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 27 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, U.S. Army Military Police School, 464 Manscen Loop, Building 3201, Fort Leonard Wood, MO 65473

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 31 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 31 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS 31B and 31E within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Performance and potential: The majority of NCOs in CMF 31 demonstrated superb leadership skills at their current grade in critical and demanding positions from 1SG to Police Transition Team (PTT) NCOIC. In other instances, some NCOs in the CMF also demonstrated outstanding leadership skills at the SGM and CSM level. Overall, NCOERs provided a clear picture as to which NCOs were excelling within the CMF; however, senior rater bullets often lacked sufficient qualifying and quantifying bullets to determine the very best performers. For example, bullets such as "best 1SG in the Battalion", "number 1of 6 1SGs in the Battalion, or "best 1SG I have seen in my 20 years of service" would have helped to clearly establish the best of the best within the CMF. The 31 CMF was identified by the panel as the only CMF reviewed which did not consistently utilize qualitative or quantitative bullets in the senior rater comments block.

b. Utilization and assignments: The CMF was doing well at creating a balance between leadership assignments and operational assignments with only a few exceptions. A balance between critical leadership assignments and challenging operational assignments gave the panel a more complete picture of the NCOs ability to function across the full spectrum of responsibilities within the CMF.

c. Training and education: The majority of NCOs within the CMF demonstrated a persistent career long approach towards the completion of Army and CMF specific

leadership and career enhancement training such as Battle Staff, Hostage Negotiations and Special Reaction Team training. The achievement of Honor Graduate during professional development courses demonstrated a clear mark of accomplishment above the NCO's peers; however, it was recommend the first line of the comments section of the 1059 clearly identify this accomplishment for the panel. Further, despite a high operational tempo and service in demanding leadership positions, a number of NCOs within the CMF had completed 120 semester hours or more of civilian education. The persistent pursuit of military and civilian education was viewed as being indicative of a dedication to self-improvement, effective time management, and potential for academic success.

d. Physical Fitness: The Army has placed strong emphasis on the requirement of every Soldier to maintain their physical fitness to ensure combat readiness, to control stress and to build the stamina necessary to work the demanding hours of the military. Raters must clearly articulate the awarding of the Physical Fitness Badge and the NCO's overall score in order to justify an excellence rating. The absence of such data with an excellence rating left the panel guessing at the accomplishments which justified the rating. Photos across the CMF primarily depicted Soldiers who appeared to be in compliance with Army height and weight standards and served as a solid indicator of the overall health and physical readiness of the Soldiers in the CMF.

e. Overall career management: Those NCOs who followed the CMF Professional Development Model and performed successfully in both leadership and operational assignments were viewed as well-rounded and best qualified for promotion. The overall assessment of career management with the CMF was good; however, NCOs and leaders were cautioned against extended operational assignments, especially those outside of the CMF, and prolonged periods of time in leadership positions. The board noted down turns in performance when NCOs were left in leadership positions for periods longer than 36 to 48 months. Additionally, NCOs who had not completed the recommended leadership time and were in extended or back to back operational assignments were not viewed favorably by the board.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment:

a. MOS compatibility within CMF: The three distinct specialties within the CMF each perform a unique role in support to the CMF's overall mission within the Army. The fact that NCOs within the CMF primarily performed duties only within their distinct specialty demonstrated the unique attributes associated with each MOS. The related yet distinctly different missions required a NCO who could lead while coaching, teaching, and mentoring Soldiers and leaders on the finer points of executing law enforcement, internment and resettlement (I/R) and criminal investigative missions.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure: The overall structure and standards of grade of the CMF appeared to be in compliance with and supported Army standards. The detailed descriptions of the duties and responsibilities of NCOs

performing nonstandard Army missions such as PTT NCOIC and Chief I/R NCO on both the proponent packet and the NCOER were extremely helpful to the panel.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity: The CMF proponent packet and board files demonstrated there were sufficient leadership and operational assignments available to every Soldier in relation to their MOS. Soldiers were strongly encouraged to seek out leadership assignments while striking a balance with operational assignments in order to remain competitive with their peers as it relates to their distinct specialty.

d. Health of the CMF: The overall health of the CMF was good and consisted of many capable and competent NCO leaders who were performing well at a variety of leadership and operational positions in both garrison and deployed environments. There were more than sufficient numbers of highly qualified NCOs capable of performing at the SGM level.

e. Professional Values: There was a slight concern over the numbers of senior NCOs in leadership positions who were identified as having abused their position of authority or engaged in inappropriate behavior which resulted in their punishment and jeopardized the moral and welfare of the Soldiers whom they were entrusted to lead.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence: The CMF must continue developing versatile and adaptive leaders who are capable of leading Soldiers and running the Army in complex 21st Century environments to include joint environments. The responsibility to accomplish this objective rests with the individual Soldier, the proponent, and leaders within the CMF.

b. CMF structure and career progression: The proponent, as it has done historically, must continue to make the structural changes necessary to ensure a force capable of supporting a transformational Army in the 21st Century and beyond while ensuring a balance of operational and leadership positions are available for the development of their leaders. NCOs within the CMF must seek out those challenging leadership positions within their MOS and take an aggressive approach to the management of their careers in order to maintain their competitive edge for future advancement. Leaders must utilize the professional development model when counseling their Soldiers on career progression and the keys to success in their particular MOS.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The proponent packet provided sufficient information regarding critical leadership assignments and demanding assignments within the CMF. The packet gave panel members a clear picture of the leadership and operational positions available to each NCO within the CMF based upon their specific MOS. Additionally, the proponent packet ensured panel members were aware of the distinct differences

between the three complex MOSs which comprised the CMF and the capabilities and limitations of each in regards to the availability of leadership assignments and deployments.

b. Recommended improvements: The proponent must now take the detailed information contained within the packet and find a way to clearly articulate the information from the packet in DA PAM 600-25 for future boards.

PATRICK J. DONAHOE
Colonel, AR
Panel Chief