**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 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, USAJFKSWCS, Directorate of Special Operations Proponency, Fort Bragg, NC 28310

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 37 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 37 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for the one MOS within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone.

a. Performance and potential. In general, performance and potential ratings did not seem to reach expected levels for a Special Operations CMF. It was unclear as to whether this was a function of the actual quality of the population or a result of very demanding group of raters. Language proficiency was a particularly glaring and significant weakness, with very few NCOs attaining and maintaining the USASOC standard.

b. Utilization and assignments. Overall, the force did not seem to provide NCOs with sufficient time in leadership positions. Evaluation reports tended not to indicate why an NCO was removed early from a leadership position. Furthermore, most of the evaluations lacked the clarity and specificity to determine whether the NCO was removed to take advantage of their leadership in another assignment or for other, less favorable, reasons.

c. Training and education. Far too many NCOs were not Static Line Jumpmaster qualified. While the force's OPTEMPO remains extremely high, records indicated that sufficient time was available to attend several iterations of advanced training. Yet, a significant portion of the population has not attended Static Line Jumpmaster training.

d. Physical Fitness. Evaluation reports and APFT scores indicate that physical fitness is a significant shortcoming across the force. The Special Operations community is known for its high standards and emphasis in this area, yet this population did not seem to meet that expectation.

e. Overall career management. Since a portion of the force did not provide NCOs with sufficient time in leadership positions, many of those NCOs are not adequately prepared for follow-on assignments of greater responsibility. This may adversely affect the quality and quantity of NCOs available for promotion to the most senior levels. Additionally, if this trend continues, the force may face manning challenges as the organizational structure continues to grow.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment. Standards for grade and structure remain suitable and appropriate. Assignment and promotion opportunities are sufficient and appropriate. However, there seemed to be a number of extended (multi-year) profiles without a clear indication as to why the individual remained on jump status or in an MOS that requires airborne qualification and active status. The overall health of the CMF will remain stable, provided that NCOs are afforded sufficient time in leadership development positions.

5. Recommendations.

a. Raters and senior raters must be consistent with ratings by matching comments with the blocks checked. Senior raters must provide quantifiable bullet comments that support the ratings provided. There are too many cases of both positive comments with low ratings blocks as well as negative comments with high ratings blocks.

b. Leaders should properly manage personnel assignments in order to adhere to proponent guidance on leadership positions. This proponent guidance provides for specific leadership development necessary for advancement to the next higher grade. If circumstances require early removal of an NCO from a leadership position, the evaluation report should clearly indicate that reason.

c. Language proficiency, a cornerstone of cultural awareness, needs increased emphasis and focus to ensure NCOs attain and maintain the USASOC standard.

d. Static Line Jumpmaster training needs increased emphasis and focus to ensure more NCOs achieve proponent prescribed career advancement standards.

e. Duty titles and duty descriptions should be clear, concise, and consistent across the force. In particular, duty titles need to be standardized across the force. There are too many different duty titles for similar positions throughout the force. This makes it difficult to determine the relative level of responsibility and complexity of each position.

f. NCOs should take the time to make sure their ERBs are accurate and up-to-date. A significant number of ERBs were missing large portions of data or showed information that was contrary to the rest of the personnel file. Grossly inaccurate ERBs may indicate a lack of interest or motivation.

g. NCOs should make sure that they have a current official photo on file. A significant number of files were missing photos or contained old photos with the NCO wearing the wrong/previous rank. A file without a current official photo may indicate a lack of interest or motivation.

6. CMF Proponent Packets. The proponent packet provided was accurate, appropriate, and valuable. There is just one addition that would improve the packet. Until duty titles are standardized across the force, provide a list of all possible duty titles for appropriate leadership and leadership development positions.

JAMES E. SAENZ
COL, SF
Panel Chief