



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMAND
DA SECRETARIAT FOR SENIOR ENLISTED SELECTION BOARDS
8899 EAST 56TH STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46249-5301

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

AHRC-EB

21 February 2007

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, US Army Quartermaster Center (ATZM), Fort Lee, VA 23604

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 92 Review and Analysis - FY07
SFC Promotion Board

1. References.

a. Memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 30 January 2007, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY07 SFC Promotion Board.

b. Memorandum, HQ US Army Quartermaster Center and School, ATSM-CG-CSM, 5 January 2007, subject: CY 2007 Sergeant First Class Selection Board Guidance for Career Management Field (CMF) 92.

2. In accordance with reference a, this Review and Analysis is provided to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for CMF 92.

3. Competence assessment of Promotion Zone (strengths and weaknesses).

a. Performance and Potential (particularly leadership opportunities):

(1) Exceptional performance of duty in the most challenging assignments at the current grade was of primary importance to board members during the selection process. Clearly articulated statements regarding future potential were also key to selection for promotion. In most cases, raters and senior raters provided a clear picture of overall performance and potential. However, the board members did note a tendency among rating officials to inflate indications of potential when the block checks and rater comments indicated satisfactory, but average performance. Examples include instances of "Promote with peers" and "Among the Best" and "1" blocks in both performance and potential. These incongruent indicators send mixed messages to board members and reduce the likelihood of fair and accurate record reviews.

(2) A significant portion of the OMPFs reviewed by the board had not been validated by the NCOs. While it is understood that NCOs deployed to operations around the world may have difficulty obtaining access to review their records, the volume of non-reviewed files was significant, especially by those NCOs who were not deployed. Many of the files that had been validated were “validated with comments,” giving clear indication that the NCOs had reviewed their records and found that files were not current.

(3) Principal duty titles on the NCOER did not always reflect the duties performed. There were numerous NCOERs noted with duty descriptions of leading Transition Teams, Convoy Logistic Patrols, or Traffic Control Points, yet provided duty titles of “Cook” for example. While these positions are critical to the success of ongoing operations, support the warrior spirit, and contribute to the future success of our leaders in key leadership positions, failure to clearly identify the position as one of leadership inhibits the board from giving due credit in the leadership criterion of scoring the record.

(4) The board found many apparent discrepancies in the Duty MOSC (Part III b. of the NCOER). For example, there were numerous instances of NCOs serving as the Battalion S4 NCOIC, being rated by the S4 and Battalion XO, yet the Duty MOSC was indicated as a skill level 30 position. Without clear and accurate indications of skill level requirements, it is difficult for board members to give due credit in the skill level criterion of scoring the record.

(5) The board found many examples of inadequately written Daily Duties and Scope (Part III c) descriptions. In addition to the assigned technical position such as Water Treatment NCO, many NCOs served in leadership positions such as Platoon Sergeant, Section Sergeant or Squad leader, yet these are not clearly defined in the job description. Most of the duty descriptions were written to support the Soldier duty MOS, but did not offer detailed descriptions of the duties, scope, and responsibilities as leaders.

(6) It is clear that many rating chains are not following the regulatory systematic approach established to ensure quality review of NCOERs. This was evidenced through incongruent comments and block checks, wide variation in height / weight data for individuals, and in one case, an NCO who remained in the same unit, in the same position, with the same duty description, yet had three different skill levels: 20, 30, and 40).

b. Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS):

(1) NCOs who served in a variety of assignments at the current and previous grades were more competitive for selection for promotion. Further, NCOs who accepted and performed well in leadership positions and other tough,

high risk/challenging assignments identified in reference b have a greater chance of being selected for promotion.

(2) There were several NCOs working outside their MOS, especially as Detailed Recruiters, whose performance evaluations were substantially lower than their previous and subsequent NCOERs covering assignments within their PMOS. These NCOERs resulted in NCOs not being recommended for promotion, who otherwise would have been.

c. Training and Education: NCOs demonstrated strong commitment to the pursuit of civilian education. The overwhelming majority of NCOs had between two and four years of college credits. NCOs who exceeded course standards, as annotated on NCOERs and DA Form 1059s, were considered more favorably in this area. Those who met standards, but had specific comments related to achievements in the area of "Leadership" also stood out during the process. Further, some NCOs completed ANCOC or have acquired additional skill identifiers such as Property Book Officer (G3) and Battle Staff (2S). These items also received additional merit in the selection process.

d. Physical Fitness:

(1) The overall physical fitness of CMF 92 NCOs was excellent. Many NCOs achieved and maintained APFT scores that exceed the Army Standard. Those that demonstrated a trend of physical fitness excellence, as annotated on NCOERS, received exceptional consideration by board members. However, NCOs who had exceeded the allowable height and weight standards and also failed the APFT were at a disadvantage.

(2) On many NCOERs, although an NCO may have consistent high APFT scores, it was not clear as to whether they had earned the APFT badge if it was not documented on the NCOER.

(3) Of particular concern to the board was the fact that there were several instances of height variations of up to 3" associated with weight gains of 20 to 30 pounds in one rating period. Files with these types of variations were not viewed favorably by the board.

e. Combat Operations: Reference b requested that the board "pay special attention to those Soldiers that have served in special assignments such as Transition Team NCO." The board found that NCOERs written for Soldiers performing in combat continue to minimize the leadership responsibilities in challenging environments. The bullet comments often appeared to the board to justify "excellence" ratings but reflected a successful rating instead. The quality emphasis placed in writing these bullet comments seemed significantly less than NCOERs received in garrison operations.

f. Overall career management for CMF 92 is encouraging and strong. Soldiers have accepted the challenge in seeking leadership positions and have excelled, thereby increasing their potential for promotion.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF: NCOs continue to have a wide range of duty assignments which continues to provide depth and experience across the CMF.

b. Two areas of concern were noted regarding Enlisted Aides. The first concern is that NCOs who serve multiple assignments as Enlisted Aides are disadvantaged in the area of leadership experience when they come out of the program and return to the operational field. The second concern is that there appears to be a pattern of senior raters giving "2" block ratings for performance and potential, yet providing bullet comments of "Promote ahead of peers." This sends a mixed message to board members.

c. The vast majority of the 92G NCOERs reviewed indicated duty positions of "Cook," "Senior Cook," and "First Cook." Reference b has no mention of "Cook" in the Quartermaster Professional Development Model for MOS 92G. There appeared to be no standard duty description for these positions as judged by the wide variation seen in the NCOERs. Additionally, it was noted by the board that many NCOERs identified First Cooks and Senior Cooks as either 92G20 or 92G30 positions. Without an accurate description of the duties and responsibilities of this seemingly common position, the board members were not able to give due credit to those NCOs who had served in these positions.

d. Suitability of standards of grade and structure: The standards of grade and force structure were viewed as appropriate and compatible with other CMF's. Opportunity and assignments in positions above their current grade continue to be available for those NCOs willing to take the challenge as reflected on reviewed ERBs. Accurate and explicit duty descriptions and levels of responsibility remain critical for evaluating performance, career progression, and selection for promotion.

e. Assignment and promotion opportunity: It was observed that there are adequate opportunities to serve in both the proponent and Army-wide high risk / challenging positions within the CMF, and to attain subsequent promotion to SFC. Soldiers in CMF 92 who continuously accepted a variety of assignments and positions, and consistently demonstrated their ability to perform well, had better odds to be selected for promotion. One area of concern noted was that many NCOs had served in several (five or more) consecutive NCOERs as a

company / battery supply sergeant, thereby limiting their ability to be considered as the "balanced NCO" described in reference b.

f. Overall health of CMF 92: Board members assessed the health of the CMF to be excellent. The board review of CMF 92 records indicated a career field of highly motivated NCOs who clearly demonstrated their potential to serve at the SFC level.

5. Recommendations (keyed to subparagraphs above).

a. Competence:

(1) Raters should clearly define the NCO duty descriptions to match the skill level currently worked and include the levels and scope of leadership in terms of personnel, equipment and fiscal responsibility. As so clearly indicated by Regimental Command Sergeant Major Silva in his memorandum to the board (reference b), "raters should take extra care to mention [Leadership] positions throughout the NCOER."

(2) Rating chains, including the Reviewer should ensure that comments and block checks are congruent. It is the responsibility of the rater to ensure Soldiers are within the Army standards and must accurately verify the current height and weight data.

(3) Recommend emphasis be place on the importance of documenting the awarding of the Physical Excellence Badge on the NCOER.

(4) Support and encourage NCOs to submit current photo and provide updated documentation to support personnel files.

b. CMF structure and career progression:

(1) Recommend that emphasis be placed on the ratings of Enlisted Aides to ensure that they remain competitive with the rest of their MOS. Additionally, recommend that consideration be given to establishing a distinct professional development model for Enlisted Aides / Flight Stewards.

(2) Recommend that emphasis be provided to the field regarding the importance of providing NCOs with a variety of challenging assignments vice multiple consecutive assignments to the same level of positions.

(3) Recommend that consistency be established across the MTOE/TDA positions and duty titles. For example, the duty title "S4 NCO" appears in skill levels 92Y20 through 92Z50.

AHRC-EB

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 92 Review and Analysis

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality: The proponent briefing packet (reference b) to the board members was very helpful during the selection process. It clearly defines each different MOS and their associated professional development models within the CMF.

b. Recommended improvements: Recommend that the CMF review the professional development model for MOS 92G and provide guidance to the field (and subsequent promotion boards) regarding the use of the term "Cook" and its variations.



J. DOUGLAS SERRANO
Colonel, QM
Panel Chief