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, Office of the Chief of the Ordnance, Fort Lee, VA 23801-1521

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 91 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 91 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Performance and potential: The Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER) remains the most important document in a Soldier's file for evaluating past performance and future potential during Department of the Army (DA) Centralized Selection Boards. Strong NCOERs that reflected above-average duty performance trends, potential for increased responsibility and demonstrated initiative/self-development weighed highest. The majority of the 91 CMF Sergeant First Class (SFCs) clearly displayed good performance while in challenging and higher positions such as First Sergeants, Maintenance Supervisors, Battalion Operations NCOIC, and Detachment Sergeants. While these duty positions were considered opportunity for a SFC, NCOs also performed extremely well at other positions such as Platoon Sergeants and Motor Sergeants.

(1) Strengths.

(a). A significant number of Ordnance Sergeant First Class demonstrated outstanding leadership in a variety of different duty positions, showing that the Ordnance Corps is strong and versatile. NCO's who were given justified NCOERs that for next higher grade and promotion to Master Sergeant (MSG) were competitive.

(2) Weakness.

(a). Senior Raters must ensure that their ratings are consistent. Ratings such as "among the best" by the rater and a 2 or 3 block and "promote with peers" sends a mixed message to the board panels. This created confusion and the board panel must decide what the rater and senior rater really mean. A rating of "fully capable" by the rater and 1 blocks by the senior rater creates the same confusion for the board members. Marginal and needs improvement ratings and among the best along with 1 blocks also created confusion among the panel members as well.

(b). The official DA Photograph is also an important piece in the file when being considered for promotion. There were many photos that were missing or outdated, and in many cases the board members had to try to determine if the Soldier had enough time to take a photo or not, based on deployments. In most cases, deployments are not a short notice; Soldiers should take the time to get the most current and up to date photo possible. If not, then the NCO should either write a letter to the board or make a comment in his/her board file and explain the reason for not having an up to date photo. There were many photos that the ERB would show a certain amount of awards, but the photo would only have a portion of them. A number of photos had the badges the wrong way, the brass on the wrong side; badges were missing the clasps that hang down, awards that were in the wrong precedence, good conduct medals that had oak leaf clusters instead of knots, service stripes were wrong according to the Basic active service date on the ERB. NCOs should take a copy of their ERB and look at their uniform, and take a second set of eyes that should know the uniform regulation to the photo shop with them to make last minute corrections. A missing or poor photo sends a strong message to the board panel that the NCO does not care about their records enough to update it.

b. Utilization and assignments: Given the numerous demands placed on the Ordnance CMF today, our SFCs are generally well- rounded. There were a few SFCs who were being utilized outside of their Primary MOS. In the case of Drill Sergeants (DS) or recruiters, just to name a few, the board realized these are demanding jobs and recognized the difficulty in performing these duties. Additionally, these jobs were generally viewed positivity for the overall rounding of an NCO's knowledge, competence, and abilities. The board did question the need for an NCO who worked outside his/her MOS for a significant amount of time (3 or more years). In some cases, this did not allow SFCs to adequately to demonstrate his/her ability to work positions of higher responsibility in the Ordnance Branch. Deployments and assuming leadership positions while deployed was also viewed as a positive for the SFC.

c. Training and education: A few of the Ordnance Soldiers had civilian education. Roughly ten to twenty percent of the 91 CMF Soldiers had either had a degree or was working towards a degree. It was obvious that our NCOs are taking the time to conduct continuous education to improve themselves especially while doing their mission and while deployed. There were a few NCOs who still needed to attend the Senior Leaders Course (SLC). The board did look favorably on the NCOS who exceeded course standards in SLC.

d. Physical Fitness: Ordnance SFCs are for the most part physically fit Soldiers. Those who achieved the APFT badge and maintained the badge were looked upon favorably. Some raters ensured that those Soldiers who did not meet the height and weight standards or failed an APFT received a "needs improvement". Some raters tried to rate the Soldier as a success when they failed one or both. The NCOES system is ensuring that the Soldiers who fail to meet the standards in SLC are receiving a marginal rating on the DA Form 1059. These Soldiers were not looked favorably for promotion to Master Sergeant.

e. Overall career management: A majority of Ordnance SFCs are well rounded and are working assignments conducive to their career progression. They generally demonstrated an understanding the importance of taking the hard jobs and doing well at those jobs. It remained obvious that these hard jobs are out their norm if the SFC wants to find them and except them.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF: The lack of standardization for job titles made it difficult for the board members to actually determine the level of which the Soldier was actually working at. For example some Maintenance Supervisors are at a -40 level and some are at a -50 level. Some Soldiers were actually assigned a -50 level on their ERB but being rated as a -40 level on the NCOER and others were assigned a -40 level on the ERB and being rated as a -50 level on the NCOER. This was a serious challenge for the board members to actually determine which was which.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure: There are certain MOS's within the CMF 91 that did not provide the level of leadership opportunity as others did, based upon the SFC and higher level -50, authorized duty position on the Military Table of Organization and Equipment (MTOE). As this is low density, the 91X seemed to have more of an opportunity to assume leadership positions. However when the other MOS's (91A, 91K, 91M, and 91P) did assume the leadership positions, it made them much more competitive.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity: The SFCs considered during this board had a variety of assignments. For instance, many SFCs were serving as logistical advisors on a MiTT team and Detachment Sergeants.

d. Overall health of CMF: The overall health of the CMF 91 is good. The only concern is that the new equipment that is being fielded, some additional training on this new equipment will have to happen.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence: Raters and senior raters must understand that they are a significant component to the SFCs overall competitiveness. Raters and senior raters must ensure that they give an accurate picture of the NCO being rated.

b. CMF structure and career progression: The current structure and career progression maps that the Ordnance Corps has is working and is a valuable tool for the Soldiers to see and identify what positions they should strive for. There are a few SFCs who have spent a significant time as instructors or other duty outside their MOS that do not allow the opportunity for deployment. These Soldiers should strive to search for other opportunities and positions to make them more competitive for promotion to Master Sergeant within the CMF.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The overall quality of the proponent packet is good. It covered all the duty positions that a CMF 91 Soldier could hold. The packet also included the duty positions such as MiTT teams, Force Protection NCOs, and Convoy Commanders/NCOICs.

b. Recommended improvements: Recommend that the packet be updated yearly or as needed, as new jobs and positions change rapidly in the ever changing environment that we operate in.

7. Conclusion. There were many highly qualified Sergeants First Class considered. The field was very competitive; those selected were the best qualified.

ROBERT B. OLIVERAS
Colonel, LG
Panel Chief