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 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, 7 January 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 46 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. The panel members found that the majority of NCOs in this CMF possess the leadership skills necessary at their current grade and many are already demonstrating the skills required at the next higher level. Many records set themselves apart not only by their diverse assignments but by the well documented manner of great or outstanding performance in these leadership opportunities. Rater and Senior Rater comments were imperative to the selection process. Rater and Senior Rater comments need to be up front, clear, concise and quantitative. Raters must ensure Excellence bullets are justified. Raters do NCOs more damage than good by producing inflated unjustified Excellence bullets. For Senior Raters, not every Soldier can be among the best and not all NCOERs can be Senior Rated as a 1/1 on the potential and performance. Addressing this will greatly assist the promotion panel in selecting the best qualified NCOs for promotion.

b. Utilization and Assignment. For the most part NCOs were seeking assignments within their PMOS consistent with their career progression. The use of career enhancing opportunities also gave some NCOs the opportunity to set themselves apart from their peers by demonstrating outstanding performance and potential in demanding assignments. At the local level, leaders must ensure NCOs are being afforded the opportunity to serve in positions of greater responsibility; in particular on large installations with numerous CMF46 units. NCOs who were challenged and excelled at positions of greater responsibility were regarded as more well-rounded than their peers. Those who followed the published CMF career map were viewed as best-qualified and suited for promotion

c. Training and Education. The panel members agreed that the majority of NCOs review for selection had an adequate amount of civilian education and military training according to their MOS. CMF 46 had one of the higher civilian education rates therefore those NCOs who did not possess any civilian education were not seen as positively as those who did.

d. Physical Fitness. The panel found this area to be lacking across the CMFs considered. Senior leaders must make physical fitness excellence a priority. NCOs who excelled on the APFT regularly stood out across the spectrum of rated NCOs. CMF46 NCOs fared well but those who pushed themselves towards physical excellence stood out amongst their peers.

e. Overall Career Management. There were only a small portion of NCOs who had not followed career management guidance. Those who did not follow the career management guidance appeared to be less competitive for promotion than their peers. HRC is doing a good job placing NCOs in locations that provide professional development opportunities. Overall, the career management within this CMF is proficient.

4. The structure of the MOS encourages NCOs to become more competitive. It also provides each Soldier the same opportunities for career advancement, leadership positions, and promotion. Duty positions in current grade for the MOS appeared to be in line with the commensurate levels of responsibility.

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. Sampling of the records for this board revealed assignment opportunities and leadership positions helped to enhance promotion competitiveness.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. A few cases existed of NCOs serving in specific positions for too long, which could affect them in the long run since they may not be getting the overall leadership experience opportunities of their peers. When NCOs step up and seek the difficult specialty assignments such as Drill Sergeant, Recruiter, Small Group Leader and operationally tough assignments such as PAD NCOIC, they were more competitive and better prepared to take on the responsibilities of NCOs at skill level 40.

d. Overall health of CMF. The overall health of the CMF appears to be very strong. NCOs are excelling in demanding assignments and demonstrating remarkable leadership skills both in garrison and deployed environments.

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 keystone to development. This is an area NCOs and their leaders need to take ownership of to ensure individual development. NCOs cannot wait to be handed these opportunities; they must seek them out in bold form.

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 and development and serve to prepare NCOs for the demands of 1SG-level (or comparable) responsibilities. Leaders need to provide NCOs the opportunities to serve in these leadership positions and NCOs need to be assertive in their efforts to serve.

c. Several NCOERs contained "created" duty titles and position. Raters do not do justice to NCOs by inventing duty positions, especially those who title an NCO as Commander. NCOs are not commanders, even if they serve as the acting OIC/Commander. Duty positions on the NCOER should be reflective of legitimate TDA or TO&E positions. Rater bullets should highlight the NCOs' ability to serve in an officer's absence which is common in the CMF, but the duty title should not. Created or invented titles only serve to confuse board members as they strive to rate NCOs against their peers. It is also imperative to clearly describe the duty scope and responsibilities in the Daily Duties and Scope section of the NCOER. The board members use this area to determine the level of responsibility of the NCO serving in the position.

d. Some NCOs were missing photos or displayed dated photos on their records. No photo in an NCOs file reflects unfavorably and speaks volumes to the board members. Also, although the standard is a photo is valid for five years before an update is required, it was viewed negatively by board members when the NCO did not attempt to update their DA photo; especially with significant additions to award accommodations or a change of rank. This gave board members the impression that the reviewed NCO did not care.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The overall quality of the CMF46 Proponent Packet was outstanding. Information was clear and in line with CMF and Army guidance. The panel especially appreciated the additional memorandum which specified exactly what duty positions were of greatest weight to the CMF.

b. Recommended improvements. Recommend a review to determine if CMF 46 is in the appropriate panel board for promotion review. It is currently aligned with CMFs 31, 12 and 74, which have career paths very similar to each other. CMF 46 is somewhat unique in that it's career path differs from these because it is not necessarily designed with the squad and platoon sergeant models for advancement. There may be other CMF structures more in line with the CMF 46 force structure for review of commensurate duty positions and career paths.

c. Areas of concern, some NCOs in the zone for consideration had recently changed their PMOS to CMF 46. Of those NCOs who were new to the CMF, some had no rated time in their current PMOS. Recommend proponent provide guidance on whether there should be an acceptable time-in-MOS requirement for these NCOs. The time-in MOS requirement would ensure NCOs are afforded enough time in the field before consideration for promotion to Sergeant First Class and the responsibilities inherent at skill level 40.

JOHN D. DROLET
Colonel, EN
Panel Chief