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 28 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 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, 7 January 2011, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY11 Sergeant First Class 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. The selection board process is a pivotal tool for determining the most deserving and best qualified Soldiers for promotion to Sergeant First Class. There are numerous documents to review in a short period of time, but the three documents that helped produce the most accurate snapshot were the Noncommissioned Officer Report (NCOER), the Enlisted Records Brief (ERB), and the Department of the Army (DA) Photo. The Soldier, rater, and senior rater all have a role in ensuring these documents are updated and present an accurate description of the Noncommissioned Officer (NCO) being considered. In addition, senior leaders must present a unified performance and potential assessment. The board is looking for NCOs that demonstrate the qualities, behaviors, performance and have the potential to serve in positions of greater responsibility. As such consistency among raters and senior raters is critical to the selection process. Some of the inconsistencies in this CMF are outlined below.

(1) Principle duty titles were not always accurate or consistent with the ERB. Numerous duty titles did not exist in accordance with (IAW) applicable CMF manpower documents and appeared to be created to lend more credibility to the rated NCOs position, duties, and responsibilities. Such efforts, while descriptive, were confusing and cast doubt on the accuracy of the evaluation. An example was the use of Platoon Sergeant (not including the actual coded position "Platoon Sergeant" in the Advanced

Individual Training environment). Platoon Sergeant is an additional duty for individuals in this CMF. Another example is Chief Paralegal NCO of a certain division within the organization such as Legal Assistance, Claims, and Administrative Law when again; no such position exists in this CMF. Recommend CMF standards for Principle Duty Titles be disseminated to the CMF population, as well as educating the population on the potential adverse and/or negative impacts of creative duty titles.

(2) Raters should be educated on the impact of inconsistent messaging. Deeming an NCO "Fully Capable" when the bullet comments in the evaluation portray a stronger performance and potential picture puts the NCO at a distinct disadvantage and leave the board members having to speculate. Senior Raters should also understand the negative impact of marking a "2" or "3" block when accompanied by comments such as "promote now, immediately, or ahead of peers". Such inconsistency may not send the intended message, whether negative or positive.

(3) The DA Photo is an essential part of a NCOs promotion file. Soldiers are not authorized to physically appear before the Centralized Promotion Board, so the photo is the only opportunity the NCO has to make a "first impression" with board members. It allows the board members to determine a Soldier's professional appearance and military bearing. An NCO that does not take the time or make an effort to submit a DA Photo were viewed as having a lack of professionalism, discipline, and self-motivation, and had a negative impact on the board.

(4) The ERB is an essential document in the selection process. It contains data on assignments, promotion, and education. This document, when updated and accurate, in conjunction with the DA Photo, provides a good snapshot of the NCO being considered for selection. Numerous ERB's were not updated and/or were missing critical information when compared to the DA Photo, job titles and/or education.

b. Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS). NCOs serving in a variety of assignments were viewed more favorably by the board. Successfully serving in various units in the MTOE, TDA, SOC, SMU, and joint communities demonstrated diversity and the potential and ability to serve in different operating environments. By observation, CMF 27 is consistent with the MOS Professional Development Model in the proponent packet provided.

c. Training and education. Training was consistently lacking throughout the CMF. In general, only a small percentage of CMF personnel completed MOS specific or enhancing training courses such as the Battle Staff, Operational Law/Law of War, Brigade Combat Team NCOIC, and Military Justice Manager's courses.

d. Physical Fitness. CMF personnel were adequate in the area of Physical Fitness.

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. A majority of the records indicated that NCOs were operating competitively in their current grade or at least one grade higher. A small number of records reflected that the NCO was operating in a position subordinate to their rank or level of training. One noted area is the impact of Modularity on the SSG population. After the conversion of BCT NCOIC positions from SSG/E6 to SFC/E7, it proved challenging to place SSGs/E6's in higher level positions due to the limited number of positions available. Recommend expanding the number of smaller brigade NCOIC assignments/positions to the SSG/E6 population to create opportunities to serve at levels of greater responsibility.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. Some files indicated NCOs were habitually assigned in the same core competency areas (Legal Assistance, Claims, Administrative Law, and Trial Defense Services) within like organizations and units. This can be interpreted as an NCO operating within a "comfort zone" or at a certain "comfort level". Every effort should be made within units/organizations to ensure Soldiers are given the opportunity for growth and development by placing them in positions of greater responsibility in various competency areas whenever possible.

d. Overall health of CMF. Upon review, the CMF promotion records were very competitive. Each record demonstrated the unique talent, versatility and outstanding quality of CMF 27 personnel operating today in a wartime Army. CMF 27 is a thriving, mature, and healthy population of true leader professionals. Every effort should be made to ensure the best performers and those with the most potential are clearly identifiable and distinguishable by their promotion file.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. Continue to advocate for the attendance of NCOs at the MOS enhancing courses and continue to expand the number of assignments in the smaller brigade communities for the SSG/E6 population.

b. CMF structure and career progression. Sustain/No change.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The CMF packet was very concise and appropriate.

b. Recommended improvements.

(1) Non-Traditional Assignments. List the number of personnel or positions allocated for each assignment in addition to listing them on the current slide. This would illustrate the uniqueness of the referenced assignment.

(2) NCO Professional Development Model. Very good formatting; recommend document be updated regularly so that CMF 27 is receiving the most accurate career map possible.

TRACEY E. NICHOLSON
COL, AG
Panel Chief