

MEMORANDUM FOR Commander, USAAVNC, Fort Rucker, AL 36362

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 67 and 93 Review and Analysis

1. Reference: Memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 29 May 2003, SUBJECT: Memorandum of Instruction for the CY03 Sergeant First Class Selection Board.

2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 67 and 93 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within these CMFs.

3. Competence assessment (strengths and weaknesses).

a. General. The overall quality of the group selected for SFC is impressive. Beyond those recommended for promotion, a large number of fully qualified NCOs remain in the SSG inventory.

b. Primary zone.

(1) Performance and potential (particularly leadership opportunities). It was easy to pick out the NCOs who were doing the tough jobs. Many of the files showed an average soldier until the NCO is placed in a leadership role, then the NCO becomes stellar. Most units have a fixed number of leadership positions; raters must properly articulate to NCOs in non-leadership rolls how they can achieve excellence ratings in a *quantifiable manner*. Leadership opportunities such as Platoon Sergeant, Production Control NCOIC, ATS Facility Chief or Operation NCOIC were viewed as a positive, especially when reports covered a six or more month period.

(2) Utilization and assignments (particularly in PMOS). Most NCOs are working in their PMOS. Drill Sergeant, Recruiting, Instructor and Small Group Leader duties are still viewed as going the extra mile to better ones promotion opportunities and rounding out their careers. We also understand most NCOs have little control over their assignments.

(3) Training and education. Most NCOs have the required training and education to perform in their PMOS. Many NCOs are deployed and some did not have the opportunity to attend BNCOC, this was not held against them for this promotion board. We found some NCOs worked hard to get the Superior checks on their DA Form 1059

PCRE-B

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 67 and 93 Review and Analysis

and some actually failed a NCOES course and had to return. Unless it was for disciplinary, weight control, or APFT reasons, it wasn't held against the soldier. Records indicating courses such as Battle Staff or MOS mission enhancing courses such as SERES, Safety, and HAZMAT and Additional Skill Identifier are viewed as a plus. Improvements on civilian education were also noted. Majority of records indicated Bachelors, Associates or college education with two or more years with some exceptions of 67Rs and 67Ss.

(4) Physical Fitness. Photographs of some NCOs give the appearance the soldier is overweight, yet the NCOERs and school reports indicated they meet the standards. NCOs need to pay attention to the height entries on their NCOERs. We found some with differences of more than several inches. The rated NCO signs the NCOER, that NCO must take accountability for all the administrative data on their NCOER. If a soldier earned the APFT badge, then the Rater should simply state that to justify an excellent block and make the entry as the first bullet. We found too many statements that dodge the APFT results. Bullets such as: "Improved APFT by 15 points" or "Exceeds Company APFT standards", did not add value to the rating.

(5) Overall career management. NCOs still need to seek out the leadership jobs and do them well. Don't wait for them to come to you, instead tell someone in your Chain of Command you are seeking out more responsibility and challenging jobs. Job description's that clearly state responsibilities (number of soldiers and the dollar value of the equipment) is very helpful.

c. Secondary zone. Overall, the secondary zone files were strong and NCOs in this zone were evaluated with the same standards as those in the primary zone. However, in many instances NCOs recently promoted had few NCOERs to screen, and lacked photos in their file. Several NCOs had only one or two NCOERs in current grade. The reviewing panel could only evaluate the information provided.

#### 4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. CMF 67 and 93 Proponent Guidance provided an excellent career map to evaluate job progression. This career map should become the standard for all CMF's.

b. Assignment and promotion opportunity. There seemed to be ample opportunities in CMF 67 and CMF 93 for NCOs to seek out the tough jobs. This board did not penalize an NCO that remained in one place for any length of time. The panel looked at each assignment and job description independently of each other. NCOERs rating time of only three months provided little value for the promotion panel members. There was a multitude.

PCRE-B

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 67 and 93 Review and Analysis

5. Recommendations (proposals keyed to subparagraphs above)

a. CMF structure and career progression. Crew Chiefs and Flight Engineer still face the challenge of leadership positions, or the lack there of. This might sound like a broken record, but rotating these experienced soldiers out should help the situation. Additionally, Standardization Flight Engineer Instructors (SFEI) and Standardization Instructors (SI), ATS Quality Assurance NCOs should be better identified as they represent the best of the best. This board viewed these positions as a plus.

b. Other(s) as appropriate. Sergeant Audie Murphy/Sergeant Morales members are sometimes difficult to find in the NCOs files. Post on NCOER along with award citation on ERB and OMPF.

c. NCOER. This document remains the main input to the board. The quality of the NCOER remains high. However, it is very evident when the Rater and Senior Rater view the soldier differently; many times this difference gives mixed signals to the board. Raters still need to put the most important bullet first. We are still finding some bullets were buried at the bottom of each section on the NCOER.

d. Photographs. The promotion panel continued to place much value on the quality of the photograph. Poor lighting on many official photographs made it difficult to see the badges, awards etc. It was very evident when awards and decorations were mal-aligned or in the wrong order, and uniforms were not sized properly. There was also a large number of NCOs that did not have an official photo in their record.

e. Enlisted Record Brief. The ERB is not a reliable document. We found many discrepancies between the ERB, DA Form 2-1 and NCOERs.

6. CMF Proponent Packets is excellent. Provided the panel members a good, easy to follow guide of CMF 67 and CMF 93.

/// Original Signed ///

**FACT SHEET**

SUBJECT: CY2003 SFC Selection Board Results

1. Purpose. To inform the Command Group of the Aviation Branch Selection Board results for the CY2003 SFC Promotion Board.

2. Points of major interest and facts.

a. Total Army Breakout:

<u>Considered</u>	<u>Selected</u>	<u>Percent</u>
34,360	10,213	29.7

b. Our overall performance was above the Army average by .6 percent:

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Army Percent</u>	<u>Aviation</u>
Primary Zone	33.1	30.3
Secondary Zone	24.5	30.3
Overall	29.7	30.3

c. A breakdown by Career Management Field (CMF) is as follows:

CMF	<u>Primary Zone</u>			<u>Secondary Zone</u>			<u>Total</u>		
	Con	Sel	%	Con	Sel	%	Con	Sel	%
67	914	271	29.6	558	179	32.1	1472	450	30.6
93	177	60	33.9	138	32	23.2	315	92	29.2

3. POC is *AVM Propensity* at DSN 558-2650, Comm (334) 255-2650

//// Original Signed ////