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 20 June 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, USA HQ USAREC, United States Army Recruiting Command, 1307 3rd Ave., Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121-2726

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 79S Review and Analysis

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 11 May 2011, Subject: Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) for the FY11 United States Army Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA) Training and Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 79S 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 most competitive Soldiers were those that had majority of their time spent in proponent demanding positions. Their NCOERS reflected "Among the Best" Performance within these demanding positions and consistent strong ratings by both the rater and the senior rater.

b. Utilization and assignments: Packets reviewed revealed that 79S's are being utilized properly and serving in a variety of proponent demanding positions. Soldiers who served in demanding assignments at modular and expeditionary Battalions and Brigades were seen as having very good leadership experience and experts with supporting the ARFORGEN process.

c. Training and education: There were a few Soldiers that graduated from USASMA, but the majority were 1SG and SLC graduates. Education credentials seem to really be lacking based on the records reviewed for this board, quite a few Soldiers with either credit hours and no degree, or no college at all.

d. Physical Fitness: Soldiers that met height and weight standards and consistently earned the physical fitness badge were viewed as most competitive by the board.

e. Overall career management: Would place more emphasis on getting the 79S career model out to the field to reinforce what it takes to be competitive during the board selection process.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment. CMF 79S Soldiers do not compete for promotion with Soldiers outside the 79S series. There are no compatibility issues.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF: There did not appear to be any challenges with MOS compatibility within the CMF 79S.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure: Equal consideration was given to all 1SGs and MSGs in the zone for SMC selection and promotion to SGM. Board members reviewed all leadership positions across the full spectrum of assignments.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity: Soldiers serving in a SGM position and serving in a proponent demanding position were viewed as most competitive by the board.

d. Overall health of CMF: It appears that the overall health of the CMF is good based on the number of competitive packets that were viewed by the board.

e. Other, as appropriate: None.

5. Recommendations. (Proposals keyed to subparagraphs above).

a. Competence: Recommend the command place more emphasis on continuing military and civilian education.

b. CMF structure and career progression: Structure is adequate: NCO's need to stay in positions identified as proponent demanding. Physical fitness and appearance, civilian education and military education were identified by the board as areas of improvement for career progression.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The proponent packet was very detailed and easy to read. No recommendations to change the proponent packet.

b. Recommended improvements: None.

ROBERT C. WHALEY
Colonel, AG
Panel Chief