



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

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

AHRC-PDV-SEB

21 February 2008

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, ATTN: ATZM, 1201 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, Fort Lee, VA 23801-1601

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

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 29 January 2008, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY08 Sergeant First Class Promotion Board.
2. In accordance with the reference 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. Overall, the Noncommissioned Officer (NCO) records considered for this promotion board allowed board members to select the best qualified NCOs for promotion to Sergeant First Class (SFC). The best qualified continued to meet the career path gates of their CMF. Other factors that contributed to strengthening the Soldier's file included his/her duty position; performance in leadership; overall potential; current photo; physical fitness and bearing; military and civilian education levels.
  - a. Performance and potential. A variety of challenging and high risk assignments in the current grade with exceptional ratings that matched justified comments was viewed as strengthening the Soldier's file. Senior raters that articulated future promotion potential with accurate bullet statements up front helped board members to identify NCOs for future promotion. Inconsistent ratings by the rating officials sent mixed signals to board members and often degraded the overall potential strength of the report. For example, NCOs were rated "among the best" with bullets stating promote now or immediately ahead of peers, yet the senior rater marked them with 2's or 3's in the performance and potential blocks. This method often made it difficult for a board member to evaluate the file in an efficient manner and potentially degraded the Soldier "potential" power.

b. Utilization and assignments. The NCOs serving in a wide range of tough and diverse jobs (specifically identified by proponents) both in the operational and TDA environments in the current grade and in some instances in a Skill Level 40 or 50 often had a competitive edge. NCOs who remained in low risk assignments (less demanding) or positions outside CMF 74 for an extended period in the current grade and up to 36 months were viewed negatively by the board. Favorable consideration was given to the NCOs who sought the tough jobs in their CMF and outside their CMF. A few Key positions outside the CMF included Drill Sergeant, Recruiter, Equal Opportunity Advisor, Transition Teams, and Rear Detachment.

c. Training and Education. NCOs who continued to pursue both military and civilian educational opportunities were favorably considered in the evaluation process. A large number of NCOs either had pursued an Associates Degree or already attained it and continue to pursue a Bachelor Degree or higher. Performance in NCOES was also given favorable consideration during the board process. NCOs who exceeded the standards, honor graduates, or top 10% in NCOES courses were contributors to strengthening the board file.

d. Physical Fitness. Overall assessment, the majority of NCOs appeared to be within the standards of AR 600-9 and achieving the Army goal by earning the physical fitness badge. Board members considered this area as a strong point in the file when NCOs who consistently scored 270 or higher on their NCOERs. Conversely, the board viewed negatively NCOERs and photos that portrayed the NCO exceeding the height and weight standards by 30 lbs or higher, but met the standards of AR 600-9. To further degrade this situation, many of these situations depicted and increase in height and weight from one report to another and the photo was several years old or missing. Based on these indicators, the perception of exceeding the height and weight standards by a large number of pounds depicted on the NCOER or in the photo was viewed negatively by board members.

e. Overall career management. Overall, CMF 92 is effectively managed based on a significant amount of NCOs serving in diverse and tough leadership jobs.

#### 4. CMF Structure and Career progression assessment.

a. Compatibility within CMF. While leadership skills and application of sustainment techniques (i.e., maintaining the modern logistics automation) within the Quartermaster force have significant similarities, the 92F, 92S, 92R, and 92M have limited compatibility to support combining MOSs, routine cross utilization (mixed assignments), etc.

b. Suitability of standards and grade structure. Given the criticality of the key positions of squad leader, section sergeant, platoon sergeant, and operations sergeant, particular attention must be given to ensuring candidates are equitably afforded the opportunity to serve, develop and demonstrate their potential in these assignments. Providing these opportunities equitably before a candidate enters the primary zone is

difficult. Competing critical assignments such as recruiting and drill sergeant within the generating and operating forces place a premium on timely service in these PMOS positions. Given the time-in-grade (TIG) requirements to be considered in the primary zone for SFC, a 24-36 month assignment outside the critical billets within the first two years as a SSG will hamper his/her potential to be highly competitive in the primary zone.

c. Overall health on the CMF. Overall assessment of the CMF is strong. The members were impressed with the high quality, potential, and competitiveness of the 92s serving across the spectrum of assignments.

## 5. Recommendations.

a. Competence. Competence as reflected in an NCOER must focus on MOS related accomplishments. Too often, raters will highlight excellent remarks as a result of an additional duty or schooling. Although good supporting information, the board expects NCOs to perform competently within their MOS and the resulting assessment reflective of those accomplishments.

b. CMF structure and career progression. The CMF 92s provided ample opportunities for NCOs to pursue the key high risk (demanding) and tough leadership positions. Guidance from the proponents that highlighted challenging positions i.e. positions at the Brigade Combat Team (BCT) level are getting to the field and NCOs are pursuing these leadership positions. NCOs should continue to have a balance TOE and TDA in leadership positions within and outside their career fields. For example, a NCO performing exclusively outside their CMF for the majority time in the current grade were disadvantage when compared to a NCO serving in challenging positions within and outside their CMF. Additionally, assignment managers and leadership in the field must continue to emphasize the importance of NCOs having a diversity of assignments of TOE, TDA, and special assignments.

### c. Other

(1) Rater should not list recruiting as a future assignment on the NCOER unless they really feel the NCO could accomplish those duties. Do not just fill in the blank to fill in the blank for the top notch NCOs. Recruiting requires specific skills of our NCOs that not all possess, even our top quality NCOs. It takes a specific type of individual to be successful and raters should only list recruiting as a potential assignment if they feel the NCO could do that job well.

### (2) NCOERs.

a. In many cases, duty positions on the NCOER did not match the positions annotated on the Enlisted Record Brief (ERB) and often the grade of the positions were different. The position should match and provide the board member accurate

information of the duty position and the correct grade. It is imperative that NCOs review and validate their records on a consistent basis.

b. NCOERs depicted height and weight increase from one NCOER to another. Gaining weight is possible but growing 2-4 inches is not likely. Recommend the NCO pay more attention to ensure accurate height data is annotated on his/her NCOER. Additionally, when completing a NCOER, the rating chain may want to review past NCOERs to ensure consistency in this area.

c. In several instances, disciplinary actions at the current grade did not match the NCOER ratings and comments for the same rating period. When appropriate, NCOERs should be annotated with required value and rating marks when a NCO conduct warrants.

d. Senior raters should only use statements such as “promote immediately, now, and promote ahead of peers” for the best NCOs. In many instances, these strong statements were matched with raters annotating “fully capable” and the senior rater giving marks of 2s in both the performance and potential categories. When rating inconsistencies occur, recommend the reviewer be responsible for mitigating the differences. Additionally, all rating officials should be knowledgeable of DA Pamphlet 623-3, Evaluation Reporting System.

e. Bullet comments by the rater must be justified. Excellent bullets should be clear and supported by justified and measureable statements. A bullet not justified as excellence was viewed by the board members as a success.

## 6. CMF Proponent packets

a. Overall Quality. The Proponent packet served as an excellent tool of useful information that prepared board members to review and vote the NCO record, but the reproduction quality was lacking.

b. Recommended improvements. New high risk leadership positions should be added, such as NCOs in MiTT Teams (in Iraq and Afghanistan), Special Operation and Joint Forces units.

7. Conclusion. The board is confident that the best qualified NCOs were selected for promotion to Sergeant First Class. The board primarily focused on the NCOERs in the current grade to determine the NCO overall performance and potential for the next higher grade. Records that revealed exceptional leaders and diverse positions were favorably considered in the selection process. The photo remains an important part of the promotion process. The rating chain must continue to write clear bullets that are justified and supported with measurable statements.

Additionally, when completing a NCOER, the rating chain may want to review past NCOERs to ensure consistency in this area.

c. In several instances, disciplinary actions at the current grade did not match the NCOER ratings and comments for the same rating period. When appropriate, NCOERs should be annotated with required value and rating marks when a NCO conduct warrants.

d. Senior raters should only use statements such as “promote immediately, now, and promote ahead of peers” for the best NCOs. In many instances, these strong statements were matched with raters annotating “fully capable” and the senior rater giving marks of 2s in both the performance and potential categories. When rating inconsistencies occur, recommend the reviewer be responsible for mitigating the differences. Additionally, all rating officials should be knowledgeable of DA Pamphlet 623-3, Evaluation Reporting System.

e. Bullet comments by the rater must be justified. Excellent bullets should be clear and supported by justified and measureable statements. A bullet not justified as excellence was viewed by the board members as a success.

#### 6. CMF Proponent packets

a. Overall Quality. The Proponent packet served as an excellent tool of useful information that prepared board members to review and vote the NCO record, but the reproduction quality was lacking.

b. Recommended improvements. New high risk leadership positions should be added, such as NCOs in MiTT Teams (in Iraq and Afghanistan), Special Operation and Joint Forces units.

7. Conclusion. The board is confident that the best qualified NCOs were selected for promotion to Sergeant First Class. The board primarily focused on the NCOERs in the current grade to determine the NCO overall performance and potential for the next higher grade. Records that revealed exceptional leaders and diverse positions were favorably considered in the selection process. The photo remains an important part of the promotion process. The rating chain must continue to write clear bullets that are justified and supported with measurable statements.



ANDRE Q. FLETCHER  
Colonel, LG  
Panel Chief