

DL Roadmap Frequently Asked Questions

Page, Paragraph, Line	MAJCOM Concern or Question and AFDLO Answer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How will competitive sourcing affect DL and Education Offices AF-wide? • Answer: We won't know until the A-76 study is completed. An average A-76 study takes three years to complete and implement. The current effort will not be completed until FY01.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How does the DL Roadmap handle pay and compensation for the reserve component? Because our overall manning posture is comprised mainly of civilians performing AFRC duties on a part-time basis, it will become increasingly difficult for traditional reservists to balance the needs of their families, civilian jobs, and military training requirements. Currently, no legal authority exists to compensate personnel for training (in terms of pay or points) while accomplishing AFSC related or ancillary training requirements in the home environment. • Answer: The Air Force must establish a compensation policy on DL training for the reserve components. It is identified as a deficiency in Table 13, page 49 and paragraph 4.0320, page 45. We asked the Total Army DL Program (TADLP) program manager (PM) how they approached the problem. The answer was: "It would depend on whether the individual is undergoing training on a full-time or part-time basis, and that should be the same as when a reservist is placed on orders to attend similar, conventional training. It would also depend on the final decision the PM and Training Program Integration Office (TPIO) will make regarding how inter-agency funding is coordinated between a central pot and separate funding pots. This issue is still undergoing analysis." The Army policy is that if a soldier must take a DL course, the soldier must be placed on orders. If the reserve component soldier is placed on orders, the soldier must be compensated.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How does the DL Roadmap address certain reserve component issues? Some of the issues AFRC must face daily include: smaller work force, dwindling budget, less on-the-job training (OJT), more training being conducted away from the workcenter, and more training moving to alternative training delivery mediums. ...AFRC's manning does not consist of full-time active duty personnel that are available 7 days a week. Our work force consists mainly of <i>Traditional Reservists</i> who participate 1 weekend each month and 2 weeks each year for a total of 39 days. In fact, out of a total force of almost 58,000 personnel, some 49,000 fall into the traditional reservist category. For the remainder of each year, these personnel are full-time civilian employees working for companies in the private sector. These numbers are significant when one considers that 85 percent of the AFRC is in this category. Thus, recruitment and retention issues can and will become primary factors if we expect traditional reservists to give up more of their civilian life than they signed for. • Answer1: IAW ISD Vol 5, "Instructional Technology and Distance Learning," AFRC should conduct a front-end media and cost analysis to determine if some of its courses could benefit from conversion to DL tailored to reserve component requirements (ie. need for training compression). The Roadmap identifies in Table 12, page 43, the need for conversion of informal/ancillary courses to DL tailored specifically for the active force, and the reserve components. • Answer2: The AETC contracted course analysis will result in some courses being recommended for conversion to DL media. Some of those courses, if converted to DL, will experience "course compression." Course compression is the phenomena that

	<p>most students complete the DL courses faster on their own when compared to group performance in residential settings. Some or all of those courses recommended for conversion to DL may be courses that the reserve component would like to see compressed. If there is a course that the reserve component think should be converted to DL to facilitate compression, but is not recommended for conversion to DL by the contractor, the reserve component will have to identify the requirement and the benefits.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: The DL Roadmap lacks the requirements and benefits for Air Staff POM approval. • Answer: The Roadmap is a broad brush. The HQ AETC contracted course evaluation will generate several analyses, including a detailed economic analysis, that will support the need for DL funding. The Economic Analysis will adhere to OMB A-94 which provides guidance on performing benefit/cost analysis for government investments. It recommends approaches to treatment of inflation, constant dollars, then year dollars, and discount rates. The analyses are listed in Table 8, DL Roadmap Milestones, page 31.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: What inefficiencies and redundancies does the Roadmap address? • Answer: The advantages of DL are on pages 14-17. The benefits of the AFIADL are on pages 20. The education and training deficiencies are on pages 39-40.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How does the DL Roadmap address modeling and simulation? • Comment: The Air Force Agency for Modeling and Simulation (AFAMS) is the AF focal point for implementation and support of the Joint Synthetic Battlespace, which includes all forms of modeling and simulation. The AFDLO has a representative on the AFAMS education and training requirements Tiger Team. Some simulations are types of distance learning and are contained in the definition of DL on page 11.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: How does the DL Roadmap address embedded training equipment? • Comment: Some training embedded in equipment meet the definition of DL on page 11. This may include some electronic performance support systems (EPSS).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Using the Mission Area Plan (MAP) format is really awkward. It makes the document unreadable. • Answer: In accordance with AETCI 90-104, 6 May 99, AETC Planning Process, the MAP is a modernization plan. Modernization plans focus on evolutionary needs. The MAP format steps the reader and the organization through the established Air Force requirements process. These long-range documents include mission area plans and program and process roadmaps. AETC is responsible for producing MAPs for flying training, technical and space training, accessions and education. The DL Roadmap, in MAP format, will enable MAJCOMs to see how their DL requirements fit into their own mission area plans.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: As we discussed before, there's lots of filler that doesn't necessarily belong in a Roadmap. For example, the media discussions and the benefits of DL are probably best saved for a pamphlet of some sort. Cutting out the filler, removing the ECI roles and missions explanation, and cutting out the MAP format will probably reduce the document from 70+ to about 20 pages—much more readable and usable. • Answer: Unlike many other systems and technologies, the concepts and implementations of DL are not widely understood in the Air Force. The AFDLO staff has seen many puzzled faces in briefings across the Air Force. Some think DL is exclusively Air Technology Network. Others think DL is only computer-based or Internet-based instruction. Still others think it is only correspondence paper-based courses. In fact, DL also includes videotape, computer-mediated conferencing, e-mail, and many

	<p>other forms of instruction. To ensure the audience understood the concepts, the AFDLO staff thought it necessary to include and illustrate fundamental DL concepts and how they contribute to readiness and reduced costs.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Does the Roadmap have a deficiency document associated with it like the HQ AETC MAP? Deficiencies used as a baseline by the roadmap are very old (pre-1996) and may not be valid. I know that the ones addressing ICW flight training and equipping are OBE because we're paying for their training and education. Using these deficiencies as source documents/requirements is not very wise. • Answer: The education and training deficiencies identified in the Roadmap, pages 38-39 are directly related to the deficiencies identified in the 1996 AETC Education MAP and the AETC Training MAP. MAJCOMs identified additional deficiencies in DL conferences. They are listed on page 39. Once the contracted AETC course evaluation is completed, the Infrastructure Analysis and Course Reengineering Plan may identify additional deficiencies. Additionally, the AETC Education MAP is being updated in 1999, and AFDLO has identified the same deficiencies as in the DL Roadmap.
Page 15, para 1.133	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: The Roadmap states that DL can improve readiness by reducing course backlog, delivering on-time training, increasing joint training throughput, and solving education and training deficiencies in Air Force Mission Area Plans (MAPs). Beyond that, the plan asserts that "tens of thousands of Air Force students around the globe will take state-of-the-art DL courses" in 1998. To strengthen this assertion, we recommend adding specific numbers, where available, to demonstrate how DL is already improving readiness. • Answer: Some numbers, in the thousands, are listed in Table 2, page 20. The list of about 100 DL courses from technical training alone would take three pages to depict. We just wanted to depict a representative sample.
Page 20, para 1.15.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: We concur that both the Air Force and AETC need a "focal point" for management of distance learning. Having policy, funding and management splintered among various offices of responsibility is difficult at best. Our staff works with HQ AETC/XPRT on funding issues, HQ AETC/DOOM on operational issues, and HQ AETC/DOVP on policy issues. In addition, they work closely with the Air Technology Network Program Management Office (ATN PMO) and HQ AETC/EDD (AF Distance Learning Office) on many of these same issues. However, we are concerned that an Air Force Institute for Advanced Distributed Learning (AFIADL) at Gunter will be viewed by the Air Force as belonging to Air University. This may not be an insurmountable problem, but it would require some work. • Answer: At a recently conducted DL strategic planning session involving facilitators from the AF Center for Quality, Manpower and Innovation (AFCQMI), we recognized "DL Integration" as a key result area. A DL Marketing Plan would certainly include publicizing the AFIADL as the AF "focal point" for management of distance learning. The history of the AFDLO, the organization that has managed DL, is on page 4.
Page 21, para 1.161, ln 7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Need to make sure Roadmap investment strategy is robust enough to accommodate a different proportion of conversions (perhaps 200-1000 courses). • Answer: The Roadmap investment strategy is our current best projection, based on Army experience. Once the contracted economic analysis is completed in Jul 99, we will have firm numbers.
Page 23, para 1.162	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: We would like to see the AF move toward a system like the Chief of Naval Operations' (CNO) Naval Education and Training (CNET) Electronic Schoolhouse Network (CESN), which is a VTC network. • Answer: Because the costs for VTC are significantly higher than the costs for ITV, a move to VTC should be based on requirements for capabilities inherent in VTC that ITV cannot satisfy. In most courses, studies show no significant difference in

	<p>student outcomes between VTC and ITV courses. Front-end media and cost analyses should be conducted to determine the best medium or media for a particular course. A 1997 Army Science Board (ASB) report on the Total Army Distance Learning Program recommended low-end technology for DL classrooms and one-way video to the greatest extent possible to save money. The ASB allowed for two-way video and high-end classrooms to underwrite the use of simulations as learning aids for operations planning, exercising and rehearsal, and other just-in-time contingency driven requirements. (Source: ASB, "Distance Learning," 1997, 42.)</p>
<p>Page 24, Para 1.1627</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment1: Table 4 implies that the base infrastructure and bandwidth necessary to handle DL is already in place. This is not the case as evidenced by the initiative at Lackland AFB to use DL to teach Security Forces training. The base backbone could not handle the additional load. • Comment2: Infrastructure funding comes in way too late—the money needs to be loaded in FY03 (or earlier)—not FY04+. • Answer: The statement of work for the evaluation of education and technical training courses states, “Courses will not be recommended for conversion in the first two years if the available infrastructure will not support delivery of the courses. Because DL course conversion capability is limited in the first two years, technical training course conversion recommendations will not exceed 15 courses for conversion in the first year and 15 courses in the second year of the plan.” This design approach permits time for in-depth analysis of, and programming for, the required infrastructure.
<p>Page 31, Table 8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Table 6 indicates that the Air Force will not have a final DL plan for POM submissions until 2002. Is there a reasonable way to improve this time line? If MAJCOM plans are not dependent upon the results of the contract evaluation of AETC courses, perhaps they could generate their DL plans simultaneously with the AETC review. When will MAJCOM courses be evaluated? • Comment: Not having a wedge for the other MAJCOMs in FY02 is going to hurt all of us. We lose credibility in building an AF solution if our input is only AETC. • Answer: Because AETC provides education and training to all the other MAJCOMs, the DL Roadmap will have an Air Force-wide impact. According to Table 6: Roadmap Milestones, p 28, the MAJCOMs should generate their own DL Plans by FY00. IAW ISD Vol 5, MAJCOMs should first conduct either an in-house or contracted media and cost analysis of their courses. Once the front-end analysis is performed, effective planning can begin. In short, MAJCOMs should start evaluating their courses as soon as possible. The AFDLO will make an FY02 POM submission based on the contract evaluation.
<p>Page 29, para 1.205</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Manning issues are addressed on page 29 in conjunction with the contract review of courses. However, we believe some manpower issues must be addressed prior to completion of the contract review to support ongoing DL courses as well as those projected to come on-line over the next several months. Specifically, we remain concerned about the lack of manpower standards in the Instructional Technology units for DL conversion and delivery, and course administration at our training groups as well as at receive sites. Will we have sufficient manning to effectively administer DL? • Answer: This issue was elevated to the Air Staff. HQ USAF/DPPE said at the Nov 98 Air Force DL conference that they were working manning shortfalls into the DL funding baseline. The short-term solution is non-personal services contracts. Manning is identified as an issue in Table 12, page 43.
<p>Page 29, Para 1.207</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Support Costs. This section appears to only address infrastructure for the development end of the process, and does not cover any necessary base infrastructure costs. Without additional money to improve the base-level infrastructure, delivery to the user will be severely impaired. • Answer: See reply to Page 24, Paragraph 1.1627 above.

Page 41, Table 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Funding is a concern in researching and moving toward Internet delivery. Sheppard is currently relying heavily on the Education and Training Technology Applications Program (ETTAP) to fund technology initiatives. However, initiatives such as ETTAP do not provide yearly operating costs to continue or maintain proven technologies. For this reason, we are concerned that the recurring lifecycle maintenance costs in Table 10 may be too low. Should we make the annual funding line more like the Army? (\$55M+ per year) • Answer: The recurring lifecycle costs are a conservative estimate. Firmer numbers for sustainment will be generated by the Economic Analysis in the AETC contracted course evaluation. • Comment: The program funds need to match the contracted course evaluation estimate. • Answer: The initial contracted course evaluation estimate is undergoing further analysis by the contractor.
Page 39, para 3.4 and Page 44, para 4.0312	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: The need for base-level JST POC standardization for manpower allocations and performance criteria is addressed under paragraphs 3.4 and 4.0312. However, the comment that MAJCOMs may want to adopt a strategy of outsourcing additional manpower requirements seems too open-ended. In FY99, the security forces course alone will add between 4,000 and 5,000 students to the current workload on our JST POCs. Should this be left up to the MAJCOMs or elevated to Air Staff? • Answer: This issue was elevated to the Air Staff. HQ USAF/DPPE said at the Nov 98 Air Force DL conference that they were working DL manning shortfalls into the DL funding baseline. The short-term solution is non-personal services contracts. Manning is identified as an issue in Table 12, page 43.
Page 44, para 4.0311 and Page 41, Table 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: We need to ensure that we have manpower standards and the total infrastructure (internal and external to AETC) in place to support additional course conversions identified in Table 10. There is an initial investment of time that must be factored into development and conversion efforts, and we will not be ready to act on the results of the contract review unless we have AETC manpower standards in place. Manpower standards are required to ensure manpower savings are not taken prematurely. • Answer: In recent strategic planning, the AFDLO recognized "Resources" as a key result area, and one of the primary goals is to develop DL manpower standards. According to AFCQMI representatives, manpower studies are on hold until the reorganization into Air Expeditionary Forces is completed. The issue has been elevated to the HQ AETC/XP.
Page 43, Table 12,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: What does a base-level DL POC (manpower) do? • Answer: See page 44, paragraph 4.0312.
Page 45-46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Add a paragraph, "Need for MAJCOM courses to be contractually evaluated." Also need to provide guidance to MAJCOMs on how to proceed. • Answer: Once the AETC contracted course evaluation is completed, the AFDLO will look at evaluating MAJCOM courses.
Page 44, paras 4.0312, and 4.0313	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Does the stated budget include an estimate to fund these TBD manpower, facility, and equipment requirements? Should we expect a separate funding issue to be staffed? • Answer: The stated budget is our best projection of expenses for the TBD requirements. In Aug 99, after the contracted study, we will have firmer numbers.
Page 45, para 4.0315	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: After the MAJCOMs evaluate their own courses, the frequency of developer courses may need to be increased. (AFSPC) • Answer: The frequency of the developer courses depend on the number of courses that will be redesigned in-house versus by contract.
Page 45,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Will we standardize PCs? It is impossible to standardize LANs.

para 4.0316	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer: Minimum performance standards will have to be published. For example, the Army chose to buy computers that are periodically upgraded. The contract calls for complete refresh every five years. Also, the Army chose a standard network technology for DL.
Page 45, para 4.0319	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: We note the Air Force will evaluate informal/ancillary courses for possible DL conversion after the formal courses have been evaluated and converted, approximately 2014. This paragraph seemed particularly pointed at our Guard and Reserve members. Last year, we got a dazzling briefing on "CyberGuard" initiatives from Maj Gen Don Shepperd, then the Director of the Air National Guard, which seemed to point to a faster rate of closure than 2014. Also, several functional communities are currently converting informal/ancillary courses and others are reviewing their options. We recommend a look at least an evaluation of some courses for DL concurrently with the AETC formal courses. More generally, we hope and expect that DL courses will deploy on a shorter timeline. • Answer: Once the AETC contracted course evaluation is completed, the AFDLO will look at evaluating informal/ancillary courses. Additionally, the 1997 Army Science Board report on the Total Army DL Program stated, "Accelerating CW [courseware] development and fielding by a factor of 2 to 3 puts the entire program on a self-paying basis in three to five years, rather than the current plan of eleven to thirteen years." The AFDLO approach will be to convert 25-30 courses the first few years, to ensure the process is working, and then to accelerate, if resources are available, for maximum return on investment.
Page 55, para b (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Can we include a program like "Old Dominion University" for Air Force personnel? • Answer: The problem is not technical but legal. HQ AF/DP recently authorized each base Education Office the ability renegotiate their contracts to allow for DL voluntary education courses. The courses may be delivered via IMI, IBI or IVT, depending on the delivery capabilities of the contracted university.
Page 23, 49, 52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Our groups believe that courses with higher levels of classified information that lend themselves to DL should be included in the Roadmap. • Answer: Because costs for courses at higher levels of classified information are significantly higher to produce because of security issues, the initial goal is to work with classified information only up to the Secret level. If future analysis reveals significant return on investment, TS and SCI courses will be revisited for possible inclusion in the Roadmap.
Pages 13, 22, 25, 42-46, 48, 56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: Our training groups would like to see the area on collaborative learning expanded and would like to see more on the plan to resolve deficiencies. • Answer1: The references to collaborative learning are simply placeholders for the body of learning activities that enable team problem solving through the use of information technologies. For example, many of today's aircraft and aircraft components were built in cyberspace by different teams, in different locations, working on a single "cyber-aircraft" before a single piece was physically manufactured. Universities are using the same approach in student projects where project team members, in different locations, must collaborate to solve a problem for a community or a group of communities. • Answer2: The Roadmap is a broad brush plan. The detailed Infrastructure Analysis and Course Reengineering Plan generated by the course evaluation contract will address many of the deficiencies. Additionally, in recent DL strategic planning, the AFDLO and ECI managers worked to identify key result areas, goals, objectives, and proposed action plans for AFIADL. These action plans aim to mitigate the deficiencies.