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

22 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, U.S. Army Quartermaster Center (ATTN: ATZM) 1201 22nd Street Fort Lee, VA 23801-1601

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 92 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 92 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: Those Soldiers who displayed excellent performance (exceeding the standard) while serving in assignments deemed challenging and demanding, and who's duty description clearly articulated a high level of responsibility were rated as exceptional. Excellent block checks by Raters and Senior Raters in the Performance or Potential portion without justifying bullet comments were not favorably considered, and caused the panel to question the validity of the other remarks on the NCOER.

b. Utilization and assignments: Files for NCO's in CMF 92 reflected outstanding performance in a variety of diverse assignments. These assignments include Operations NCO, Support Operations NCO, Brigade and Battalion S4's, and other MTOE/TDA deployment critical positions were all viewed favorably. Additionally, NCOs who served as Warrior Transition Cadre/ Drill Sergeants, Recruiters and Military Transition Teams (MiTT) demonstrated leadership potential in a challenging and/or demanding organization and were also given special consideration

c. Training and education: Soldiers who took advantage of opportunities afforded them to further their education were viewed much more favorably than those who did not. Having a Bachelor or professional degree was viewed as a plus by the panel. Even the ones who had not obtained a degree, but had credit hours and were working towards one, were seen by the panel as being worthy of favorable consideration. To

the panel, NCOs who attended tough and challenging courses such as Battle Staff and Support Operations, where seen as Soldiers who cared about enhancing their professional development. Also, attendance and completion of these types of courses sent the message that their superiors believed these NCOs have the potential for greater responsibility. Conversely, those NCOs who had little to no civilian education, and only the required military schools, were seen as "stagnant

d. Physical Fitness: The APFT and height and weight standards, were either met or exceeded by 90 percent or more of the population. However, in some of those cases, the photos depicted a conflicting view, which makes the "YES" reflected on the NCOER questionable. The Rater must validate height and weight standards to reflect the most current data. It is highly recommended that the Rater screen photos to ensure they depict the true image of the Soldier and that it aligns with the NCOER.

Photos: Many records lacked photos and did not have a valid justification for not having one in the file. For some of those records that appeared with photos, it was truly evident to the board members that many of our NCOs were not familiar with the wear and appearance standards of the uniform IAW AR 670-1.

e. Overall career management: Panel members agreed that CMF 92 is healthy and is being managed well, overall. However, panel members were very concerned with the quality of NCOERs from the 92G and 92Y military occupational specialties relative to those of the others in the 92 CMF. Post board discussion revealed several theories in an attempt to explain the glaring difference in the quality of the NCOERs. The one theory the stood out from the rest was that NCOs in those specialties may not be taking full advantage of opportunities to lead when they are presented. Also, they are far removed from the presence of their Raters and Senior Raters who may understand what they do, or see the great things they do every day.

Special consideration was given to those Soldiers who held positions as Platoon Sergeants, Drill Sergeants, Operation NCOs, WTU Cadre, Observer/Controllers, Instructor/Writer/Squad Leaders, Detachment Commanders, 1SG,and those who held skill level 40 positions for a certain length of time. They were considered a level above those who only performed technical portions of the MOS. Consequently, the panel did not look favorably upon those NCOs who chose to work out side of their MOS for an extended period of time and were not in one of the positions mentioned above.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF: Due to the diversity of the CMF 92 many NCOs were serving in variety of key leadership positions which afforded them the opportunity to be challenged and furthermore enhance their leadership potential.
However, the panel members recognize that some duty descriptions did not clearly define their leadership responsibilities. Duty titles/descriptions need to be standardized

in accordance with current MTOEs to assist the board in determining the significance and level of responsibility of the job.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure: Proper managing of the NCO's within the CMF 92 is critical. Several NCOs were rated as senior leader but were manned in skill level 10/20 positions as depicted on their ERB.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity: A significant amount of NCOs were afforded the opportunity to serve at levels of greater responsibility both within and outside of their CMF. Many NCOs had diverse assignment backgrounds and multifunctional.

d. Overall health of CMF: The panel rated the overall health of CMF 92 as good. Most NCOs within CMF 92, at the SSG level, are actively seeking leadership roles and are pursing self improvement through education.

5. Recommendations.

a. Competence: An honest and accurate assessment of the NCO being rated is key to assessing his or her potential for greater responsibility. The Rater/Senior rater has a responsibility to the NCO, the unit and the Army to give an accurate picture of the NCO. Also, the NCO has a responsibility to take an active role in the development and submission of his or her NCOER.

b. CMF structure and career progression: It is critical that the Soldier utilizes the CMF career map to develop their career. Although leadership positions are limited in some specialties, NCOs must continue to seek out leadership positions in the next higher grade. The completion of civilian education and military education to improve technical competence are joined at the hip. These are required to ensure Soldiers set themselves apart from their peers and stay competitive within the CMF

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The overall quality of the proponent packet was excellent. The packet provided a good breakdown of the duty titles/descriptions at the SSG level. It also provided a detailed description of what SSGs should be doing, what is expected of them, and what makes them stand out in their particular specialties. Continue to ensure the proponent packets are in line with guidance from Department of the Army Memorandum of instruction.

b. Recommended improvements: None at this time. Continue the outstanding job of providing a first-rate road map to success in CMF 92.

PHARISSE BERRY
Colonel, LG
Panel Chief, QMAC Branch