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

AHRC-PDV-S 18 November 2010

MEMORANDUM THRU Commandant, US Army Chaplain Center and School, Fort Jackson, SC 29207

Headquarters, United States Army Training and Doctrine Command, Attention: ATTG-P, 3 Fenwick Road, Building 11, Fort Monroe, VA 23651-1049

FOR Chief of Chaplains, 2700 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-2700

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 56 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 56 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS 56M within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone. The overall strength of the CMF is strong with the majority of Soldiers considered were highly qualified for promotion.

a. Performance and potential. The chaplain assistants screened for promotion have limited opportunities to provide direct leadership; however, there are many significant opportunities to oversee and provide technical guidance and supervision of subordinate UMTs within their organizations. Those chaplain assistants that have an immediate impact on subordinate UMTs like Operations NCOs, O/Cs, DRU NCOICs, Separate Brigade NCOICs, etc have the clearest and most demonstrable ability to provide leadership for panel members to discern.

b. Utilization and assignments. Those chaplain assistants that successfully demonstrated the ability to move between operational and institutional positions are the best qualified for promotion. This variety of assignments proved a significant indicator of potential to serve at the next level. However, many chaplain assistants would stay at the same location, most often in the same organization, for extended periods of time achieving a comfort level of performance – not something that reflects potential for promotion. Chaplain assistants working outside the CMF have a difficult time translating that time to actual potential for leadership within the CMF.

(1) Duty descriptions on NCOERs are not reflective of actual scope of duties or span of control. They frequently would reflect the command's mission but failed to reflect the UMT mission.

(2) Duty titles on NCOERs were creative in many cases, but not reflective of the actual duty position held. Duty titles rarely matched the ERB and the "stock" CMF duty titles give no indication of what the job actually entails.

(3) CMF 56 is an extremely small branch that DA directed positions have a significant impact on. With the high quality of CMF 56 Soldiers, there was no discernable difference in duty performance or requirements between the normally managed chaplain assistant duty positions and the thirteen DA directed positions.

c. Training and education. CMF is an extremely well educated and trained branch. The overwhelming majority of chaplain assistants have at least 60 semester hours of college with many holding advanced degrees. Chaplain assistants take advantage of the many training opportunities available to them; however, the utility to the CMF is sometimes suspect and not keeping within the guidance of DACH (Master Resiliency Training).

d. Physical Fitness. With few exceptions, the CMF is physically fit. Those not meeting the standards are noticeable in the small, eligible population for promotion and were an immediate negative discriminator. The panel observed significant discrepancies between the height/weight/APFT recording of unit and NCOES schools that reflected negatively on the NCO.

e. Overall career management. The CMF is adequately managed but a more proactive stance to provide a greater variety of assignments to all eligible chaplain assistants would enhance the strength and capability of the CMF. Staying at one location without a distinct, fundamental change in assignment from institutional to operational is a negative discriminator for the panel.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment. The CMF structure is sound and career progression is sustainable. There are many opportunities to serve in a variety of assignments with ample opportunity for new and varied positions of responsibility. However, many chaplain assistants are not getting or taking the opportunity to stretch their abilities within the branch.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF is very strong. Other than the DA directed jobs (Platoon Sergeant, Recruiter, EOA, etc) the MOS is working to support the branch in a variety of jobs and positions that directly tie into, support, and strengthen the mission of the chaplaincy.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure is very good. The CMF is small but continuing to grow with added duties and responsibilities constantly evolving. A continual and sustained interaction with force structure is a necessity to keep

abreast of the future changing religious support environment to ensure the CMF keeps abreast of standards of grade requirements and force structure.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity remains to be seen. How large of an impact the redesign of the Sergeant's Major program has on a very small CMF remains to be seen. However, chaplain assistants are well positioned to continue to provide quality religious support to the Army.

d. Overall health of CMF is very strong. The CMF has incredibly talented and dedicated Soldiers in all areas and will continue to represent the branch with honor into the future. Chaplain assistants have redefined their role in the religious support arena and it's evident in the exceptional performance reflected by the chaplain assistants eligible for promotion selection.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. The best indicator of competence is the NCOER. Responsibility starts with the rated Soldier and continues up through the senior CSM/SGM in the command. Senior CMF NCO oversight is critical to ensuring the NCOER reflects an accurate picture of the rated Soldier. A well trained, informed Rater and Senior Rater is critical to NCOER development. This was not evident in a review of promotion eligible chaplain assistants.

(1) "Among the best" is the norm with "fully capable" acting as a minus to selection. Raters must ensure they aren't sending mixed signals/sending a message to the board (we aren't mind readers !!!).

(2) Senior Rater's blocking and comments are important and are a major factor in promotion selection. A "2" block may kill any chance for promotion. The norm is a "1" block. The Senior Rater comments should reflect the blocking. Now is not the time to send a mixed message or unclear signal to the board.

b. CMF structure and career progression. As noted above, it is vital to have a proactive branch management stance to ensure and enhance our extremely talented, capable, and dedicated CMF which is well rounded with all due consideration given to developing all chaplain assistants into potential leaders.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality of the proponent packet was functional but incomplete. This may be a systemic issue with format/guidance from DA Secretariat but the information was incomplete and not very user friendly outside the CMF. Other panel members may not have a working knowledge of the CMF and the packet should be as descriptive and user friendly as possible.

b. Recommended improvements.

(1) Clarify and group what a CMF specific "hard" job is, with every job special, no job is special. Specifically, there were several questions regarding the degree of difficulty of CMF professional job precedence. The guidance provided by the proponent should include more detailed information on the proponent career path and expanded to include as many positions as possible to ensure the entire scope of TDA and MTOE positions are covered. Also, we are looking to promote the best leaders for the CMF and working outside the CMF for a prolonged period of time is a negative discriminator. One thing to keep in mind is that DA listed thirteen jobs that they considered important. It is redundant to put them on a CMF specific list as the board panel will assign a qualitative ranking of those positions.

(2) The proponent giving CMF specific examples of what an excellence bullet looks like on an NCOER gives a clearer picture of what to look for. No generic examples! The panel is comprised of many different CMFs and what is clear for one CMF is not clear for another.

(3) A breakdown of SQI/ASI into percentages of Soldiers holding the identifiers and what percentage of positions require the identifiers to focus on what are the most important skills to have. Not all SQI/ASI have the same weight to the CMF and panels may limit them to help discriminate among the best and most capable candidates.

Richard L. Shepard

RICHARD L. SHEPARD
Colonel, AG
Panel Chief