**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 Commandant, US Army Adjutant General's School, 10000 Hampton Parkway, Fort Jackson, SC 29207-7045

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 36B Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 9 September 2010, 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 36 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. Enlisted Finance Operations (FO) and Resource Management (RM) functions were merged into one multi-function Financial Management (FM) specialty less than two years ago. Although this is only the second selection board since the merger, the records reviewed indicated strong performance and potential within both the FO and Comptrollership/RM fields. The board reviewed numerous documents in a short period of time, but the three documents that helped produce the most accurate snapshot were the Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation 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.

b. Utilization and assignments. A small percentage of the records reflected NCOs were serving in leadership positions in Comptrollership/RM operations. Efforts should be made to ensure NCOs have an opportunity to gain operational and leadership experience within these specialties. The board considered highly competitive NCOs as

those with a combination of MTOE (FM Company, FM Center, Division and Group G8), non-traditional (Drill Sergeant, Special Missions Unit, Recruiter), and TDA (FM School & NCOES Instructors, FM Doctrine and Proponency) assignments which both challenge the NCOs and provide exposure to the total operational structure of the Army. It appears that many of the FM core competencies are not performed in a home station or peacetime environment, so the most desired developmental plan suggested assignments which provide the NCO with an opportunity to hone these skills in a forward deployed environment. NCOs who remained at the same location performing the same job for periods in excess of 36 months were perceived to be less competitive.

c. Training and education. NCOs for the most part are afforded the opportunity to attend required NCOES and a variety of "War Fighting Skills" enhancing courses and schools; however, only a small percentage of the population had the CMF recommended functional courses. The FM School currently offers online courses that NCOs should take advantage of for professional development using the "Self Development Pillar" of leadership development. Since it's often difficult to attend the resident version of these courses, NCOs should be encouraged to complete all functional courses offered online. Civilian education continues to be an indicator of self development progression and was looked upon favorably by the board. NCOs at this level should be encouraged to pursue at a minimum, an Associate's Degree and continue to pursue Bachelors and Masters Degree. Those with less than 60 credit hours were considered less competitive.

d. Physical Fitness. Evaluation reports indicate the CMF is both physically fit and a fair number of the NCOs continually excel in physical fitness; however, often an "Excellence" rating was given without explanation. Raters should clearly state the justification. Examples include "earned the APFT Badge" or "scored 270 or above on the APFT".

e. Overall career management. Managers should aggressively afford NCOs the opportunity to work within both FO and Comptrollership/RM specialties to develop multi-functional NCOs who can operate in all facets of the career field. Managers should encourage diversity in assignments and should work to eliminate the stagnation created when an NCO remains at one location, in the same duty position for an extended period of time.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. Assignment and promotion opportunity. Many Soldiers in this CMF had deployment time in excess of 12 mos. Opportunities to deploy remain critical to mastering many of the core competencies in this CMF.

b. Overall health of CMF. The CMF, while in transition, appears to be healthy. FM NCOs should be encouraged to continue to take advantage of the professional development opportunities they can gain through operational assignments, institutional training, and self-development.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. In general, bullet comments provided sufficient information to both qualify and quantify the rating given. Both Raters and Senior Raters should strive to clearly communicate the NCOs current performance and whether or not he/she is ready TODAY to perform at the next higher grade. Most NCOs demonstrated the importance they place on their career progression to the board by taking time to review/validate their records and address items which might cause confusion for the board members.

b. CMF structure and career progression. The majority of the records reviewed listed NCOs serving in Skill Level 30 or higher positions. Managers should strive to ensure maximum use of Skill Level 30 positions when available.

c. Photographs. The absence of a photograph was not looked upon favorably by the board. Newly promoted Staff Sergeants are directed on their promotion order to take a photograph. The absence of a photograph communicates an unwillingness to adhere to orders and suggested a lack of discipline. The board does understand that an NCO might be unable to take a new photograph each year due to deployment, however, a photograph taken within the last five years can be included in the record.

d. Duty Description and Position should be specific to the function performed. Often times "Legacy Duty Titles" (Chief of Military Pay, Military Pay Review NCO, Processing NCO, Certifier, Document Control NCO, etc.) were listed as the Principal Duty Title on evaluations prepared since the merger. Board members have a clearer understanding of the scope and level of responsibility when there is a correlation between the Principal Duty Title and Duty MOSC. For example, Senior Financial Management Manager equals 36B4O which indicates the NCO is serving in a Sergeant First Class Position. Mismatches between Principal Duty Title and Duty MOSC such as Senior Financial Management Advisor paired with 36B3O were also common and created questions for selection board members. Raters should be reminded to review duty titles and descriptions and ensure they are accurate.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The CMF 36 "Career Pattern" Slide was very helpful in establishing the correlation mentioned above. The unique MOS characteristics breakout of SQIs and ASI to the current population of Staff Sergeants was very useful to identifying the NCOs who have challenged themselves with non-traditional

assignments. The "Education Slide" and "Career Map" Slide were useful to identify recommended CMF courses and civilian education goals for FM NCOs.

b. Recommended improvements. The "Demanding Assignments" slide was useful; however, categorization of these as well as other typical assignments as "High, Medium, and Low Risk" would be extremely beneficial and standardize the 36B hierarchy ranking for board members.

TRACEY E. NICHOLSON
Colonel, AG
Panel Chief