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

22 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, US Army Acquisition Support Center, 9900 Belvoir Road, Building 201, Suite 101, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5567

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 51 Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 7 January 2011, 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 51 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: These areas of the Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER) were the focus of this board and weighed the greatest as this board evaluated each record. Strong excellent bullets in the areas of competence, leadership and accountability/responsibility (especially for 51Cs) carried a great deal of weight. The issue of unjustified bullets for excellence ratings continued and seems to be a systemic problem. Duty positions as NCOIC of Contingency Contracting Team (CCT), Battalion or Brigade level NCOIC were given higher consideration.

(1) Rater/Senior Rater comments and ratings continue to send mixed messages to the board and do not send a clear picture of the NCO. The performance ratings from the senior rater with strong and justifiable comments were favored very highly. Rater and Senior Raters need to be more in sync when completing NCOERs in order to portray a clear representation of the NCO.

(2) NCOs that are eligible to receive a complete the record evaluation should submit the evaluation in lieu of submitting a letter to the president of the board explaining their reclassification. The board found a large percentage of the 51C personnel without an NCOER in the field. Recommend that at least one annual evaluation in the field be on file for promotion consideration to the next rank.

(3) The official DA photograph was also evaluated highly for consideration to promotion. A missing, not current or poor DA photo sent a clear message to the board members that the NCO did not take the time to prepare his or her records to compete for promotion. DA photos with Sergeant Rank, missing buttons and uniforms that were too small or too big were just some of the infractions noted. Recommend that leaders in the field take a more active role in the preparation and submission of DA photos by their NCOs.

b. Utilization and assignments: A majority of the SSGs in 51CMF have been serving for only a year or less. Based on our current structure, leadership positions at the SSG level are limited. However, the SSGs seemed to be well rounded based on their evaluations in their MOSs prior to reclassifying. The board did recognize the high OPTEMPO of the CMF and took that into consideration.

c. Training and education: The emphasis on education needed to obtain certifications within the 51s is high. The completion of 60 credit hours or higher was found favorable by this board. A few Bachelor degrees and some Masters degrees were found as well. The completion of degrees showed that the NCO had made an additional effort to place him or herself above their peers. The board also looked favorably on those NCOs who have taken the opportunity to improve their technical competence by enrolling and completing additional military training such as Battle Staff Course, Support Operations Course and Level 1 or 2 Contracting Certification.

d. Physical Fitness: Overall the field looked physically fit; however, the board did observe differences in height changes on the NCOER over time. Although, the record may read one thing, the photo may depict another, leaving the board members questioning the records. It is the responsibility of the rater to ensure the NCOER comments are in accordance with AR 600-9.

e. Overall career management: Based on our current structure and the continued growth of the CMF, the field is well managed overall.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF: Duty titles/descriptions need to be standardized in accordance with current MTOEs to assist the board in determining the significance and level of responsibility of the job. Some of the duty titles, such as "Resource and Contracts Manager" confused board members, and made it difficult to accurately assess the record.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure: A majority of the positions seen were aligned with current MTOE; any positions outside of this were understood, based on the growth of the CMF.