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) 79R 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 79R 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 rating by both the rater and the senior rater. Moreover, the Soldiers not only had bullets that reflected strong production, their evaluations and comments reflected strong leadership by their ability to develop and take care of Soldiers.

b. Utilization and assignments: The file consisted of Soldiers who had a deep experience as both a First Sergeant and staff jobs at the Brigade and Battalion level. Those who had minimum time as a 1SG were perceived as checking the block.

c. Training and education: There were a few Soldiers that graduated from USASMA, but the majority was 1SG course graduates. The board found a substantial number of marginal and failed ratings while reviewing 1059's. Education credentials seem to really be lacking based on the records reviewed for this board; Soldiers had 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: Soldiers have the opportunity to serve in a variety of assignments and experience the opportunity to deploy in small numbers and fill positions outside the United States Army Recruiting Command.

4. Utilization and assignments: Packets reviewed revealed that the 79R's are being utilized properly and serving in a variety of assignments thoughout the recruiting command. Those NCO's that had a variety of assignments while spending the majority of time in proponent demanding positions were viewed as the most competitive.

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

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 CSM or SGM position and serving in a 1SG position were viewed as most competitive by the board. As mentioned earlier, more command and control of assignments appears to be needed to control the amount of time Soldiers are staying in staff positions vs 1SG positions.

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; would emphasis the need to go to a 1SG position after serving no more than 24 months in a staff position. Soldiers that were most competitive had a variety of assignments with the majority of time spent in a 1SG position.

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