

Security Cooperation Workforce Training

By now, many of you may be well aware that the training of DoD's security cooperation and security assistance workforce has drawn attention at the highest levels of the U.S. Government (USG). A Memorandum from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), to all USG Departments and Agencies stated in part:

Over the next several months, OMB will work with Congress, interagency management councils, experts in Federal management policy, Federal employees, and other key stakeholders to craft a broad management and performance framework that will achieve near term priorities and overcome long standing management challenges. This effort will include addressing the high-priority performance goals discussed below and will help inform budget decisions.

One of those high priority performance goals noted above which has been forwarded to the Executive Office by the Department of Defense is the enhancement of the security cooperation workforce. In the DoD response to OMB, the performance area being addressed is:

The ability to strengthen and expand alliances and partnerships is a key goal for achieving the objectives established by the Secretary of Defense in the *2008 National Defense Strategy*, which is the point of departure for the ongoing Quadrennial Defense Review. An important element of strengthening partnerships is assisting other countries in improving their capabilities through U.S. Security Cooperation programs. The importance of strong partnerships has come into clearer focus in today's operational environment, where there is a highlighted need for trained personnel in U.S. Security Cooperation Organizations (SCO) located in each country. Security Cooperation (SC), which includes DoD-administered Security Assistance (SA) programs, is an important tool of national security and foreign policy, and is an integral element of the DoD mission.

There are 107 SCOs worldwide, totaling approximately 670 personnel (U.S. military, U.S. civilian, and U.S.-hired foreign-service nationals) [*editor's note: this number includes only those personnel directly funded by FMS/FMF funds*]. *Not all SCO personnel have received formal training in their SC duties and responsibilities.* This results in less than optimal and timely provision of assistance to partner countries. A priority for the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy [USD(P)] and the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) is increasing the training of SCO personnel. A well-qualified and responsive Security Cooperation workforce is often the face of the United States Government in many countries, and the primary enabler of Combatant Command (COCOM) Theater Campaign Plans.

The DoD document continues in articulating some of the **Key barriers and challenges**:

Personnel assigned to SCOs belong to the respective COCOM, and are staffed in accordance with the COCOM Joint Tables of Distribution (JTD) and Joint Manning Documents (JMD). DSCA and the COCOMs, working in concert with the Joint Chiefs of Staff J1 and the Military Departments, are responsible for proper staffing of the SCOs. With the level of responsibility for SCO staffing cutting across four levels of command (i.e., COCOM, Joint Staff, MILDEP, and OUSD(P)/DSCA), a unified effort to identify and designate those SCO positions requiring training will require work-intensive coordination.

Personnel staffing of SCOs can consist of U.S. military, U.S. DoD civilians, local national civilians (typically in high-skill, programmatic positions such as budget or training management) and local national contractors. This mix of nationalities, career status (military and civilian), and skill sets will make it difficult to determine and implement a standard training model for all.

There are no standard functional staffing models for SCOs because they are organized and tailored to meet the unique SA/SC objectives for the country in which they are assigned. Some positions devote full-time attention to Security Assistance; others have responsibilities divided between Security Assistance, Security Cooperation, and other duties. This will limit the amount of standardization possible across the six COCOMs with respect to resources and training. Some SCO positions are located in regions supported with one-year tours of duty; others are in multi-year tour regions. The need for formal training in support of a one-year billet will be more time-sensitive than that of a multi-year billet. SCOs—and the billets of those assigned to SA positions—are funded by Title 22 security assistance funds. Additionally, many SCOs also receive DoD-appropriated funds (Title 10) to resource billets and operations in support of DoD SC programs. This mixture of funding sources, in some cases present in the same SCO, will make the management of education programs more challenging.

In order to manage this broad and extensive effort, the Director, DSCA has tasked DISAM to develop an action plan to meet the DoD goals and provide for measurable milestones (metrics) to ensure we are making progress. On 10 Nov 2009, VADM Wieringa, the DSCA Director, issued a Memorandum to the Geographic Combatant Commands and Military Departments, "Request for Support for Security Cooperation Training Initiative." That Memorandum is provided on this web site. The remainder of this description will discuss some of those key activities and measurements.

Who makes up the SC/SA Workforce, and How to We Measure Trained?

The DISAM action plan for achieving the DoD and DSCA goals is broken down into several manageable components. Those components are based on the answers to a few key questions:

- Who makes up the SC/SA workforce and where are they?
- What is the definition of trained?
- What are the capacities for training?
- How is the workforce and their management motivated to achieve the training goals?

In previous documentation, the reader observed a number (~670) of Security Cooperation Officers working within the U.S. Embassy and GCC structures overseas. There was also noted a number of additional personnel funded under Title 10, vs. Title 22, that vary between occasional and daily involvement in either SC or SA activities, or both. The same holds true in the CONUS based MILDEPs and Agencies – DSCA via the FMS Administrative budget and in accordance the Financial Management Regulation (DoD 7000.14R, Vol 15) - funds a substantial number of personnel involved in SC and SA activities. As is the case in the SCOs, there are a number of other people with various sources of funding, who also perform some level of SC/SA activities. For example, a training organization within the Army, Navy, AF, etc which allows for international students to participate in course offerings will have an International Military Student Office tasked to interface and oversee the activities the international students at that training facility.

Do these non- “FMS/FMF” funded personnel require training? Of course they do. While the level of training is the variable – not everyone requires a Master’s degree in international relations - they most certainly need training at some level and should be counted as a part of the workforce. To establish not only the how many and where are they question, but also what level of training does the individual occupying a specific billet require; DISAM has developed a data collection tool and a training level matrix which has been or will be sent to all DoD organizations with SC or SA activities. The object is to go to the organizations themselves - those most knowledgeable - in both how many billets and personnel are involved in SC/SA, and what level of training each needs to effectively do their job. The data collection sheet and training guide matrix are shown as separate documents on this website; however, we have established a Security Cooperation Workforce Database (SCWD) on the Security Assistance Network (SAN) where organizations are able to enter data and updates directly, and training verification will occur via automated connection with the DISAM student training database.

Training Capacity

Over the last few years, primarily since 9/11/2001, the throughput of students at DISAM has steadily grown to over 4900 students for FY 2009. The Security Cooperation Management course (SCM-O) offerings have had such a tremendous rise in attendance over the last few years that they have exceeded a single classroom space (>65 students), and DISAM has “split” the class into two simultaneous SCM-O courses to accommodate the requirements as well as enhance the learning environment. The attendant increase in instructor requirements has been met by “surging the course teaching load.” It appears this requirement is not abating, and given our “EWAG” – educated wild guess – that the results of our data collection will not diminish but increase that demand; coupled with increasing demands from our CONUS workforce customers (SAM-C, TO, E, CM, CS, CF, CR) and wait lists for those classes; has resulted in DSCA authorizing the immediate hiring of an additional 6 DISAM faculty members and 2 staff positions. The actual mix of courses requiring additional offerings will be resultant of analysis of the training shortfall from our noted data collection effort. In the long run, DISAM/DSCA have embarked upon preliminary actions to increase classroom space, another limiting factor, but in the short run, other alternatives will be explored – off-campus training in courses that have not been traditionally offered in that mode, temporary use of Wright-Patterson facilities, off base facilities, etc. The bottom line is that DSCA and DISAM are putting in motion a number of initiatives to increase our student throughput capacity, but the specifics in terms of courses, locations, and a myriad of cost benefit considerations must be based upon the analysis of the “gaps” as indicated by our data collection.

Achieving the Goal

Recall from VADM Wieringa’s Memorandum:

In support of this goal, DepSecDef directed the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to develop a plan to educate 95% of the SC workforce by the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011. This plan includes personnel assigned to the Military Departments, Combatant Commands, and Security Cooperation Offices (SCOs). My goal is to have all overseas based SC officers complete the minimum required training by the end of FY 2010.

One might consider that direction from the DepSecDef and the Director, DSCA would be “sufficient motivation” to achieve the training goals articulated, but as often is the case, the devil is in the details. On-going conflicts of substantial magnitude in the CENTCOM theatre (Afghanistan and Iraq); a natural disaster of yet unknown, but certainly tremendous impact in SOUTHCOM (Haiti); a new command establishing a foothold in an area replete with challenges (Africa Command) and the possibility for other “high priority taskings” around the globe could bear on these goals. VADM Wieringa has augmented and committed the current resources of DISAM to attaining these goals and we will continue to provide feedback to DSCA, DoD, and the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) at regular, specified intervals.

We know where we’re heading – our goal – 95% OCONUS SC/SA personnel trained at the desired level by the end of FY 10; and 95% of all SC/SA personnel trained to the appropriate level by the end of FY 11. But where is the origin of our graph which ends at the 95th percentile? That is what we are currently determining via the DISAM/DSCA data collection effort. Once that point is determined, the greatest efficiency and utilization of DISAM’s expanded capabilities will be put to the task and a series of “task completions,” measurements/metrics, and new and innovative approaches (e.g. better use of distance learning for the basic levels of training) will be established to map and measure our progress to goal achievement. Of utmost importance to this project, it’s not simply the goal of 95% of the workforce being appropriately trained, it goes beyond that in maintaining 100% accountability of the workforce.

While this recent “visibility” has highlighted the goal of a well trained workforce, it is has always been a goal of the many organizations involved in SC/SA – note the DSCA initiatives on International Affairs Certification, the Graduate Studies program – GMAP II ; the MILDEPs long standing use of Internship programs and MILDEP specific training activities, and the Combatant Command’s efforts to get their folks training which may have been missed in the Pipeline of new assignments – mobile training teams, on-site training, local OJT sessions, etc. Motivation of these organizations and the personnel who dedicate their efforts on a daily basis is not a significant area of concern, but rather the challenge is to be able to provide these “troops” the opportunity to complete the necessary level of training in a timely fashion – that is the challenge that DISAM and DSCA must meet.