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 Commandant, US Army Chaplain Center and School, 3392 Magruder Avenue, Fort Jackson, SC 29207-5140

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 56M 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 reviewing records for CMF 56M submits this Review and Analysis to assist in executing the duties as proponent for this CMF.

3. Competence Assessment of Promotion Zone (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Performance and potential. Chaplain assistants working in demanding assignments outlined in the CMF NCO Professional Development Map and/or performed successfully in higher level positions, demonstrated a clear ability to serve at the next higher grade level and were viewed favorably.

b. Utilization and assignments. The NCOs in this CMF served in both operational and institutional positions. NCOs serving in a wide range of demanding positions, both in MTOE and TDA environments in the current grade and at Sergeant First Class Level with multiple deployments were highly competitive. In addition, Soldiers who performed successfully in non-traditional assignments were viewed favorably by the board. NCOs should be encouraged to continue seeking challenging and rewarding non-traditional assignments. For those who successfully performed in the high risk position of Recruiter, the board took the difficulty of the mission into consideration.

(1) Duty description on NCOERs did not give an accurate or clear description of the NCO's daily duties and scope.

(2) Duty title on NCOERs should reflect the level of the duty position. The board had a difficult time determining the NCO's level of responsibility. For example, If the NCO is assigned to the brigade chaplain assistant slot, the principle duty title should

read Brigade Chaplain Assistant NCO. This provides the board panel with accurate information of the duty position and correct grade.

c. Training and education. 56Ms continue to pursue both military and civilian education. The majority of chaplain assistants had 30-60 semester hours. A few chaplain assistants completed degrees with a very small number having less than 15-20 semester hours. NCOs performing well in military schools by exceeding the course standards and/or achieved Distinguished Leadership Awards or Honor Graduate status were viewed favorably by the board. Failure to achieve course standards or "marginally passing" course standards was also noted and had an impact on overall record assessment.

d. Physical Fitness and Military Appearance. The CMF is physically fit and the majority of NCOs are within the Army standards of AR 600-9. Earning the physical fitness badge was considered positive among the board panel. NCOs without a photo were viewed negatively and a missing photo indicated to the board that NCOs lacked the discipline, professionalism and/or the attention to detail to ensure a complete record was presented to the board.

e. Overall career management. The CMF is effectively managed. A significant amount of NCOs served between MTOE and TDA assignments and had a diverse assignment history in demanding positions. Successful performance in diverse assignments was also an indication of experience and proven performance in a variety of challenging environments.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment. The CMF structure is strong and career progression is healthy. There are many opportunities to serve in a variety of assignment and positions. NCOs should be encouraged to continue to take advantage of the opportunities that are available, so that they can become effective leaders.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF is very good. 56Ms appeared to be versatile Soldiers, capable of performing in the MOS and in non-traditional duties such as Drill Sergeant, Platoon Sergeant, Recruiter and Equal opportunity Advisors. NCOs that seek these assignments and performed successfully should remain competitive for promotion.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure is good. The CMF appears to be growing and evolving. It is necessary to keep current force structure and standard of grade requirements, particularly as responsibilities, changes and duties are added.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunities are trending with the rest of the Army. However, it is imperative that NCOs be made aware of the challenging positions for

upward progression to allow 56M NCOs to compete in the new redesign of the Command Sergeant's Major Program.

d. Overall health of CMF. The overall health of the chaplain assistants' career field is good. CMF is producing quality, competetive NCOs.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. The NCOER is one of the most effective tools used to measure competence. The NCOER should not be inflated, but used to communicate to the NCO and the board. It should be consistent and create a snapshot of the rated NCOs performance and their potential for promotion. The rater, senior rater and reviewer are all responsible for reviewing the NCOER and ensuring it is accurate.

(1) Rater assessment of performance on evaluations appears to be inflated and excellence ratings were not always justified. On a few NCOERs, the rated NCO had identical reports with only the date changing. Ratings should be used as feedback for performance and not simply reproduced with the same verbiage from year to year. This sends a poor signal to the board and an improper message to the rated NCO.

(2) Senior rater assessment of overall performance and potential also appeared inflated. The majority of the NCOERS were marked 1 and 1 in sections Vc and Vd for senior rater performance and potential. The bullet comments stated "promote ahead of peers or promote now." A rating of 1/1 and promote ahead of peers should be given to the absolute best performing NCOs and those with the most potential for increased responsibility. These comments were very important to the board and when consistent, provided them with clear rater and senior rater intent.

(3) NCOERs which had "no" checked in values or a "needs of improvement", were not clearly explained by the rating chain. This made it difficult for the board to assess the severity of the issue and the NCOs potential or ability to recover.

(4) NCOs awarded the Sergeant Audie Murphy, Sergeant Morales, Soldier of Year and other distinctions, should be clearly indicated in the NCOER and/or NCOs should be encouraged to send a letter to the President of the Board. Such awards are not reflected on the ERB, which may cause the achievement to be overlooked. The board viewed these distinctions positively.

b. CMF structure and career progression. The career managers should stay proactive by ensuring NCOs are challenged with diverse assignment opportunities which will allow them to stay competitive for promotion.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. Overall, the proponent information packet was thorough and provided the necessary information to prepare the board members to review and vote the 56M CMF records.

b. Recommended improvements. Recommend the proponent review the proponent packet for positions considered to be the highest risk and most demanding. As the Army reduces the force, and Soldiers redeploy, 56Ms who serve on CONUS installations will have the difficult mission of assisting with the healing mission and reintegrating combat veterans.

TRACEY E. NICHOLSON
COL, AG
Panel Chief