

ATZK-AR

14 July 2025

## MEMORANDUM THRU DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ARMOR

FOR CHIEF OF ARMOR, US ARMY ARMOR SCHOOL

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY25 Staff Sergeant (SSG) Evaluation Board.

1. Purpose: To provide information to the Chief of Armor on the results of the FY25 SSG Evaluation Board and Most Qualified (MQ) personnel.

2. Summary: The Department of the Army SSG Evaluation board convened on or about 20 May 2025 at Fort Knox, KY to evaluate eligible SSGs, create an Order of Merit List (OML) identifying Most Qualified (MQ) and Fully Qualified (FQ) NCOs that influences a myriad of decisions, from NCOES attendance to assignments. The reference is MILPER Message 24-407. The board considered and evaluated the Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) of all RA, USAR AGR, and IMR Soldiers meeting the following criteria:

RA/AGR/IMR: SSG RA/AGR DOR: 15 JAN 22 and earlier RA/AGR BASD: 15 JAN 06 and later RA/AGR/IMR DOB: 15 JAN 67 and later

3. SSG Evaluation Information. The following is a profile of the 19C/19D/19K Staff Sergeants identified as MQ during the SSG Evaluation Board.

- a. The total number of CMF19 SSGs evaluated: 951
- b. Fully Qualified: 916; 19C (31); 19D (572); 19K (313)
- c. Most Qualified: 35 or 3.8%; 19C (3 or 9.6%); 19D (27 or 4.7%); 19K (5 or 1.5%)

d. The average age of those identified as MQ within Armor Branch was 30 years. The oldest was 39 years of age and the youngest was 25 years of age. There is no significant difference between the FY24 Evaluation Board.

e. The average Time in Service (TIS) for those identified as MQ was 11 years, 1 month. The highest TIS was 16 years, 11 months and the lowest was 7 years, 7 months.

f. The average Time in Grade (TIG) for those identified as MQ was 4 years, 11 months. The highest was 8 years, 11 months and the lowest was 3 years, 6 months.

g. Of the MQ, the following is the level of education completed:

- (1) No college: 60% had no college (21/35)
- (2) Some College: 25.71% had some college (9/35)
- (3) Associate's degree: 2.86% had the equivalent of two-year degree (1/35)
- (4) Bachelor's Degree: 8.57% had the equivalent of a four-year degree (3/35)
- (5) Master's Degree: 2.86% had the equivalent of a six-year degree (1/35)

h. The average GT score for those identified as MQ was 109. The highest GT score was 137 and the lowest GT score was 88.

i. 6 of the 35 MQ (17.14%) had re-classed from various MOSs.

j. The following data depicts professionally developing assignments based on 3 19C MQ, 27 19D MQ and 5 19K MQ (35), respectively:

	Master Gunner	Drill SGT	Recruiter	Instructor	OC/T	NCOA	First Army
19C (3)	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
19D (27)	4	6	5	8	1	1	0
19K (5)	1	2	0	0	1	0	0
Totals	7	9	5	8	2	1	0
Percentage	20%	25.71%	14.28%	22.85%	5.71%	2.85%	0%

k. The following data depicts attendance at Functional courses.

	Tank Commanders Course	Bradley Commanders Course	*SLC	*Ranger	Battle Staff
19C	An article of the second secon	0			1
19D		0	0	2	2
19K	0				0
Totals	0	0	0	2	3
Percentages	0%	0%	0%	7.40%	8%

(\*) Annotated functional courses are only tracked for MOS 19D. These functional courses are not recommended for 19C/K. The percentages for the functional courses are for MOS 19D only.

I. Key Development Time: The following chart below outlines the amount of key development time as a SSG that each MQ selectee completed. The average time spent as a Squad Leader/Tank Commander was 34 months. 9 MQ selectees were serving in, or had served in, a Platoon Sergeant position.

Key Development	<24	24-36	37-48	>49	Total
19C	0	2	0	1	3
19D	2	9	8	8	27
19K	1	3	0	1	5
Total	3	14	8	10	35

General observations

a. The 35 NCOs identified as MQ did the tough demanding assignments. They served the Armor Force as Master Gunners (20% selected), Drill Sergeants (25.71% selected), Recruiters (14.28% selected), Instructors (22.85%), Observer/Controllers (5.71% selected), and many other important assignments.

b. Of the 35 MQ, the following are in the Excellence in Armor Program or earned the Expert Solider Badge: 19C (1 or 2.85%); 19D (12 or 34.25%); 19K (2 or 5.71%).

c. Armor NCOs across all the branch competed equitably. The key for selection remains excellence in key development positions as evidenced by multiple NCOERs, supported by sustained performance in the generating force. Completing more than the required Key Developmental time was seen and graded favorably by the board.

4. Point of contact is the undersigned at russell.j.zacherl.mil@army.mil, or (706) 545-7725.

ZACHERL, RUSSELL, Digitally signed by ZACHERL, RUSSELL, MARS, 1040 JAMES, 104048992 Date: 2025.07.14 (9559.00 attemption of the statement of t

RUSSELL ZACHERL SGM, USA Office of the Chief of Armor



## FY 2025 SSG Evaluation Board Results



Fort Benning, Home of the Armor & Cavalry



	Master Gunner (K8/J3)	Tank Commanders Course (19K)	Bardley Commanders Course (19C/19D)	*SLC (19D)	*Ranger (19D)	Battle Staff (CMF19)	Notes		
19C	2		0			1	<ul> <li>(*) Annotated functional courses are only tracked for MOO 19D. These functional courses are not recommended for</li> </ul>		
19D	4		0	0	2	2			
19K	1	0	0			0	19C/K.		
Total	7	0	0	0	2	3	The percentages for the (*) functional courses are for M 19D only.		
РСТ	20%	0%	0%	0%	7%	8%	lob only.		

## Conclusion:

NCOs that followed the Career Progression Plan guidance listed in DA PAM 600-25 fared well and were selected as Most Qualified. Completing more than the required Key Developmental Time, both as a Squad Leader, Section Leader, Tank Commander and as a Platoon Sergeant, was seen and graded favorably by the board. OCOA recommends following the TDMs outlined in DA PAM 600-25. NCOs should strive to maximize KD leadership positions prior to moving to broadening assignments. NCOs should strive to diversify assignments between operational and generating force

The DA PAM 600-25 Armor Career Progression Plan and Talent Development Models for CMF19 can be found online at https://www.army.mil/g-1#org-g-1-publications