



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-PDV-SEB

22 February 2010

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, U.S. Army Quartermaster Center, (ATTN: ATZM), 1201 22d Street, Fort Lee, VA 23801-1601

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

1. Reference memorandum, HQDA, DAPE-MPE-PD, 13 January 2010, Subject: Memorandum of Instruction for the FY10 SFC Promotion Board.
2. In accordance with the referenced 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 (strengths and weaknesses).
 - a. Performance and potential (particularly leadership opportunities).
 - (1) Raters/Senior Raters sent mixed messages to the board by not properly justifying their bullet comments and presenting bullet comments which did not match the blocks marked for performance and potential.
 - b. Training and education. Those Soldiers exceeding course standards in military education and attaining 60 or more credit hours had a competitive advantage over their peers. However, marginal performance or failure in military education was not looked at favorably. Additional merit was also given to those career enhancing military courses such as Battle Staff, Advanced Culinary Skills, Support Operations, etc.
 - d. Physical Fitness. The population was physically fit. Soldiers consistently earning the APFT badge had an advantage. Soldiers with recent APFT failures and height/weight non-compliance were not competitive. The board observed many occasions where the height and weight increased from NCOER to NCOER. Raters and NCOs should understand that OMPFs contain all NCOERs in sequence where the variance in height and weight are easily comparable.

e. Overall career management. The board recognized that Soldiers in the 92A field spent too much time in SGL/Instructor Writer positions and not enough time in Alpha positions as a SSG. Soldiers that held 92A30/40 positions and did well had the advantage over SSG that held positions such as SGL/Instructor Writer positions, and didn't have any Warehouse experience. 92A's serving in positions outside their MOS such as; Company Training Room NCOIC or Company Orderly Room NCOIC was not favorable as a SSG.

4. CMF structure and career progression assessment.

a. MOS compatibility within CMF. 92A's were very compatible within the 92 field. SSG's holding valid Alpha positions and excelled, were greatly recognized for their outstanding logistical experience in and out of theater.

b. Suitability of standards of grade and structure. Accurate and explicit duty description/duty title remains critical for correct placement of our NCOs. The board observed many cases where Platoon Sergeant positions (Skill Level 40) were coded as Skill Level 30 on the NCOER and ERB.

c. Assignment and promotion opportunity. Soldiers were afforded the opportunity to serve in positions of higher responsibility and special assignments. Soldiers that performed well in these positions were better positioned for selection.

d. Overall health of CMF. The health of the CMF is excellent and depicted a professional force that is performing demanding duties while maintaining high standards.

5. Recommendations. (Proposals keyed to subparagraphs above).

a. Competence. Recommend NCOs work in their perspective CMF positions and not outside their CMP longer than 1 year.

b. CMF structure and career progression. The 92 field structure has a good balance with structure and career progression, as long as the NCO holds positions within their career field.


6. CMF Proponent Packets.

a. Overall quality. Proponent packets from the 92s seem to provide good guidance and selection criteria for Soldiers serving in institutional units but did not provide guidance for the logistical war fighter on the battlefield.

AHRC-PDV-SEB

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

b. Recommended improvements. Focus on our many logisticians that are providing support in the theater of operations.



JAMES L. MCGINNIS JR
Colonel, LG
Panel Chief