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, USAMEDCOM, Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 68 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 68 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 files of those in the promotion zone clearly set them apart from their peers. The performance and potential of this elite group was clearly articulated. The strongest performers also received the best leadership opportunities.

b. Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS): Many, if not most, of the selectees were in positions of responsibility above their skill level. Those performing in their skill level had clearly articulated performance and potential that stood out. Too many files had duty title, duty MOS, daily duties and scope of responsibility that were inconsistent.

c. Training and education: College degree was a discriminator. Too many NCOs had several college hours but no degree. These NCOs should focus on completing their associate degree. Several NCOs had no additional training outside of NCOES. Many files were missing NCOERs because the NCOs were in IPAP, OCS, or nursing school. The nursing schools supplied 1059s to justify the absence of NCOERs. IPAP and OCS candidates need this too.

d. Physical Fitness: This is the cornerstone of combat readiness. Selectees consistently performed well in this arena. NCOERs need to reflect that the NCO earned the Army Physical Fitness Badge when they did. Excellence blocks in Physical Fitness need appropriate justification; ie 270 or above .

e. Overall career management: The vast majority of the population experienced a proper balance between MTOE and TDA experience. Additionally, niche assignments such as recruiter, drill sergeant, observer-controller, and instructor writer were well represented across the force.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment: All MOSs experience appropriate opportunity for positions of increased responsibility and leadership. Standards for grade and structure remain thoroughly suitable and appropriate. The overall health of the CMF remains strong.

5. Recommendations:

a. Raters and senior raters must be consistent with ratings by matching comments with the blocks checked. Senior raters should provide quantifiable bullet comments that support the ratings provided.

b. Duty descriptions should be clear, concise, and consistent across the force. Descriptions should also specifically state the level of responsibility or echelon.

c. 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.

d. 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 was adequate for the panel and did not contradict guidance from the Secretariat's MOI.

ERIN P. EDGAR
Colonel, MC
Panel Chief