



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY ENLISTED RECORDS AND EVALUATION CENTER
8899 EAST 56TH STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46249-5301



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

AHRC-EB

25 February 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, U.S. Army Intelligence Center (ATZS-MI), Fort Huachuca, AZ 85613

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 33, 96, 98 Review and Analysis

1. Reference: Memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 3 February 2004, subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the CY04 Master Sergeant Selection Board.
2. In accordance with the referenced memorandum, the selection board panel reviewing records for CMF 33, 96, and 98 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as proponent for MOS within this CMF.
3. Competence assessment. This promotion board considered primary zone and secondary zone soldiers as one group. Overall, NCOs in the 33, 96, and 98 CMF were highly competitive for promotion and with excellent records. Military Intelligence NCOs' records continue to show strong performance in demanding positions of leadership, to include highly technical and sensitive positions. There are a few NCOs in the zones of consideration that show incidents of non-performance or disciplinary infractions in their current or previous grade.
 - a. Primary zone.

(1) Performance and potential. Senior MI NCO records show varied opportunities to lead soldiers. However, most opportunities appear to exist in the operational areas within the career field. Most successful NCOs have combined leadership positions (i.e. First Sergeant, Operations Sergeant time, Drill/Senior Drill Sergeant, and consecutive Platoon Sergeant positions), as well as successful operational assignments (i.e. ACE NCOIC, EW Chief, G2 NCOIC, etc.). There were a few NCOs already successfully serving in Sergeant Major positions. First Sergeant, Platoon Sergeant, etc. should be stated up front in the duty position and not hidden in the body of the duty description or in additional duties on the NCOER. Duty descriptions are generally well written, but there were many cases where duty MOSs did not match written duty descriptions. Full range/scope of responsibilities were not always clearly defined (i.e. number personnel led/supervised, resources/dollars managed, etc.). NCOs serving in Recruiting duty tended to receive lower evaluations as compared to their overall manner of performance through the rest of their career files. Recruiting duty provides a critical function for the Army, but in many cases, NCOERs received in Recruiting positions do not enhance the soldier's file.

(2) Utilization and assignments. Most records indicate that soldiers are getting the mix of leadership and operational assignments, however, there are still many records indicating no leadership time in current grade. NCOs at training bases/National level and "strategic" units in excess of over 48 months should cross-pollinate into conventional leadership positions. However, leadership positions remain key for promotion and must be cited clearly in Army (vice intelligence) terms on the NCOER. NCO's should strive to seek the hard jobs and serve in a myriad of assignments, mixing tactical and strategic, leadership and staff, MOS specific and MOS immaterial, operational and instructional.

(3) Training and education. CMF 33, 96, and 98 senior NCOs continue to pursue civilian education with the majority currently enrolled or having completed some college. College education ranged from none (H. S. Diploma) to Masters Degree, with most of the files showing somewhere between two and three years of college credit. All have completed the appropriate level of NCOES (ANCOC) and the CMF appears to be well in this area.

(4) Physical Fitness. Most APFT scores exceed the Army standard with some NCOs receiving the Army Physical Fitness Badge (APFB). Award of the APFB should be clearly annotated on the NCOER, "awarded the APFB"--this was not always the case. The majority of soldiers comply with height and weight standards and there are very few with profiles. Most NCOERs accurately reflect profile limitations on duty performance. Many NCOERs still stated "meets body fat standards IAW AR 600-9." The requirement to include this statement on the NCOER was rescinded about five years ago. Raters should be familiar with regulatory requirements/guidelines for preparing NCOERs.

b. Secondary zone. The primary and secondary zones were considered the same with no differences in performance and potential.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. Although there are differences in the job titles and descriptions, there appears to be ample opportunity, at the senior level across the CMF, to lead soldiers. In all MOSs, those pursuing these opportunities continue to be competitive for career advancement. Clear, concise, and accurate duty descriptions are essential for comparative analysis. Career progression assessment continues to be healthy.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. The CMF seems structured adequately, with many NCOs working above their grade level in consecutive assignments. The grade structure is consistent with other CMFs.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. The majority of the most competitive soldiers served successfully in current grade positions. They have also pursued special

d. duty assignments, continued civilian or technical educations opportunities, and performed well throughout their careers. Excellent promotion opportunities exist across the MOSs within the CMF.

e. Overall health of CMF. The overall health of CMF 33, 96, and 98 at this level appears satisfactory.

5. Recommendations.

a. Update photographs. Photographs continue to be very important. Too many photos were outdated (over 5 years) and/or not in current grade. Some records did not have photographs. Outdated photos and photos not in current grade, or photos missing in the soldiers' record cannot be explained, and absolutely not acceptable. Leaders must engage and soldiers must take responsibility for keeping their records complete and current.

b. NCOERs appear to be well written. However, Senior Raters need to address Promotion, Schools, Potential, and Performance (include opportunities for additional leadership) in that order. Those NCOERs stating "promote now/immediately/ahead of peers" as the first bullet immediately grab your attention. Senior Rater comments that state "best in the Bn or Bde" or "best I served with" carry significant weight. Negative NCOERs without rebuttals from rated NCOs are accepted on face value. Reviewer non-concurrence letters proved extremely helpful when questionable NCOERs were found. Good, solid, quantifiable excellence comments as the first bullet proved extremely helpful when looking at NCOERs.

c. ERBs. Overall, these documents were in fair shape. ERBs provide the opportunity to give a good view of a soldier's career on a single document (same as the Officer Record Brief). ERBs proved to be a very useful and important document when they were current and up-to-date. Soldiers must take ownership of their ERBs and their careers and must ensure their ERBs are accurate and up-to-date before any board.

d. OMPFs were generally in good shape. The most common missing document appeared to be the ANCOC Academic Evaluation Report (DA Form 1059). However, many OMPFs did not contain award orders/certificates, college transcripts, and orders awarding qualification badges (i.e. Parachutist, Air Assault, Foreign Awards/badges, etc.).

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. The 33, 96, and 98 CMF Proponent packets provided were mostly clear and easily understood. In some cases, information appeared confusing and/or "cut and pasted" from the SGM board packet (e.g. 96U MOS Description states "Ideally, 96U SFC candidates for MSG should have served successfully as a First Sergeant or Chief UAV Sergeant and/or at least one other position as noted below.

AHRC-EB

SUBJECT: Career Management Field (CMF) 33, 96, & 98 Review and Analysis

Those soldiers serving in a SGM position as a MSG should be viewed in the highest positive sense.”). Significant differences in the MOSs and duties do not necessarily relate to traditional Army job titles. The CMF proponent packet greatly assisted the cross walk of duties.

b. Recommended improvements. The Proponent supplemental information provided to the CY 04 MSG selection board proved very helpful—recommend continue for future boards, following careful review and update.



ANTHONY W. CHANEY
COL, MI
Panel Chief