DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
1600 SPEARHEAD DIVISION AVENUE
FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY 40121

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

AHRC-PDV-S

18 November 2010

MEMORANDUM THRU Headquarters, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, Attention: ATTG-P, 3 Fenwick Road, Building 11, Fort Monroe, VA 23651-1049

FOR Commanding General, Maneuver Center of Excellence, Fort Benning, GA 31905

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 11/Infantry Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 9 September 2010, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY11 Master Sergeant Promotion and Selection Board; memorandum, HQDA, AHRC-PDV-S, 26 October 2010, subject: FY11 Master Sergeant Promotion Selection Board Standard Operating Procedures, HQDA, Office of the Chief of Infantry, subject: FY11 Master Sergeant Selection Board Briefing

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 11 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.

3. General. In accordance with the references above and the experience of the board members, we are confident that the best qualified Sergeants First Class have been selected for promotion to master Sergeant. There performance, potential was considered equally important as the duty position held.

4. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone.

a. Performance and potential. The Master Sergeant selectees are unquestionably the best of the best from the FY11Master Sergeant Promotion population/List. The performance and potential ratings provided invaluable insights to the panel/board members. Those leaders/SFCs consistently rated among the best with clearly defined and measurable excellent ratings were more competitive than their peers. The board thought it was equally important for the bullet comments to reflect the leader's unit performance as well as his individual performance (i.e. "qualified expert" versus "80% of his platoon qualified expert"). While individual performance is important to demonstrate competence in any task, team performance is considered the best tool to demonstrate the individual's potential to build and develop a Soldier/team at the MSG/1SG level. Finally, the board considered the Expert Infantry training essential in the development of CMF 11 leaders and was pleased to learn that 98% of this population of Noncommissioned Officers earned his EIB. Recommend increased emphasis on EIB

training and testing because it's that single event that allows soldiers to demonstrate individual competence in basic Soldier Skills.

b. Utilization and assignments. CMF 11 is well represented throughout the Department of Defense, Multinational, Interagency, and intergovernmental environment. The competitive NCO's served in a variety of demanding positions and maintained a balance between the Operating Force and generating force assignments. The board placed special consideration for the diverse experiences mentioned above. Operationally, this system is working well but the administrative actions are lagging behind. For example; the duty description and duty MOS often failed to reflect what job the NCO is actually. Duty description and scope must address the duties performed and overall responsibilities and number of soldiers supervised. It's imperative that the duty scope and title clear to avoid the perception of misleading the reviewer.

c. Training and education. CMF 11 efforts to promote civilian education was evident in 90% of the SFC population and those best qualified show a trend of 30 credit hours or possessed a degree. The most competitive SFC's also sought self-improvement through one or more Combat Skills Training Courses (CSTC) certification. These additional skills are combat-multipliers and will better prepare leaders for increased responsibility and obviously set themselves apart from their peers.

d. Physical Fitness. There is an alarming trend of overweight and unkempt appearance in this population of SFCs. Several of the files ht/wt data fluctuated by 2 to 4 inches and weight 10 to 30 pounds during a rating period. Obviously, emphasis must be placed on the field to accurately reflect the NCO's ht/wt data and to hold leaders accountable. Additionally, APFT score must be annotated numerically on the NCOER. Failure to pass the APFT or meet the Height and Weight (body fat) requirement is a clear indicator that the NCO's was not prepared to be a Master Sergeant. Leaders are encouraged to get involved early to assist the service member with maintaining standards and enforce photograph policy IAW AR 640-30, paragraph 6.d.

e. Overall career management. The board favored balanced experience in both generating and operating force however there is substantial number of SFC serving multiple back-to-back assignments in operating and generating forces, this creates a lack of balance in experience among NCOs. There are instance where leaders remain in a staff position and as platoon sergeant for more that 48 to 60 months. This is counterproductive in the efforts to address the total soldier concept and give others the opportunity to work those key positions. This issue require immediate attend.

5. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. The duty description and scope must be clear, concise, and consistent across the field. Be specific to the level of responsibility, overall duties performed, responsibilities, and number of NCOs/Soldiers supervised. The duty MOS and skill level must match MTOE/TDA authorizations.

This was a consistent point of concern with various 11C and NCOs in Non-traditional assignments.

b. Assignment and promotion opportunity. Soldiers who consistently performed well were afforded the opportunity to serve in a variety of demanding assignments. Soldiers whose performance in demanding assignments did not indicate their ability to perform at their current level were generally assigned to less demanding positions.

c. Overall health of CMF. The CMF is doing exceptionally well and continue to demonstrate incredible resiliency as the force continue to spearhead the efforts to prosecute two wars. The board is pleased with the Master sergeant selectees and has the utmost confident that they will have an immediate impact on our Army.

6. Recommendations.

a. Competence. Increase our Senior NCO technical competence level by continuing to provide education and training opportunities (NCOEs, College, CSTC), assign NCOs to a diverse array of units (HBCT, SBCT, Mech/Armor, IBCT, Air Assault, Airborne, Light or Ranger), and continue to validate Individual/NCO skills with tools such as the EIB.

b. CMF structure and career progression. Continue to assign and utilize our Infantrymen IAW our CMF 11B/C Professional Development Model.

7. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The CMF 11 Proponent Information Packet and the Chief's guidance were very helpful but more important the guidance was aligned with the DMPM's guidance. The board recommends emphasis placed on units to conduct professional development discussing with all noncommissioned officers on the specifics of

b. Recommended improvements. (embedded above).

FRANK McCLARY
Colonel, IN
Panel Chief