

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND (FORSCOM)
INSPECTOR GENERAL (IG) REPORT
DAY IN THE LIFE INSPECTION



Day in the Life
Oct 21 – Feb 22

WHAT WE DID:

Inspectors from the U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) Inspector General, augmented by FORSCOM G-3, conducted a no-notice inspection observing a “Day in the Life” of FORSCOM companies.

SCOPE:

We visited eight (8) Active Component installations; and included 66 company-level units from 25 Brigades. Our focus was on the company- sized units, which included those identified as a Troop or Battery. Our inspection included the following type units; 21 light maneuver, 25 heavy maneuver, 8 Engineer/Field Artillery and, 12 sustainment/support).

INSPECTION OBJECTIVES:

Objective 1. Assess how much time Soldiers spend on training, administrative, people first and other activities and requirements.

Objective 2. Assess how much time leaders spend on training, administrative, people first and other activities and requirements.

Objective 3. Identify primary sources of schedule disruption and inefficiency at company, platoon, and squad levels.

KEY OBSERVATIONS:

- Without specified training or a planned event, Soldiers typically worked a total of five and a half hours a day, to include PRT.
 - A Soldier’s (SGT and below) day generally started with physical readiness training (PRT) from 0630 – 0745 and their duty day was 0930 - 1530 with lunch from 1100 until 1300.
- 61% (40 of 66 company level units) published training schedules and only 44% (29 of 66) of the units followed the schedule.
- Squad leaders and above spent minimal time with Soldiers throughout the day. Soldiers were generally doing the right thing, but often spent time waiting for direction. Units with leadership presence appeared to execute planned training more effectively and efficiently than those that lacked leader presence.
- Soldier accountability procedures and frequency varied across each installation; and regardless of the procedure accountability degraded as the day progressed.

WHAT WE FOUND:

A “Day in the Life” of a FORSCOM company started with Soldiers arriving between 0545 and 0615. First formation occurred and leaders took accountability, which varied by unit. Some units reported with “all accounted for” while a few required by-name accountability for Soldiers not physically present. Nearly all units (65 of 66) had Soldiers depart the organized PRT area following first formation; and some had up to 50% of the Soldiers depart. Unit PRT ended between 0730-0800 and Soldiers were released for personal hygiene.

Soldiers returned to their unit between 0900 and 0930 for training or mission. However none of the units had training schedules that were prepared in accordance with Field Manual (FM) 7-0, Training. Of the 66 units observed, a majority (40 of 66) had published training schedules posted in the unit area. In 29 of those 40 units there was correlation between what was on training schedules and what units accomplished. Some units used hourly training schedules from Digital Training Management System (DTMS), while others used Microsoft Power Point, Excel or an Outlook calendar designated to a specific event. Nearly all units had a majority of their formation present during the morning and were consistently conducting various Military Occupational Skill (MOS) or administrative related tasks. Senior and junior leader presence with Soldiers varied based on proactive versus reactive leadership. Units released Soldiers between 1100 and 1130 for lunch.

Soldiers returned from lunch to their place of duty between 1300 and 1330 and lingered as they waited for guidance. Leader presence in the afternoon decreased significantly and as a result many Soldiers idled away their time using cell phones, sleeping, sitting around, etc. Junior leaders issued directed closeout tasks around 1400 and Soldiers typically departed for the day by 1530. In most cases platoon-level leadership was given and exercised daily release authority. Unit leadership continued administrative tasks until 1630 or longer.

FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

Finding 1: Unit training schedules were not in accordance with (IAW) FM 7-0.

Standard: FM 7-0, Training (Published 14 June 2021).

(a) Chapter 3-17 stated “Training schedules are posted in company common areas and are provided to Soldiers. Figure 3-2 illustrates a sample training schedule. At a minimum, company training schedules include the following information”:

- Date and time of training (start and end).
- Attendees.

- Tasks trained (task title and numbers for reference).
- Trainer (primary and alternate).
- Uniform and equipment.
- Location (such as training areas or facilities).
- References (such as FM 6-22 and TC 7-101).
- Authentication (company commander signature and battalion commander signature when approved).

Chapter 3-18 discussed that the training schedule should “enable predictability and consistent quality execution, events codified in a training schedule should not change. However, changes to approved training are sometimes unavoidable. Any substantive changes between Weeks T-6 through T-4 require battalion commander approval, changes between Weeks T-3 through T-2 require brigade commander approval, and any change inside Week T-1 requires division commander approval. Consistent changes within two weeks of training indicate a commander failure to accurately plan unit training or higher commander failure to protect subordinate units from un-forecasted distractors.”

Finding Discussion 1: None of the units observed had published and posted a training schedule IAW with FM 7-0. However the majority of units (40 of 66) had a version of a training schedule posted in their company areas. None of the units had published training schedules that met the doctrinal requirements and few were signed by the battalion commander. Training schedules varied throughout FORSCOM and there was no standard format except for the 3-2 illustration in FM 7-0.

Root Cause: **Won't Comply:** Company commanders are not publishing and posting training schedules IAW FM 7-0.

Observation 1: **Soldiers typically worked a four hour day.**

Discussion 1: A Soldiers’ work day consisted of four hours of actual work, absent time allocated for PRT. Most units had their Soldiers report back to the unit area for duty between 0900-0930. The Soldiers remained at the duty location until 1100 or 1130 and were released for lunch break from 1130-1300. **After lunch Soldiers returned to their place of duty and were released by 1530.**

Throughout the day Soldiers conducted various MOS or administrative related tasks, but often lacked clear and concise guidance. When a Soldier completed a task, they often stood idly waiting on guidance. Junior leaders were idle and did not take initiative to either conduct training or issue guidance in the absence of orders.

Observation 2: Unit leadership presence with Soldiers was a significant factor in companies that operated effectively and efficiently.

Discussion 2: Most unit leaders were unaware of what their Soldiers were doing, and almost all were out of touch and disconnected from their Soldiers. A common theme

heard from almost all unit command teams was “we never have time” and “we are not allowed to have white space on a calendar”. The same leaders felt they were obligated by an endless series of higher level tasking requirements. Few were aware of how much time they actually had available.

Unit leaders expressed frustration with requirements coming from battalion headquarters and staff. These requirements were typically administrative in nature, such as participating in meetings as a command team. There was an expectation that First Sergeants (1SG) had to attend any meeting where the Command Sergeant Major was present or if the Company Commander was in a meeting, the 1SG was also expected to attend. This culture created an adverse effect and negatively impacted the 1SG’s battlefield circulation and his time to observe training. These leaders explained tasks they would take care of themselves and the tasks they would delegate to their platoons, or company training room to get accomplished. Units that had consistent leadership presence had functioning systems and their Soldiers worked hard to complete their daily tasks. The junior leaders within those units companies appeared to be more proactive in comparison to the leaders in the units that lacked leader presence and were more reactive than proactive.

Observation 3: Platoon and squad leadership spent minimal time with Soldiers throughout the day.

Discussion 3: Consistent observations revealed team and squad leaders spent the majority of their day moving between squad areas and platoon offices providing administrative data to platoon leadership. When squad leaders observed Soldier’s sitting around and not engaged with unit activities, very few issued orders or provided guidance. Instead the junior leaders ignored their Soldiers disengagement and continued with their individual concerns and activities within the unit area. Some junior leaders engaged a few Soldiers in a joking manner and on some occasions sought out one or two Soldiers for a specific purpose, generally administrative in nature, then departed the area.

We observed that platoon leadership spent more time in their offices away from interacting with Soldiers. Those leaders were frequently found conducting work in support of their Soldiers or the unit. We recognized such tasks, completing administrative related tasks or planning training, were delegated to the platoon leadership and were aligned with platoon-level responsibilities. Company leaders were aware of the tasks they delegated down, but were unaware of how the task affected and competed with time junior leaders spent with Soldiers.

Observation 4: Accountability varied throughout the day.

Discussion 4: Nearly all units held a morning accountability formation before conducting PRT. Unit Soldier accountability procedures varied regarding the amount of information that was conveyed concerning absences. Most platoons provided a generic “all accounted for” to the First Sergeant and did not specify the status or whereabouts of

Soldiers who were not present due to appointments, charge of quarter (CQ) /Staff Duty, or leave/pass. Only a few platoons provided their accountability in detail to the 1SG. Nearly all units had the largest number of Soldiers present during the morning PRT formation and as the day progressed, fewer Soldiers were observed in and around the unit areas. Other than PRT formation there was no formal accountability process; and leaders were comfortable with accepting a sporadic virtual accountability for Soldiers not physically present. Despite this nearly all unit and platoon leadership conveyed confidence in the accuracy of their Soldier's accountability status throughout the day.

When periodically throughout the day leaders were asked about their Soldiers whereabouts, most were confident that a virtual status that the Soldier provided to them was adequate; **most often a text message**. Some team and squad leaders were able to articulate where their Soldiers were if not physically present, however, platoon and unit level leaders were not able to confidently articulate that. The platoon and unit level leaders were comfortable with junior leaders' use of virtual accountability measures.

WHAT WE RECOMMEND:

- Commanders adhere to and enforce a predictable training environment as outlined in AR 350-1 Army Training and Leader Development (training in units and organizations) and FM 7-0 and strive to minimize substantive changes to approved schedules.
- In accordance with FORSCOM Order 220050, “FORSCOM Tasked ISO FY20-21 Tactical Readiness Inspection Results”:
 - Commanders/Unit leaders and staff ensure disciplined execution of UTM at all echelons focusing on the use of the eight-step training model. Ensure training “planned but not conducted” is identified and reasons for cancellation are understood and corrected when appropriate. (order para 3.B.2.A.3)
 - Senior Commanders assess and revise as required the standardized Program of Instruction (POI) for installation-based Commander/First Sergeant Courses to improve leader understanding of UTM. (para 3.B.2.A.9)
- FORSCOM directs Senior Mission Commanders to establish/enforce standard duty day and accountability policy.
- Commanders at echelon brief the results of this inspection two levels down to platoon level NLT 30 September 2022.

ANECDOTAL (REPRESENTATIVE) OBSERVATIONS:

1300-1415: A PSG and three NCOs from the same section were playing spades in the section office. During this time the First Sergeant walked by the office and did not make a correction. A Private in the section (4 months in the army) sat outside alone for 1.5 hours while the leaders were playing their game of spades. The Soldier stated that he does this often. He discussed a desire to start college, however, he did not know where to start. He said his NCO is aware of his desire, however, nobody has helped achieve this goal.

1335: A platoon leader and platoon sergeant loaded the platoon leader's personally owned vehicle with their issued pistols and NVGs to take to the motor pool. A SGT told them to stop and give him their equipment and he would walk it over. The platoon leader and platoon sergeant gave the equipment to the SGT who walked over to the motor pool while the other two drove their POV.

1335: A new 2LT platoon leader was giving an OPORD brief to his platoon as part of his introduction as the new PL. The out-going PL was observed moving amongst his, now former, platoon and creating a disruption as he joked with Soldiers and NCO's.

1000-1130: 21 Soldiers (PVT-SPC) in the motor pool with four working on vehicles and the remainder on their phones or conversing/joking around. During this same time, seven junior leaders were observed sitting idly in COF offices (some doing admin/some on cell phones).

0930-1130: Company Master Gunner (SFC) conducted Gunnery Skills Test training with 16 newly assigned gunners.

0945-1100: Platoon conducting C-Wire mechanical breach rehearsals prior to field problem behind the COF working on cutting and pushing through C-Wire. Training was being broken down crawl, walk, run with Platoon Leader and Platoon Sergeant leading rehearsals.

A Senior Commander stated their Company Commander and 1SG course includes a module during which attendees conduct a training meeting under the observation of a sitting battalion commander.

The point of contact is MAJ Matthew Molino, Inspections Division, Comm. 910-570-7899/DSN 312-570-7899, email matthew.j.molino.mil@army.mil.

JOHN G. SCHWEMMER
COL, IG
FORSCOM Command IG

Notes on Inspector General numerical terms and references:

Note 1: Report data is presented using the following percentage ranges: **All** (100%), **Nearly all** (90-99%), **Most** (76-89%), **Majority** (51-75%), **Half** (50%), **Some** (26-49%), **Few** (1-25%) and **None** (0%).

Note 2: IG Root Cause analysis is described using three terms as described below.

a. Don't Know.

- (1) Never Knew: Did the person or unit ever know about the requirement?
- (2) Forgot: Did the person or unit forget about the requirement?
- (3) Task Implied: Was the task implied but the unit or person lacked the knowledge or experience to recognize the requirement?

b. Can't Comply.

- (1) Scarce Resources: Did the person or unit have the resources to accomplish the requirement?
- (2) Don't Know How: Did the person or unit know how to meet the requirement
- (3) Impossibility: Was the requirement impossible for the unit or person to perform?

c. Won't Comply.

- (1) No reward: Would the person or unit be rewarded for completing the requirement?
- (2) No Penalty: Would the person or unit suffer a penalty by failing to complete the requirement?
- (3) Disagree: Did the person or unit disagree with the requirement?