DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
1600 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 US ARMY Military Police School, Fort Leonard Wood, MO 65473

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 31 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 31 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. It was evident that the majority of NCOs in the CMF demonstrated the leadership skills at their current grade preparing them for advancement. Although captured in the rater's bullet comments, senior raters generally were not clear in telling board members their intentions for promotion. Senior rater comments should match the performance and potential markings and need to be up front, candid and clearly articulated.

b. Utilization of Assignment. NCOs serving in a majority of key leadership and operational positions with one specialty assignments were viewed as well rounded and best qualified for advancement. Those serving in back-to-back specialty assignments such as Drill Sergeant, Recruiter and Instructor limited opportunities for assessment in key developmental troop leading opportunities. Those that followed the published CMF career map were viewed as best qualified for promotion.

c. Training and Education. All panel members agreed that the majority of NCOs had an adequate amount of civilian education and military training according to their MOS under current OPTEMPO. Those that showed a gradual and continuous record of continuing education were viewed favorably.

d. Physical Fitness. The lack of an individual's physical fitness excellence displayed in NCOERs indicates a decline in emphasis in this area. Bullets justifying

excellence routinely focused on subordinates achievements and did not give an accurate reflection of the rated NCOs fitness level. With the removal of the APFT from NCOES, it was hard for board members to evaluate an individual's fitness level since it is no longer a rated portion on Academic Evaluation Reports.

e. Overall Career Management. There was only a small portion of the population that failed to follow career management guidance. Those serving in back-to-back staff or administrative positions were generally assigned to installations with adequate leadership opportunities. It appeared that HRC is doing a good job placing NCOs in locations of opportunity and local leadership is not assigning in line with the CMF career map. Overall, the career management within this CMF is strong.

4. CMF structure. Duty positions in grade band for each respective MOS appeared to be in line with commensurate levels of responsibility. In many cases, NCOs were rated at the MSG and 1SG level in rear detachment roles while the duty descriptions listed a span of control of 10 to 20 Soldiers. Some NCOs were rated as the "Rear Detachment Commander" giving the impression of made-up duty titles for this key and essential role. Those rated as SFC while serving in this role were viewed as legitimate.

a. MOS Compatibility within CMF. Very few NCOs reviewed served for extended periods of time outside their respective MOS. This indicates a strong linkage of skills to career field and mission.

b. Suitability of Standards of Grade and Structure. The standards and grade structure outlined in the proponent guidance were compatible with the DA Secretariat guidance and should be maintained. Records for this board revealed that assignment and leadership opportunities in order to enhance development are available across the CMF.

c. The overall health of the CMF appears to be very strong. NCOs are excelling in demanding assignments in garrison as well as combat conditions.

5. Recommendations. (Proposals keyed to subparagraphs above).

a. Competence. NCOs should continue to follow the CMF career map to capitalize on operational experience as the key stone to development. This is an area NCOs and leaders need to take ownership of to ensure individual development.

b. CMF structure and career progression. NCOs need to seek out the tough assignments that will place them in developmental positions. Key leadership positions such as Platoon Sergeant (or MOS Equivalent) are essential for professional growth to prepare for the demands of 1SG level responsibilities. Leaders need to provide NCOs the opportunity to serve in these leadership positions and NCOs need to be assertive in their efforts to serve.

c. NCOs that served in multiple short duration duty positions did not appear to have adequate time to display performance and show potential. It was not uncommon for NCOs in the 31E field to serve in as many as 10 different duty positions in a five year time frame. It is recommended that NCOs should serve a minimum of 12 months in assigned positions to allow them time to demonstrate abilities and potential.

d. There were many NCOs within the 31D career field that had NCOERs reflecting "Senor Rater does not meet qualifications". Numbers were significant enough to indicate issues with movement of Senior Raters inside of the career field negatively impacting the evaluations of rated NCOs.

e. Many NCOs were missing or displayed SSG photos. Although the standard is that a photo is valid for 5 years before Soldier is required to update, it was viewed negatively by board members when the NCO did not attempt to update, especially with significant additions to awards and rank. Records of service indicated opportunity existed for photos to be taken but the NCO did not take the initiative to do so. This gave board members the impression the reviewed NCO did not care.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. The overall quality of the CMF31 Proponent Packet was very good. Information was clear and in line with CMF and Army guidance.

b. It is recommended that CMF 31, 21 and 74 align general guidance at the Maneuver Support Center of Excellence. This can be accomplished while maintaining CMF integrity, and will aid in board members evaluating an individual's file for demonstrated duty, performance and potential.

Pamela L. Martis

PAMELA L. MARTIS
Colonel, MP
Panel Chief