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, United States Army Transportation Center and School, Fort Lee, VA 23801-2102

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 88 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 88 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOSs within this CMF.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone.

a. Performance and potential Indicators.

(1) Strengths: NCOs in leadership positions did well during the review and voting process. Sergeants First Class are seeking the tough jobs such as First / Detachment / Platoon Sergeant, Truckmaster, Senior / Drill Sergeant, Recruiter, Senior / Instructor, Military Transition Team, Observer / Controller, White House Transportation Agency, First Mate, Harbor Master, etc. A good number of NCOs took the time to have a current photo (reflecting current grade, awards, etc), updated / correct and reviewed Enlisted Record Briefs (ERB). This was viewed favorably by the Board Members (BM).

(2) Weaknesses.

(a) NCOERs.

(1) Lack of Quality Control was evident throughout CMF 88. Command / Sergeants Major must review all NCOERs IAW policy. Rated NCOs are an essential part of the process and must review the report for accuracy, to include administrative data. As for ratings, many excellence ratings were not justified, and on several occasions an excellence rating would have been justified, but the rater gave only a success rating. In several instances, when the Rater and SR sent conflicting messages, the Reviewer (REV) failed to non-concur and provide enclosures to clarify

the situation. In cases where the REV non-concurred, it played a significant part in the BMs ratings. SRs must address performance and potential. In many instances SRs were not clear as to promotion of 'now / immediately'; 'ahead of peers'; 'with peers'. Also, SRs sent inconsistent messages by giving a '1 / 1' rating, but giving a bullet of 'promote with peers', or vice versa.

(2) Disciplinary, Values and Needs Improvements. For most of the files, which had disciplinary data (GOMOR / Art 15), it was not reflected in the NCOERs covering that rating period in which the infraction occurred. Also, many NCOERs would have a 'NO' in values, but no corresponding bullet, or a 'NO' in APFT or HT/WT without 'Needs Improvement' marked. In addition, in these instances, as well as those reports which were marked appropriately, the rater would still give a rating of 'Fully Capable' and / or the SR would mark the '1', '2', or '3' blocks in performance and potential with bullets of promote 'ahead' or 'with peers'. NCOs who do not meet the standards, should be blocked accordingly by the rater and SR.

(3) Missing NCOERS. There were a number of board files missing NCOERs, which left BMs guessing at the status of the NCO. Several files had duplicated NCOERs (same as previous report with only date changes). Many of the reports also still made reference to service school performance which are covered by the Academic Evaluation Report (AER). This is in violation of AR 623-3. Also, many reports stated that they were for a full 12 months of rated time, even though the rated NCO attended one or more service schools and had several AERs on file during that same rated period. One file contained an SR Option NCOER, which only covered two rated months. However, the rater is still required to rate the NCO for at least 90 days.

(b) Current Photos. Many of the files had either no photo or no current photo (still at former grade, or not representing all authorized awards and decorations IAW those on the ERB). This was not viewed favorably by the BMs. Also, NCOs should have their uniforms looked at / take someone with them when having their photo taken. (US and Branch Brass was wrong, no DUIs, Drivers / Mechanics / Marksmanship badges without clasps, badges / awards placed in incorrect order, oak leaf on Good Conduct Medal instead of knot / s, incorrect number of oak leaves denoting second and subsequent awards, etc.).

(c) ERB. Although the BMs saw a significant improvement with the quality of ERBs, continue to emphasize to NCOs that they must update and review. The BMs observed a number of ERBs that were not updated and found that duty positions did not match those on the NCOERs.

b. Utilization and assignments in CMF 88: 'Homesteading' is not a significant issue. However, a fair number of NCOs are spending more than 48 months in the same position. A handful of CMF 88 NCOs spent upward of six-plus years performing White House duty. NCOs need to understand that this could significantly impact their relevance and promotion opportunities.

c. Training and Education. Board files, which reflected continued military and civilian education, were looked upon favorably by the BMs. NCOs are furthering their education despite the OPTEMPO. AERs which were marginal for any reason were not viewed favorably by the BMs.

d. Physical Fitness. Many NCOs are in excellent physical condition, as is evidenced by the many excellence blocks, attaining scores above 270 / consistently scoring above 300 / earning and / or maintaining the Physical Fitness Badge.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. BMs invested a significant amount of time and effort in reviewing types of positions held at the Sergeant First Class level. The BMs favorably viewed NCOs who served / are serving in CMF 88 positions mentioned in par 3.a.(1) in Division / Brigade Combat Teams / Battalion Headquarters. Continue to encourage Staff Sergeants and Sergeants First Class to seek the tough traditional and non-traditional CMF 88 positions.

b. Quality of NCOERs continues to improve. However, the Chain of Command must review NCOERs for correctness, timeliness and accuracy. Rater and SR need to ensure that ratings are justified and consistent. Remember, the NCOER remains the most important vehicle for the rater and SR to communicate to the BMs performance at the current, and potential for increased responsibility at higher grades.

d. Overall health of CMF 88 remains strong and viable. NCOs in the field have accumulated a wealth of knowledge and experiences in varying positions / levels / types of organizations which will be of benefit as our Army continues to transform and adapt for the future.

5. CMF 88 Proponent Packets.

a. The quality of the packets was good and served as a good tool for the BMs. The career maps were very specific as to positions, key and important assignments.

b. Improvement: The Proponent recommended that NCOs in MOS 88K and 88L should not be favorably considered if they did not have two 1059s for ANCOC (Water Craft Operator / Engineer and the Theater Deployment Distribution courses). However, until CMF 88 comes up with a suitable way to communicate this to HRC, these NCOs are eligible to compete along with their peers, if their file is a part of the board files.

6. Conclusion. There were many highly qualified Sergeants First Class considered. The field was very competitive; those selected were the best qualified.

ROBERT B. OLIVERAS
Colonel, LG
Panel Chief