DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
1600 SPEARHEAD DIVISION AVENUE
FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY 40121

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 and Commandant, Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School, 600 Massie Road, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

SUBJECT: Career Management Field CMF 27 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 27 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 (particularly leadership opportunities). The single most important document when considering a Soldier for promotion is the Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER). Responsibility starts with the rated Soldier and continues up through the rating chain. Oversight of the NCOER process by the senior noncommissioned officer (CSM/SGM/1SG) within the unit/command is a must. In accordance with Army Regulation 623-3, paragraph 2-8a, the preparation of noncommissioned officer evaluation reports must include a review by these senior noncommissioned officers. Ensuring this review is accomplished will add a much needed NCOER quality control measure. Additionally, CMF along with leadership guidance is critical to ensuring the NCOER reflects an accurate picture of the rated Soldier. Many of the NCOERs reviewed for Master Sergeant promotion and selection were not in agreement with the standards of grade noted for this CMF and the following abnormalities were noted:

(1) Principle duty titles were inconsistent throughout the CMF; rated NCOs, Raters, and Senior Raters were far too creative in this block of the NCOER and had a negative impact on NCOER credibility when detected. An example of this creativity was the liberal use of the title Chief Paralegal NCO when identifying positions normally associated with the titles Senior Paralegal NCO or NCOIC (BCT, Legal Assistance, Military Justice, Criminal Law, Claims, Client Services, and individual Branch Legal

Offices). The NCO Professional Development chart and lists of demanding assignments provided in the Proponent Packets gave panel members notice of these irregularities and added in detection of what may have been erroneous principle duty titles. Recommend CMF standard for Principle Duty Titles be socialized within the CMF with a strong warning of the potential adverse effects of creative duty titles.

(2) NCOs being rated as Chief Paralegal NCOs of a command or installation where a more senior NCO is concurrently serving also proved to have a negative impact on NCOER credibility and can be perceived as an inflated NCOER when detected.

(3) NCOER excellence ratings must be accompanied by supporting bullet comments of sufficient quality to meet heavy scrutiny. Additionally, Senior Raters should be educated on the potential negative impact of the "2" and "3" blocks. A "2" block accompanied by comments stating "promote now" or "promote immediately" may not send the intended message or have a positive result.

b. Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS). A variety of assignments between the operational and institutional force gives a better indication of potential. Staying too long in the same place or the same position shows a comfort level for the Soldier and not growth or potential. For highly competitive Soldiers, a variety of assignments between MTOE, TDA, SMU, SOC, Joint is the best mix and most desirable. Generally, the management of personnel within CMF 27 appears to be consistent with the career pattern provided in the CMF Proponent Packets while maintaining variety.

c. Training and education were consistent throughout the CMF with regard to general Professional Military Education (PME) and Noncommissioned Officer Education System (NCOES) courses, but the level of civilian education for some otherwise strong promotion packets was lacking.

d. Physical Fitness was adequate within this CMF.

e. Overall career management was excellent.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF was not applicable for this CMF as it has only one MOS.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. Not specifically studied during the panel process, but the CMF appears to have all positions staffed at the appropriate levels.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. One noted area of concern was the assignment trend of personnel holding the Additional Skill Identifier C5, Court Reporter.

Recommend more variety of assignments for these Soldiers in positions requiring leadership opportunities.

d. Overall health of CMF. Based on the promotion packets reviewed and the Army's goal of selecting the best qualified NCOs who are versatile leaders who possess the attributes necessary to operate as part of a joint team in the complex 21st Century Security Environment, CMF 27 is very healthy and very competitive. The difference between those selected for promotion and those not selected was minuscule and a clear indication of the overall strength and capability within the CMF.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. Broaden current levels of NCO education and development by increasing opportunities for Continuing Legal Education; Professional Military Education (to include Joint, Interagency, and Multinational); and introducing more assignment and duty position variety for personnel with ASI C5.

b. CMF structure and career progression. Sustain.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. Adequate for general information, but could and should be improved for clarity by the CMF.

b. Recommended improvements to proponent packet.

(1) Career Pattern/Path. Provide more clarity as to the significance of NCOs with additional skill identifier C5. The slide provided in the proponent packet sends the message that ASI C5 is no longer relevant after 27D4O, and the referenced DA Pam 611-21 did not have a chapter 10.

(2) Modularity Impacts. Recommend the addition of a Legacy and a Modular task organization chart beneath the text for visual clarity on broadened scope of responsibility under the new BCT model.

(3) Demanding Assignments/ASI/SQI. Provide demanding assignments, SQIs, and ASIs in order of precedence according to their importance within the CMF. The CMF must determine which assignments and ASIs / SQIs highlighted in the proponent briefing are most critical to the professional development of 27D personnel.

(4) Special Mission Units. There was a typographical error that should read "Combined Security Transition Command (CSTC)". The title of the slide "SMU" leads the reader to believe that the slide refers to special mission units such as SFOD, JSOC, etc., but lists a non-traditional assignment unit (NATO Training Mission and CSTC). Recommend adding a new slide for CSTC and use this slide to highlight paralegal NCO SMU positions and their relevance or criticality.

Richard L. Shepard
RICHARD L. SHEPARD
Colonel, AG
Panel Chief