



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

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

ATZK-AR

5 September 2018

MEMORANDUM THRU DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ARMOR

FOR CHIEF OF ARMOR, US ARMY ARMOR SCHOOL

SUBJECT: Information Paper - Results of FY 18 Sergeant Major Training and Selection List

1. Purpose. To provide information to the Chief of Armor on the results of the FY 18 selection list for attendance to USASMA Class 69 and promotion to Sergeant Major (SGM).

2. Summary. The Department of the Army selection board convened on 14 August 2017 at FT Knox, KY to consider eligible Senior Noncommissioned Officers for selection to attend the United States Sergeants Major Academy (USASMA Class 69) for the purpose of promotion to SGM. The eligibility criteria for promotion consideration to SGM were: "ALL SSD-IV AND SLC QUALIFIED ISG'S/MSG'S WITH A DOR OF 18 AUG 15 AND EARLIER AND WITH A BASD BETWEEN 18 AUG 93 AND 18 AUG 07 (BOTH DATES INCLUSIVE)." The reference is MILPER Message 17-142.

- Primary Zone. DOR IS 8 SEP 14 AND EARLIER.
- Secondary Zone. DOR IS 9 SEP 14 THRU 18 AUG 15 (INCLUSIVE).

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

- The total number of Armor First Sergeant/Master Sergeant's considered for promotion was 91; number selected for promotion was 46. Armor selection rate was 50.54%; the total Army selection rate was 24%.
- The average age of those selected for promotion within CMF 19 was 41.3 years. The oldest was 54 years of age and the youngest was 35 years of age. The difference between selectees of class 68 (FY 17, 39.86) and class 69 (FY 18, 41.36) is 1.5 years.
- The average Time In Service (TIS) for those selected for promotion was 21.5 years. The highest TIS was 25 years and the lowest was 17 years. The difference in the TIS of selectees of class 68 (FY 17, 19.9) and class 69 (FY 18, 21.5) 1.6 years.

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper- Results of FY18 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 69

- The average Time in Grade (TIG) for those selected for promotion was 5 years. The highest was 10 years and the lowest 3 years. There is no significant difference between TIG of selectees of class 68 (FY 17, 4.4) and class 69 (FY 18, 5.0)

- All of the NCOs selected for attendance to USASMA Class 69 were high school graduates or equivalent. Of the 46 Armor NCOs selected for attendance to USASMA Class 69, 84.7% had some college. The following is the level of education for selectees:

- (1) No college: 15.2% had no college (7 of 46).
- (2) Some College: 84.7% had some college. (39 of 46).
- (3) Associates Degree: 32.6% had the equivalent of a two year degree (15 of 46).
- (4) Bachelor's Degree: 19.5% had the equivalent of a four year degree (9 of 46).
- (5) Masters Degree: 0% attained a Masters Degree 0 of 46).

- The average GT score for those selected for promotion was 110 . The highest GT score was 130; the lowest GT score was 89.

- 1 of 46 of the selectees (2.17%) had converted from 19K to 19D.

- The Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) of the selectees had an average of 259.78. The highest score recorded was 300, with the lowest being 100.

- Professionally developing assignments:

	Master Gunner	Drill Sergeant	Recruiter	Instructor	O/C	NCOA	AC/RC	ROTC
19K	7	2	2	10	7	2		5
19D	1	5	1	20	9	1		13
TOTALS	8	7	3	30	16	3		18
Percentage	17.39%	15.21%	6.52%	65.21%	34.78%	6.52%	0	39.13%

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper- Results of FY18 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 69

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

	Sniper	Battle Staff NCO	Airborne	Air Assault	Pathfinder	Ranger	EIA
19K		9	1	4			10
19D		12	10	13	4	1	10
TOTALS		21	11	17	4	1	20
Percentage	0	45.65%	23.91%	36.95%	8.69%	2.17%	43.47%

	Jump Master	Rappel Master	Cavalry Leaders Course	Army Reconnaissance Course	Master Resiliency Trainer	Master Fitness	SHARP
19K					3	1	2
19D	7	2	4	7	6	2	3
TOTALS	7	2	4	7	9	3	5
Percentage	15.21%	4.34%	8.69%	15.21%	19.56%	6.52%	10.86%

- 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 69. The average time spent as a First Sergeant was 38 months, with the highest being 63 months and the lowest being 23 months. In addition, 29 of those selected for attendance to Class 69 had served as HHC level 1SGs at the Battalion/Brigade/Division and/or Garrison level successfully. (16 of 27 19Ds 59.2% selected) and (13 of 19 19Ks 68.4% selected) served as HQ/HHC/HHT/H HO 1SGs. Those serving as HQ/HHC/HHT/HHD 1SGs successfully were looked extremely favorably upon by the board. In addition, (22 of 46 47.8%) 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 32 months.

First Sergeant Time	<24	24-36	37-48	>49
19K	5	5	7	2
19D	5	12	6	4
TOTALS	10	17	13	6
Percentage	21.73%	36.95%	28.26%	13.04%

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper- Results of FY18 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 69

4. General observations.

- 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 69. 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 18 months, 24 months optimal of critical leadership time to be eligible for promotion to Sergeant Major. 100% of MSG/1SG's completed their critical leadership time.

- Of the Armor selectees, 19 were of a 19K background and 27 were of a 19D background.

- 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 Gunnery Sergeants (17.39% selected), Drill Sergeants (15.21% selected), Recruiters (6.52% selected), Observer/Controllers (34.78% selected), Senior Military Science Instructors (26.08% selected) and in many other important assignments.

- 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.

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

a. Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER).

(1) Discussion: The new NCOER format and constraint requirements for box checks is an improvement from the previous version. With the exception of comments noted in paragraphs 3b and 3c below, the board members were able to assess the message being conveyed by both raters and senior raters. The NCOER allows board members to be able to clearly identify those Soldiers who are Best Qualified amongst their peers.

(2) Recommendation: The new NCOER should be maintained.

b. Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER).

(1) Discussion: The most competitive files contained a consistent pattern of outstanding performance in leadership positions, staff, and broadening assignments. Rater and senior rater comments that support block checks with specific, qualitative, and quantitative bullets are extremely useful when determining the best qualified NCOs.

Rater comments that support "Exceeded Standard" and "Far Exceeded Standard" box checks on the NCOER were useful in determining the quality of performance of NCOs. Unsupported or marginally supported box checks generally detract from the credibility of

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper- Results of FY18 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 69

the rater and the overall value of the evaluation.

(2) Recommendation: Raters should provide comments that support "Exceeded Standard" and "Far Exceeded Standard" block checks with specific, qualitative, and quantitative bullets. Senior raters should provide enumeration that clearly supports the overall message that is trying to be conveyed to the board.

c. Senior Rater Enumeration.

(1) Discussion: A significant number of NCOERs viewed by the board indicated a "Highly Qualified" rating by the senior rater; however, many of these NCOERs lacked enumeration that distinguishing the rated NCO from his/her peers or the enumeration did not supported this check box, e.g. "5 of 8." Percentages often did not match the check box, e.g. "Highly qualified" with a "top 49%" comment. Clear enumeration sent a much stronger message to the board than the use of percentages. Generic comments such as "a true professional" or "one of the best" were viewed less favorably than a strong enumeration.

(2) Recommendation: Senior raters should provide the board a word picture which accurately describes the performance and potential of the rated NCO. Senior raters should reserve the highest enumeration for those NCOs most deserving of promotion. Failing to enumerate the best NCOs sends an unclear message to the board.

d. Enlisted Record Brief (ERB).

(1) 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 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 be considered less favorably. Other discrepancies on the ERB included not inaccurate military and civilian education, duty description not matching NCOERs, and time in duty position errors. Additionally, many Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) scores were not recent or did not match what was being shown in the Soldiers' NCOERs.

(2) Recommendation: Soldiers of all ranks should take personal ownership of their files, to include the ERB. Human resource specialists at the company and battalion level should assist Soldiers in screening ERBs for accuracy. Soldiers should work with their unit S1 to ensure that they are properly slotted in authorized positions. Paying appropriate attention to the holistic summary the ERB provides 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 sends a clear message to the board and are considered more favorably for promotion.

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper- Results of FY18 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 69

e. Supporting Documentation.

(1) Discussion: All entries on the ERB should be up to date and supported with documentation in the NCO's Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR). Many ERBs had annotations (college credit, awards, military courses, etc.) that were not supported by documentation (transcripts, award certificates, course completion certificates, etc.) in the AMHRR.

(2) Recommendation: Leaders should emphasize the importance of records review. A records review with a human resource specialist is a designated opportunity for Soldiers to ensure the proper documentation is in their AMHRR, and Soldiers should be taking advantage of those opportunities.

f. Derogatory Information.

(1) Discussion: Letters to the Board President referencing derogatory information within a candidates file were often verbose and/or did not directly address the derogatory data.

(2) Recommendation: Soldiers writing Letters to the Board President about derogatory data should be direct, concise, and focus on the issue at hand. Letters to the Board President that followed the aforementioned guidance were viewed more favorably by the board.

g. Missing evaluations.

(1) Discussion: Many files were missing the most recent NCOER, and a number of files were missing the last two NCOERs. The board relied heavily on evaluations to develop an understanding of a Soldiers' pattern of performance. The board viewed files that were missing the most recent NCOERs less favorably.

(2) Recommendation: Soldiers should work with rating chain officials to ensure evaluations are submitted to Headquarters, Department of the Army no later than 90 days after the "Thru" date of the evaluation report, in accordance with Army Regulation (AR) 623-3. Failing that, Soldiers' are encouraged to address the missing NCOER(s) in a letter to the board.

h. DA Photographs.

(1) Discussion: The photo is a key document in the voting process and is often the first document viewed by the board members. Having an inaccurate or outdated DA

Photo sends a strong message to board members that the NCO does not comply with Army regulations and does not have a vested interest in their own career progression.

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper- Results of FY18 Selection List for selection and attendance to USASMA Class 69

(2) Recommendation: NCOs should ensure their file contains a current and accurate DA Photo. Soldiers should update their DA photo when promoted, laterally appointed, upon award of a new badge, or an MSM or higher award.

i. ERB and DA Photo not matching.

(1) Discussion: The photo does not match the ERB or is not in compliance with AR 670-1. Several Soldiers' awards and decorations on their uniform did not match their ERB or were not supported by documents in their AMHRR. Board members also identified several violations of the proper wear of awards and badges that were not in compliance with AR 670-1.

(2) Recommendation: Soldiers should take the appropriate time to inspect their uniform to ensure it is in compliance with AR 670-1 and that all awards worn on the uniform match the Soldier's ERB and are supported by documents in their AMHRR. Supervisors should assist in the inspection of Soldiers' uniforms prior to the candidate taking their DA Photo. Further, supervisors should also review the Soldiers' DA Photo and ERB prior to the candidate validating their board photo.

5. POC for this memorandum is SGM Todd Crawford at todd.r.crawford.mil@mail.mil or 706-545-7725.

Todd R. Crawford
SGM, USA
Office Chief of Armor

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper- Results of FY18 Selection List for selection and attendance to
USASMA Class 69