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) 38 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 38 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. 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 provide NCOs with sufficient time in leadership positions. There were numerous cases where NCOs left leadership positions with less than one year in that position. Furthermore, evaluation reports did not specifically indicate why an NCO was removed early from a leadership position. These evaluations also lacked the substance necessary to indicate whether the NCO was removed to take advantage of their leadership in another assignment or for other, less favorable, reasons.

c. Training and education. The population was very strong in this area. NCOs clearly took advantage of the various opportunities for professional development.

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. The Civil Affairs (CA) Team seems to be the center of gravity for this CMF. If this is true, then the best qualified NCOs should be assigned to these teams for extended periods of time. This population showed quite the opposite. The vast majority of NCOs spent minimal time on CA Teams, with very few serving any appreciable amount of time as Team Sergeants. This meant a very small portion of the population had any significant experience on a team and even fewer met the proponent standard of 18 months service as a CA Team Sergeant.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment. Standards for grade and structure seemed suitable and appropriate. Assignment and promotion opportunities seemed sufficient. However, the overall health of the CMF may be in jeopardy if NCOs are not afforded the opportunity to serve a sufficient amount of time as a CA Team Sergeant. Without this leadership experience, NCOs are not adequately prepared for follow-on assignments of greater responsibility. This adversely affects 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.

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; 18 months as a CA Team Sergeant. This proponent guidance provides for the 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. Duty titles and duty descriptions should be clear, concise, and consistent across the force. Continue to standardize duty titles and descriptions so that relative levels of responsibility are not ambiguous.

d. 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.

e. 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.

JAMES E. SAENZ
COL, SF
Panel Chief