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, Office of the Chief, Public Affairs, 1500 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 46 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 46 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS 46Z within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone.

a. Performance and Potential. The panel members found that the majority of the NCOs in CMF 46 possess the technical competency to accomplish the mission, but the NCOs who sought out multiple leadership opportunities stood out. Attention was given to quantifiable leadership time that made an impact in the mission. Clearly not every Soldier is among the best, but the rater needs to accurately reflect where the Soldier should be placed between Among the Best and Fully Capable. The panel paid attention to the amount of responsibility, overall performance and impact recorded on the NCOER. A 1/1 with the traditional three comments of "promote now/immediately," "select for USASMA now/immediately" and "ready for positions of greater responsibility" in the senior rater block does not set that NCO apart. The panel looked to select the best qualified from others with the same traditional bullets. Strong comments such as "top 5% of the Master Sergeants in the Task Force," or "best 1SG I have worked with in my 20 year career" set that NCO apart.

b. Utilization and assignments. The CMF's Career Map outlined the progression of assignments needed for success. NCOs who followed that path were competitive while those who stayed in TDA positions for multiple assignments were not looked at as favorably as those who had a successful and varied career. Successful MTOE

leadership opportunities stood out when they were quantified by the senior rater on the NCOER and not just on the ERB.

c. Training and education. The panel found that many members of CMF 46 had civilian education that followed the proponent's Career Map. NCO's with advanced degrees stood out from their peers with little or no civilian education. Military education beyond the scope of NCOES was not as prevalent in CMF 46 as in other CMF's on this panel. While ERB's reflected many technical CMF 46 schools up to the rank of Staff Sergeant, NCOs with Combatives, Battle Staff, the First Sergeant Course, and other schools within their current grade were viewed as furthering themselves. For this panel it was noticed that NCOs who came up through the ranks as a 46Q had more MOS related schooling than the 46R NCOs.

d. Physical Fitness. The panel found this area to be average across the CMF's considered but senior leaders must make physical fitness excellence a priority. CMF 46 NCOs who excelled on the APFT regularly stood out across the spectrum of rated NCOs. Fitness is not limited to the garrison environment and has always been an individual responsibility and raters need to capture how the NCO's fitness equates to deployments if applicable.

e. NCOs serving in key positions during deployments received evaluations with more clearly defined and measurable ratings. Many NCOs had multiple deployments, and while the deployment itself was not a factor in the panel's consideration it did lead to more clearly defined comments in the competence and leadership blocks along with quantifiable senior rater bullets.

e. NCOERs. Of the eight CMFs represented in this panel it was noted by the panel members that the CMF 46 NCOER's stuck out clearly in two ways:

(1.) They were hardest group of packets to clearly understand the scope of responsibility for the rated NCO (except for 1SG's and the DIV PA NCOIC). Garrison technical jargon or specific deployment/Task Force/or other "responsibility" did not clearly define the scope of responsibility the rated NCO had.

(2.) Excellence blocks were not adequately quantified and did not in many cases substantiate strong senior rater comments. Raters across the CMF need to ensure that the standard of excellence is defined differently than success.

f. Overall career management. There were very few NCO's who chose not to follow the career map. NCOs who served outside the career field in some capacity were not kept away too long.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. The standards of grade structure outlined in the proponent guide were compatible with the DA Secretariat guidance and should be maintained. Sampling of the records for this board revealed assignment opportunities and leadership positions helped to enhance promotion competitiveness.

b. Assignment and promotion opportunity. Leadership in grade is key to advancement. The career field as a whole seems to have multiple opportunities to get to the positions outlined in the career map. As an example, serving as an E6 Drill Sergeant could be a help for a Sergeant First Class promotion, but having the badge alone didn't demonstrate leadership at the E8 Senior NCO level. There are ample opportunities for NCOs in this CMF to serve in valid leadership positions and NCOs desiring to be competitive for continued promotion need to seek those slots.

c. Overall health of CMF. The health of the 46 career field appears to be strong. NCOs are excelling in leadership opportunities while deployed and in garrison environments. There are many NCOs with multiple deployments in this CMF who continue to seek civilian and military education.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. In the panel's view, the CMF 46 career map is the key tool to understanding the road to success for NCO's in that field.

b. CMF structure and career progression. NCOs need to seek out the "hard" or "Branch Qualifying" jobs within the CMF. Again, the proponent's Career Map outlines the positions and there are opportunities for multiple leadership positions at a current grade within the Career Map. Serving within a TDA/staff position for multiple or back to back grades may be an option for the Soldier, but will not set that NCO up for success at the senior grades. NCOs need to be aggressive in seeking out the BDE PAO NCOIC and 1SG positions to be considered competitive.

c. Many NCOER's had "created" duty titles and positions. Supervisors do not help NCOs by inventing duty positions. A PAO NCOIC can mean many things and needs to fully outline what the job required the NCO to do. The NCO needs to ensure they have the correct title and position listed.

d. Military Education. Attendance and performance at military schools needs to be stressed as to not only attend, but to attempt to exceed the course standards. This is one of the only ways an NCO can clearly set themselves apart from their peers. Those who continually exceeded the standard made an impression on the panel.

e. Photos and ERBs. An NCO who updates his photo and ERB before the board shows that the NCO is taking an interest in their career. The importance of a good photo cannot be stressed enough. Both current authorized uniforms were looked at equally. As an example, while a photo may be current within five years it is a disadvantage to have a SFC photo if you have been a MSG since 2007. Documentation needs to

accompany the award in the file and if it cannot be accounted for when the ERB is validated. Multiple instances of "Incoming Personnel" listed on the ERB are not to the NCO's advantage. Additionally, the ERB and NCOER duty descriptions should match.

f. Letters to the President of the Board. These letters were beneficial when they addressed notable items missing from the ERB or OMPF. Examples the panel saw from all CMF's include civilian education when the work had been completed but the degree conferral date was the beyond the board cut-off date, inductions into the Audie Murphy and Sergeant Morales clubs, and instances when photos could not be updated due to deployments when ERB items were top loaded or changed (GCM, unit awards and service/combat stripes).

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The packet provided to the panel was a great example of what right looks like. The information was presented clearly and showed that NCOs needed to have accomplished in order to be considered competitive for selection. Duty descriptions within the CMF are quite similar and sometimes became quite creative. Knowing the career "BQ" positions that were weighted in the eyes of the proponent was an advantage to the panel. The packet addressed the use of a balanced methodology in selecting Public Affairs Sergeants Majors while stressing that leadership was a major factor needed in the future of the CMF. It was obvious that in many cases the "created" positions and structure were not at the direction of the proponent.

b. Recommended improvements. The CMF needs to address the raters and senior raters to more adequately capture and articulate the achievements of the NCOs within the field.

PATRICK J. DONAHOE
Colonel, AR
Panel Chief