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

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 Commander, USAJFKSWCS, Directorate of Special Operations Proponency, Fort Bragg, NC 28310

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 18 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.

2. In accordance with the referenced 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 MOSs within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone.

a. Performance and potential. In general, the force clearly articulated expectations and evenly evaluated performance. Evaluations indicated the very strong performance and potential expected of this elite group. Furthermore, the strongest performers consistently received the appropriate leadership opportunities. However, language proficiency was a glaring and significant weakness, with very few NCOs attaining and maintaining the USASOC standard.

b. Utilization and assignments. The force consistently assigned the NCOs to positions that properly matched each individual's MOS and areas of expertise. Assignments also afforded the NCOs appropriate challenges and opportunities for development. In a few cases, NCOs left Special Forces Operational Detachment Alpha (SFODA) positions early. In most of these cases, the reason for early removal was annotated in the evaluation report. However, there remained some instances where the reason for early departure was not clear.

c. Training and education. Far too many NCOs were not Static Line Jumpmaster qualified. While the force's OPTEMPO remains extremely high, records indicated that sufficient time was available to attend several iterations of advanced training. Yet, a significant portion of the population has not attended Static Line Jumpmaster training.

d. Physical Fitness. As expected, this group of NCOs remains exceptionally fit, maintaining the highest standards through a time of extended deployments.

e. Overall career management. The vast majority of the population experienced a proper balance between significant time on a SFODA and developmental assignments in other key areas. The force continued to provide quality NCOs to significant staff, training, and special assignments (GRP/BN Staff, 1st SWTG (A), Recruiter, Drill Sergeant, specialty teams, SMUs). However, there were still some cases where the NCO's career path did not adequately support either the health of the force or the professional development of the NCO. These were cases where an NCO either never experienced an assignment outside the SFODA or fulfilled several back-to-back assignments away from an operational Special Forces Group.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment. All MOSs remain fully compatible within this very cohesive CMF. Standards for grade and structure remain thoroughly suitable and appropriate. Assignment and promotion opportunities are sufficient and appropriate. The overall health of CMF appears strong.

5. Recommendations.

a. Language proficiency, a cornerstone of cultural awareness, needs increased emphasis and focus to ensure NCOs attain and maintain the USASOC standard.

b. Raters and senior raters must be consistent with ratings by matching comments with the blocks checked. Senior raters should provide quantifiable bullet comments that support the ratings provided. Both raters and senior raters should clearly indicate why an NCO is being removed from a SFODA position before meeting proponent guidance for team time.

c. Static Line Jumpmaster training needs increased emphasis and focus to ensure more NCOs achieve proponent prescribed career advancement standards.

d. Duty descriptions should to be clear, concise, and consistent across the force. Descriptions should also specifically state the level of responsibility or echelon. For instance, SFODA-level positions should clearly state as such in the duty description, even for teams in unique structured units.

e. NCOs should take the time to make sure their ERBs are accurate and up-to-date. A significant number of ERBs were missing large portions of data or showed information that was contrary to the rest of the personnel file. Grossly inaccurate ERBs may indicate a lack of interest or motivation.

f. NCOs should make sure that they have a current official photo on file. A significant number of files were missing photos or contained old photos with the

NCO wearing the wrong/previous rank. A file without a current official photo may indicate a lack of interest or motivation.

6. CMF Proponent Packet. The proponent packet provided was accurate, appropriate, and valuable. The only shortfall concerned the 18Z MOS Description. The duties and responsibilities of Team Sergeants have changed over time. Update this description with input from the field.

JAMES E. SAENZ
COL, SF
Panel Chief