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 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, 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 88 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 (particularly leadership opportunities).

(1) Strengths: Most NCOs with multiple and demanding leadership positions did well during the review and voting process. Staff Sergeants who are seeking the tough and diverse jobs, where considered favorably by Board Members (BM), such as Platoon Sergeants, Squad Leader, Section Sergeant, Recruiter, Drill Sergeant, Instructor, Military Transition Team, Observer Controller, Cargo Operations NCO, Marine Operations NCO, Marine Maintenance Supervisor, Truck Master, Chief Movement Supervisor, Senior Movement NCO, Trans Logistics NCO, Patch Foreman, Marine Maintenance Sergeant, and First Mate. The new ASU uniform although not mandatory demonstrated an investment on individuals own career, and was looked upon favorably. Inductions into Audie Murphy, and competition into NCO boards, such as NCO of the Year, Instructor of the Year, and Drill Sergeant of the Year, demonstrated the NCOs desire to excel. As for ratings, many excellence ratings would have been justified, but the rater gave only a success rating. The clear cut justifiable/quantifiable excellence bullets were most effective in communicating to the BM the performance level of the NCO.

(2) Weakness:

(a) NCOERs.

(1). Lack of Quality Control was evident throughout CMF 88 however, this was especially prevalent in the 88N MOS in which Rater/Senior Rater (SR) provided an incoherent message as far as clarity, and there was no clear determination of performance trends. CMF 88 misconduct was often not captured in the NCOER, leadership failed to document the ratings that follow administrative and disciplinary actions i.e., weight control, and UCMJ. SRs must address performance and potential. In many instances SRs were not clear on stating whether the SM was to be promoted "now/immediately"; "ahead of peers"; "with peers". Also, SRs sent inconsistent messages by giving "1 / 1" ratings, but giving a bullet of "promote with peers", or vice versa.

(2). Missing NCOERs. The board took a neutral stance on missing NCOERs and other key documentation from the Soldiers file.

(3). Current Photos. There should be leadership involvement during the DA photo appointment. NCOs should have their uniforms looked at; take someone with them when having their photo taken. Board Members noticed blatant multiple uniform violations, i.e. combat badge, drill sergeant, and recruiter badge.

(4). ERB. The Board Members observed numerous ERB's that were not updated and found that duty positions did not match those on the NCOERs or, were not entered at ALL.

b. Utilization and assignments in CMF 88: A fair number of NCOs are spending more than 36 months in non-demanding positions, i.e. chauffeur, training NCO, human resource NCO, and PAC clerk. This was viewed as non-favorably by the Board Members. NCOs need to understand that in today's high OPTEMPO, and ever changing environment 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 the Board Members. NCOs are furthering their education despite the OPTEMPO. There was a disappointing lack of effort to attain civilian education by 88L, 88K, and 88N.

d. Physical Fitness. Board Members observed a sharp downward trend in the pursuit of physical fitness excellence as demonstrated by the small number of NCOs obtaining and maintaining the APFT badge.

e. Overall career management.

(1). Working outside the core competency of the MOS for extended periods, was looked upon unfavorably by the Board.

(2). Quality of NCOERs. The Chain of Command must review the NCOERs for correctness, timeliness, and accuracy. The quality of the NCOER was lacking. It is 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. Reviewer needs to ensure rater/SR ratings are justified/quantified and consistent.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment. Many of the NCO in the zone of consideration displayed a general apathy towards the maintenance of their own records, and board files.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. Soldiers within their MOS were competitive. However, the disparity between the quality of records within 88 CMF will likely place them at a disadvantage for future 88Z boards. Quality of the record, i.e. civilian education, military education, and general strength of the NCOER rating, proved to be the most important criteria for the BMs.

b. Other, as appropriate. There were an excessive number of files without photos; the Chain of Command needs to be involved with Soldiers board records preparation. Records were looked unfavorably by BMs if individuals did not have viable reason for an absent photo. Secondly, letters to the board were welcomed when they clearly and concisely addressed deficiencies on their record.

5. CMF Proponent Packets. Up front guidance tailored to the SFC and future boards needs to be given by component elements and level of quality for each MOS. The proponency needs to highlight characteristic special skills, attributes and mandatory requirements, in each individual MOS.

MARTIN B. PITTS
Colonel, LG
Panel Chief