



UNITED STATES ARMY
THE CHIEF OF STAFF



27 February 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Warrant Officer Leader Development Action Plan (WOLDAP)

1. As the Army prepares to face the challenges of the 21st Century, leader development will continue to be a primary imperative. We must ensure that warrant officers, in their respective technical specialties, are developed into confident and competent leaders. The enclosed Warrant Officer Leader Development Action Plan will serve as the blueprint to prepare warrant officers for their special leader-technician role throughout the Army.
2. This Total Army Leader Development Action Plan focuses on training, personnel management, and the total leader development process for the Army's warrant officers. Commanders must create an environment that builds and nurtures warrant officers and fully integrates them into the leader development process through progressive and sequential training, assignments, and self-development.
3. All segments of the Army are needed to forge a winning team. The high percentage of warrant officers deployed in support of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm served to underscore their importance to the Total Army.
4. Warrant officers provide technical expertise and continuity in many highly specialized fields. As we move into the next century, implementation of this plan will maximize the contribution of the warrant officer force to a smaller ready Army.

Encl



GORDON R. SULLIVAN
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

DISTRIBUTION:
VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, ARMY
DIRECTOR OF THE ARMY STAFF
THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INTELLIGENCE
(CONT)

ATTG-ILO

SUBJECT: Warrant Officer Leader Development Action
Plan (WOLDAP)

DISTRIBUTION: (CONT)

DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR OPERATIONS AND PLANS
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
CHIEF OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
CHIEF OF ENGINEERS
THE SURGEON GENERAL
CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS
CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU
CHIEF, ARMY RESERVES
THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

COMMANDERS IN CHIEF

U.S. FORCES COMMAND
U.S. ARMY EUROPE

COMMANDERS

EIGHTH U.S. ARMY
U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND
U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND
U.S. ARMY COMBINED ARMS COMMAND
U.S. ARMY COMBINED ARMS SUPPORT COMMAND
U.S. ARMY AIR DEFENSE ARTILLERY CENTER AND FORT ELISS
U.S. ARMY ARMOR CENTER AND FORT KNOX
U.S. ARMY AVIATION CENTER AND FORT RUCKER
U.S. ARMY CHEMICAL AND MILITARY POLICE CENTERS
U.S. ARMY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION COMMAND
U.S. ARMY ENGINEER CENTER AND FORT LEONARD WOOD
U.S. ARMY FIELD ARTILLERY CENTER AND FORT SILL
U.S. ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND
U.S. ARMY INFANTRY CENTER AND FORT BENNING
U.S. ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND
U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY COMMAND
U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE CENTER AND SCHOOL
U.S. ARMY JAPAN
U.S. ARMY JOHN F. KENNEDY SPECIAL WARFARE CENTER AND SCHOOL
U.S. ARMY MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
U.S. ARMY ORDNANCE CENTER AND SCHOOL
U.S. ARMY PACIFIC
U.S. ARMY QUARTERMASTER CENTER AND SCHOOL
U.S. ARMY RECRUITING COMMAND
U.S. ARMY RESERVE PERSONNEL CENTER
U.S. ARMY SIGNAL CENTER AND FORT GORDON
U.S. ARMY SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER AND FORT BENJAMIN HARRISON
U.S. ARMY SOUTH
U.S. ARMY TRAINING SUPPORT CENTER
U.S. ARMY TRANSPORTATION CENTER AND FORT EUSTIS
U.S. TOTAL ARMY PERSONNEL COMMAND
SUPERINTENDENT, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY

ATTG-ILO

SUBJECT: SUBJECT: Warrant Officer Leader Development Action
Plan (WOLDAP)

COMMANDANTS

ACADEMY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

U.S. ARMY ADJUTANT GENERAL SCHOOL

U.S. ARMY AVIATION LOGISTICS SCHOOL

U.S. ARMY FINANCE SCHOOL

U.S. ARMY INTELLIGENCE SCHOOL, FORT DEVENS

U.S. ARMY CORDNANCE MIS:ILE AND MUNITIONS CENTER AND SCHOOL

**The
Total Army
Warrant Officer
Leader Development
Action Plan
(WOLDAP)**

27 February 1992



GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part

i.	LDDN Activation Memorandum	2
ii.	Leader Development Decision Network Participants .	3
iii.	LDDN Participating Action Officers	4
iv.	Disclaimer	5
I.	Introduction	6
	Additional Background	9
	Methodology	11
II.	Assumptions Used	12
III.	Issue/Recommendation Table of Contents	13
III.	Prioritized Recommendation List	15



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR OPERATIONS AND PLANS
WASHINGTON, DC



DAMO-TRO

01 MAY 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Warrant Officer Leader Development Action Plan (WOLDAP)

1. This memorandum activates the Leader Development Decision Network (LDDN) to formulate a Warrant Officer Leader Development Action Plan (WOLDAP).
2. The mission of the LDDN is to produce a single-source action plan for both Active and Reserve Component Warrant Officer Leader Development.
3. TRADOC is tasked to chair the LDDN and produce a coordinated WOLDAP that addresses the three pillars of leader development-- institutional training, operational assignments, and self-development. The plan should parallel existing plans for commissioned officers, NCOs, and civilians and should be applicable to both the Active and Reserve Components.
4. Training Directorate, NGB, OCAR, ODCSPER, PERSCOM and CAC/CGSC are tasked to support with personnel and expertise as required. ARSTAF, USAREUR, FORSCOM, USARPAC, USASOC are invited to participate as appropriate.
5. The status of the action plan will be briefed at CSA Quarterly Updates beginning with the update tentatively scheduled for August 1991. The completed action plan will be submitted for DA approval NLT 1 November 1991.
6. Action addressees are to identify a POC and notify TRADOC POC of name, office symbol, FAX, and phone number NLT 10 May 1991. TRADOC POC is MW4 Mooney, office symbol ATTG-ILO, phone DSN 680-5659, FAX DSN 680-5713.

DENNIS J. REIMER
Lieutenant General, GS
Deputy Chief of Staff for
Operations and Plans

LDDN MEMBERS

HQDA:

ODCSOPS: DAMO-TR, DAMO-TRR

ODCSPER: DAPE-HR-L, DAPE-MPO

OCAR: DAAR-PE

NGB: NGB-ARO, NGB-ARP-O

USATRADO

USAREUR

FORSCOM

USARPAC

USASOC

USACASCOM

USACAC

USAAVNC

US Total Army PERSCOM

USARPERCEN

USAREC

LDDN WOLDAP ACTION OFFICERS

LTC BEHRENS	HQ USJFKSWCS, AOJK-SP, FT BRAGG, NC 28307
LTC BURWELL	HQ, TRADOC, ATTG-ILO, FT MONROE, VA 23651
LTC COOK	DCSOPS, DAMO-TRO, PENTAGON, WASH DC 20310
LTC DENISON	HQ, TRADOC, ATTG-IL, FT MONROE, VA 23651
LTC LAWSON	CAL, ATZL-SWC-LD, FT LEAVENWORTH, KS 66027
LTC STANFORD	DADCSOPS, DAMO-TRO, WASHINGTON, DC 20310
MAJ BAILEY	HQ, FORSCOM, FT McPHERSON, GA
MAJ O'DONNELL	NGB, NGB-ARP-O, WASH DC 20310-2500
MAJ PROFFITT	USAREUR, AEAGA-M, APO NY
MW4 DAMRON	USAAVNC, ATZQ-DOT-WO, FT RUCKER, AL 36362
MW4 DAVIS	DA PERSCOM, TAPC-OPW-D, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22332
MW4 HEATON	DADCSPER, DAPE-MPO, WASHINGTON, DC 20310
MW4 LYNCH	NGB, NGB-ARP-O, WASHINGTON, DC 20310
MW4 MEINE	HQ, TRADOC, ATTG-ILO, FT MONROE, VA 23651
MW4 MULLINS	HQ, CASCOM, ATCL-CP, FT LEE, VA 23801
MW4 WELSH	OCAR, DAAR-PE, WASHINGTON, DC 20310-2400
CW4 GRUVER	ARPERCEN, DARP-OPF-WO, St Louis, MO
CW4 LETENDRE	DA PERSCOM TAPC-OPW-D, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22332
CW4 REID	CAL, ATZL-SWC-LE, FT LEAVENWORTH, KS 66027
CW3 DOUGAN	ARPERCEN, DARP-OPF, ST LOUIS, MO 63132-5200
CW3 SHIREMAN	HQUSAJFKSWCS, AOJK-SP, FT BRAGG, NC 28307
CW3 SHUE	ARNG-OAC, NGB-ARO-E, APG, MD 2110-5420
MR FREDERICKSON	HQ, CASCOM, ATCL-TLO, FT LEE, VA 23801

DISCLAIMER

The opinions and ideas presented in this Warrant Officer Leader Development Action Plan (WOLDAP) are those of the Leader Development Decision Network (LDDN) participants and other action officers, and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion or position of the Department of the Army.

INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the last decade, TRADOC studies showed that the policy of direct appointment of warrant officers that was not supported by a coordinated and standardized training system, did not always ensure identification and preparation of the most promising future officer technicians. While some fields provided extensive training to WO, others relied solely on the newly appointed WO's experience for future success.

In 1983, the VCSA directed the end of direct appointment of warrant officers. In July 1984, to replace direct appointment, the VCSA approved a three tier Warrant Officer Training System (WOTS). During 1984 and 1985 the Army conducted the Total Warrant Officer Study (TWOS) to examine completely the warrant officer system. The TWOS study supported the utility of the three-tiered approach of WOTS. The primary intent of WOTS was to support earlier warrant officer accession by training them better in preparation for longer utilization.

The TWOS study recommended a relook of the warrant officer system after five years. That relook did not take place until activation of this WO LDDN. Today's warrant officers are dedicated, well trained officers providing invaluable technical expertise to the Army. Soldiers entering the Warrant Officer Training System emerge as highly qualified warrant officer technicians. The goal of earlier accession and longer utilization, however, has yet to be realized. The average years of service of newly accessed non-aviation warrant officers has increased since the inception of WOTS. A training system designed turn soldiers from the five to eight year service population into officer technicians is instead honing the skills of already seasoned non-commissioned officers. As a result WO emerging from WOTS are often better trained and more qualified than the developers of WOTS envisioned.

At the time of TWOS, many fields in the active Army were experiencing extreme shortages of warrant officers. In some cases the shortages were so extreme, that readiness in some units was adversely impacted. Various recruiting efforts attempted, although resulting limited successes, did not solve the shortage problem until USAREC was tasked with the active component WO recruiting mission. USAREC's tremendous successes resulted in few remaining AC warrant officer shortages.

Active Component successes were however, not mirrored in the Reserve Component. RC troop unit warrant officer vacancies have risen to about 3800. These shortages, while aggravated by recruiting shortfalls, result primarily from rising RC WO authorizations. Warrant officer shortages in RC units resulted in significant problems during Desert Shield/Desert Storm deployments. As a result, urgent calls have been sounded to find innovative ways to fix the problem quickly.

There is a belief in the reserve component that the current warrant officer appointment process and WOTS are detriments to warrant officer recruiting. It should be noted at this point, that six USAREC recruiters conducting about 100 field site visits annually accomplish active component warrant officer recruiting to fill about 500 annual vacancies. USAR recruiters, while also numbering six, must struggle to recruit for over 1500 vacancies while hindered by limited access to soldiers due to the weekend nature of RC training and the dispersion of RC units.

ARNG recruiting, a state responsibility, also results in significant shortfalls. LDDN action officers concluded that more should be accomplished in RC recruiting, particularly by increasing RC recruiting resources at USAREC, and by improving coordination between the AC and RC recruiting efforts. The greatest need may, however, be to increase local RC command emphasis on WO recruiting.

Whatever the cause, reserve component needs are not being adequately met. Active component management of warrant officer issues may not always provide adequate means for the reserve component to reach established goals and standards under a Total Army concept without the creation of dual standards. The LDDN membership recognized the problem, and worked diligently to make this WOLDAP address the Total Army.

This Leader Development Action Plan includes recommendations that should significantly improve RC WO recruiting. RC issues are addressed throughout the WOLDAP with the firm conviction that the Total Army concept requires single standards--standards that will ensure the appointment and training of fully qualified and competent warrant officers in both the active and reserve components.

While some pre- and post-TWOS initiatives, including WOTS were implemented, the process of modernizing the Warrant Officer Corps remained incomplete. The Defense Officer Personnel Management Act did not include warrant officers. As a result, today's Army warrant officers are still under a complex and confusing dual promotion system. Many force management tools of DOPMA are not available for warrant officers. The new warrant officer grade of CW5 to support WOTS and to improve retention, while recently enacted, has not yet been implemented. As a result, the transition rank of Master Warrant Officer is still in use. While that rank allows selection of the Army's best and most experienced warrant officers to serve in the most technically demanding jobs, the incentive for CW4 to remain in service to compete for those positions is still lacking.

The legislative package designed to make these changes, known as the Warrant Officer Management Act (WOMA), was a result of TWOS. WOMA, intended to align warrant officer management more closely with DOPMA, did not become law until its inclusion in the Fiscal Year 1992-1993 Defense Authorization Act. Although WOMA is now law, the implementation process has just begun. In short, the restructuring of the warrant officer system is ongoing.

During the years since TWOS, the Army undertook a review of leader development. This review resulted in the creation of leader development action plans for commissioned officers, non-commissioned officers, and civilians and an inclusive plan for reserve component leader development. In May 1991 a TRADOC chaired Leader Development Decision Network was activated to integrate the Warrant Officer Corps into the leader development process. The WOLDDN began its work using a Total Army warrant officer philosophy to address both active and reserve components.

This WOLDAP, the result of the LDDN's effort, is intended to become the road map for the Warrant Officer Corps of the future. Since the five year TWOS relook did not take place, the LDDN accepted as part of its charter the mission to do exactly that.

While the original charter of the LDDN was to develop recommendations that were best for the Army and the Warrant Officer Corps without regard to costs, the LDDN recognized the Army of the future will be smaller, face constrained resources, and be ever more technologically oriented. A more stable, CONUS-based Army may result from ongoing world and national political and budgetary changes. The new Army, while leaner, must be able to respond quickly to national priorities, and be able to quickly ramp-up for any contingency. Training and technical skills will play an ever more important role in tomorrow's Army. Warrant officers, the Army's technical officers, must be developed so they will continue to offer the maximum contribution in their areas of expertise. The Warrant Officer Corps is ready to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND

Before TWOS, warrant officers could be assigned to any WO position regardless of grade. This policy resulted in much dissatisfaction among senior warrant officers, and it often resulted in unrealistic expectations among commanders of their senior warrant officers. The WO assignment system became one in which major commands competed for the most senior warrant officers by placing ever increasing requirements on WO requisitions.

As a result of TWOS, WO positions were coded by the grade categories Warrant Officer (WO1 & CW2), Senior Warrant Officer (CW3 & CW4), and Master Warrant Officer (MW4 - CW5 upon WOMA implementation). Although rank groupings have improved warrant officer utilization, old processes are difficult to change. To this day warrant officers are often used in positions with little regard to grade, limiting their professional development and their value to the Army. Unless rank coding by individual grade above the CW2 level is instituted, optimum utilization may never be a reality.

TWOS envisioned accessing warrant officers at the five to eight year service point, training them properly, and then using them for a long career to maximize the Army's benefit of their training and experience. After TWOS, however, changes in WO recruiting methodology resulted in an increasing pool of applicants. Predictably, proponents, having a greater selection pool, increased their minimum standards. Selection boards, seeking the best qualified applicants for appointment, tended to choose senior and experienced NCO's as the most qualified to enter the WO career field. As a result, instead of recruiting earlier and retaining longer, the opposite occurred. In the technical service fields, applicants were being chosen later in their military career.

The average accession point for non-aviation WO changed from approximately nine years AFS to over twelve years. Since warrant officers, like other soldiers have an average retirement point of about twenty three years AFS, current technical service WO utilization, without additional retention incentives, is reduced to eight to ten years. Increased emphasis on earlier recruiting and accession is vital to properly balance the trade-offs caused by higher experience levels at the accession point and the resulting shorter utilization.

While accessing warrant officers at an optimum point and then retaining them for an adequate period is important, if the Army is to realize the maximum potential from warrant officers, their roles, duties, and functions must be clearly understood by all levels of the Army. Commanders must understand the difference

between junior and senior warrant officers in terms of their skill levels, training, and experience, and support their proper professional training and development. Warrant officers themselves must understand their roles and fully participate in the Army leadership process while maximizing their technical contribution.

This WOLDAP should aid the Army as a whole in best selecting, training and using warrant officers. It also should assist commanders and warrant officers themselves to ensure WO make the greatest possible contribution to the Army and fully participate in the leader development process.

METHODOLOGY

The WOLDDN was activated on 2 May 1991. TRADOC was tasked to chair the process assisted by ODCSOPS, ODCSPER, OCAR, the NGE, and CAC/CGSC. In addition, USAREUR, FORSCOM, USARPAC, and USASOC were invited to participate as appropriate. CASCOM, USAAVNC, USAREC and the AC and USAR personnel commands were asked to participate because of their special significance to warrant officer issues.

Participating action officers met at HQ, TRADOC in May 1991 and through a series of work groups using field recommendations, developed initial issues for further study by the LDDN. Of significance is that the LDDN was not a continuously sitting body, instead, action officers returned to their normal duties, assembling only when called to participate in workshops.

A June 1991 workshop refined issues that were again tasked to action officers for additional staffing. A July 1991 workshop, served to present the refined issues to proponent action officers. During the July meeting, LDDN action officers, working with proponent representatives, again revised and modified issues for later staffing.

An August 1991 mini-LDDN workshop served to finalize WOLDAP issues for submission to LDDN agencies and Proponent Schools for staffing. Staffing resulted in significant changes being incorporated into the WOLDAP during a Mid-October 1991 LDDN action officer workshop in preparation for a General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC). That GOSC met on 30 October 1991. Although the GOSC approved all issues for further study, some recommendations were revised significantly. The WOLDAP, as it emerged from the GOSC was once again submitted to LDDN agencies, MACOM, and proponents for final staffing and comment. Potential resource implication data for WOLDAP recommendations was solicited through the final staffing process.

Final field staffing results were considered during an early December 1991 action officer meeting. Although limited, field input collected served to develop best estimates of resource implications and proposed time lines for WOLDAP actions. This final draft WOLDAP, a result of that meeting, includes those estimates and forms the basis for presenting the plan to the Chief of Staff, Army for approval.

ASSUMPTIONS

In developing the issues/recommendations contained in this Warrant Officer Leader Development Action Plan, LDDN action officers relied on the following assumptions:

1. There will be a continuing need for narrowly focused officer technicians in the Army of the future.
2. The Army's warrant officers satisfactorily fill the officer technician need, but improvements in their training and utilization can be achieved.
3. The Army, while downsizing in an era of constrained resources, will continue its rapid high-tech spiral.
4. Although the Army is becoming smaller, it is desirable to continue efforts to improve the warrant officer corps along with other segments of the force.
5. TWOS recommendations as approved by the Chief of Staff, Army remain valid. As a result modifications to the warrant officer system, not overhaul are appropriate.
6. Since TWOS recommendations have not been fully implemented, efforts to do so should continue.

ISSUE/RECOMMENDATION TABLE OF CONTENTS

Recommendation Number	Page
--------------------------	------

I - General Issues

8	Market WO roles/duties/responsibilities	39
3	a. Standardize WO selection criteria	25
	b. Accession goal 8 year-or-less service/12 yr cap	
	c. Limit waivers to special cases	
10	a. Retain current WO insignia	43
	b. Continue centralized management of WO	
7	a. Increase RC recruiting manpower/resources	37
	b. Improve AC/RC recruiting coordination	
	c. Increase command emphasis on RC WO recruiting	
13	Establish WOMA implementation team	49

II - Institutional Training Issues

6	Establish WO Career College	35
2	a. Update WOCS content, methodology, duration	19
	b. Standardize WOCS training eliminate ACCP	
	c. Review WOTTC, reenforce leadership skills	
	d. Develop/expand alternative certification	
	e. Set standards for alternative certification	
	f. SWOTC Phase I/train at career status point	
	g. Review/update SWOTC and MWOTC	
	h. Develop intermediate training at CW4 point	

ISSUE/RECOMMENDATION TABLE OF CONTENTS

Recommendation Number	Page
--------------------------	------

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 4 | a. Appoint WO candidates upon completion of WOCS . | 29 |
| | b. Provide transitional WO BES increase | |
| 11 | a. Establish WOCS at State Academies | 45 |
| | b. Do not mingle OCS/WOCS candidates | |

III - Operational Assignment Issues

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----|
| 5 | a. WO by grade position coding | 32 |
| | b. Position coding by grade | |
| | c. Branch/MOS immaterial positions | |
| | d. Pinpoint assign MWO (CW5 per WOMA) | |

IV - Self Development Issues

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | Establish/update proponent life cycle models | 17 |
| 12 | Develop WO MQS | 47 |
| 9 | a. AA degree as civ. ed. goal at career point | 41 |
| | (Eight yrs WO svc for RC) | |
| | b. BA degree as goal by CW4 select point | |
| | c. Encourage pursuit of advanced degrees | |
| | d. Support with Army continuing education programs | |

PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATION LIST

Recommendation Number

- 1 Establish/update proponent life cycle models
- 2a Update WOCS content, methodology, duration
- 2b Standardize WOCS training options eliminate ACCP
- 2c Review/update WOTTCC reenforce leadership skills
- 2d Develop/expand alternative certification
- 2e Set/enforce standards for alternative certification
- 2f Develop SWOTC Phase I/train at career status point
- 2g Review/update SWOTC and MWOTC
- 2h Develop intermediate prof. dev. training at CW4 point
- 3a Standardize WO selection criteria
- 3b Accession goal 8 year-or-less service/cap of 12 yrs svc
- 3c Limit waivers to special cases
- 4a Appoint WO candidates upon completion of WOCS
- 4b Provide transitional WO BES increase for early appoint.
- 5a Except WO1/CW2 establish WO by grade position coding
- 5b Require MACOM/Proponent position coding by grade
- 5c Identify branch/MOS immaterial positions
- 5d Pinpoint assign MWO/CW5
- 6 Establish WO Career College as WO training proponent
- 7a Increase RC Recruiting manpower/resources
- 7b Improve AC/RC recruiting coordination
- 7c Increase command emphasis on RC WO recruiting
- 8 Market WO roles/duties/responsibilities

PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATION LIST

Recommendation
Number

- 9a Set AA degree as civ. ed. goal at career point
(Eight yrs WO svc for RC)
- 9b Set BA degree as goal by CW4 select point
- 9c Encourage self development pursuit of advanced degrees
- 9d Modify Army continuing education programs
- 10a Retain current WO insignia
- 10b Continue centralized management of WO
- 11a Establish WOCS at State Academies
- 11b Do not mingle OCS/WOCS candidates in resident training
- 12 Develop WO MQS
- 13 Establish WOMA implementation briefing team

RECOMMENDATION 1

ISSUE: Warrant officer life cycle models are not available to all warrant officers by MOS.

RECOMMENDATION: Develop/update proponent based life cycle models for all warrant officer MOS and publish them in DA Pamphlet 600-11, to provide clear career plans for training and education, assignments, promotion, and self development.

DISCUSSION: Life cycle models outline career patterns. They are a road map for leader development planning and assist commanders in understanding and supporting those development needs for each warrant officer MOS.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: AR 140-10 and NGR 600-101 provide necessary flexibility to apply life cycle models in the Reserve components.

ACTIONS:

<u>MILESTONES</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Proponents Life Cycle Model Development	2d Qtr, FY 93
Lead: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Assist: Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)	
Revise DA Pam 600-11 to include standardized Life Cycle Models	1st Qtr, FY 94
Lead: DAPERSCOM POC: MW4 Davis, DSN 221-7843	
Assist: ODCSPER POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751	

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Life cycle model development at a cost of \$ +/- 30K
- Increase DA Pam 600-11 by approximately 36 pages

NOTE: No additional personnel authorizations

RECOMMENDATION 1

PROPONENT POC LIST:

WOCAREERCEN (USAAVNC)	MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803
TJAG:	CW3 White, DSN 680-4363 (Temporary)
	At OTJAG TBD, DSN 225-4717
AIR DEFENSE ARTILLERY:	MW4 Dawson, DSN 978-6961/6217
	CW4 Bucksath (SWOT)
AVIATION:	MW4 Mock, DSN 558-4313
MILITARY POLICE:	Mr. Monday, DSN 865-3155/4299
	Mr. Powell, DSN 865-4229/3155
USACIDC:	CW3 Cerase, DSN 289-1490
ENGINEER:	CW4 Rinehart, DSN 676-5399
FIELD ARTILLERY:	CW4 Baxendale, DSN 639-5025
	CW2 Miller, DSN 6005/3611 (WOTTCC/SWOT)
AMEDD:	CPT Solesbee, DSN 471-4124
INTELLIGENCE:	CW4 Molina, DSN 821-1183
SF (USAJFKSWC):	CW3 Shireman, DSN 239-2415/9002
ORDNANCE:	MW4 Reno, DSN 278-4400/5400
QUARTERMASTER:	MW4 Zimmerman, DSN 687-4237
SIGNAL:	CW4 Little, DSN 780-2267/6652
SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER:	Dr. Malone-Turner, DSN 699-4275
AG	MW4 Wade, DSN 699-4735
TRANSPORTATION:	MW4 Williams, DSN 927-6318
AVIATION LOGISTICS:	CW4 Ford, DSN 927-6560
OMMC:	CW4 Walters, DSN 788-6864

RECOMMENDATION 2

ISSUE: The Warrant Officer Training System (WOTS), implemented in 1984, should be reviewed to ensure the content, method, duration and timing of training is appropriate to develop the most professional warrant officer possible. The need for evaluation and revision is demonstrated by:

a. A WO candidate course that has not been fully reviewed for applicability and utility since its inception as an Army-wide requirement in 1984.

b. The use of an ACCP for a portion of RC WOCS.

c. Long, complex Proponent certification courses (WOTTCC), that are difficult to field as RC configured courses and create an RC warrant officer training process taking up to five years to complete.

d. Long gaps between warrant officer professional development courses.

RECOMMENDATION:

a. Update the Warrant Officer Candidate School (WOCS) content, methodology, and duration to support leader development goals.

b. Eliminate the use of ACCP as a WOCS training option for RC candidates to strengthen leadership training.

c. Review and update proponent Warrant Officer Technical and Tactical Certification Courses (WOTTCC) to reenforce leadership skills.

d. Encourage development of Proponent certification testing and alternative training programs (except aviation) taking advantage of acquired skills to produce fully qualified and certified warrant officers in a timely and efficient manner to support readiness.

e. Establish minimum standards for certification testing to ensure full qualification of warrant officers certified through testing.

f. Develop a non-resident SWOTC Phase I for distribution to warrant officers upon selection for career status. Require Phase I completion prior attendance at the SWOTC resident phase.

g. Review and update Senior and Master Warrant Officer training as necessary to ensure the right training is presented at the right time.

RECOMMENDATION 2

RECOMMENDATION: (Continued)

h. Mandate that Proponents develop a training program, based at least in part on resident training (ie. SWOTC Phase III), that provides warrant officer professional development upon selection to CW4. Permit Proponents to develop new training courses or to use existing training such as CAS3, or other multi-functional military or civilian training.

DISCUSSION:

a. Since WOCS implementation in 1984, there is no record of any DA level review to ensure that the content, methodology, and duration of the course meet current Army needs.

b. USAR and ARNG WOCS training employs two different methods. ARNG WO Candidates have the option to complete WOCS in a phased resident/non-resident mode, while USAR and AC WO candidates must complete resident WOCS at either Fort McCoy or Fort Rucker.

c. Proponent WOTTCC is purely technical training. Some WOTTCC courses are quite lengthy allowing leadership skills to erode. Proponents should review and update WOTTCC to ensure continued leadership skills training.

d. With limited exceptions, in 1987 TRADOC mandated the development of RC configured training. That development is not yet complete. Some proponent developed certification programs require up to four years for RC warrant officer candidates to complete. Such lengthy training periods, particularly when added to the time required to complete WOCS, act as a disincentive to potential WO applicants.

e. Some proponents have developed innovative diagnostic and certification testing programs for RC warrant officer candidates designed to reduce the time it takes to train and appoint fully qualified RC WO. The varying programs use such divergent approaches that a centralized evaluation of them by TRADOC would better accredit the standards and methods applied.

f. There are long gaps between warrant officer professional development courses. After appointment, a warrant officer serves approximately 8 years before SWOTC attendance. Only a few warrant officers are selected to attend the MWOTC near the twenty-year service point. As a result most warrant officers serve an entire career with a single professional development course to support sequential and progressive assignment needs.

RECOMMENDATION 2

DISCUSSION: (Continued)

Understandably, students attending Senior Warrant Officer Training frequently criticize the training as coming too late in their careers. Changes are needed to ensure presentation of the right training at the right time to support effective warrant officer utilization.

g. The ACCP Phase I portion of the current Master Warrant Officer Course, based on the CAS3 ACCP Phase, provides excellent information and training in staff officer and general military subjects. However, when used as part of MWOTC, that training comes too late in a warrant officer's career since MWOTC typically occurs at the eighteen to twenty year WO service point.

h. Development of a SWOTC Phase I (ACCP) for use at the career status selection point will provide developmental training needed by the officer before becoming eligible to attend the SWOTC resident phase.

i. Senior warrant officers, particularly at the CW4 level, are frequently assigned to positions requiring significant staff or management skills without the benefit of appropriate training. Proponent developed training or the use of existing training such as CAS3, or other existing military/civilian training courses will better prepare these warrant officers to succeed in these assignments.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: Any course changes will require updating RC configured training. While additional training is desirable for the RC, it will be more difficult to accomplish due to time constraints. Proponents must therefore consider RC applicability for any training developed.

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Update content, methodology, and duration of WOCS, in conjunction with other WO training, to support leader development goals.

4th Qtr, FY 92
(common TSSB)

4th Qtr, FY 93
(update complete)

Lead: USAAVNC (WO Career Center)
POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-5844

Assist: TRADOC
POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659

RECOMMENDATION 2

ACTIONS: (Continued)

<u>MILESTONES</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Review and update WOTTCC to include leadership skills.	4th Qtr, FY 92 (Common TSSB)
Lead: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	2nd Qtr, FY 93 (Proponent TSSBs)
USAAVNC (WO Career Center) POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-5844	
Assist: Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)	
Standardize training option by eliminating non-resident WOCS training. Delete from ACC Catalog.	1st Qtr, FY 93 (End enrollments)
Lead: ODCSOPS POC: LTC Stanford, DSN 224-5411	1st Qtr, FY 94 (End program)
Assist: NGB POC: CW3 Shue, DSN 584-1731	
TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Establish standards for optional alternative certification methods.	1st Qtr, FY 93
Lead: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Assist: Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)	
Publish alternative certification methods in appropriate regulations and pamphlets.	2nd Qtr, FY 93
Lead: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Include alternative WOTTC in ATRRS.	2nd Qtr, FY 93
Lead: Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)	

RECOMMENDATION 2

ACTIONS: (Continued)

<u>MILESTONES</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Review and update Master and Senior WO training.	4th Qtr, FY 92 (Common TSSB)
Lead: USAAVNC (WO Career Center) POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-5844	2nd Qtr FY 93 (Proponent TSSBs)
Assist: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)	
Develop a Phase I for SWOTC.	4th Qtr, FY 92 (Common TSSB)
Lead: USAAVNC (WO Career Center) POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-5844	
Assist: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)	
Develop SWOT Phase III training plan.	2nd Qtr, FY 93 (Proponent TSSBs)
Lead: USAAVNC (WO Career Center) POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-5844	
Assist: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)	
Change WO MEL codes to support.	4th Qtr, FY 93
Lead: DAPERSCOM POC: MW4 Davis, DSN 221-7843	
Increase WO training budget appropriately to support.	4th Qtr, FY 93
Lead: DCSOPS POC: LTC Stanford, DSN 224-5411	
Assist: DAPERSCOM POC: CW4 Latendre, DSN 221-7843	

RECOMMENDATION 2

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Development time for new/updated courses using existing resources.
- \$.5 to .75 mil based on \$5 - 7.5K per distributed training course hour for development costs. (Est. 100 hrs)
- \$32K @ \$40.00 estimated cost per student printing/mailing of ACCP SWOTC Phase I times estimated annual student load of 800. (Cost dependant upon outcome of the SAT process.)
- Two civilian clerical spaces at the Warrant Officer Career College to administer SWOTC Phase I.
- Task Site Selection Boards: Estimated \$ 104K TDY for TSSB (\$25-36K TDY, 79K travel based on 331 to 474 TDY days @ \$75 average per diem and travel for 158 people @ \$500 per person average. (Common TSSB = 25-30 SME x 3 days & Proponent TSSB 8 SME x 16 schools x 2-3 days TDY each.)

PROPONENT POC LIST:

WOCAREERCEN (USAAVNC)	MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803
TJAG:	CW3 White, DSN 680-4363 (Temporary)
	At OTJAG TBD, DSN 225-4717
AIR DEFENSE ARTILLERY:	MW4 Dawson, DSN 978-6961/6217
	CW4 Bucksath (SWOT)
AVIATION:	MW4 Mock, DSN 558-4313
MILITARY POLICE:	Mr. Monday, DSN 865-3155/4229
	Mr. Powell, DSN 865-4229/3155
USACIDC:	CW3 Cerase, DSN 289-1490
ENGINEER:	CW4 Rinehart, DSN 676-5399
FIELD ARTILLERY:	CW4 Baxendale, DSN 639-5025
	CW2 Miller, DSN 6005/3611 (WOTTCC/SWOT)
AMEDD:	CPT Solesbee, DSN 471-4124
INTELLIGENCE:	CW4 Molina, DSN 821-1183
SF (USAJFKSWC):	CW3 Shireman, DSN 239-2415/9002
ORDNANCE:	MW4 Reno, DSN 278-4400/5400
QUARTERMASTER:	MW4 Zimmerman, DSN 687-4237
SIGNAL:	CW4 Little, DSN 780-2267/6652
SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER:	Dr. Malone-Turner, DSN 699-4275
AG	MW4 Wade, DSN 699-4735
TRANSPORTATION:	MW4 Williams, DSN 927-6318
AVIATION LOGISTICS:	CW4 Ford, DSN 927-6560
OMMC:	CW4 Walters, DSN 788-6864

RECOMMENDATION 3

ISSUE: Proponent selection criteria for many technical branch warrant officers have become very restrictive. As a result soldiers are selected so late in their military career that optimum utilization is sometimes not being realized. These increasingly restrictive prerequisites make it extremely difficult for RC units to address warrant officer shortages. The Army does not fully benefit from the service of its most highly trained and seasoned technicians if the need for prior training and experience of warrant officer candidates is not carefully balanced with expected retention.

RECOMMENDATION:

a. Standardize minimum prerequisites for warrant officer selection and appointment as much as possible to make them achievable for soldiers with eight years of service or less.

b. Establish the accession goal for technical branch (non-aviation) warrant officers to eight years or less (AFS or RC) service as approved under the Total Warrant Officer Study (TWOS).

c. Limit AC warrant officer accessions to soldiers with twelve years of service or less.

d. Limit Proponent waivers of the twelve year cap to shortage or exceptional cases and to RC soldiers who serve based on age not maximum service limitations.

DISCUSSION:

a. Warrant officers are managed in two primary subgroups, aviation and technical. Aviation is the single largest warrant officer specialty, encompassing 47% of the warrant officer force. The various technical fields make up the remaining 53% of that force. The average accession point for aviators is 5.7 years AFS. The technical warrant officer accession point, on the other hand, has increased to 12.8 years AFS since implementation of the Warrant Officer Training System (WOTS). The current accession process is in direct opposition to the WOTS intent to "access earlier, train better, and use longer."

b. Since both aviators and technicians retire from the Army near the 23 year AFS point, the Army realizes only a 10 year utilization of its technical warrant officers. While career aviation warrant officers are able to rise to the highest WO grades before retiring, most technical warrant officers retire in the grade of CW3, reducing the pool of the most experienced and

RECOMMENDATION 3

DISCUSSION: (Continued)

best trained technicians and adversely impacting readiness. Implementation of the Warrant Officer Management Act (WOMA) could result in some additional utilization of senior warrant officers, however, only earlier accession can increase utilization significantly.

c. The 1984-85 Total Warrant Officer Study recognized the utilization problem and established the accession goal for warrant officers at the five to eight year AFS point. The success of the AC recruiting effort, however, has resulted in ever increasing Proponent prerequisites. These favor selection of the most senior and experienced NCO's over qualified but less experienced junior NCO's who have the potential for longer successful warrant officer service. The current process robs the NCO corps of its most experienced soldiers and makes RC warrant officer recruiting more difficult.

d. The recruiting process is further impeded by the lack of a current Warrant Officer Procurement Circular (last published in 1986).

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: Standardized minimum prerequisites should assist the RC recruiting effort. Liberal waiver authority will still be necessary in the RC.

ACTIONS:

<u>MILESTONES</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Change AR 135-100 and NGR 600-101 to standardize minimum technical accession prerequisites, to reflect an 8 year or less service accession goal, and establish an accession cap of 12 years service except for RC soldiers. Limit Proponent waivers to shortages or exceptional cases only.	4th Qtr, FY 92

Lead: ODCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

NGB
POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072

Assist: OCAR
POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

RECOMMENDATION 3

ACTIONS: (Continued)

MILESTONES

DATE

Establish minimum technical WO
accession prerequisites within
guidelines of revised AR 135-100,
and NGR 600-101.

2nd Qtr, FY 93

Lead: Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)

Assist: USAREC

POC's: MW4 Foli (RC), DSN 459-2666
CW3 Carnes (AC), DSN 459-7277

Revise, publish and distribute
DA Cir 601-92-XX to reflect
new standards.

3rd Qtr, FY 93

Lead: USAREC

POC: CW3 Carnes, DSN 459-7277

Assist: Proponents (See attached proponent POC listing)

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: Minimal time/manpower resources to
develop standardized prerequisites and change the appropriate
publications (DA Circular 601-XX is currently overdue for
publication).

RECOMMENDATION 3

PROPONENT POC LIST:

WOCAREERCEN (USAAVNC)	MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803
TJAG:	CW3 White, DSN 680-4363 (Temporary)
	At OTJAG TBD, DSN 225-4717
AIR DEFENSE ARTILLERY:	MW4 Dawson, DSN 978-6961/6217
	CW4 Bucksath (SWOT)
AVIATION:	MW4 Mock, DSN 558-4313
MILITARY POLICE:	Mr. Monday, DSN 865-3155/4299
	Mr. Powell, DSN 865-4229/3155
USACIDC:	CW3 Cerase, DSN 289-1490
ENGINEER:	CW4 Rinehart, DSN 676-5399
FIELD ARTILLERY:	CW4 Baxendale, DSN 639-5025
	CW2 Miller, DSN 6005/3611 (WOTTCC/SWOT)
AMEDD:	CPT Solesbee, DSN 471-4124
INTELLIGENCE:	CW4 Molina, DSN 821-1183
SF (USAJFKSWC):	CW3 Shireman, DSN 239-2415/9002
ORDNANCE:	MW4 Reno, DSN 278-4400/5400
QUARTERMASTER:	MW4 Zimmerman, DSN 687-4237
SIGNAL:	CW4 Little, DSN 780-2267/6652
SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER:	Dr. Malone-Turner, DSN 699-4275
AG	MW4 Wade, DSN 699-4735
TRANSPORTATION:	MW4 Williams, DSN 927-6318
AVIATION LOGISTICS:	CW4 Ford, DSN 927-6560
OMMC:	CW4 Walters, DSN 788-6864

RECOMMENDATION 4

ISSUE: Should warrant officers be appointed immediately after completing the Warrant Officer Candidate Course (WOCS) vice the current policy of appointment after completion of certification training at Proponent Schools.

RECOMMENDATION:

a. Appoint warrant officer candidates to warrant officer upon completion of WOCS, using contingent appointment orders, in both the active and reserve components.

b. Provide transitional budget end-strength (BES) relief for the warrant officer force to accommodate the sudden increase in the WO transient, holdees, and students (THS) account.

DISCUSSION:

a. Commissioned officers are appointed upon completion of OCS or other pre-commissioning training before attending a branch qualifying school. Warrant officers, on the other hand, remain in candidate status during MOS certification training courses, which has resulted in questions of equity. Aviation WO candidates have voiced fairness concerns because they continue in a relatively high stress environment while attending flight training with new lieutenants who enjoy full officer status and privileges.

b. RC warrant officer recruiting is handicapped by the long candidate training prior to certification and WO appointment (2 to 5 years). Contingent appointment at the end of WOCS would provide an incentive for more soldiers to apply for warrant officer and help eliminate existing shortages.

c. Earlier appointment would eliminate the problem of differing standards applied to the treatment of WO candidates at proponent schools.

d. Implementation of earlier appointment for warrant officer candidates would increase active component WO THS. Increased WO BES for the transition period, particularly the first FY following implementation, would be necessary to avoid offsetting measures such as reducing WO accessions or a reduction in the AC WO inventory.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: This recommendation should assist WO recruiting in both components.

RECOMMENDATION 4

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Implement appointment of WOC upon
completion of WOCS.

1 Oct 92

Lead: ODCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

NGB
POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072

Assist: DAPERSCOM
POC's: MW4 Davis, DSN 221-7843

OCAR
POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

Increase WO BES for a transitional
period to accommodate the increased
inventory of WO.

FY 93 (If needed)

Lead: ODCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

Make WO appointments contingent and
revocable for both AC and RC candidates
who do not complete certification within
established time limits.

1 Oct 92

Lead: ODCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

Assist: OTJAG
POC: CPT Rives, DSN 224-4586

Establish maximum time limits for
completion of WO certification training.

1 Oct 92

Lead: DCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

NGB
POC: MW4 Lynch, 225-0072

Assist: OCAR
POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

RECOMMENDATION 4

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Annual cost of \$1.5 - 2.5 million for pay differential for WO pay beginning after WOCS vice after WOTTCC.

- Above costs are offset in part by:

a. Currently BES for WO is serving WO only, candidates in certification training are additional expense. Upon implementation WO BES will include candidates in certification training.

b. Readiness issues caused by slightly lower (1.5% reduction) WO fill rates because of larger THS (Est. less than 200) are offset in part by a small reduction in the enlisted THS and corresponding higher fill rate.

c. Improved RC WO recruiting.

d. Housing picture will improve at Ft Rucker, the largest concentration of candidates, because BOQ occupancy rate will improve, enlisted housing waiting list will improve, and accompanied WO will be housed sooner because of shorter officer waiting list.

RECOMMENDATION 5

ISSUE: Assignment of warrant officers without regard for specific grade continues. The practice, based in part on outdated TAADS warrant officer position coding that relies on artificially imposed grade ceiling percentages, adversely affects warrant officer effectiveness, efficiency and individual professional development.

RECOMMENDATION:

- a. Establish TAADS warrant officer position coding by specific grade except WO1/CW2 which should continue to be grouped. Establish WO branch/MOS immaterial position coding.
- b. Require MACOM/Proponents to review and recode all warrant officer position by grades WO1/CW2; CW3; CW4; and MWO/CW5.
- c. MACOM/Proponents identify those WO positions that should be AERS coded and those which can be filled by branch or MOS immaterial WO.
- d. Institute pin-point assignment of MWO/CW5 by DA PERSCOM to specific MWO/CW5 coded duty positions.

DISCUSSION:

- a. Warrant officers position coding following TWOS resulted in the three WO grade levels of warrant officer (WO1/CW2), senior warrant (CW3/CW4), and Master Warrant (MW4). This process did not eliminate the grade immaterial assignment practices frequently used for warrant officers. Unless WO positions, including those in shelf requisitions, are coded by specific grades (except WO1/CW2), warrant officer grade strength requirements cannot be clearly identified and will continue to be based on percentage ceilings. Without specific grade coding it will continue to be difficult to ensure that WO experience and education level is accurately matched with position requirements.
- b. Warrant officer positions in TAADS are coded by specific MOS. Some WO positions such as proponenty offices, professional development and personnel management positions at ARSTAF Agencies and DA PERSCOM, and training positions at TRADOC and Proponent Schools; could and should be filled by the best qualified person regardless of Branch or MOS or be based only on Branch not MOS.
- c. Optimum utilization of MWO/CW5, the Army's most trained and experienced warrant officers, is critical. Pin-point assignment of MWO/CW5 will ensure that these officers serve in only the most critical and demanding duty positions requiring the highest level of warrant officer training and experience.

RECOMMENDATION 5

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: To date, MACOMs and proponents have not completed rank coding for the Reserve Components, however, the RC must continue to have maximum flexibility in filling warrant officer positions.

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Direct WO position coding by grade
(WO1/CW2; CW3; CW4; CW5) and establishment
of WO Branch/MOS immaterial coding.

1st Qtr, FY 94

Lead: ODCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

NGB
POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072

Assist: OCAR
POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

Apply position coding to shelf requisitions

1st Qtr, FY 94

Lead: DAPERSCOM
POC: MW4 Davis, DSN 221-7843

Change AR 611-112 and 614-100 and other
appropriate regulations as needed.

1st Qtr, FY 95

Lead: ODCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

NGB
POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072

Assist: OCAR
POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

MACOM/Proponents review and change WO
position rank coding in TAADS.

1st Qtr, FY 94

Lead: ODCSOPS
POC: LTC Stanford, DSN 224-5411

PERSCOM
POC: MW4 Bullock, DSN 221-3266

Assist: Proponents
POC's: (See attached proponent POC listing)

RECOMMENDATION 5

ACTIONS: (Continued)

MILESTONES

DATE

MACOM/Proponents identify WO positions not requiring a specific MOS as either branch or MOS immaterial positions.

1st Qtr, FY 94

Lead: ODCSOPS

POC: LTC Stanford, DSN 224-5411

Assist: Proponents

POC's: (See attached proponent POC listing)

Establish pinpoint assignment of CW5/MWO.

1st Qtr, FY 94

Lead: DAPERSCOM

POC: MW4 Davis, DSN 221-7843

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: No additional resources are required, but there are significant time and workload implications for MACOM/Proponents. There is a minimal cost for regulation changes.

PROPONENT POC LIST:

WOCAREERCEN (USAAVNC)

TJAG:

AIR DEFENSE ARTILLERY:

AVIATION:

MILITARY POLICE:

USACIDC:

ENGINEER:

FIELD ARTILLERY:

AMEDD:

INTELLIGENCE:

SF (USAJFKSWC):

ORDNANCE:

QUARTERMASTER:

SIGNAL:

SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER:

AC

TRANSPORTATION:

AVIATION LOGISTICS:

OMMC:

MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803

CW3 White, DSN 680-4363 (Temporary)

At OTJAG TBD, DSN 225-4717

MW4 Dawson, DSN 978-6961/6217

CW4 Bucksath (SWOT)

MW4 Mock, DSN 558-4313

Mr. Monday, DSN 865-3155/4299

Mr. Powell, DSN 865-4229/3155

CW3 Cerase, DSN 289-1490

CW4 Rinehart, DSN 676-5399

CW4 Baxendale, DSN 639-5025

CW2 Miller, DSN 6005/3611 (WOTTCC/SWOT)

CPT Solesbee, DSN 471-4124

CW4 Molina, DSN 821-1183

CW3 Shireman, DSN 239-2415/9002

MW4 Reno, DSN 278-4400/5400

MW4 Zimmerman, DSN 687-4237

CW4 Little, DSN 780-2267/6652

Dr. Malone-Turner, DSN 699-4275

MW4 Wade, DSN 699-4735

MW4 Williams, DSN 927-6318

CW4 Ford, DSN 927-6560

CW4 Walters, DSN 788-6864

RECOMMENDATION 6

ISSUE: Should a Warrant Officer Career Center be established as a TRADOC tenant organization at an installation to serve as the executive agent for all warrant officer training, to develop and distribute common core training, and to conduct warrant officer candidate and master warrant officer training.

RECOMMENDATION: HQDA approve and resource a Total Army Warrant Officer Career Center at Fort Rucker as a TRADOC/CAC tenant organization to serve as the executive agent for all warrant officer training matters, including, but not limited to:

- a. Command and control of warrant officer candidate training.
- b. Command and control of master warrant officer training.
- c. Coordination/development of warrant officer common core training.
- d. Development and publication of a warrant officer professional journal.

DISCUSSION:

a. Except aviation, warrant officers comprise a small portion of each branch/proponent. As a result, resource constraints frequently limit the attention given warrant officer training, utilization, and leader development issues.

b. A WO Career Center, with most command and staff positions occupied by warrant officers, would provide the optimum environment to address warrant officer issues. The center would enhance development of WO Candidates and benefit warrant officers through interaction with and mentorship by the center staff.

c. Locating the institute in existing facilities at Ft Rucker and assigning to it personnel and other resources currently supporting WO training, would require few new resources.

d. A single-source training agency would be well suited to continuously review and define warrant officer roles, duties, and functions, and to disseminate information about warrant officer issues to serving warrant officers and the Army at large.

e. Common core training for warrant officers could best be developed and maintained by an organization that serves as the Army's home for the key subject matter experts for warrant officer training and other issues.

RECOMMENDATION 6

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: A WO Career Center would provide a centralized focal point for RC WO to receive information and guidance on WO training issues. Publication of a WO professional journal would provide a venue for RC WO to stay abreast of current issues, training, education, self-development, and related topics.

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Establish a WO Career Center
at Ft Rucker, AL.

2nd Qtr, FY 93

Lead: TRADOC

POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659

USAAVNC

POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803

Assist: CAC

POC: CW4 Reid, DSN 552-3472

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: Based on the proposal to shift 26 existing positions as well as current facilities and equipment at the USAAVNC, Ft Rucker into the career center, new resources could be limited to:

1 - Commander (Preferably Colonel, command select position, to provide the appropriate stature to the organization).

1 - GS Secretary

(Two spaces required to administer Phase I SWOT are included under recommendation 2)

Appropriate equipment (i.e., copiers/fax/computers, etc.)

RECOMMENDATION 7

ISSUE: A significant warrant officer shortage exists in the ARNG and the USAR, adversely affecting the readiness posture of some RC units. Current recruiting efforts are unlikely to correct that situation in the foreseeable future.

RECOMMENDATION:

a. Increase recruiter and administrative assets at USAREC to expand USAR recruiting efforts and establish appropriate recruiter recognition programs to support WO recruiting.

b. Establish closer working relationships and information exchange between AC, ARNG and USAR recruiting efforts.

c. Conduct specific education programs in the RC to increase command emphasis on the recruiting of Warrant Officers.

DISCUSSION:

a. Making about 100 field site visits annually, six USAREC recruiters conduct active component warrant officer recruiting to fill about 500 annual vacancies. USAR recruiting, while also conducted by six recruiters, is faced with over 1500 existing vacancies while also striving to replace normal losses. The RC recruiting is hindered by the limited access to audiences because of the weekend nature of RC training and the dispersion of RC units.

b. While ARNG recruiting is a state responsibility, the significant shortages of WO in ARNG units (over 2000) coupled with normal attrition have made current recruiting efforts inadequate to meet the need. More centralized coordination and management of the shortage problem is needed. Currently there is little information exchange and interface between the AC, ARNG and USAR recruiting efforts.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: The sole intent of this recommendation is to assist the RC in alleviating persistent WO shortages.

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Increase recruiter and administrative staffing at HQ, USAREC to bolster the USAR recruiting effort.

1st Qtr, FY 93

Lead: OCMR

POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

RECOMMENDATION 7

ACTIONS: (Continued)

MILESTONES

DATE

Assist: USAREC

POC's: MW4 Foli (RC), DSN 459-2666

CW3 Carnes (AC), DSN 459-7277

Convert NCO recruiter positions to WO for
WO recruiting.

2nd Qtr, FY 93

Lead: ODCSPER

POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

OCAR

POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

Use AC recruiters to assist
RC WO recruiting.

1st Qtr, FY 93

Lead: USAREC

POC's: MW4 Foli (RC), DSN 459-2666

CW3 Carnes (AC), DSN 459-7277

Emphasize WO recruiting to ARNG and USAR
commanders.

2nd Qtr, FY 92

Lead: NGB

POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072

OCAR

POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Increased spaces as needed at USAREC (to be determined).
- Increased pay/allowances for WO recruiters versus NCO recruiters.

RECOMMENDATION 8

ISSUE: Because warrant officer roles, duties, and responsibilities are not adequately understood at all levels of the Army, optimum use and professional development of warrant officers is adversely affected.

RECOMMENDATION: Institutionalize in regulations and doctrinal publications warrant officer roles, duties, and responsibilities. Market WO roles, duties, and responsibilities and include instruction about WO in leader development courses.

DISCUSSION: Commanders and other supervisors are frequently unfamiliar with the roles and experience levels of warrant officers assigned to the organization. As a result, unrealistic expectations, improper utilization, and inadequate leader development especially at the unit level are common. Commanders should receive training in their leader development courses about what to expect from warrant officers at each grade level to maximize WO utilization. A lack of familiarity with WO roles is pervasive throughout the Army and justifies implementation of a concerted marketing effort to provide that information through training courses and official and unofficial publications.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: Aggressive marketing of WO roles, duties, and responsibilities will improve RC recruiting.

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Clearly spell out WO roles, duties, and responsibilities in appropriate regulations and doctrinal publications.

1st Qtr, FY 94

Lead: ODCSPER

POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

Assist: TRADOC

POC's: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659

MW4 Dillard, DSN 680-5662

CAC, LDO

POC: CW4 Reid, DSN 552-3472

RECOMMENDATION 8

ACTIONS (Continued)

MILESTONES

DATE

Develop a marketing program to explain the WO system to the Army.

1st Qtr, FY 93

Lead: ODCSPER

POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

Assist: ODCSOPS

POC: LTC Stanford, DSN 224-5411

TRADOC

POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659

NGB

POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072

OCAR

POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

Add or expand training about WO roles, duties and responsibilities into leader development courses to include OAC, CGSOC, PCC.

2nd Qtr, FY 93
(OBC done,
OAC - 2Q, FY93
CGSC - 4Q, FY92
PCC - 4Q, FY92

Lead: TRADOC

POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659

CAC, LDO

POC: CW4 Reid, DSN 552-3472

Assist: USAAVNC (WO Career Center)

POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Development costs \$7.3K
- Four weeks development time

NOTE: No additional personnel requirements.

RECOMMENDATION 9

ISSUE: Warrant officer civilian education requirements are inadequate for a rapidly changing high-technology oriented Army.

RECOMMENDATION:

a. Establish an associate degree goal or its equivalent (i.e., 60 semester hours) for warrant officers to be attained prior to entry into career status for AC and prior to completing eight years warrant officer service for RC warrant officers.

b. Establish a baccalaureate degree goal for warrant officers to be attained prior to reaching the CW4 selection point.

c. Encourage warrant officers, via appropriate publications and professional development counseling at all levels, to pursue advanced degrees through off-duty education programs.

d. Review and modify, as needed, Army Education Requirements System programs to support warrant officer civilian education goals and other leader development actions.

DISCUSSION: Educational goals for warrant officers have remained unchanged for more than two decades while the Army and society at have progressed rapidly into ever more technologically oriented environments. The warrant officer accession requirement of high school GED and the goal of two years of college by the fourteenth year of service are inadequate in keeping up with dramatically changing technology in the Army. Warrant officer candidates currently average a 15 year reading level and a 13 year education level. Clearly higher goals are readily attainable and would better support the self development. An associate degree goal to be attained by about the five year WO service point is within reach for all warrant officers. Individual self development efforts can, at the career status point and again at promotion selection points for CW4 and MWO/CW5, become important selection discriminators and personnel management tools.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: Education funding for Reserve Component warrant officers is currently not authorized by law.

RECOMMENDATION 9

ACTIONS:

<u>MILESTONES</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Amend AR 621-1 and other publications to instate new education goals.	1st Qtr, FY 93
Lead: DAPERSCOM POC: MW4 Davis, DSN 221-7843	
Assist: NGB POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072	
OCAR POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879	
Review/modify ACES programs to implement WOLDAP (as needed).	4th Qtr, FY 93
Lead: ODCSPER POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751	
Assist: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	
Prepare recommendation to amend Title 10 U.S.C. to delete the prohibition on assistance in civil education for RC warrants.	3d Qtr, FY 92
Lead: ODCSPER POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751	
Assist: NGB POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072	
OCAR POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879	

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Minimal cost implications for changing regulations and other publications.
- Cost implications for education funding if a change to Title 10, U.S.C. is successful have yet to be determined.

RECOMMENDATION 10

ISSUE: Should warrant officer branch affiliation be identified through the wear of specific branch insignia, and should WO assignments and professional development be managed by proponent branches vice the Warrant Officer Division (WOD) at The Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM).

RECOMMENDATION:

a. Retain distinctive warrant officer insignia since warrant officers are managed by military occupational specialty as opposed to branch.

b. Continue centralized warrant officer management at Warrant Officer Division, PERSCOM, for the AC; and ARPERCEN/State AGs for the RC to ensure consistency of warrant officer personnel management and leader development.

DISCUSSION:

a. The wearing of branch insignia is a uniform policy and should not be tied to personnel management. There is a long tradition of warrant officer unique insignia, distinctive piping on overseas caps, a distinctive service cap insignia, and distinctive warrant officer colors for Army Dress and Mess uniforms. This tradition has strong support in the field as a means of clearly identifying warrant officers.

(1) A survey of Army Proponent Schools, MACOM, Staff Agencies, and the WO population disclosed strong support for retaining the current distinctive WO insignia.

(2) Of special significance is the JAGC position opposing the wearing of branch insignia by WO because JAGC branch insignia identifies trained and bar qualified lawyers.

(3) Although the Aviation and Ordnance Schools support the wearing of branch insignia, a single uniform policy for all warrant officers is important.

b. Regardless of the uniform policy, personnel management of Army warrant officers should continue to be centralized at the Warrant Officer Division, PERSCOM--a position that has strong support with MACOM and Proponent representatives and the warrant officer community. The low density of many warrant officer MOS would make personnel management and professional development much more difficult if given to the individual branches. The Warrant Officer Division, PERSCOM is the Army's single focal point in dealing with personnel and professional management issues relating to active Army warrant officers and is best equipped to support the leader development process.

RECOMMENDATION 10

DISCUSSION:

c. It should be noted that the USAR also uses a centralized WO personnel management system.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION:

None

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Dispatch an ALARACT message confirming
continuing centralized WO management
and retention of WO unique insignia

2nd Qtr, FY 92

Lead: ODCSPER

POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS: None, other than minimal costs of publicizing the resolution of this issue.

RECOMMENDATION 11

ISSUE: Should NG WO Candidates be permitted to attend state academy OCS in lieu of AC or RC WOCS.

RECOMMENDATION:

a. Establish and accredit Warrant Officer Candidate Schools as regional training sites at state academies, where practical, using warrant officer instructors/TACs and using approved WOCS POI.

b. Do not use state academy resident OCS courses to train warrant officer candidates.

DISCUSSION:

a. The need to maintain a single Total Army standard for warrant officer candidate training and the need for warrant officer mentorship of warrant officer candidates are imperatives that mandate separate officer/warrant officer candidate training. Officer candidates generally have very limited military experience, while WO candidates generally have extensive military experience and training. Therefore, the focus of leadership skills training for the two groups differ significantly.

b. WO candidates should be taught and mentored by warrant officers wherever possible. Warrant officer instructors provide role models to emulate and provide special insights into warrant officer roles, duties, and responsibilities. This mentorship approach to training is possible at state academies using separate warrant officer candidate courses and accrediting them to the same standard as the AC and RC WOCS at Forts Rucker and McCoy.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: This recommendation should help reduce the WO shortages in the ARNG. Although of little direct impact on the USAR, any effort to train ARNG WO at new sites will likely reduce the training load at the RC WOCS at Ft McCoy unless offset by increased recruiting efforts.

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Establish standardization and accreditation process for RC WO training.

3rd Qtr, FY 92

Lead: TRADOC

POC: MW4 Maine, DSN 680-5659

RECOMMENDATION 11

ACTIONS: (Continued)

<u>MILESTONES</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Establish WOCS courses at appropriate State Academies.	4th Qtr, FY 93
Lead: NGB POC: CW3 Shue, DSN 548-1731	
Review and accredit state academy WOCS programs.	4th Qtr, FY 93
Lead: TRADOC POC: MW4 Meine, DSN 680-5659	

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Based on an NGB estimate that no more than six regional WOCS sites would be established, the total cost is estimated at \$1.02 Million (\$170K per site).
- Based on projected class sizes of 40 students this translates to a per student cost of \$4250.00, including man-day costs.

RECOMMENDATION 12

ISSUE: Most warrant officer MOS lack MQS manuals that provide guidance in understanding individual responsibilities and tie together the three pillars of leader development.

RECOMMENDATION: Develop a warrant officer MQS system and publish common and branch specific WOMQS manuals for warrant officers through the grade of CW4.

DISCUSSION: Most warrant officer MOS currently do not have a document available that clearly outlines the critical skills, knowledge and attitudes required at each of the three warrant officer grade levels. Properly developed WOMQS manuals would greatly assist warrant officers in understanding individual responsibilities in acquiring the necessary skills to serve successfully at each level, and would provide commanders a road map of realistic expectations for their warrant officers.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: WOMQS manuals and the associated process are critical to the development of RC warrant officers whose leader development does not benefit from the more extensive training and assignment opportunities of the AC.

ACTIONS

MILESTONES

DATE

Develop Common WOMQS Manual

1st Qtr, FY 94

Lead: CAC

POC: CW4 Reid, DSN 552-3472

Assist: USAAVNC (WO Career Center)

POC: MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803

Develop Branch specific WOMQS Manual

4th Qtr, FY 96

Lead: CAC

POC: CW4 Reid, DSN 552-3472

Assist: Proponents

POC's: (See attached proponent POC listing)

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- Common manuals: \$ 88.8K (\$50K development and \$38.8K distribution [could be done by WO Career College]).
- Branch manuals: \$ 638.8K

TOTAL: \$ 727.6K (worst case)

RECOMMENDATION 12

PROPONENT POC LIST:

WOCAREERCEN (USAAVNC)	MW4 Damron, DSN 558-2803
TJAG:	CW3 White, DSN 680-4363 (Temporary)
	At OTJAG TBD, DSN 225-4717
AIR DEFENSE ARTILLERY:	MW4 Dawson, DSN 978-6961/6217
	CW4 Bucksath (SWOT)
AVIATION:	MW4 Mock, DSN 558-4313
MILITARY POLICE:	Mr. Monday, DSN 865-3155/4299
	Mr. Powell, DSN 865-4229/3155
USACIDC:	CW3 Cerase, DSN 289-1490
ENGINEER:	CW4 Rinehart, DSN 676-5399
FIELD ARTILLERY:	CW4 Baxendale, DSN 639-5025
	CW2 Miller, DSN 6005/3611 (WOTTCC/SWOT)
AMEDD:	CPT Solesbee, DSN 471-4124
INTELLIGENCE:	CW4 Molina, DSN 821-1183
SF (USAJFKSWC):	CW3 Shireman, DSN 239-2415/9002
ORDNANCE:	MW4 Reno, DSN 278-4400/5400
QUARTERMASTER:	MW4 Zimmerman, DSN 687-4237
SIGNAL:	CW4 Little, DSN 780-2267/6652
SOLDIER SUPPORT CENTER:	Dr. Malone-Turner, DSN 699-4275
AG	MW4 Wade, DSN 699-4735
TRANSPORTATION:	MW4 Williams, DSN 927-6318
AVIATION LOGISTICS:	CW4 Ford, DSN 927-6560
OMMC:	CW4 Walters, DSN 788-6864

RECOMMENDATION - 3

ISSUE: The need to implement the Warrant Officer Management Act (WOMA), to inform commanders and serving warrant officers of its implications, and to explain implementation procedures requires immediate action.

RECOMMENDATION: Conduct WOMA implementation briefings and develop a marketing plan to inform the Army and serving WO about changes and implementation procedures.

DISCUSSION: The WOMA is the warrant officer equivalent of DOPMA. Its provisions include the new grade of CW5 and significant new personnel management policies, to include management by years of warrant officer service, a single promotion system, and selective early retirement. All of the changes will require a concerted effort to inform commanders and serving WO of new policies and administrative procedures.

RC IMPACT/CONSIDERATION: RC representatives should participate in the briefing process.

ACTIONS:

MILESTONES

DATE

Develop a marketing plan and provide information/briefings to the Army and serving WO about WO changes and WOMA implementation.

1st Qtr, FY 93

Lead: ODCSPER
POC: CW4 Oldroyd, DSN 227-0751

Assist: DAPERSCOM
POC: MW4 Davis, DSN 221-7843

NGB
POC: MW4 Lynch, DSN 225-0072

OCAR
POC: MW4 Welsh, DSN 225-0879

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

No additional resources.