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-SEB 26 February 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 Office of the Chief of the Ordnance Corps, 2221 Adams Avenue, Fort Lee, VA 23801-2102

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 89, 91 and 94 Review and Analysis for the FY 11 Sergeant First Class Promotion Selection Board

1. References.

a. DAPE-MPE-PD, Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) dated 7 January 2011, Subject: MOI for the FY11 Sergeant First Class Promotion and Selection Board.

b. FY11 Sergeant First Class Promotion and Selection Board Standard Operating Procedures effective 3 February 2011.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for Career Management Fields (CMF) 89, 91, and 94 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for Military Occupation Specialty (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 cornerstone document in a Soldier's file for evaluating performance and future potential during Department of the Army Centralized Selection Boards. Strong NCOERs that reflected above-average duty performance trends, potential for increased responsibility and demonstrated initiative weighed highest. The majority of 89, 91 and 94 CMF Staff Sergeants clearly displayed good performance while in challenging and higher grade positions, such as Motor Sergeant, Senior Electronic Maintenance Supervisor, Section Sergeant, Platoon Sergeant, battalion and brigade level staff positions. While these duty positions were considered favorable for a Staff Sergeant (SSG), Non-Commissioned Officers also performed extremely well at positions outside the MOS as members of Military Transition Teams, Observer/Controller, and Warrior Transition Units.

(1) Strengths

a. There were clearly indications that more than 94% of Ordnance Staff Sergeants served in positions consistent with their leadership and technical skill requirements. A number of NCOs with less than 3 years time in grade had already demonstrated exceptional performance at the next higher level, serving as Platoon Sergeant, Maintenance Control Sergeant and Senior Electronic Mechanical Supervisors. This indicates to the board that NCOs in the grade of SSG demonstrated outstanding leadership in a variety of assignments and duty positions, showing that the Ordnance Corps remains strong and flexible.

(2) Weaknesses

a. NCOs who received multiple disciplinary actions showed a pattern of undesirable performance and conduct were considered unfavorable by board members. NCOs who recently received disciplinary action were not viewed as Among the Best and also considered unfavorably. The board also observed that negative comments were not reflected on NCOERs during the rating period when a noncommissioned officer had committed an offense or infraction (UCMJ/LTR REP/Courts Martial).

b. Rater and Senior Rater comments are not consistent with overall rating (Fully Capable by Rater/1-1 Performance/Potential by Sr. Rater). There were many NCOERs where the rater gave Among the Best while the Senior Rater gave a 2 in Performance, 2 in Potential and Promote with Peers. Rater gave a rating of Fully Capable while the Senior Rater gave a 1 in Performance, 1 in Potential and a comment of Promote now/ immediately/ ahead of peers. Although acceptable it sent mix messages to board members of the Rater/Senior Rater's professional assessment of the NCO.

c. Uniform for DA Photo – Board members weighed Class A uniforms and ASUs the same, as long as they were worn correctly. It was evident that some NCOs took great pride and initiative in preparing uniforms and took exceptional photos that were viewed as favorable. There were also photos taken in the wrong uniform, Dress Blues versus ASUs, awards worn incorrectly, incorrect items i.e., silk ties, non conservative eye glasses, faddish fingernails and uniforms too tight or too large. This gave the indication that NCOs either knew or cared little about uniform regulatory guidelines and that there was a lack of leadership, oversight and mentoring in the NCO's chain of command prior to them taking photos and was viewed unfavorably by the board.

d. Missing DA Photos from OMPF. The board observed several files where the NCOs did not have a DA Photo posted within the last 5 years as per the MOI.

e. Missing evaluations were constant throughout the board files. NCOs were missing one or more NCOERs from the OMPF that were outside the MOI window. Missing current NCOERs i.e., ending period 20101031 made it difficult for board members to get a complete assessment of the NCOs performance and potential. This caused many candidates to receive lower scores than those who had current NCOERs on file.

b. Utilization and assignments: Staff Sergeants in the Ordnance CMF serve in a wide variety of assignments which support ongoing operations of our Army. Due to these assignments, our NCOs are both agile and versatile. There were a number of Staff Sergeants serving in positions that were not directly associated with the technical skills of their Primary Military Occupational Specialty (PMOS). In the case of Drill Sergeants, WTU Cadre, Recruiters, Military Transition Team (MiTT) Members, and other difficult non- PMOS positions, the board recognized the demands that such assignments placed on the NCO. These tough and challenging assignments were viewed positively by the board and were essential and in line with the Army's total Soldier concept. Staff Sergeants who served for three or more evaluations outside of their PMOS were scrutinized based on the duty position held. There were cases where evaluations from duties outside the NCOs PMOS did not allow the SSG to demonstrate the ability to work in demanding positions at the current or next higher positions within the Ordnance Branch. The board understood the need in the units to have NCOs serve in functions outside their PMOS (i.e. Training NCO, Admin NCO). Leaders need to realize that by having NCOs serve in positions outside their PMOS for prolonged periods of time, they potentially degrade the core competent skills of that NCO. Taking demanding leadership positions during deployment and while accomplishing the Army's mission was viewed favorably as the rigors of conducting two wars and numerous operations creates its own set of challenges to our Warriors.

c. Training and education: The vast majority of Ordnance Soldiers had civilian education. Roughly 85% of the population had some college and about 20% had between two and four years of college. Soldiers who took the time for self-improvement by taking college courses while also balancing their daily missions and deployments were looked upon favorably. However, in the 89D (Explosive Ordnance Disposal) field, there was a much lower rate of Soldiers who had completed correspondence courses or college. NCOs who exceeded course standards in NCOES schooling were looked at favorably among their peers.

d. Physical Fitness: Ordnance Staff Sergeants are generally physically fit and meet height and weight (HT/WT) standards. However, in some cases the NCOs DA Photo, his or her actual recorded HT/WT on the NCOER caused board members to question obvious differences between the two. Raters and Senior Raters should ensure that NCOs HT/WT is current and recorded accurately on their NCOERs to avoid questions by board members of the validity of the NCOs HT/WT when viewing their DA Photo.

Raters did ensure that those NCOs who failed their APFT and or HT/WT standards received a needs improvement. However, there were some cases that the Rater did not rate the NCO appropriately when they failed to meet Army standards. Raters must also ensure that those NCOs that clearly exceed standards on the APFT are recognized with excellent ratings and indicates this by stating that the NCO achieved a score, e.g, of 270 points and was awarded the Army Physical Fitness Badge. The actually score and awarding the APFT badge helps board members determine excellence versus a general score of 270 points.

e. Overall career management: Staff Sergeants in the Ordnance Career Fields generally work in assignments which are vital for their career progression. They tend to serve in a variety of assignments which creates a Staff Sergeant capable of performing in an ever changing environment supporting the missions of the Army and Joint Operations. Many NCOs in the field demonstrate "The Total Soldier Concept" by taking challenging assignments and excelling in the performance of their duties. This field is able to find demanding positions which support the needs of the Army at most bases whether forward deployed or at home duty stations.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. Assignment and promotion opportunity: The Staff Sergeants considered during this board had a variety of key and demanding assignments. There were many Staff Sergeants serving in -40 level positions such as Logistics and Maintenance Advisors on Transition Training Teams. Staff Sergeants have also served as Platoon Sergeants, WTU Cadre, and AIT Platoon Sergeants, which shows the ability of the NCOs in the Corps to find and perform in the toughest positions. Staff Sergeants in CMF 94 seemed to have less opportunity to serve in the above mentioned duty positions however they have had opportunities for assignments in Special Mission Assignments in Asymmetric Warfare Units and White House Communication Support serving at the highest level of our government.

b. Overall health of CMF: The overall health of CMF 91 is good, while CMFs 94 and MOS 89D still has challenges meeting SFC select promotion objectives. One concern is that increased requirements to support future contingency operations will accelerate the need to fulfill Army grade requirements for critical MOSs. Leaders need to scrutinize the maturity level of SSGs when considering positions of greater responsibility. Also within CMF 91, and CMF 94, there are MOSs that requires review due to the limited amount of promotion opportunities.

5. Recommendations. (Proposals keyed to subparagraphs above).

a. Competence: Raters and Senior Raters must ensure they give an accurate picture of the NCO being rated. This includes requisite counseling and use of the DA Form

2166-8-1 NCOER Counseling and Support Form. Raters and Senior Raters must understand that they are a significant component of the Staff Sergeants overall competiveness.

b. CMF structure and career progression: The current structure and NCO Professional Development maps the Ordnance Corps has is working and is valuable for Soldiers to see what positions they should be striving to work in. There are NCOs who have spent significant amounts of time as instructors or in duty positions which do not provide the opportunity to deploy. It is recommended that these Staff Sergeants search for different leadership positions to make them more competitive with other Staff Sergeants in the CMFs. There seemed to be a trend in Staff Sergeants with more time in service (15-20 years) to stay in duty positions outside the CMF or consistently work in -30 level positions. Staff Sergeants must stay competitive by continually working in tough and demanding leadership jobs.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The overall quality of the Ordnance Corps Proponent Packet was excellent. The content is thorough providing key points in assisting with understanding critical/key/unique positions for Staff Sergeants serving in the MOS. Special duty assignments such as Drill Sergeant, Recruiter, AIT Platoon Sergeant, WTU Squad Leader and Provincial Reconstruction and Transition Team members, were also covered, which assisted board members understanding of the demanding assignments and challenges these NCOs face.

b. Recommended improvements: Recommend future proponent packets take in consideration other broadening assignments where NCOs have operated in joint, interagency, intergovernmental and multinational environments. We expect our NCOs to be versatile leaders who possess the attributes necessary to operate in these situations. This is significant for board members and leadership to recognize the challenging assignments and duties our NCOs are given and the vast responsibilities they are empowered with. Experience counts.

7. Conclusion or general comments: The panel selected the best qualified Non-Commissioned Officers to the grade of Sergeant First Class based on overall performance and potential for greater responsibility as future Senior Leaders of the NCO Corps. Of note the panel also recognized the great sacrifices made by these NCOs in the number of deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan over the past 10 years. Their experiences and the combination of challenging environments across the spectrum of conflict will yield a population of agile leaders capable of leading and running the Army in the complex 21st Century security environment.

LINWOOD B. CLARK
Colonel, OD
Panel Chief