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) 94 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 94 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 (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Performance and potential: The majority of 94 CMF Sergeants First Class (SFCs) clearly displayed good performance within the typical challenging CMF duties and higher grade positions. While these duty positions were considered opportune for SFC, Noncommissioned-Officers (NCOs) also performed extremely well at non-traditional positions such as Maintenance Control Supervisor and Platoon Sergeant. Relevant additional duties in combination with the actual duty position were viewed positively as well.

(1) Strength. NCOs in leadership positions did well during the review and voting process. Sergeants First Class are seeking the tough demanding jobs such as Operations NCO (GP/BDE/BN Level), Training Developer and Writer, Recruiter, First & Detachment Sergeant, Senior/Drill and AIT Platoon Sergeant, Instructor/SGL NCOES, Career Management NCO, Military Transition Team, Observer/Controller Trainer & Advisor, etc. A fair number of NCOs took the time to have a current photo (reflecting current grade, awards, etc), along with updated and reviewed Enlisted Record Briefs (ERB). This was viewed favorably by the Board Members.

(2) Weaknesses.

(a) A considerable amount of NCOERs, specifically duty description did not reflect accurately and align with the ERB. Inconsistency with ratings between Raters and Senior Raters sent a mixed message to the board members. In many instances

SRs were not clear as to promotion of 'now/immediately'; 'ahead of peers'; 'with peers'. Files which had disciplinary data (GOMOR/Art 15), occasionally was not reflected in the NCOERs covering that rating period in which the infraction occurred. NCOERs with 'NO' in values did not always contain a corresponding bullet, or a 'NO' in APFT or HT/WT without 'Needs Improvement' marked. In these instances, as well as those reports which were marked appropriately, the Rater would still give a rating of "Among the Best" / "Fully Capable" and/or the SR would mark the 1/2/3 blocks in performance and potential with bullets of promote "ahead" or "with peers". NCOs who do not meet the standards, should be blocked "marginal", "Needs some Improvement", or "Needs much Improvement" and as such should be "retain in grade", "do not promote", or language to that effect and either "4" or "5" blocked. There were a number of board files with missing NCOERs, which left PMs guessing at the status of the NCO.

(b) The official DA photograph is also an important component of an NCO's file when being considered for promotion. There were many files that were missing Photos and based on deployment time frames, board members in most cases could determine whether or not the NCO had sufficient time to obtain a photo. Many NCOs did not state the reason for a missing photo in the comments when validating their record. Specific, legitimate reason should be explained in the Enlisted Records Brief (ERB) comments. There were a moderate amount of obvious uniform infractions. Reversed brass, wrong pertinences on ribbons, i.e. oak leaf(s) on Good Conduct Medal (GCM), missing clasp on badges, no DUIs, unauthorized wearing of unit awards to name a few. NCOs must ensure they and a Senior NCO review their DA Photo before accepting it into Department of the Army Photo Management Information System (DAPMIS). NCOs with photos matching their ERB and in ASUs reflected highly in their overall file review. An additional set of eyes to check for mistakes, quality and blurriness can ensure that quality DA Photo is available for the board members to review. Bottom line: A missing or poor DA Photo sends a message to the board members that the NCO may not care enough about his or her record.

b. Utilization and assignments: Given the numerous demands placed on the Ordnance CMF today, our Sergeant First Class NCOs are generally well rounded. A number of Sergeants First Class were being utilized outside of their Primary Military Occupation Specialty (PMOS). Drill Sergeants/AIT Platoon Sergeants and Recruiters; to name a few, the board recognized the difficulty in performing in such positions. Additionally this was generally viewed positively for the overall rounding of an NCO's knowledge, abilities and competence. However, the board questioned NCOs who are spending a significant amount of time, more than 36 to 48 months in the same position. NCOs need to understand that this could significantly impact their relevance and promotion opportunities. In some cases, this did not allow Sergeant First Class NCOs to adequately demonstrate his or her ability to work in positions of higher responsibility in the Ordnance Branch. Deployments and assuming Leadership positions, while being deployed was viewed favorably, as our country has been in two wars simultaneously for over eight years now. The board also recognized the challenges of serving in rear detachment and Warrior Transition Unit leadership position.

c. Training and Education: Board files, which reflected continued military and civilian education, were looked upon favorably by the board members. NCOs are furthering their education despite the OPTEMPO. AERs which were marginal for any reason were not viewed favorably by the board members. A substantial amount of Ordnance NCOs (94) had civilian education. The Education population level ranged from NCOs completing semester hours to those with Masters Degrees. 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 did not already complete the Senior Leadership Course (SLC). Additionally, the board looked favorably on NCOs who achieved honors in NCOES Schooling.

d. Physical Fitness: Ordnance SFCs for CMF 94 are generally physically fit. Those who achieved above a 270 and maintained their score over several NCOERs were evident by the many excellence blocks which looked positive by board members. Soldiers who achieved the APFT badge and maintained the badge were looked upon favorably. Some raters ensured that those Soldiers, who did not meet the HT/WT standards or failed the APFT, receive "needs improvement". The NCOES system is ensuring that the Soldiers who fail to meet standards, receive "marginal" on DA Form 1059.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. Board Members invested a significant amount of time and effort in reviewing duty positions held at the SFC level. The lack of standardization for the job titles made it difficult for the board members to actually determine the level of which the Soldier was actually working at. The board members favorably viewed NCOs who served / are serving in Division / Brigade Combat Teams and Battalion Headquarters. Continue to encourage SFCs Class to seek the traditional and non-traditional CMF 94 positions.

b. Quality of NCOERs continues to improve: However, the Chain of Command must review NCOERs for correctness, timeliness and accuracy. Rater and Senior Rater (SR) need to ensure that ratings are justified and consistent. Remember, the NCOER remains the most important and primary vehicle for the rater and SR to communicate to the board members. Performance at the current level and potential for increased responsibility at higher grades were consistently addressed.

d. Overall health of CMF 94 remains strong and viable: NCOs in the field have accumulated a wealth of knowledge and experiences in varying positions / levels / types of organizations which will be of benefit as our Army continues to transform and adapt for the future.

5. CMF 94 Proponent Packets.

a. The quality of the packets was good and served as a good tool for the board members. The career maps were very specific as to positions, key and important

assignments that a CMF 94 NCO can hold. The packet also included guidance from the Proponent and was helpful and valuable to board members.

b. Improvement: Recommend that future proponent packets be kept up to date with the latest duty titles and positions that come from an ever changing Army involved on two different war fronts. This is critical for panel members and leadership to stay abreast and give all SFCs a fair and balanced look at the job they are performing. These NCOs will rare eligible to compete along with their peers.

6. 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