Although the analyses conducted here were exploratory, there are still some important implications from the research. Basically, the implications have to do with the benefits of further integration, whether the maintenance-related results can be generalized to other areas, and the potential next steps for the Army.

AC/RC SCHOOL INTEGRATION PROVIDES A RANGE OF PERSONNEL-RELATED BENEFITS

The exploratory analysis suggests that there are benefits for three personnel groups: instructors, school support staff, and AC and RC students. We examine each in turn.

Instructor Benefits

Our analyses suggest that allowing students to attend the nearest school offering a course, regardless of the component of the student or the school, can result in a large number of student training days migrating from the AC schools to the RTS-Ms. This migration reduces the platform time and workload of AC instructors, thereby providing a boost in morale to what may be a currently overworked and overstressed workforce. In addition, many believe that the current cadre of RC instructors can accommodate this increased workload, particularly given current levels of quota utilization.

Although fewer overall instructors may be needed in the integrated system, we stress that a more thorough analysis is needed to understand
stand how best to utilize the AC, AGR, and part-time RC instructors. For example, sending an AC instructor temporarily to schools close to the students may be preferred to sending the students to a school some distance from the location of their home. Moreover, temporarily assigning RC instructors, either full-time AGRs or part-time M-day personnel, to AC schools may be an efficient way to satisfy peak demands.

**Support Personnel Benefits**

In terms of support personnel, we found that the number of school support personnel is fairly insensitive to the training workloads at the school. Therefore, increasing the workload at the RTS-Ms, or decreasing it at the AC schools, should have almost no effect on the number of school support personnel. If RTS-Ms are closed, however, or have their missions changed, there may be some support staff personnel savings in the system.

**Student Benefits**

The greatest advantage of furthering the integration of the AC and RC school systems may be associated with the students. Travel time and cost can be reduced, and, most important, the time away from home (and the resulting per-diem costs) will be reduced for AC soldiers who go to an RTS-M either at their home base or within an easy commute. Also, the AC does not have separate courses for MOS reclassification. AC soldiers needing training in a new MOS go to the same course as soldiers receiving their first MOS training. A portion of these “full” MOS courses addresses common skills and provides soldierization beyond what is needed for a prior-service soldier. RC MOS reclassification courses assume that the soldiers have received the common skill and soldierization portions during IET and, therefore, are shorter than the corresponding initial entry course. If AC soldiers needing reclassification training in a new MOS were permitted to take the RC version of the course, overall AC training time could be reduced.

Although many of the advantages are monetary, integration of the training and education of AC and RC soldiers would presumably enhance the overall integration of the total force. When students are
taught by instructors from other components, in the facilities of the other components, and potentially alongside students from the other components, one could expect that cultural barriers would begin to disappear and cross-component contact and confidence would increase.

**RESULTS CAN BE GENERALIZED BEYOND MAINTENANCE TRAINING AREA**

Our analysis has focused on maintenance training. However, we believe the concepts and opportunities for further integrating AC and RC training exist in other areas as well. The most obvious extensions beyond maintenance would be to other functional areas with regional training sites in the RC (e.g., engineer, medical, and military intelligence). However, we think that in principle the concept could be extended readily to those RC training organizations that operate regional training sites, such as maintenance, medical, and intelligence.

The alternative training opportunities and the potential for more efficient operations largely result from the RTS facilities and personnel that may already exist. RTSs are miniversions of their AC counterparts with fixed facilities, permanent training equipment, and full-time personnel. The training of RC soldiers could greatly benefit from similar structures in other areas, such as the conversion of some existing RTS-Ms to other functions (e.g., to Regional Training Sites for Transportation (RTS-Ts)) or the development of similar regional RC schools in other functional areas.

**PILOT-TESTING AC/RC INTEGRATION AND CONDUCTING MORE DETAILED ANALYSES OF INSTRUCTOR REQUIREMENTS ARE LOGICAL NEXT STEPS**

The foregoing analysis indicates that there are potential benefits from integrating training across components. If the Army should decide to proceed along these lines, the next step should be a pilot test, to better understand the options and the policy and resource implications. Such a pilot program might include selecting two or three RTS-Ms, potentially those collocated at active bases, to conduct AC-configured courses. Aberdeen, or another AC school, could
begin to offer RC-configured MOS reclassification and possibly NCOES courses. One or more RTS-Ms, potentially those with low student workloads, could also offer transportation or quartermaster courses on a trial basis.

Admittedly, these changes could have significant implications if found beneficial and adopted on a wider scale. The integration of reclassification training in the maintenance area seems straightforward enough; however, it could result in a shorter reclassification course for AC soldiers, along the lines of (and perhaps in conjunction with) current RC reclassification training. The integration of NCOES could face strong cultural resistance, since some AC NCOs would then take some or all their BNCOC or ANCOC at an RTS-M (presumably with oversight from a proponent or major command NCO Academy). However, some RC NCOs will now attend AC NCO Academies. While such changes seem dramatic, it may be impossible to maintain the status quo. Reduced training budgets and TDA personnel allowances at the schools require the Army to find more efficient ways to conduct the training of all soldiers, regardless of component.

A second desirable step, as we have noted previously, would be a more thorough examination of the instructor requirements resulting from a more fully integrated school system. A potential barrier to integration arises from Army manpower staffing standards, which “reward” shifts in workload with reductions in manpower resources. An estimate of how many instructors, and what type of instructors (e.g., AC, AGR, or part-time RC), are needed at various training locations is necessary to better understand potential cost and resource implications and to identify options for encouraging such innovation. Such analyses should consider the potential for temporarily assigning instructors to training locations, either by detailing them from their assigned school to another school or by using part-time (i.e., M-day) RC instructors, to help meet a surge in training workload and encourage systemwide efficiency.