DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
STREE1600 SPEARHEAD DIVISION AVENUE
FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY 40121

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

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 Ordnance, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5201

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 89 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 89 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of CMF 89 Promotion Zone.

a. Performance and potential:

(1). The Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER) remains the most important document in a Soldier's promotion file. Raters and Senior Raters sent many mixed messages in their remarks. A Rater would give very well rounded and quantitative bullets but the senior rater would give weak comments and give ratings of 2/2 or 2/3 with bullets of "promote now" or conversely give a 1/1 and "promote with peers". These comments became very confusing for evaluating a Soldier's promotion potential. Bullets need to be quantitative and qualitative and reflect the overall performance of the rated Soldier. A significant amount of unjustified excellence bullets also sent an unclear message to board members.

(2). The DA photo is also an important component of a Soldier's record. Many Soldiers either had no photo or had a photo in the grade of SSG. This made many of the board members have to question whether the Soldier could not take a photo based upon deployment history or whether the Soldier just failed to place emphasis on the need for a photo. If a Soldier is unable to take a current photo in grade due to a deployment, they need to ensure that it is annotated in their board packet validation. For those that had photos, many had badges and awards improperly worn. A small few had branch insignia reversed. Some Soldiers had decorations worn with no record of the awards being issued. Soldiers need to ensure they have senior NCOs assist them with inspecting their uniform prior to taking a photo. Many of the infractions could have been corrected with more oversight from senior leaders. Soldiers also need to ensure all documentation is included in their Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) and that their

Enlisted Record Brief (ERB) is updated and accurate. ERBs need to accurately account for duty positions filled during rating periods.

b. Utilization and assignments: Many Ordnance Soldiers performed outside of their normal career path (i.e. Drill Sergeant, Recruiter, Observer/Controller). These Soldiers were given special consideration based upon the demanding nature of the assignment. However, the board questioned the need for these Soldiers to perform outside of their career path for an extensive amount of time (3 years of more). This, while required by the Army, caused many of our extreme performers to have their performance decreased causing many of our high performers to fall behind their peers based on their performance outside their career field.

c. Training and education:

(1). Civilian Education: Approximately 20-30% of CMF 89 Soldiers had a Baccalaureate degree or higher. Conversely a significant number of Soldiers had 50 credit hours or less. With the expansion of programs like GoArmyEd and the increase of the online education services many Soldiers are not taking advantage of the multitude of civilian education opportunities.

(2). Professional Military Education (PME): Many Soldiers started Phase I of requisite Non-Commissioned Officer Education System (NCOES) but had not completed all phases of schooling at the time of the board. This shows the increased OPTEMO our Ordnance Soldiers face. Leaders need to continue to place emphasis on the need for PME and the completion of required NCOES. Additionally, the board looked favorably on those who exceeded course requirements. Many Soldiers reached their current grade and stopped taking any further PME outside of NCOES. This showed a potential for lack of further professional development.

d. Physical Fitness: Raters need to continue annotating high Army Physical Fitness Test scores on the NCOER. A Soldier's continued excellence demonstrated to the board that he/she is physically fit and was viewed favorably by the board. Additionally, Soldiers failing to maintain APFT requirements or height and weight requirements IAW AR 600-9 made these Soldiers much less competitive for promotion.

e. Overall career management: The majority of our Ordnance SFC's are well rounded career professionals. They continue to demonstrate the excellence and professionalism required by our nation. Many continue to perform in leadership assignments above their current pay grade and continue to strive for excellence.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF: The lack of standardized job titles continues to make it a challenge for board members to evaluate the level of responsibility and level of leadership

required during that rating period. Supervisors need to ensure they accurately capture the level of responsibility the rated Soldier performed.

b. Assignment and promotion opportunity: Soldiers need to continue to seek those demanding assignments that will allow them to stand out from their peers. Many performed in 40 level assignments with no supervisory role, this potentially limits their profession growth and potential for promotion. Leaders need to seek out the demanding leadership role allowing their full potential to be measured. This will further emphasize their potential for future leadership in the Army. Raters need to ensure the duties of the rated Soldier, serving in a position of increased responsibility or working above their grade, are accurately reflected in the duty title and daily duties and scope section of the NCOER, not as a sub bullet of the additional duties (i.e. BN Operations NCO/ Platoon Sergeant).

c. Overall health of CMF: Overall the health of the 89 CMF appears well. Specifically the 89D CMF appears undermanned as can be seen by the significant number of Soldiers performing in positions above their current pay grade. Leaders need to continue to ensure this is properly annotated on the NCOER.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. Leaders need to ensure they give an accurate picture of the NCO being rated. Raters and Senior Raters need to understand the significance of the NCOER in promotion potential process.

b. CMF structure and career progression. The current structure and career progression chart 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 staff oriented duty positions which do not provide the opportunity to deploy. This limits the potential of the NCO from excelling among their peers. It is recommended that these Soldiers search for more competitive and demanding assignments. Although the Army routinely requires Soldiers to work outside their CMF, it is recommended that these Soldiers not continue to work outside their CMF for more than two years. SFC's need to remain competitive for promotion to MSG and higher.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The overall quality of the proponent was adequate. The packet was thorough in listing the proponent demanding positions. Unfortunately it was left up to the board members to determine the ranking and prioritization of the demanding assignments. The proponent guidance could have provided more specific information for each MOS, to include special considerations. The board packet significantly addressed the challenges faced by our young NCOs and assisted the board in understanding these issues. Continue to ensure that

proponent packets are in line with guidance from Department of the Army Memorandum of Instruction.

b. Recommended improvements: Recommend future proponent packets keep up to date with the latest duty titles as unit MTOEs change to meet the modernization and modularization requirements our Army demands.

JOSE R. ENRIQUEZ
Colonel, LG, RA
Panel Chief