DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
1600 SPEARHEAD DIVISION AVENUE
FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY 40121

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

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 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, 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 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. It was evident that the majority of NCOs in the CMF possess the leadership skill at their current grade and the next higher level. Many records set themselves apart not only by their diverse assignments but by the documented manner of performance in these leadership opportunities. One area to address involves Senior Rater comments in that the comments need to be up front and clear. Not every Soldier can be among the best, and not all NCOERs can be Senior Rated as a 1/1 on potential and performance. Addressing this will greatly assist the promotion panel in selecting the best NCOs for promotion.

b. Utilization of Assignment. For the most part NCOs were seeking assignments consistent with their career progression within their PMOS. The use of career enhancing opportunities also gave some NCOs the opportunity to set themselves apart from their peers in exhibiting demonstrated performance and potential in demanding assignments. One area to keep an eye on centers on is that of deployment opportunities. In this, several of the NCOs competing for promotion have at least two deployments or more of experience whereas some have yet to deploy. Those who followed the published CMF career map were viewed as best-qualified suited for promotion.

c. Training and Education. The panel members agreed that the majority of NCOs had an adequate amount of civilian education and military training according to their MOS. CMF 46, in particular, had one of the higher civilian education rates although a bit lower in military training. Those who aggressively sought military education tended to further separate themselves from their peers.

d. Physical Fitness. The panel observed too many inflated bullets on the APFT portion of the NCOERs. Many of the bullets referencing the APFT did not support the Excellence rating received, nor did the Soldier exceed the standard or meet the standard for the APFT Badge. Raters need to ensure the NCOERs reflect the correct information pertaining to APFT, height, weight and rate the NCO accordingly. The overall physical fitness of the CMF was good. A few Soldiers appeared to be overweight, but the NCOERs stated they were in compliance.

e. Overall Career Management. There were only a small portion of NCOs who have not followed career management guidance. Those who did not appeared to be less competitive for promotion than their fellow NCOs. It appeared that HRC is doing a good job placing NCOs in locations of opportunity. Overall, the career management within this CMF is strong.

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 for promotion. Duty positions in grade band for the MOS appeared to be in line with 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 that assignments opportunities and leadership positions helped to enhance promotion competitiveness and is available across the CMF.

c. 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.

d. 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 and Recruiter, upon completion of those specialty assignments, an observation would be for the hard-charging NCOs to be placed back into leadership positions in their specific career field to remain competitive and maintain MOS proficiency.

5. Recommendations. (Proposals keyed to subparagraphs above).

a. Competence. NCOs should continue to follow the MCF career map to capitalize on operational experience as the keystone to development. This is an area NCOs and leaders need to take ownership of to ensure individual development.

b. CMF structure and career progression. NCOs need to seek out the tough assignments that will place them n developmental positions. Key leadership positions, such as Platoon Sergeant (or MOS equivalent), are essential for professional growth to prepare for the demands of 1SG-level (or comparable) responsibilities. Leaders need to provide NCOs the opportunity to serve in these leadership positions and NCOs need to be assertive in their efforts to serve.

c. NCOs who served in multiple short duration duty positions did not appear to have adequate time to display performance and show potential. It is recommended that NCOs should serve a minimum of 12 months in assigned positions to allow them time to demonstrate abilities and potential.

d. The board saw several "NO" ratings in values, which equated to NCOs no longer being competitive for promotion.

e. Several NCOERs contained "created" duty titles and DMOS. If the NCO is serving in a created position, it is imperative to clearly describe the duties and scope of responsibilities in the "Daily Duties and Scope section" of the NCOER to determine the level of responsibility of the NCO serving in the position.

f. Some NCOs were missing photos or displayed SSG photos on their records. Although the standard is that 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. Additionally, a portion of the records were not reviewed and signed off on by the NCOs. This left a lasting impression on the board members as well.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The overall quality of the CSM46 Proponent Packet was very good. Information was clear and in line with CMF and Army guidance. Recommend the proponent packet identify what the proponent considers to be leadership positions commensurate in responsibility to "green tab" positions, such as those that are essentially Platoon Sergeant equivalent.

b. Recommended improvements. Recommend review to determine if CMF 46 is in the appropriate panel board for promotion review. It is currently aligned with CMF 31, 21 and 74, which have career paths very similar to each other. CMF 46 is somewhat

unique in that its career path differs from these because it is not necessarily designed in 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 position and career paths.

PAMELA L. MARTIS
Colonel, MP
Panel Chief