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 20 June 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, US Army Signal Center, 506 Chamberlain Ave. Bldg 2980 A, Fort Gordon, GA 30905

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 25 Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 11 May 2011, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY11 United States Army Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA) Training and Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 25 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

a. Performance and Potential: The majority of CMF 25 NCOs are successful in performing their duties across a wide spectrum of duty assignments and were competitive for selection. Duty descriptions which clearly annotated the level of responsibility and operating environment were helpful to the board. To identify the best of the best, the board relied heavily on the performance and potential portions of the NCOER. Board members were dismissive of instances where Excellence bullets were not strongly justified and particularly scrutinized NCOERs where all five blocks were checked Excellent without quantifiable bullets. Generic comments or average bullets hindered rather than helped the rated NCO towards selection. Concise, quantitative, hard-hitting bullets (e.g. "best 1SG in the Battalion") were most effective. Instances of inconsistency between Rater and Senior Rater ratings sent mixed messages. The Reviewer is critical in eliminating these discrepancies. Finally, if an NCO failed to live by the Army Values as a senior NCO and received a "NO" in block IV of the NCOER, the panel viewed this as a significant discriminator.

b. Utilization and Assignments: The vast majority of NCOs are pursuing diverse assignments in varied locations which provide ample opportunities for them to develop the desired leadership, expertise, technical and tactical ability for their CMF. NCOs who stayed in the same location or position for extended periods often lacked such opportunities. NCOs were further detrimented when comments referencing the same accomplishments were repeated on several NCO evaluations. NCOs should

aggressively pursue positions that measure and assess their potential for increased responsibility. Many NCOs displayed solid performance at the MSG level and were sometimes already performing at Sergeant Major and Command Sergeant Major level. The board considered tough assignments such as any Sergeant Major position, First Sergeant, G6 Information System Chief, Senior Drill Sergeant, Operations Sergeant and MiTT NCOIC as challenging and viewed this favorably. Repeated assignments in these positions were viewed especially well. For instance, an NCO who served as a 1SG for 18 months but then moved to non-leadership roles was much less likely to be selected than an NCO who successfully served in several 1SG positions or other strong leadership positions such as G6 Information System Chief, Spectrum Management at the Joint, Theater, and Corps level, or Operations Sergeant Major.

c. Training and Education: All NCOs were expected to have completed SLC. If completion was not annotated on the ERB, board members found it tough to credit the NCO. Additional military functional and special duty courses were favorably considered. Exceeding course standards or graduating with honors projected a stronger potential for selection. Some NCOs have pursued higher levels of civilian education and these achievements were viewed as a commitment to higher learning, self improvement and development. Conversely, NCOs with minimal military education within the previous five years and/or civilian education (e.g. no college) were sometimes discriminators, as board members considered that these NCOs were not actively seeking self improvement. Certifications also weighed heavily; however, since most certifications were not annotated on the ERBs it was helpful when Raters commented on these accomplishments on the NCOER.

d. Physical Fitness and Height/Weight: The majority of NCOs are meeting physical fitness standards. NCOs who earned the Physical Fitness Badge, especially over extended periods of time, were viewed positively. Conversely, failing to pass the APFT or meet body fat standards as outlined in AR 600-9 were significant discriminators. The board also noticed that as some NCOs became heavier, their height increased.

e. Photo: NCOs need to update their photos as required by AR 640-30, paragraph 6. The board considered a missing or outdated photo as a lack of preparation on the part of the NCO. Letters from deployed NCOs to the President of the Board explaining the lack of an updated photo were helpful. In cases where NCOs looked very large in their photo, board members compared weight with that of earlier NCOERs to identify whether the Soldier had recent significant weight gain.

f. Disciplinary Action: Board members took notice of disciplinary action in the NCO's OMPF. Disciplinary Action in the NCO's current or previous grade held significant weight with board members.

g. Overall career management. The greatest key to selection was strong performance in a series of challenging leadership positions with Soldiers.

4. CMF 25 Structures and Career Progression Assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. All CMF 25 MOSs were given opportunities for career progression and leadership positions. The majorities of assignments are very diverse and allow the NCO to develop their technical, tactical and leadership skills. The assignments CMF 25 NCOs held were very compatible within the MOS.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure: CMF 25 NCOs competing for United States Army Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA) Training and Selection held a variety of positions that allowed them to be competitive for promotion to the next grade.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity: The board panel saw vast opportunities for CMF 25 to be highly successful for selection. There were ample leadership opportunities across the majority of CMF 25 MOSs. NCOs must continue to seek out tough and demanding jobs that will place them in the best position for selection and promotion. The board looked very favorably on NCOs who took on challenging assignments such as Sergeant Major, First Sergeant, G6 Information System Chief, Detachment Sergeant (performing the duties as First Sergeant), Operations NCO, or MiTT NCOIC, and excelled in those positions. NCOs who sought out other Skill Level 50 positions and succeeded in those positions were also viewed favorably by the board. Such positions are important for advancement to the next higher rank. The Spectrum Management field was the only field noted with limited leadership opportunities.

d. Overall health of CMF: The overall health of CMF 25 is strong and diverse. CMF 25 NCOs continue to go above and beyond expectations. CMF 25 must continue to further their civilian and military schooling to stay competitive.

e. NCOs who go the extra mile to distinguish themselves from their peers stand out. Some of the examples are active participation in the Sergeant Morales or Sergeant Audie Murphy clubs, MOS certifications, military/civilian education, consistent APFT badges, and important special duty assignments.

5. Recommendations.

a. Leadership: NCOs must continuously diversify in assignments and positions. Reflecting performance on the NCOER is crucial in determining their potential for promotion and increased responsibility. If a leadership position is not reflected in the duty position, it must be annotated on the NCOER in appointed duties or areas of special emphasis with bullet comments indicating performance in that role.

b. Training and Education: NCOs should continue to pursue military and civilian education to include any certifications or courses. This clearly depicts continuous self-development. Exceeding course standards or achieving a high GPA sends an even stronger signal.

c. Physical Fitness: Adding the APFT score on the NCOER as a bullet comment would be helpful in evaluating the NCO for promotion selection. Additionally, consistency of height /weight on all board documents is an important factor for the board.

d. Disciplinary Action: GOMORs and Article 15s should be annotated on the NCOER for the rated period. Board members took notice that GOMORs and Article 15s administered during the rated period were not annotated on NCOERs. These NCOs were still given "among the best: and "promote immediately" from the rater and senior rater respectively. GOMORs and Article 15s should be annotated in the values and responsibility and accountability ratings of the NCOER.

e. Rater/Senior Rater Overall Evaluation: It is important to ensure that rater and senior rater comments complement each other. Several NCOERs contained conflicting ratings and comments in Part IV and V of the NCOER. This presented a confusing representation of the NCO's performance and potential to serve at higher levels of responsibility.

f. CMF structure and career progression: As the Army transformation continues, the proponent should continue to monitor and adjust to ensure opportunities exist for challenging assignments, career progression, and ability to build tactical, technical and leadership skills.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The CMF Proponent Packet was a useful tool and provided detailed information to the board regarding MOS specific career patterns and identified leadership positions and their equivalents.

b. Recommended improvements: Recommend proponents continue to make CMF Proponent Packets available on AKO and that Soldiers know and understand its contents. Raters, Senior Raters, and Reviewers must ensure they use the same language as the proponent career path in writing duty descriptions. Information pertaining to Special Mission Units for Sergeant Major and Master Sergeant positions should better articulate equivalent assignments in the conventional force.

KAREN H. GIBSON
Colonel, MI
Panel Chief