

DOCUMENT RESUME

05355 - [B0965897]

**Army's Test Comparing OSUT with Two Station Training.
FPCD-78-37; B-146890. April 3, 1978. 2 pp.**

**Report to Secretary, Department of the Army; by H. L. Krieger,
Director, Federal Personnel and Compensation Div.**

**Issue Area: Federal Personnel Management and Compensation:
Military Skill Training at Lowest Cost (314).
Contact: Federal Personnel and Compensation Div.
Budget Function: National Defense: Department of Defense -
Military (except procurement & contracts) (051).
Congressional Relevance: House Committee on Armed Services;
Senate Committee on Armed Services.**

**The Congress directed the Army to conduct a test comparing one station unit training (OSUT) with two station training to determine whether two station training could produce qualified soldiers as economically as OSUT. The Army designed a test, scheduled to begin late in 1978, which would compare a 12-week OSUT program with a 13-week two station program to train infantrymen. The course of instruction for the two station program contains 38 more hours than the OSUT program. The difference between the length of the two programs automatically introduces a cost bias in favor of OSUT. A more useful test and one more in consonance with congressional intent would be a comparison of the 12-week OSUT program with a program of equal length at two stations. The Secretary of the Army should redesign the test to compare similar programs of equal length.
(RRS)**



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND
COMPENSATION DIVISION

B-146890

April 3, 1978

The Honorable
The Secretary of the Army

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The purpose of this letter is to advise you of our concerns regarding Army's planned test comparing one station unit training (OSUT) with two station training. The Congress directed Army to conduct this test to answer the question whether two station training could produce qualified soldiers as economically as OSUT. Because of congressional interest, we made a limited examination of the test plans.

The Army designed a test, scheduled to begin late in 1978, which would compare a 12-week OSUT program with a 13-week two station program to train infantry men. The course of instruction for the longer two station program contains 38 more hours than the OSUT program.

The difference between the length of the two programs automatically introduces a cost bias in favor of OSUT. The value of many of the additional hours seems to be the same as that which has been challenged in the past. For example, the Army added 4 hours of physical training in the final week of the two station program, eight hours of commanders' time, and eight hours of review and reinforcement time.

The Army has established that it can produce qualified entry level soldiers with the 12-week OSUT program. As stated in our report ^{1/} on the OSUT test, there is evidence that the Army could train qualified soldiers at two stations using the reduced (12-week) infantry program of instruction that was previously used in the test at Fort Polk. A more useful test and one that is more in consonance with congressional intent and direction would be a comparison of the 12-week OSUT program with a program of equal length at two stations.

^{1/} "The Army's Test of One Station Unit Training: Adequacy and Value" (FPCD-76-100, Feb. 9, 1977).

FPCD-78-37
(990516)

If under the present plan the two station program produces an equally qualified soldier, the Army and the Congress will be faced with a decision on which program to use in the future on the basis of only cost and, obviously, the 13-week program will be more expensive.

Conclusion and Recommendation

To meet the needs of the Congress and avoid biased results, the Army should design a test comparing training programs of equal length and as nearly identical as possible consistent with the training locations. Accordingly, we recommend that the Secretary of the Army redesign the test to compare similar programs of equal length.

As you know, section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requires the head of a Federal agency to submit a written statement on actions taken on our recommendations to the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs no later than 60 days after the date of the report and to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with the agency's first request for appropriations made more than 60 days after the date of the report.

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and the Secretary of Defense. Copies are also being sent to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services, the House Committee on Government Operations, and to the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Sincerely yours,



H. L. Krieger
Director