



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ARMOR
1 KARKER STREET; MCGINNIS-WICKHAM HALL
SUITE 6600
FORT BENNING, GEORGIA 31905-4500

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

ATZK-AR

1 January 2017

MEMORANDUM THRU DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ARMOR

FOR CHIEF OF ARMOR, US ARMY ARMOR SCHOOL

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 16 Sergeant Major Training and Selection List

1. Purpose. To provide information to the Chief of Armor on the results of the FY 16 selection list for attendance to USASMA Class 68 and promotion to Sergeant Major (SGM).

2. Summary. The Department of the Army selection board convened on 07 September 2016 at FT Knox, KY to consider eligible Senior Noncommissioned Officers for selection to attend the United States Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA Class 68) for the purpose of promotion to SGM. The eligibility criteria for promotion consideration to SGM were: "ALL SSD-IV AND SLC QUALIFIED 1SG/MSG'S WITH A DOR OF 8 SEPT 14 AND EARLIER AND WITH A BASD BETWEEN 8 SEPT 92 AND 08 SEPT 06 (BOTH DATES INCLUSIVE)." The reference is MILPER Message 16-130.

a. Primary Zone. DOR IS 10 SEPT 13 AND EARLIER.

b. Secondary Zone. DOR is 11 SEPT 13 THRU 8 SEPT 14.

3. SGM Selection Information. The following is a profile of the First Sergeant/Master Sergeant's selected for promotion to Sergeant Major:

a. The total number of Armor First Sergeant/Master Sergeant's considered for promotion was 167; number selected for promotion was 59. Armor selection rate was 35%; the total Army selection rate was 28%.

b. The average age of those selected for promotion within CMF 19 was 36.3 years. The oldest was 50.8 years and the youngest was 30.1 years. There is no significant age difference between selectees of class 67 (FY 15, 38.96) and class 68 (FY 16, 39.86)

c. The average Time In Service (TIS) for those selected for promotion was 19.9 years. The highest TIS was 23.11 years and the lowest was 15.10 years. There is no significant difference between TIS of selectees of class 67 (FY 15, 19.4) and class 68 (FY 16, 19.9)

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 68

d. The average Time in Grade (TIG) for those selected for promotion was 4.4 years. The highest was 8 years and the lowest 2.10 years. There is no significant difference between TIG of selectees of class 67 (FY 15, 3.88) and class 68 (FY 16, 4.4)

e. All of the NCOs selected for attendance to USASMA Class 68 were high school graduates or equivalent. Of the 59 Armor NCOs selected for attendance to USASMA Class 68, 88.1% had some college. The following is the level of education for selectees:

- (1) No college: 10.2% had no college (6 of 59).
- (2) Some College: 61.0% had some college. (36 of 59).
- (3) Associates Degree: 18.6% had the equivalent of a two year degree (11 of 59).
- (4) Bachelor's Degree: 10.2% had the equivalent of a four year degree (6 of 59).
- (5) Masters Degree: 0% attained a Masters Degree 0 of 59).

f. The average GT score for those selected for promotion was 101.0. The highest GT score was 130; the lowest GT score was 100. There were no senior NCOs who had a GT score below 100.

g. 1 of 59 of the selectees (1.69%) had converted from 19K to 19D.

h. The Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) of the selectees had an average of 279.12. The highest score recorded was 300, with the lowest being 226.

i. Professionally developing assignments:

	Master Gunner	Drill Sergeant	Recruiter	Instructor	O/C	NCOA	AC/RC	ROTC
19K	16	8	4	9	5	3	10	7
19D	2	7	2	2	9	6	9	10
TOTALS	18	15	6	11	14	9	19	17
Percentage	30.51%	25.42%	10.17%	18.64%	23.73%	15.25%	32.20%	28.81%

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 68

j. The following data depicts attendance at common professional development schools.

	Sniper	Battle Staff NCO	Airborne	Air Assault	Pathfinder	Ranger	EIA
19K	0	10	4	5	0	1	11
19D	2	10	14	14	5	3	2
TOTALS	2	20	18	19	6	4	13
Percentage	3.39%	33.90%	30.51%	32.20%	8.47%	6.78%	22.03.%

	Jump Master	Rappel Master	Cavalry Leaders Course	Army Reconnaissance Course	Master Resiliency Course	Master Fitness	SHARP
19K	2	0	0	1	2	0	3
19D	10	1	3	0	4	1	1
TOTALS	12	1	3	1	6	1	4
Percentage	20.3%	1.69%	5.08%	1.69%	10.17%	1.69%	6.78.%

k. Critical Leadership Time. The following chart below outlines the amount of critical leadership time as a 1SG that each selectee completed upon selection to USASMA Class 68. The average time spent as a First Sergeant was 41 months, with the highest being 68 months and the lowest being 25 months. In addition, 43 of those selected for attendance to Class 68 had served as HHC level 1SGs at the Battalion/Brigade/Division and/or Garrison level successfully. (19 of 59 19Ds 32.2% selected) and (24 of 59 19Ks 40.6% selected) served as HQ/HHC/HHT/HHD 1SGs. Those serving as HQ/HHC/HHT/HHD 1SGs successfully were looked extremely favorably upon by the board. In addition, (15 of 59 25.4%) served as Operation Sergeants Major in addition to the critical leadership time as a 1SG required, with the lowest being 3 months and the longest being 25 months.

First Sergeant Time	< 24	24-36	37-48	>49
19K	0	9	15	7
19D	0	13	8	7
TOTALS	0	22	23	14
Percentage	0%	37.3%	38.9%	23.8%

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 68

4. General observations.

a. OCOA believes the selection board voted our best First Sergeant/Master Sergeant's for selection to attend the United States Army Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA) Class 68. It is our opinion that the promotion board did fully follow the Branch guidance written in DA Pam 600-25 (Chapter 10, 10-10, para 1) which clearly states that a Master Sergeant/First Sergeant needs to have 24 months critical leadership time to be eligible for promotion to Sergeant Major. 100% of MSG/1SG's completed their critical leadership time.

b. For Armor selectees in the Primary Zone, the selection rate was 41.1% (51 of 124), the selection rate for the secondary zone was 18.6% (8 of 43)

c. Of the Armor selectees, 31 were of a 19K background and 28 were of a 19D background.

d. Goals for development, the NCOs selected did the tough demanding assignments. They had numerous professionally developing assignments throughout their careers. They served the Armor Force well as Master Gunners (30.51% selected), Drill Sergeants (25.52% selected), Recruiters (10.17% selected), Observer/Controllers (23.72% selected), Senior Military Science Instructors (28.81% selected) and in many other important assignments.

e. Armor NCOs across all brigade combat team formations compete equitably for promotion. The key for selection remains excellence in key leadership positions as evidenced by multiple NCOERs, supported by sustained performance in the generating force.

f. The Armor proponent highlights the following from the field After Action Report:

(1) Rater Assessments Do Not Match.

(a) Discussion: There were numerous cases where rater and senior rater assessments were inconsistent (e.g. rater assessed as Fully Capable and senior rater assessed as a 2/1 or 1/1). Inconsistencies between rater and senior rater assessments are challenging for board members to interpret when there are no comments from the reviewer to clarify the inconsistency.

(b) Recommendation: The rating chain must collaborate to ensure they are sending a consistent and accurate message to the board regarding the NCO's performance and potential. When the rater and senior rater differ in their assessments, the reviewer should non-concur and account for these inconsistencies in their comments.

(2) ERB Accuracy.

(a) Discussion: The board considered the ERB as a snapshot of a Soldier's current state of readiness, experience, accomplishments, credentials, and career summary. A large number of

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 68

ERBs were inaccurate, missing information, or not updated/validated. Many ERBs showed “Known loss,” “Incoming personnel,” or “Surplus Soldier.” These entries did not provide the board with the information needed to consider the file accurately and caused the file to not be considered favorably. Other discrepancies on the ERB included not updated or accurate military and civilian education, incorrectly inputted technical certifications, duty description not matching NCOERs, and time in duty position errors.

(b) Recommendation: Soldiers of all ranks should take personal ownership of their files at all times. Human resource specialists at the company and battalion level should assist Soldiers in screening ERBs for accuracy. Paying appropriate attention to the holistic summary the ERB provides is an excellent way for Soldiers being considered for promotion to show the board they

are interested in their career advancement in the same way one would prepare for a personal interview. Soldiers who take the time and effort to update and certify their files send a clear message to the board and are considered more favorably for promotion.

(3) Professional or Civilian Education.

(a) Discussion: NCOs who exceeded course standards in attendance at Noncommissioned Officer Education System (NCOES) schools and military schools that award an Additional Skill Identifier (ASI), as annotated on DA Form 1059s, were viewed more favorably by board members. A higher level of civilian education was also an indicator of life-long learning. NCOs that continued to pursue military skill producing schools and higher levels of civilian education were viewed more favorably by the board.

(b) Recommendation: NCOs should strive to continue to their professional and personal development by attending additional skill producing schools and higher civilian education. Those that demonstrated a commitment to lifelong learning were viewed as more competitive for promotion.

(4) Physical Fitness.

(a) Discussion: NCOs who demonstrated a consistently high level of physical fitness were viewed as highly competitive (e.g., APFT score of 270 and above). Even those NCOs who had a permanent profile, yet scored high on the events that they could do, were viewed more favorably by the board. However, any “Needs Improvement” or failed APFT was looked upon less favorably.

(b) Recommendation: NCOs should strive to maintain the highest level of physical fitness possible. NCOs who earn the Army Physical Fitness Badge or achieve a high score on the APFT

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 68

should discuss with their rater about including a specific bullet comment on their NCOER to reflect outstanding performance.

(5) Soldier Physical Profile.

(a) Discussion: The board found files with permanent profiles and APFT scores over 200 points confusing. According to Training Circular (TC) 22.20, “Soldiers on a permanent profile are given a DA Form 3349. This form annotates exercise and activities suitable for the profiled Soldier. The form also stipulates the events and/or alternate aerobic events the Soldier will do on the APFT. There is no point score annotated on the DA Form 705 for performance of alternate aerobic events. These events are scored as either a GO or NO-GO.” This statement clearly states that 200 points is the maximum points available for Soldiers on a permanent profile.

(b) Recommendation: Soldiers on permanent profiles should use the NCOER (DA 2166) Part IVa to articulate the profile limitations and, if appropriate, how they exceeded 200 points. This would clarify to the board how they are able to execute the APFT or, if the limitations of their profile make 200 points their maximum. Using the PT box allows the board to understand the Soldiers overall readiness and physical fitness without manipulating scores or violating profiles. It also levels the playing field for the board members to fairly assess Soldiers on profile and Soldiers not on profile.

5. POC is MSG Valvano, Steven D. Jr. Office of the Chief of Armor, (706) 545-1921.

2 Encls



MICHAEL S. QUIBAN

SGM, USA

Chief, Office Chief of Armor