DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMEND
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
1600 SPEARHEAD DIVISION AVENUE
FORT KNOX, KY 40122

AHRC-PDV-S 20 June 2011

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

FOR Commander, United States Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School, 2502 Ardennes Road, Fort Bragg, North Carolina 28310-9610

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 18 Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 11May 2011, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY11 United States Army Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA) Training and Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the reference memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 18 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within the CMF.

3. Executive Summary. The panel established high standards for the CMF, areas of emphasis included key leadership assignments and performance while serving in the most challenging positions. Favorable consideration was also given to those who served in broadening assignments such as the United States John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School (USAJFKSWCS), Special Operations Task Forces (SOTF), Joint and Coalition organizations, and Theatre Special Operations Commands. The NCOER was the primary document in determining the best qualified in the CMF.

4. CMF Overview. MSGs that did not complete 24 months as Special Forces Operational Detachment Alpha (SFODA) Operations/Team Sergeant were considered much less qualified than MSGs who had completed assignments as SFODA Operations/Team Sergeants. MSGs that completed their SFODA Team Sergeant assignments and also served as Company, Battalion, Group, or higher HQs (i.e. SOTF, TSOC) Operations Sergeants were given an additional level of consideration. Senior or Chief Instructors, as well as personnel serving in Group Operations Detachments as instructors, were given favorable consideration. The MSGs that successfully served in both SFODA Team Sergeant positions and as Company First Sergeant were considered best qualified by the selection board. CMF Specialty schools (SOTIC, MFF, CDQC, etc), Ranger School, Jumpmaster School and civilian education were given appropriate credit. MSGs that did not have Jumpmaster school were considered much less qualified for selection by the board. The Bronze Star Medal for Service and Valor awards were also considered favorably. APFT scores of 270 and above were typical and scores of 300 were frequently observed and given favorable credit.

5. Issues and Observations (items of interest to the field relating to the board process, procedures and personnel files). This input is provided to inform leaders at all levels for use in mentoring and coaching NCOs (and officers) in the career management of the forces Senior NCOs.

a. NCOERs. The NCOER was clearly the most important document in the file. Frequently the NCOER did not accurately describe the duty position causing some confusion and delay in determining the actual duty position. Considerable weight was given to MSGs who served 24 months as a SFODA Team Sergeant; therefore, the Principle Duty Title should read "SFODA Operations Sergeant." Clearly written "Daily Duties and Scope" helped board members understand the actual duties of rated NCOs who were serving in Joint Manning Document (JMD) and other non-traditional assignments. Rater bullet comments were frequently not quantifiable and did not often warrant "excellence" blocks. Rated NCOs given an excellence for Physical Training with no APFT score annotated left doubt about the rated NCOs actual physical fitness. Rated NCOs not receiving quantifiable excellence blocks in Leadership disadvantaged the NCO. Senior Rater comments such as "Promote now" and "Promote immediately" sent a simple, but very clear message to board members that the rated NCO was ready for promotion. Senior raters who enumerated a rated NCO also sent a message to board members that the rated NCO was highly recommended for promotion. Examples are, "#1 of 6 Team Sergeants I senior rate" and "#1 MSG in this Battalion." Properly recording an NCO's performance and potential and clearly articulating that on the NCOER gave a much better snapshot of the Soldier.

b. DA Photo. There was a significant number of NCOs who did not have a DA Photo on file or had a photo taken as a SFC. This was considered a lack of individual initiative and leader involvement and disadvantaged the NCO.

c. Utilization and assignments. There was a number of MSGs who did not complete their SFODA Team Sergeant time. It must be clearly understood that this is the primary, core level assignment, for a MSG and those that did not complete 24 months, with very few exceptions, were disadvantaged. Exceptions included the very rare occasions where an NCO was taken out of his Team Sergeant position early to take a 1SG or Company Sergeant Major position. Broadening assignments such as JMD operational assignments, Chief or Senior Instructors at USAJFKSWCS and higher HQs Operations Sergeant positions were considered favorable. MSGs that completed 24 months or more as SFODA Team Sergeant, 12 months or more as 1SG considered best qualified.

d. Enlisted Record Brief (ERB). Some ERBs were not updated and duty positions did not match those on the NCOERs or were not entered at all. Overall ERBs accurately displayed the information needed with the exception of duty assignments. Board members relied heavily on NCOERs as opposed to the ERB to track duty assignments. NCOERs were more accurate and showed duty performance and potential.

e. Professional Development. Most CMF 18 MSGs had outstanding military education experience to include numerous Specialty Skill Schools. Favorable consideration was given to USASMA Grads, language scores of 1+/1+ or higher and enrollment in college (some credits). MSGs who were not static line jumpmaster qualified were significantly disadvantaged.

6. CMP Proponent Input. Information provided by the proponent was relied upon heavily by the panel members in the development of panel standards for each CMF. Request that the proponent provide more specific guidance concerning JMD, non-traditional, and SMU duty positions. When possible show how these positions relate to traditional MTOE duty assignments. Reviewing and updating proponent guidance is important to assisting panel members ensure the best qualified NCOs are recognized during the board process.

DAVID M. MILLER
COL, IN
Panel Chief