



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



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

PCRE-B

27 February 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, US Army Transportation Center, Fort Eustis, VA
23604

SUBJECT: Review and Analysis for Career Management Field (CMF) 88 (Transportation)

1. Reference: Memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 4 February 2003, SUBJECT: Memorandum of Instruction for the CY03 Master Sergeant Selection Board.
2. In accordance with the above memorandum, the selection board reviewing records for Aviation Sergeant First Class' in CMF 88 submits this Review and Analysis to assist you in executing your duties as the CMF proponent.
3. Competence Assessment.

a. Performance and Potential. The panel is confident the very best NCOs were selected for promotion. The panel focused on the NCO's overall performance and demonstrated potential for increased responsibility. Outstanding performance in MOS related leadership positions such as Operations Sergeant, Platoon Sergeant, Detachment/Movements Supervisor, Truckmaster, Maintenance Supervisor and First Mate were viewed as key indicators and favorably considered in the evaluation process. Assignments as First Sergeants and other related MOS positions above the NCO's current grade were also viewed as a plus and as key indicators of potential for increased responsibility; however, it should be noted that average performance in one of these positions was viewed by the panel as less favorable than an above average performance in a position commensurate with the NCO's current grade (e.g., a performance and/or potential rating in the "2" or "3" block as a First Sergeant was not viewed as favorably as a performance and/or potential rating in the "1" block as a Platoon Sergeant, etc.). There were ample leadership opportunities in CMF 88 for panel members to select best qualified.

b. Utilization and Assignments.

(1). Many Transportation NCOs are serving in positions outside their MOS and most were successful in these roles. Outstanding performance in positions such as Drill Sergeant, Recruiter and Equal Opportunity Advisors were viewed favorably by the panel; however, prolonged service and/or repetitive service in any position outside the NCO's MOS was not considered to be as indicative of potential as those mentioned in paragraph (1) above. NCOs assigned to Recruiting Command continue to routinely receive below average NCOERs. This is a systematic problem that is being

*OCOT -
Aerof -
club*

PCRE-B

SUBJECT: Review and Analysis for Career Management Field (CMF) 88 (Transportation)

addressed at the most senior levels. The Panel did not unfairly penalize NCOs in this situation.

(2). There is a lack of assignment diversity with many NCOs in CMF 88. Some have career patterns that are replete with assignments away from their MOS (e.g., Drill Instructor, Recruiter, etc.) while others have career patterns that are replete with repetitive assignments within their MOS. It was not uncommon for NCOs in the first group to have as much as six to eight consecutive years away from their MOS. Favorable consideration was given to those who consistently assumed leadership positions and/or assignments within their MOS. It should be noted, that while Instructor/Writer positions are generally within an NCOs MOS, prolonged or repetitive assignments in this area combined with other MOS immaterial assignments, such as Drill Instructor, placed the individual at risk for non-selection.

c. Training and Education.

(1). Across the board, NCOs have aggressively pursued civilian education. Most NCOs have one year of college with many holding Associate and Bachelor degrees. There was no direct correlation between the level of civilian education and manner of performance. NCOs whose performance was consistently outstanding and where there was limited opportunities for civilian schooling were not penalized by the panel.

(2). NCOs who exceeded the standard (e.g., Distinguished Graduate, Honor Graduate, Commandant's List) at BNCOC, ANCO, Battle Staff or other military schools usually performed well in their duty assignments. The panel took into consideration individuals who had one or more "exceeded the standard" on academic efficiency reports. Simply put, hard work in military schools generally translated to outstanding performance in the field.

d. Physical Fitness and Appearance.

(1). APFT failures and failure to meet AR 600-9 standards for height/weight were the exception. A significant number of NCOs had APFT scores above 270. Earning the Army Physical Fitness Badge was a plus.

(2). The vast majority of official photographs were taken within the last five years; however, quality left much to be desired. Numerous uniform violations indicated little or no leader involvement in the process of taking the photograph and/or in reviewing the finished product. With the Army Selection Board Systems (ASBS) due to come online with the next year, panel members will have the ability to enlarge specific areas of the photograph, making it even more imperative that NCOs ensure only quality, accurate and current photographs are submitted to the board.

PCRE-B

SUBJECT: Review and Analysis for Career Management Field (CMF) 88 (Transportation)

e. **Total Person Concept.** The Transportation NCO Corps is strong. To remain competitive, NCOs must continue to strive to do things that set them apart from their peers (e.g., successful leadership assignments, attendance at Battle Staff, exceeding the standard in ANCOC and other military schools, civilian schooling, current and quality official photographs, etc.).

f. **Overall Career Management of Transportation NCOs.** The panel consensus is that CMF 88 is being effectively managed. It is the responsibility of both the NCO and his/her personnel advisor to ensure all have the opportunity to serve in tough leadership positions.

4. CMF Structure and Career Progression Assessment.

a. **MOS compatibility within CMF.** MOSs are properly aligned with duty positions and are properly structured to facilitate career progression.

b. **Suitability of Standards of Grade and Structure.** Consideration should be given to changing duty titles in the 88K and L MOSs to more closely align with 88M and H. For example, 88K, First Mate, could be changed to 88K, Platoon Sergeant, which would align more closely with duty descriptions in the other 88 MOSs. This would facilitate the panels ability to give equal weight to similar jobs throughout the 88 community.

c. **Assignment and Promotion Opportunities.** All assignments in CMF 88 provide excellent opportunities. The most heavily weighted standard used by the panel were comments from senior raters on the NCO's performance and potential in assignments commensurate with grade and MOS. Justifiable and objectively stated comments were the most useful in determining best qualified for promotion. Successful assignments in positions above an NCO's current grade were viewed as strong indicators of potential to lead at the MSG/1SG level.

d. **Overall Health of CMF 88.** The panel felt strongly that CMF 88 is healthy and will continue to be a vital part of the Army. NCOs are well trained, fully educated and prepared to execute their duties.

5. Recommendations.

a. **Competence.** NCOs are technically and tactically proficient; however, continue to improve the assignment process to ensure repetitive tours outside the MOS are minimized and equally distributed throughout the force. Recommend Battle Staff be incorporated in NCOES.

b. **Rater.** Raters do a good job justifying ratings with bullet comments; however, there remains room for improvement. NCOERs with "excellent" ratings in all

PCRE-B

SUBJECT: Review and Analysis for Career Management Field (CMF) 88 (Transportation)

five categories are rare and generally reserved for only the very best NCOs. This is a good thing and sends a powerful message to the board. The majority of NCOERs have "excellent" ratings in two or three categories and were viewed as very competitive by the panel. Raters should put the strongest bullets first – they will stand out and send a clear message. Include references to Sergeant Audie Murphy, Sergeant Morales or other equivalent awards/honors on the NCOER.

c. Senior Rater. Senior rater comments are too subjective, inflated and often do not justify performance and potential ratings. For example, a bullet comment, "promote with peers" is not consistent with a performance and potential rating in the "1" block. When nine out of ten NCOERs have words to the effect, "promote ahead of peers," it becomes difficult for panel members to differentiate those that should be promoted from those that should not be promoted. Objective comments such as, "the best of six Platoon Sergeants" were vastly more useful than comments such as, "outstanding performance as a Platoon Sergeant," "Future CSM" or words to that effect send a strong message to the board and should continue to be reserved for only the very best. Senior rater trends and responsibilities should continue to be emphasized to officers and senior NCOs at every opportunity (e.g. CCC, PCC, etc).

d. Reviewer. Reviewers must do a better job executing their responsibilities as outlined in AR 623-205. Accuracy of NCOERs must get better to ensure the right NCOs get promoted.

e. Official Photographs. NCOs must do better ensuring their photographs are current regardless of the date taken (e.g., no Staff Sergeant photographs for the Master Sergeant promotion board, etc.). The panel consensus is there needs to be a significant improvement in the level of command involvement in the process of taking the official photograph and/or in reviewing the finished product to ensure the NCO puts his/her best foot forward.

f. Disciplinary Action. NCOs should make every effort to remove old disciplinary action from their official file.

g. Letters to the Board. Don't send letters to the board to merely draw attention to your file. Only send letters to provide new and pertinent information. If you think you need to send a letter, let your chain of command review it first. There were few if any instances where letters to the board had any impact on the final vote.

6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall Quality. The CMF Proponent Packet was well prepared and useful to the panel in the overall selection process. Especially useful was the guidance from the Branch Chief outlining his priorities for determining best qualified for promotion.

PCRE-B

SUBJECT: Review and Analysis for Career Management Field (CMF) 88 (Transportation)

b. Recommended Improvements. Provide Transportation units with copies of the CMF Proponent Packet for use in mentoring subordinates. Put on AKO.

7. Conclusion. Chain of Command involvement in all aspects of the promotion selection process (e.g., official photographs, NCOERs, 201 files, etc.) is critical. The most effective tool available to ensure the best are promoted is the NCOER. Senior leader involvement in the preparation of the NCOER and the mentoring leading up the finished product will ensure raters and senior raters do the best job possible differentiating those that should be promoted from those that should not be promoted. Raters and senior raters must make the tough call when writing NCOERs. Only the best can be "promoted ahead of peers" and only the very best can be "promoted immediately." Unlike the OER, the NCOER has no fail-safe mechanism to prevent inflation; therefore, it is incumbent on raters and senior raters to ensure they are precise in the language they use to convey information to the board. There are few responsibilities more critical to the long-term health of the Army than the proper use of words to accurately describe the outstanding work of our professional NCOs.



ALLEN S. BAKER
COL, AV
PANEL CHIEF