1. Purpose: To provide information on the results of the FY16 Career Management Field (CMF) 11 training and selection list to Sergeant Major (SGM).

2. Overview: The FY16 SGM Training and Selection Board convened at the DA Secretariat, Fort Knox, Kentucky on 7 September 2016, to select the best-qualified noncommissioned officers for training and selection to SGM.

3. Primary and Secondary Zone were broke down as follows:

    a. Primary Zone: Date of Rank 10 September 2013 and earlier.

    b. Secondary Zone: Date of Rank 11 September 2013 through 8 September 2014.

4. Summary of Selectee Characteristics: The Army selected 967 Master Sergeants/1SGs for training and selection to the rank of Sergeant Major. The Army's training and selection rate was 28%. The Infantry had 347 Master Sergeants/1SGs considered and 164 selected for a 47% average. The selection rate for primary and secondary zones of consideration were 44% for the primary and 54% from the secondary. The average time in service for the Infantry selection rate was 19.6 years and the average time in grade was 4.2 years. 62% of the selected MSG/1SGs had served in an Infantry Brigade Combat Team (IBCT) or Infantry Brigade Combat Team Airborne IBCT(A). The remainder of the population broke down as: 28% served in an Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT), 2% served in the Ranger Regiment, 6% served in a Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT).

5. Infantry Master Sergeant/1SG Training and Selection Information:

    a. 16% of the Army selected population were Infantrymen.

    b. The Infantry had a greater selection rate (47%) than the Army selection rate (28%). Of the 164 individuals selected for training and promotion to Sergeant Major, the career paths broke down as follows:

        (1) 73% of the Infantrymen selected started out as 11B.
        (2) 13% started out as 11M.
        (3) 10% started out as 11C.
        (4) 2% started out as 11H.
        (5) 2% started out as a CMF other than Infantry.

    c. The average rated 1SG time for the selected Infantry population was 40.4 months.

    d. The average APFT score was 284.

e. The average amount of semester hours was 62.2 with 31% of the selected population having a degree.

f. 30% of the selected population were Ranger qualified, 25% were Battle Staff qualified, 36% were Jumpmaster qualified and 8% were Master Gunner qualified.

g. 98% MSG/1SG selected for SGM had earned the Expert Infantryman Badge.

h. 97% of the selected population had received the Combat Infantryman Badge.

i. 39% of the selected population were a Drill Sergeant during their career and 9% of the selected population had been Recruiters.

j. 8% of the selected population had received either the Silver Star or the Bronze for valor.

k. Squad Leader rated time broke down as follows:
   (1) 73% served as Squad Leaders in an IBCT/IBCT(A)
   (2) 21% served as Squad Leaders in an ABCT
   (3) 2% served as Squad Leaders in a Ranger Regiment
   (4) 1% served as Squad Leaders in an SBCT
   (5) 3% served as Squad Leaders in generating force units.

l. Platoon Sergeant rated time broke down as follows:
   (1) 69% served as Platoon Sergeants in an IBCT/IBCT(A)
   (2) 26% served as Platoon Sergeants in an ABCT
   (3) 2% served as Platoon Sergeants in a Ranger Regiment
   (4) 1% served as Platoon Sergeants in an SBCT
   (5) 2% served as Platoon Sergeants in generating force units.

m. 1SG rated time broke down as follows:
   (1) 62% served as a 1SG in an IBCT/IBCT(A)
   (2) 28% served as a 1SG in an ABCT
   (3) 2% served as a 1SG in a Ranger Regiment
   (4) 6% served as a 1SG in an SBCT
   (5) 2% served in 1SG positions in generating force units.

n. The information in tables 1 thru 11 is from the Enlisted Distribution and Assignment System (EDAS), Army Human Resource System Enterprise Datastore, and the US Army 2016 SGM Considered Select List. Table 1 uses the Army selection rate as the base rate for comparison. Lines highlighted in green indicate those data elements where the selection rate was statistically[1] higher than the base rate.

---

[1] For the purpose of this analysis, the term "significant" indicates that there is a statistical difference in selection rates between the compared populations. Given the varying population density of the individual segments analyzed, raw percentages are at times misleading. The level of significance was set at 0.1 for this analysis. Unless otherwise indicated the base population (mean) for comparison highlighted in blue on each table. Data elements highlighted in red had statistically lower rates and those in green had statistically higher rates.

(1). Table 1 illustrates the selection rates between the Army, the Infantry, and the other Operations Division CMFs. Comparison between CMFs is impractical due to the different impacts of proposed force structure changes on requirements.

Operations Division	ELIGIBLE	SELECTED	RATE
ARMY	3448	967	28%
Air Defense	66	32	48%
Armor	167	59	35%
Aviation	148	37	25%
Infantry	347	164	47%
Field Artillery	171	49	28%
Special Forces (18, 37, & 38)	321	98	30%

TABLE 1: Operations Division Comparison

(2). Table 2 illustrates the selection rates between the Operating and Generating Force. There were no significant differences in the selection rates of the Operating and Generating Forces.

FORCE SEGMENT	% CONSIDERED	% SELECTED
OPERATING FORCE	47%	43%
GENERATING FORCE	53%	51%

TABLE 2: CMF 11 Generating Force versus Operating Force

(3). Table 3 illustrates the selection rates between Operating Force types of units. There were no significant differences in selection rates between the various types of Operational Force assignments.

TYPE OF UNIT	ELIGIBLE	SELECTED	PERCENTAGE
OPERATION FORCE	164	71	43%
RANGER REGT	2	0	0%
IBCT (ABN)	18	9	50%
IBCT	47	20	42%
SBCT	34	16	47%
ABCT	19	9	47%
EAB (DIV, CORP HQs)	38	13	34%
OTHER (CTCs, TOG)	6	4	66%

TABLE 3: CMF 11 OPERATING FORCE BY TYPE OF UNIT

(4). Table 4 illustrates the selection rates between the Divisions. For this analysis, the three Stryker Brigades located at JBLM counted under the 7th Infantry Division. There were no significant differences in selection rates between Divisions.

DIVISION	ELIGIBLE	SELECTED	PERCENTAGE
DIVISION TOTAL	118	50	43%
1ST ARMORED DIV	11	3	27%
1ST CAVALRY DIV	5	3	60%
1ST INF DIV	8	1	12%
2ND INF DIV	0	0	0%
3RD INF DIV	9	7	77%
4TH INF DIV	12	2	17%
7TH INF DIV	12	6	50%
10TH MOUNTAIN DIV	18	8	44%
25TH INF DIV	12	6	50%
82D ABN DIV	14	6	43%
101ST ABN DIV	17	8	47%

TABLE 4: Operating Force selection rates by Division

(5). Table 5 illustrates Generating Force selection rates by major components. There were no significant difference in selection rates between the various types of Generating Force assignments.

Generating Force	ELIGIBLE	SELECTED	PERCENTAGE
GENERATING FORCE TOTAL	183	93	51%
AC/RC	8	2	25%
COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS	10	7	70%
NCO ACADEMIES	5	3	60%
ROTC	59	34	58%
TRADOC	42	16	38%
WARRIOR TRAINING UNITS	1	0	0%
OTHER(EAB, USASMA)	58	31	53%

Table 5: CMF 11 Generating Force by Major Components

(6). Table 6 illustrates TRADOC broken down for further detailed explanation. There were no significant difference in selection rates between TRADOC units.

TRADOC	ELIGIBLE	SELECTED	PERCENTAGE
TRADOC Total	**42**	**16**	**38%**
MCOE (Minus ARTB)	6	2	33%
Infantry School (Minus ARTB)	10	5	50%
ARTB	2	1	50%
AWG	5	2	40%
Armor School	1	0	0%
IMT Fort Jackson	18	6	33%

Table 6: TRADOC broken down

(7). Tables 7 and 8 illustrate selection rates for Soldiers with Additional Skill Identifiers (ASI) and with Skill Qualification Identifiers (SQI). There were no significant difference in selection rates related to an SQI or ASI.

ASI	CONSIDERED	SELECTED	RATE
CMF 11 TOTAL	**347**	**164**	**47.2%**
F7 PATHFINDER	84	47	55%
2B AIR ASSAULT	158	85	54%
5W JUMPMASTER	103	53	51%
2S BATTLE STAFF	79	41	52%
J3 MASTER GUNNER	27	13	48%

Table 7: ADDITIONAL SKILL IDENTIFIERS (ASI)

SQI	CONSIDERED	SELECTED	RATE
CMF 11 TOTAL	**347**	**164**	**47%**
U 75TH RANGER REGT LDR	14	3	21%
X DRILL SERGEANT	123	63	51%
V RANGER-PARACHUTIST	79	42	53%
G RANGER	6	4	66%
P PARACHUTIST	235	112	48%
8 INSTRUCTOR	150	77	51%
4 NON-CAREER RECRUITER	35	16	46%

Table 8: SPECIAL QUALIFICATION IDENTIFIERS (SQI)

6. General observations: The Office of the Chief of Infantry (OCOI) is confident the board selected our most qualified Master Sergeants and 1SGs for training and selection to the rank of Sergeant Major. Additional observations include:

> There was no significant differences in the individual qualifications or assignment patterns of the eligible MSGs. This suggests that the majority of those have met the proponent's professional development standards and that their individual manner of performance as documented on their NCOERs was the critical indicator of potential to serve at the SGM level.

a. The Infantry promotion rate increased from 23% in FY15 to 47% in FY16. The selection was comparable for both the primary and secondary zones of consideration.

b. The average rated months as a 1SG increased from FY15 of 37.8 months to 40.4 months for the FY16 selection board. The time in grade increased from 3.7 years time in grade to 4.2 years. The drop in secondary zone promotion rates (48% to 31%) may have contributed to this increase.

c. 97% of those selected met the recommended requirement of 24 months rated 1SG time. Of the Master Sergeants and 1SGs without a minimum of 24 months 1SG rated time, 50% of them had received NCOERs in SGM/CSM positions.

d. Serving in positions of greater responsibility and higher grade continues to be a plus for promotion, 13% of the selected population were rated in a position of higher grade and or responsibility compared to 2% of the non-select population.

e. 29% of the considered population were Ranger qualified (G, V, U) with 29% being selected for training and promotion.

f. Diversity of considered population.

(1) 32% of the rated senior NCOs that served in an IBCT as a squad leader served in an ABCT and or a SBCT as a 1SG or Master Sergeant.

(2) 65% of the rated senior NCOs that served in an ABCT as a squad leader/section sergeant served in an IBCT/IBCT(A) and or a SBCT as a 1SG or Master Sergeant.

7. The following characteristics and comments were from the Senior NCOs and Officers that were members of the board.

    a. The NCOER: Enumeration of rated NCOs. Senior raters consistently enumerating the rated NCO against a "like" population was extremely helpful in identifying the strongest NCOs across the different CMFs. The consistent use of enumeration or rankings helps in the use of the "whole person" concept when evaluating for potential for higher service. Enumerating statements appeared more influential than block checks given the overall inflation of those fields.

    b. The Enlisted Record Brief (ERB): The ERB is a snapshot of a Soldier's current state of readiness, experience, accomplishments and credentials, reflecting a compilation of all documentation in the Soldier's File. A large number of ERBs clearly contained inaccurate information, which may indicate the Soldier has not updated their records before the board. Many ERBs showed multiple duty title entries of, "Known Loss", or "Incoming Personnel". Both entries are distractors in an otherwise high quality file, and can absolutely cause negative connotations for a board member considering a file with multiple other distractors.

    c. The DA Photo: the DA Photo represents the first impression of the NCO to the board and is a vital part of the selection process. NCOs are responsible for ensuring that a quality photo is on file that projects the best professional military appearance. Board files lacking a DA Photo or with an outdated photo with incorrect rank and/or poor fitting uniform failed to portray a complete record.

    d. Letters to the Board President: Several letters submitted to the Board President failed to address specifics. Often, the letters were vague and confusing and identifying remarks were not relevant to the circumstances or the issue at hand. Letters spoke solely to personal education goals, community service, and charitable organizational memberships. Many letters were improperly formatted and contained grammar and spelling errors.