week. In the 12th, 17th, and 20th week, the ranking is made by sections (half the platoon). Written ratings or evaluations are also prepared, together with a dichotomous rating on each of three traits and an over-all appraisal rating.

b. Tactical Officers ranking: In the same weeks, the tactical officers rank their platoons, using alternate nomination, they also render the three dichotomous trait ratings, and the over-all "preference for service" rating. Tactical officers endorse the written candidate evaluations by indicating comments with which they do or do not agree.

c. Company commanders' ranking: In the 12th and 20th weeks, the company commander presents a ranking of the company as a whole. This is not an independent ranking, however, but represents a consensus of tactical officers rankings, re-evaluated in the light of candidate rankings, demerit standings, physical efficiency scores, and such other factors as may affect a tactical or leadership appraisal. This moderated company ranking is taken as the principal leadership score, and it alone is included in the final composite, equally weighted with academic standing.

APPENDIX F

THE ORDNANCE OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL, ABERDEEN PROVING GROUNDS, MD.

1. Input: 80 candidates every four weeks, through class 15; 120 candidates every four weeks thereafter.

2. Tactical Organization: In the first three classes, which contained 50 candidates each, one tactical officer was assigned to each platoon of 25 candidates.

3. School Organization: Essentially the same as at the Engineer School, with academic instruction conducted by the Ordnance School.

4. General policies: When visited, the Ordnance OCS was in initial stages of development, and a firm working program had not yet been established. Efforts were being made to construct an unencumbered evaluation program which would provide tactical officers with maximum opportunities for observation of candidates. No resignations are permitted before the fourth week.

5. Leadership evaluation: While the Ordnance School began its operations with a system essentially similar to that employed at Fort Riley, plans for simplification have been made. The revised program will incorporate the following:

   a. Tactical officer's evaluations: At the ends of the seventh and 21st weeks, the tactical officer prepares a report on each of his candidates, and determines an order of merit. At the end of the 14th week, reports are prepared for those candidates who are to be sent before a board. As a basis for determining order of merit rankings, and to assist him in making reports, the tactical officer keeps a journal of observations for each candidate.

   b. Candidate rankings: Candidates submit order of merit rankings on their classmates in the seventh, tenth, and 13th weeks. The first two of these rankings are made only for barracks mates; the last ranking is made for the platoon as a whole. Alternate ranking is used.

c. Weighting of all elements in the final composite is as follows:

Tactical officer's rating	55%
Candidate ranking	10
Physical proficiency	10
Demerits	5
Drill instructor's rating	5
Academic grade	30
General knowledge test	5
	100%

APPENDIX C

THE ANTIAIRCRAFT AND GUIDED MISSILES BRANCH OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL, FORT BLISS, TEXAS

1. Input: 200 every four weeks.

2. Tactical Organization: as at Fort Sill.

3. School Organization: as at Fort Sill.

4. General policies: For the most part, the AA and GM School patterns itself after the Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, with some modifications adopted from Forts Riley and Benning. As at Sill, use is made of enlisted drill instructors. Weighting of various components in the final composite had not been determined at the time the school was visited.

5. Leadership evaluation.

   a. Tactical officer's ratings: Weekly ratings on each of ten traits are summarized in the fifth, tenth, 15th, 19th, and 21st weeks.

   b. Candidate ratings. In the fourth, 12th, and 18th weeks, candidates prepare written comments on their associates, and determine an order of merit.

   c. Over-all adaptability standing, a composite of the leadership measures, is determined in the 12th, 16th, and 21st weeks.

APPENDIX H

THE ARMY OFFICER CANDIDATE SCHOOL, THE ARMY GENERAL SCHOOL, FORT RILEY, KANSAS

1. Input: 200 every two weeks.

2. Tactical Organization: A Senior Team Instructor (a field grade officer) and an executive officer are assigned to each company. A Senior Tactical Officer and two Tactical Officers supervise each platoon of 50 candidates.

3. School Organization: The Army Officer Candidate School, under the Army General Schools, is a reasonably autonomous and integrated organization; with a few curricular exceptions, instruction is carried out by the tactical personnel, with materials and training aids provided by the general school.

4. General Policies: In many respects, the Army Officer Candidate School is unique among the many schools now in operation. Its training is branch immaterial, providing officers for the many branches (now largely technical and administrative) for which branch schools do not exist. Tactical and academic training is not as clearly dichotomized, as at the branch material schools, since for the most part all training is conducted by the four man team (platoon officers and Senior Team Instructor) within the company and platoon organizations. A highly formalized board procedure is employed; candidates are placed on probation at the discretion of the company, while appearance before the board almost invariably results in relief from school. Candidates are not relieved after the 18th week except in unusual circumstances. Branch assignment is determined after the completion of the course immediately prior to graduation.

5. Leadership evaluation.

   a. Tactical officers' observation ratings. Weekly ratings on each of ten traits are summarized, and platoon and class standings are determined every four weeks.

   b. Candidate rankings. In the 7th, 11th, and 15th weeks, written ratings are prepared and order of merit determined.

   c. Adaptability standing. Every fourth week, an adaptability standing is determined by weighting the observation ratings, candidate ratings, and demerits 60, 25, and 15% respectively.

   d. Over-all composite score is determined in the 6th, 12th, 16th, and 22nd weeks, combining adaptability, physical proficiency, and academic grades with weights of 45, 5, and 50% respectively.