

THE OFFICER EFFICIENCY REPORT
AS A TOOL OF LEADERSHIP

Captain Bryant S. Sneed, III
Roster Number 150, Faculty Advisor Group 3, IOAC 5-69
August 1969

The United States Army Infantry School
Fort Benning, Georgia 31905
25 August 1969

IOAC 5-69

SUBJECT: The Officer Efficiency Report as a Tool of Leadership

1. PROBLEM. To determine the value of the officer efficiency report (OER) as a tool of leadership.

2. ASSUMPTIONS.

a. The United States Army will continue to need and utilize the efficiency report for evaluating officers.

b. The rating officer will make an objective, unbiased, and truthful evaluation of the rated officer.

3. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM.

a. Leadership traits are those personal qualities that a successful leader should possess. These are indicated and evaluated in Part IV of the current officer efficiency report (DA Form 67-6). (Annex A) (Annex C)

b. The purpose of the current officer efficiency report (DA Form 67-6) is to provide selection boards and assignment officers with accurate information concerning performance of duty factors, performance of present duty, promotion potential, schooling potential, assignment potential, personal qualities, and over-all value to the service. (Annex B)

c. Under the current Army Regulation (AR) 623-105 it is not mandatory that the officer efficiency report be shown to the rated officer unless it is an adverse report. (Annex B)

d. AR 623-105 states that counseling is most important and must be performed extensively with junior officers. (Annex B)

4. DISCUSSION.

a. The leadership traits listed in FM 22-100 are approximately the same as those found in Part IV of the current officer efficiency report (DA Form 67-6). (Annex A) (Annex C) Therefore, the current OER does in fact rate those qualities deemed necessary in a leader.

b. Since the OER provides selection boards and assignment officers with information which will directly influence the officer's future, it is logical to say that the officer efficiency report is the most important periodic contribution to an officer's record.

c. An experienced counselor guides the counseling session and allows the officer being counseled to acknowledge his strengths and weaknesses. This can be an opportunity for the officer being counseled to discuss methods of improving his weak traits and

capitalizing on his strong traits. (12:2)

d. In a survey conducted of 22 students in Infantry Officer Advance Course (IOAC) 5-69, 55% felt the current officer efficiency report was not being utilized as a tool of leadership.

e. LTC A. G. Norris, speaking on behalf of Infantry Branch, Office of Personnel Operations (OPO), feels that all officers should be shown their efficiency reports and should be counseled prior to being rated.

5. CONCLUSIONS.

a. If the rated officer were shown the contents of his efficiency report and properly counseled prior to the report being written, the officer efficiency report would then be a valuable tool of leadership.

b. Under the current AR 623-105, which regulates the present OER (DA Form 67-6), the officer efficiency report is an effective tool of personnel management, but is not being used as an effective tool of leadership.

6. ACTIONS RECOMMENDED.

a. That AR 623-105 be changed to read that the OER will be shown to the rated officer by the rater.

b. That definite counseling policies be stated in an Army Regulation.

c. That a specific block be designated on the officer efficiency report to be signed by the officer being rated after he has been shown his report.


BRYANT S. SNEED, III
Captain, Infantry
544-3900

ANNEXES: A - Officer Efficiency Report (DA Form 67-6)
 B - Extract from Army Regulation 623-105
 C - Definitions AND EXPLANATIONS OF LEADERSHIP TRAITS
 D - Discussion
 E - Survey
 F - Personal Interview
 G - Bibliography

CONCURRENCES: (Omitted)

NONCONCURRENCES: (Omitted)

CONSIDERATION OF NONCONCURRENCES: (Omitted)

ANNEXES ADDED: (Omitted)

ACTION BY APPROVING AUTHORITY:

DATE:

Approved (disapproved), including (excluding) exceptions.

Signature

31 October 1968

C 1, AR 623-105

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL

1-1. Purpose and scope. This regulation prescribes the officer's efficiency reporting system of the U.S. Army. It includes detailed instructions for the preparation, processing, and use of the U.S. Army Officer Efficiency Report (DA Form 67-6). For instructions applicable to Academic Reports (DA Form 1059), see AR 623-106; for USAR officers not serving in Active Army warrant or commissioned status, see AR 140-143; for Army National Guard Officers, see NGR 21.

1-2. Use of efficiency reports. *a.* Officer efficiency reports provide a measure of an officer's overall value to the service and information essential to the career development, including assignments, of individual officers.

b. Each report is intended to report manner of performance of specific duties and for specific periods in a form which is readily usable by boards appointed for various personnel activities, such as promotions, and in the assignment of officers. The report will not contain remarks pertaining to prior or subsequent manner of performance or incidents. A single report provides an estimate of the officer's personal qualities, manner of performance, professional qualifications, and potential as demonstrated during a specific period and in a particular duty assignment. Normally, no single report will be used as the sole basis of any personnel action. The information produced by a series of reports submitted by different rating officials in a variety of duty situations becomes an indication of each officer's progressive development and a basis for measuring his value as compared to his contemporaries. Ultimately this information, when incorporated into and considered with the whole record, becomes a sound basis for competitive personnel actions—in short, the qualitative management of officers' careers.

c. A distinction is made between efficiency reporting for the purpose stated in *a* above and counseling. These two performance appraisal functions are performed by rating officials separately. The Officer Efficiency Report is an evaluation process to meet the needs of personnel management for officers of the Army. Various

counseling methods are available as described in DA Pam 600-3 (Career Planning for Army Commissioned Officers) and they must be adapted to the needs of the specific situation. Counseling is most appropriate when it is performed carefully and conscientiously. It must be used extensively with junior officers, particularly in their first few years of service. Counseling starts on the day the subordinate reports for duty and is performed periodically as the need arises. Counseling is performed by the rater as an important part of leadership for the purpose of assisting the individual in improving his duty performance in his present position and advising him on his future career. Perhaps the most challenging aspect of counseling is to present to an individual the analysis of his performance in such a way as to encourage maximum self-improvement and development.

d. An officer may obtain information about his efficiency record by personally visiting The Adjutant General's Office or his career branch in the Office of Personnel Operations or by deputizing in writing another officer to examine his record to obtain the desired information (see AR 640-12). Officers assigned to career management activities or to The Adjutant General's Office may not be deputized.

e. It is the policy of the Department of the Army to accept an administratively correct report as representing the considered judgment of the rating officials at time of preparation. However, an officer may appeal any report, should he feel that it violates the intent of this regulation. *A reclama is advisable only if he can provide substantial evidence in support of his belief. A request that merely alleges an unjust rating is not substantial evidence.* Appeals should be addressed to The Adjutant General, ATTN: AGPF-RA, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. 20315.

1-3. Controls. Controls will be established in each command to insure that—

a. Each rater, indorser, and reviewer receives instructions covering this regulation.

b. Reports are completed at the lowest level possible in order to obtain two accurate and con-

31 October 1968

sidered opinions based on the closest possible knowledge and observation of the officer.

c. Completed reports are accurate, impartial, and forwarded to reach The Adjutant General's Office not later than 45 days after the ending day of the report. Because of the importance of reports to personnel actions, especially selection boards, it is essential that every effort be exerted to reduce this 45-day period.

d. Specific reporting channels are established and published at each level of command. When commanders deem it justifiable, deviations from existing organizational structures are authorized. Changes to reporting channels will not be retroactive.

e. Each officer knows who his rater and indorser are and on whom he must submit or indorse a report.

f. Rating officials continually correct deficiencies and stimulate improvement in subordinates. The time for corrections is when the need is observed. Action will not be deferred until reports are due.

g. Each indorser is given the maximum possible opportunity to observe the performance of subordinates whose reports he will be required to indorse.

h. Each reviewer is aware of his responsibility to make qualitative analyses of rater and indorser entries from the standpoint of fairness with respect to the interests of both the rated officer and the Army.

i. Raters and indorsers may show their portion of the completed report to the rated officer.

j. Adverse reports are referred to the rated officer as stipulated below:

(1) An adverse report is one which contains any of the following ratings or remarks.

(a) A rating of 5 in parts IV, VI or X.

(b) A rating of unsatisfactory in part VII.

(c) A "not recommended for promotion" rating in part VIII.

(d) A comment in part XI reflecting on the character of the rated officer.

(e) A low rating of 20 percent or below in part XIIb.

★(f) A "not recommended for further schooling" in part IX.

(2) Action required:

★(a) Adverse reports must be referred in writing to the rated officer by the indorser for comment after the indorser has completed his portion of the report. The rated officer will acknowledge receipt and may inclose a statement when he believes that the rating or remarks are incorrect. His statement must be based on facts and will not contain allegations upon the character, conduct, integrity or motives of a rating official. The complete report will be returned to the indorser for further processing.

(b) Comments of the rated officer do not constitute an appeal. Appeals are filed and processed separately as outlined in paragraph 1-2e.

★(c) If the rated officer has departed the organization, the report will be handled as outlined in paragraph 3-3.

k. Personnel officers comply with chapter 3.

1-4. Restrictions. a. Except as required for compliance with the provisions of this regulation, no commander or other officer is authorized to require changes on a report. However, obvious inconsistencies or errors will be brought to the attention of the rater or the indorser by the indorser or the reviewer, as appropriate.

b. Reference will not be made to punitive or administrative action taken against an officer, or to an investigation concerning an officer, unless such action or investigation has been processed to completion, adjudicated, and final action has been taken within the rated period. Should the officer be found not guilty, comments pertaining to the incident will not be included in the report. Reference to an Article 15 action will not be made in the efficiency report at any time. Commanders imposing punishment under Article 15, UCMJ, upon officers and warrant officers will indicate that the record of punishment will be initially filed in either the efficiency portion or the personnel section of the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF), formerly the 201 file. If filed in the efficiency portion, it will be retained therein for a period of one

ANNEX C - Definitions and Explanations of Leadership Traits

1. Definitions.

a. **Military Leadership.** The art of influencing and directing men in such a way as to obtain their willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation to accomplish the mission. (6:3)

b. **Management.** Getting things done through the efforts of others. (12:173)

c. **Tool.** An instrument used to shape, form, or finish. (16:2408)

2. **Explanation of Leadership Traits.** Leadership traits are personal qualities which help the commander earn the respect, confidence, willing obedience, and loyal cooperation of his men. A study of the lives and careers of successful commanders reveals that many of the following personal traits or qualities are common to all of them and were adopted as leadership traits most desired in a leader. (6:13)

a. **Bearing** is creating a favorable impression in carriage, appearance, and personal conduct. It is a quality a leader must possess. (6:13)

b. **Courage** is both moral and physical. (6:15)

(1) **Physical courage** is to recognize fear of danger or criticism.

(2) **Moral courage** is knowing and standing for what is right even in the event of disfavor.

c. **Decisiveness** is making a decision promptly and then announcing it in a clear, forceful manner. (6:15)

d. **Dependability** is the certainty of the proper performance of duty. (6:15)

e. **Endurance** is physical and mental stamina. (6:16)

f. **Enthusiasm** is sincere interest and zeal in performance of duty. (6:16)

g. **Initiative** is deciding what has to be done and doing it without orders. (6:16)

h. **Integrity** is the rightness of character, moral principles, absolute truthfulness and honesty. (6:17)

i. **Judgment** is making decisions logically. (6:17)

j. **Justice** is the quality of being impartial and consistent. (6:17)

k. **Knowledge** is acquired information. (6:17)

l. **Loyalty** is faithfulness to country, Army, unit, seniors,

subordinates, and associates. (6:18)
7

m. Tact is the ability to deal with others without offending them. (6:18)
7

ANNEX D - Discussion

Discussion.

1. Comparison of leadership traits with those found on the officer efficiency report:

a. Leadership traits are personality qualities which if demonstrated will aid in making a successful leader of the individual who utilizes them. (Annex C)

b. The officer efficiency report utilizes Part IV to evaluate the rated officer's personality qualities. (Annex A)

c. In a comparison of the leadership traits listed on the OER and those listed as necessary leadership traits in FM 22-100, the only difference found was the number each possessed. (Annex A) (Annex C)

d. Therefore, the OER does in fact rate those qualities deemed necessary for leadership.

2. The purpose of the officer efficiency report as stated in AR 623-105 is to provide selection boards and assignment officers with accurate information on the officer being rated. (Annex B) Keeping the purpose of the OER in mind, it is logical to state that the most important periodic contribution to an officer's record is the officer efficiency report. (4:24) This fact is also brought out by the reminder of importance printed across the top margin of each officer efficiency report (DA Form 67-6). (Annex A)

3. Counseling is a must with junior officers, especially during the early years of his career. (Annex B)

a. Since the officer efficiency report is basic criteria for promotions and assignments, each young officer should be properly counseled by his superior.

b. Counseling is also documented by the United States Army Infantry School's Leadership Department, through their pamphlet, "Guide to Performance Counseling," which encourages counseling in such a way as to encourage maximum self-improvement through regular counseling sessions held at periodic intervals. (12:1)

c. Although counseling is not mandatory by any Army regulation, it is highly recommended in DA Pamphlet 600-3 and AR 623-105 that counseling of subordinates be conducted periodically. (Annex B) (4:Bd)

4. In a survey of 22 students in IOAC 5-69, with an average of 6 years, 3 1/2 months of commissioned service, the following facts were outstanding: (Annex E)

a. That approximately 55% felt the OER was not being utilized as a tool of leadership.

b. That approximately 87% of their total OER's had been seen by the 22 students.

c. That approximately 51% of their total OER's were shown to them by the rating officer.

d. That approximately 33% of their OER's were seen by visiting Department of the Army.

e. That 100% of the total 22 students agreed emphatically that the OER should be shown to the officer being rated.

f. That 100% agreed that counseling an individual helps to improve his deficiencies. Several noted that they agreed as long as the counseling was done prior to rating.

5. In a personal interview with LTC A. G. Norris, Executive Officer (XO), Infantry Branch, OPO, the following points were established as important: (Annex F)

a. That LTC Norris and Infantry Branch feel an officer should definitely be counseled and shown his OER.

b. That Infantry Branch does not keep obsolete regulations.

c. That Infantry Branch reviews OER's and notifies the individual concerned if they feel the deficiency necessitates it.

ANNEX E - Survey on the Value of the OER as a Leadership Tool

1. The attached questionnaire (Appendix 1) given to 22 IOAC students with an average of 6 years, 3 1/2 months ~~total~~ commissioned service was compiled August, 1969.

2. The following statistics were derived from the questionnaire survey.

a. That approximately 55% felt the OER was not being utilized as a tool of leadership.

b. That approximately 87% of their total OER's had been seen by the 22 students.

c. That approximately 51% of their total OER's were shown to them by the rating officer.

d. That approximately 33% of their OER's were seen by visiting Department of the Army.

e. That 100% of the 22 students agreed emphatically that the OER should be shown to the officer being rated.

f. That 100% agreed that counseling an individual helps to improve his deficiencies. Several noted that they agreed as long as the counseling is done prior to rating.

3. The questionnaire was not used in its entirety. Only those statistics pertinent to the problem were utilized.

APPENDIX 1 to ANNEX E --Questionnaire

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
20th Company, 2d Student Battalion, TSB
Fort Benning, Georgia 31905

10 August 1969

SUBJECT: Staff Study Questionnaire

TO: Advanced Course Students of IOAC 5-69

My staff study problem is to determine the value of the Officer Efficiency Report as a tool of leadership. Please answer the following questions and return.

1. How many years of commissioned service do you have to date?
2. How many officer efficiency reports have you written since date of commission?
3. Have you ever had instruction on the value of the officer efficiency report? If so, where?
4. How many officer efficiency reports have you received since date of commission?
5. How many of your officer efficiency reports have you seen?
6. How many of your efficiency reports were shown to you by the rater?
7. How many of your efficiency reports did you have to travel to the Department of Army to read?
8. When you read your officer efficiency reports, did you resolve at that time to correct the deficiencies noted on your reports?
9. When rating another officer, do you use the officer efficiency report as a form of reward?
10. Do you feel that the OER should be shown to the officer being rated?
11. Do you feel that the rater should counsel the rated officer? If yes, when?

12. Do you feel that counseling of an individual being rated helps to improve his deficiencies?

13. Do you feel that the officer efficiency report is being utilized as a tool of leadership?

Bryant S. Sneed III
BRYANT S. SNEED III
CPT, Infantry
IOAC 5-69

ANNEX F - Personal Interview

Summary of an interview with LTC A. G. Norris, XO, Infantry Branch, OPO, conducted on 18 August 1969.

I began my interview by asking LTC Norris if he had any statistics concerning the annual rate of officers who visit Infantry Branch to check their officer efficiency reports. It seems there are no exact figures relating to this question. However, Department of the Army has data on the number of officers they see each year for various reasons. This information can be obtained by a written request to DA. Since some officers visit DA more than once a year, these figures would be of no importance.

I also wanted to know the last date when OER counseling was mandatory but was told by LTC Norris that this information is kept at Department of the Army, Personnel.

LTC Norris explained that his office takes several factors into consideration when they receive a low-rated OER. Three of the most important factors were:

- a. If the rating officer is a high or low rater.
- b. If the low-rated OER is consistent with the other OER's in the individual's 201 file.
- c. If the rating officer was a civilian, naval officer, or in a branch other than Infantry.

LTC Norris went on to say that this one low report would not necessarily hurt the rated officer if it fell into a composite of high reports. Also, the validity of the low OER would be noted in his over-all file.

Speaking on behalf of Infantry Branch, LTC Norris agreed emphatically with the idea of showing an individual his OER. He also stated that there is a definite relationship between high OER's and personnel being counseled prior to the writing of his OER.

Finally, LTC Norris told me that he thought the present OER system was not perfect but is an extremely good appraisal of how an officer is doing in the Army.

ANNEX G - Bibliography

1. AR 623-105, Officer Efficiency Reports (Washington, D. C.: Department of the Army, October, 1968).
2. Command Information Fact Sheet 90 (Republic of Viet Nam: Department of the Army, April, 1968).
3. DA Pamphlet 360-304, Officers Call "Efficiency Reporting" (Washington, D. C.: Department of the Army, February, 1968).
4. DA Pamphlet 600-3, Career Planning for Army Commissioned Officers (Washington, D. C.: Department of the Army, November, 1968).
5. Doughtie, Lt Col Claude H., "Myths That Beset Army's OER's," Army, pp 44-47, July, 1969.
6. Felling, Lt Col Walter J., "How Efficient Is Our Efficiency Report?", Combat Forces Journal, pp 26-27, August, 1952, U1.C6.
7. FM 22-100, Military Leadership (Washington, D. C.: Department of the Army, November, 1965).
8. Hays, Samuel H. and Thomas, Lt Col William N., Taking Command, pp 61-73 (Harrisburg, Pa.: Stackpole Co., 1967) uB 210.H3bU.
9. Hessman, James, "New Army OER Effective 1 April '68," Journal of the Armed Forces, October, 1967, pp 1 and 8, U1.U7.
10. Hewitt, Major General RA, "Performance Counseling," Army Information Digest, December, 1961, pp 22-24, U1.A81.
11. Kirshner, Eugene, "On Military Leadership," Research Paper (Los Angeles, Calif: California State College, December 1967).
12. Leadership Pamphlet, "Guide To Performance Counseling" (Fort Benning, Ga.: Leadership Department, Infantry School, June, 1969).
13. Morris, Jud, The Art of Motivating (Boston, Mass: Industrial Education Institute, 1968), HMI41.M83 bU.
14. Nations Business, Editors of Lessons of Leadership (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1968), HF5500.N21bU.
15. Rundquist, Dr. Edward A., "Officer Efficiency Reports Discussed by Army's Personnel Expert," Army Navy Air Force Journal, April, 1952, pp 1011 and 1043, U1.U7.
16. Strauss and Sayles, The Human Problems of Management (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967).
17. Webster, Noah, Webster's Third New International Dictionary (New York, N. Y.: G. C. Merriam Co., 1961, p 2408).