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, USAMEDCOM, Fort Sam Houston, TX 78234

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 68 Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 7 January 2011, subject: Memorandum for Instruction for the FY11 Sergeant First Class Promotion 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 caliber of records for those Soldiers in the promotion zone represented a qualified force of noncommissioned officers ready for increased responsibilities. It was clearly evident that the strongest performers were functioning in a skill level above their current grade and represent the elite of the force.

b. Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS): Many of the selectees were performing in positions of greater responsibility in the TOE and MTOE operational environment. There were a significant number of selectees whose duty title and responsibilities were inconsistent with their enlisted record brief and NCOER.

c. Training and education: Many records demonstrated a lack of military education progression and college is being actively pursued despite OPTEMPO. Soldiers are seeking college opportunities, however very few actually had a degree. Many files were missing 1059's for all phases of NCOES and some files had an unexplained gap between NCOER's while others were missing numerous NCOERs.

d. Physical Fitness: This analysis indicates that despite the OPTEMPO of the current operational environment, high levels of physical fitness continues to be the predominate theme. It was also noted that selectees made significant contributions towards the increase of the overall team, squad and section physical fitness standards.

e. Overall career management: There was a balanced distribution between MTOE and TDA for the high density CMF; however the low density CMF's were predominately TDA positions. A major negative across the board was Staff Sergeants rating Staff Sergeants and raters inexperience in writing NCOER's. Also, a significant number of records lacked a DA photo. And lastly, a distinct segment of the force held demanding positions such as Instructor, Recruiter, Military Transition Team Advisor, Drill Sergeant, Warrior Transition Platoon Sergeant and Master Resiliency Trainer.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment: The overall health of the CMF is relatively strong with ample opportunity for positions of increased responsibility and leadership.

5. Recommendations:

a. The selectee should ensure their NCOER duty title matches the ERB duty title. In addition, responsibilities and duties need to be captured under special emphasis and other areas of the NCOER.

b. The requirement should change to mandate if a Soldier is missing an evaluation, he/she must write a letter to the President of the Board explaining the missing evaluation. In addition, it is incumbent upon a Soldier to ensure their record is validated as much as possible prior to consideration. Concurrently recommend that a record lacking a DA Photo is not eligible for promotion consideration unless it is waivered.

c. Recommend that in all cases, where it can be avoided, NCOs should not rate NCOs of the same grade unless one is in a promotable status. It was evident that same grade raters did not have the experience or the maturity to rate their peers using the total Army Soldier concept, and therefore the rating appeared to be inconsistent with other evaluations the Soldier received. A Rater of the same grade of the rated individual is in essence competing with the rated NCO and does not provide a complete and impartial assessment to the rated individual.

6. CMF Proponent Packets: The proponent packet was sufficient and should be updated to reflect current demanding assignments.

EARLE SMITH II
COL, MS
Panel Chief