



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
1600 SPEARHEAD DIVISION AVENUE
FORT KNOX, KY 40122

AHRC-PDV-S

2 November 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Director of Military Personnel Management, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff G-1, 300 Army Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20310-0300

SUBJECT: Field After Action Report – FY13 Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board and Sergeant First Class (SFC) Qualitative Service Program (QSP) Boards

1. References.

- a. AR 600-8-19, Enlisted Promotions and Reductions, dated 30 April 2010.
- b. Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-25.
- c. DAPE-MPE-PD, Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) dated 20 September 2012, Subject: Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) for the FY13 Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board and Sergeant First Class (SFC) Qualitative Service Program (QSP) Boards.

2. General: The FY13 MSG Promotion Selection Board and SFC QSP Boards convened at the DA Secretariat, Fort Knox, Kentucky on 15 October 2012, to select the best qualified noncommissioned officers for promotion to MSG. The board selected eligible candidates for involuntary separation from active duty in accordance with references 1a and 1c above. The board also conducted a Qualitative Service Program (QSP) Board.

3. Board Issues and Observations.

a. Career Management.

(1) Discussion: The majority of NCOs are being properly managed IAW DA PAM 600-25. It was critical for NCO's to spend sufficient time in branch qualifying positions before moving on to broadening assignments. Broadening assignments and branch qualifying positions are very important to NCO professional development. 24 months in a branch qualifying position and 36 months in a broadening assignment at the grade of E7 was preferable. Broadening assignments longer than 36 months tended to take soldiers away from their MOS for too long a period. Challenging branch qualifying positions were looked upon favorably. Rater and Senior Rater Comments regarding NCOs who were moved out of a position before completing 24 months assisted the board members.

(2) Recommendation: It is imperative that Senior Raters properly mentor and help manage NCO's careers to ensure they are meeting qualification gates as well as self improving and seeking broadening assignments. We must ensure that as a force we balance the assignment of highly qualified NCO's between TOE and TDA assignments. It is imperative that recently

redeployed combat leaders have an opportunity to use their experience mentoring, teaching and retaining our junior leaders. Assignments at Combat Training Centers, the school house, initial entry units, etc., are crucial to maintaining the professionalism and strength of our force and were looked at favorably by the board.

b. Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER).

(1) Discussion: The majority of the NCOERs clearly articulated to the board members the best qualified NCO's. In some cases rater and senior rater comments and block checks were inconsistent causing ambiguity and making it difficult for board members to accurately assess performance and potential. Misconduct during the rating period was frequently not reflected on the NCOER, although the misconduct was documented (GOMOR, Article 15) in the disciplinary section of the board file.

(2) Recommendation: Raters and Senior Raters need to send clear messages by quantifying their comments to coincide with the block checks and reserve exclusive narratives such as "promote ahead of peers" or "promote immediately" for their top performers. The enumeration of the NCO's standing against his peers stood out to the board as a clear indication of their performance and potential.

c. Letters to the board.

(1) Discussion: Many letters contained information already contained in the board file. Others correctly explained reasons why the board file was not updated. Letters that were helpful were those that explained breaks in service, recent awards while deployed, and recent prestigious (e.g. Audie Murphy) awards that are not contained in the OMPF.

(2) Recommendation: Board candidates should follow the guidance provided in the MILPER message regarding how and when it is appropriate to submit a Letter to the Board.

d. Documentation of commendatory data.

(1) Discussion: There were multiple discrepancies among the Soldiers' DA Photo, NCOER and ERB regarding awards and decorations.

(2) Recommendation: Soldiers should update their ERB and OMPF on a periodic basis.

e. Height/Weight.

(1) Discussion: For some of the NCO's, height/weight and APFT information documented over several ratings was inconsistent. NCO's, who appeared significantly overweight in their DA Photos, did not provide an updated DA photo, or had HT/WT listed on NCOERs that exceeded screening standards IAW AR600-9 caused the board members to bring into question the credibility of the height/weight information provided on the evaluation.

AHRC-PDV-S

SUBJECT: Field After Action Report – FY13 Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board and Sergeant First Class (SFC) Qualitative Service Program (QSP) Boards

NCOERs that listed accurate HT/WT data and specific APFT scores, regardless of the score, were generally viewed as positive.

(2) Recommendation: Unit level leadership must ensure that all information provided on the NCOs evaluation report to include the APFT and HT/WT is complete, accurate and in accordance with AR 600-9.

f. Department of the Army (DA) Photo.

(1) Discussion: The DA Photo is the candidate's handshake with the board members. Many DA Photos that did not project a professional military appearance. A number of NCOs did not have a DA Photo in their current rank or a new photo when ARCOM or higher was awarded. There were a number of candidates that did not have a DA Photo present in their file.

(2) Recommendation: Leaders should assist NCO's in ensuring that everyone going before a board has an accurate and up to date official photograph that is not more than 5 years old.

g. Professional development education.

(1) Discussion: There were a large number of candidates that took advantage of military and civilian education. Candidates that developed themselves through higher level military schooling or by taking college level education showed the board members their commitment to excellence. This was seen favorably by the board. There are still a large number of Soldiers that are not taking full advantage of the vast certification and education programs available to them.

(2) Recommendation: Re-emphasize the various educational programs that are available to all Soldiers and Leaders at all levels.

h. Extended dwell time.

(1) Discussion: NCOs remaining in a position for longer than 36 months with no distinct lateral or higher mobility, did not demonstrate to the board a positive indication of professional development. Deployments, lateral on-post transfers, or nominations for positions in the same location but higher headquarters were viewed as favorable as long as the information was recorded in the evaluations and ERB.

(2) Recommendation: Leaders at all levels should continue to develop and mentor the NCOs that they rate or senior rate. NCOs that sought, were selected for, and excelled in the tough jobs, were looked upon favorably by the board.

4. Conclusion or general comments.

a. The board process is a fair and equitable system to select the right NCO's for promotion.

AHRC-PDV-S

SUBJECT: Field After Action Report – FY13 Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board and Sergeant First Class (SFC) Qualitative Service Program (QSP) Boards

- b. The best qualified NCO's were selected to meet the needs of the Army.
- c. The number of high quality, combat seasoned NCO's available for consideration for promotion far exceeded the Army's requirements.

//Original Signed//
THEODORE D. MARTIN
Brigadier General, U.S. Army
Board President