

DOG to fire into that killing area at long range. A second TOW platoon could be emplaced to the south on the hill with Team B's tanks. The third TOW platoon could occupy the hill northeast of EA DOG and in the low ground southeast of the hill. Since it is the least likely to be detected, this last TOW platoon should do the most damage.

To achieve surprise fire and to control our own fires, we have designated four TRPs. TRP 1, at the east end of EA DOG, marks the point where our fires begin when the enemy arrives. TRP 2 may be used at the task force level to mass fires if the enemy attempts to breach or bypass our obstacles. TRP 4 is the final exit for the enemy from our series of obstacles or a location where he could be constrained and targeted.

Our order directs Team B to engage the enemy from TRPs 1 to 3 and to be prepared to mass fires on TRP 2 on order.

Team A should synchronize its internal fire control by engaging the enemy from TRPs 1 to 3 with the south tank platoon firing on the lead enemy elements and the north platoon firing on the trail elements. Team A would also place heavy fire on the enemy between TRPs 3 and 4.

The antiarmor company would be directed to fire on the enemy between TRPs 1 and 3 and to mass fires on TRP 2 on order. The first and third antiarmor platoons would be directed to fire on the enemy between TRPs 3 and 4.

In this example, we have demonstrated a thought process that can be used to implement tactically the tenets of Air-Land Battle doctrine at a heavy task force level. This technique emphasizes retaining the initiative and interfering with and confusing the enemy.

The destruction of the enemy can best be achieved by using the four key principles and positioning weapon systems

around the killing zone from which the task force can achieve surprise and mass its fires from multiple directions (primarily from the flank and rear) from mutually supporting positions arranged in depth. Our experience has shown that this approach can work well.

---

Lieutenant Colonel Pierce T. Graney, Jr., now Commander, Operations Group, Combat Maneuver Training Center in Germany, was formerly commander of the Mechanized Infantry Combat Training Team at the National Training Center. He recently completed the Army War College and is expected to assume the command of a brigade in August 1989.

Dr. Robert H. Sulzen is the team leader of the Army Research Institute-National Training Center Research Team. He is also a colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve with 11 years of experience training with tactical engagement simulations. His article "Winning with Tactical Engagement Simulation" appeared in the May 1987 issue of *Military Review*.

---

# Writing Efficiency Reports

MAJOR HARRY D. STUMPF

Writing efficiency reports is a big part of the job of every officer and noncommissioned officer. Since these reports will stay in the rated soldiers' files forever, and since they will be influential in the selection of soldiers for promotion, they deserve the most careful attention. In addition, their quality reflects not only upon the rated soldiers but also upon the professionalism of the writer and his unit.

In my battalion, the 1st Battalion, 36th Infantry, we have come up with some guidelines for writing reports that have proved successful. These guidelines may also be useful to other units.

First, the standard for reports in the battalion is high and uniform—the same for a corporal and for a colonel. That standard is to produce a meaningful

report with a correct narrative, to submit it on time, and to see that it contains no mistakes. There is no allowance for error.

A meaningful report must begin with an accurate duty description, because this area becomes a discriminator in selections for promotion. The duty description block is often a significant problem, however, because the same duty position in adjacent companies or platoons is frequently described much differently. FMs 7-70 and 7-71 provide some good guidelines for infantry duty descriptions at all levels with references for all military occupational specialties (MOSs). The best overall reference for duty descriptions is AR 611-201, Enlisted Career Management Fields and Military Occupational

Specialties. It is on hand in the battalion personnel actions center (PAC).

A duty description should be developed by both the rater and the rated soldier at the beginning of the rating period. This is required for officer efficiency reports, but it is equally important for enlisted efficiency reports. When a soldier is involved in describing his duties, he has a clearer understanding of what those duties are.

At the same time, duty descriptions should be tailored to the individual to some extent. The exact duty description of the incumbent, although it can be used as a guide, will not necessarily be appropriate for his successor. Additional duties, personal strengths and weaknesses, personalities, the training schedule,

and other influences affect the duty descriptions of otherwise identical positions.

One requirement on a duty description that may not be suggested in the references is that some battalions, such as ours in Germany, have immediate mobilization requirements. Similarly, a light division or the 82d Airborne Division in the continental United States should include a parallel statement in its description that the soldier must be available for immediate worldwide deployment.

## VARIETY

The indorser on a report should try not to say the same things the rater has said. If he does, he might at least say them differently or from a different perspective. Using the same words makes both individuals look bad. Whenever possible, the rater and the indorser should try to use different events, characteristics, and qualities.

Results of the Army Physical Readiness Test (APRT) and height and weight data must be entered on efficiency reports; if it is not (or if the entry in either area is not passing), a comment in the rater's block is mandatory. Often good soldiers either do not meet the height and weight standards (but pass the body fat test) or do not have a current APRT score because of a legitimate profile. A rater, in writing his narrative, should be sensitive to an NCO who has a shortcoming in one of these areas.

If a first sergeant, for example, is outstanding, leads his company PT regularly, but has not had a PT test for a good reason, the rater should try not to close his comment with a blank, meaningless statement. Instead, he might put his mandatory comment in the middle of the block and word it something like this, "In spite of setting a high standard in physical fitness and routinely leading the company in physical training, First Sergeant \_\_\_\_\_ is exempt from the APRT because . . ." An overweight but muscular soldier who passes the body fat test should be treated the same way.

A continuing source of trouble is "change-of-rater" reports. A change-of-rater report is due not only when a sol-

dier's rater changes but any time the soldier is reassigned within the unit (unless his annual rating is due). Most enlisted reports, in fact, are change-of-rater reports.

A unit must be sensitive to initiating a change-of-rater report every time a leader is reassigned, whether within the unit or to another unit. Thus, a squad leader who is reassigned to take over another squad or platoon must prepare change-of-rater reports for his team leaders. And a platoon leader reassigned from a rifle platoon to a heavy mortar platoon must prepare a change-of-rater report on his platoon sergeant.

Because annual ratings are usually on a computer that reminds raters when they are due, they are under better control. But computers are not foolproof, and a rater should also know when an annual rating is due on every soldier he rates.

In writing a report, the rater, indorser, and reviewer should pay attention to certain details of style and correctness. The following are a few guidelines:

- Be careful in using acronyms—APC, SAW, PMCS, ITV, USAREUR, ARTEP, HMMWV, SSP. While most people know what NCO means, they may not know what SSP means, including members of a promotion board. Before using an abbreviation or an acronym on an efficiency report, think carefully whether it will be understood or not. If it is not completely clear throughout the Army, write it out: "semi-annual service program (SSP)." Keep in mind that what may be clear within a battalion may not be so clear to the members of a promotion board. It is just as easy to say, for example, that a soldier is assigned to "a company in Europe" as to say "a company in USAREUR."

- Do not capitalize too much as we in the Army tend to do. Even "infantry" should not be capitalized when it is used in the duty description block. Neither should a word such as "battalion" be capitalized except when it refers to a specific battalion—"1st Battalion, 36th Infantry." It should be simply "the battalion" in subsequent references. And when writing about the officer in charge of a company or a battalion, refer to him as "the commander," not "the Commander."

- Spell out numbers less than ten, but express numbers 11 and above in arabic numerals. There are exceptions, of course, as in the designations of vehicles or weapons, and in other instances for various reasons. For example, "The maintenance team leader is responsible for one jeep, two M35A2 trucks, eight M923 trucks, two M901 antitank carriers, and sixteen M113A2 armored personnel carriers." The "sixteen" is spelled out here for consistency with the other numbers that are used the same way in the sentence.

- A company in a battalion is often referred to in various ways—sometimes "Alpha Company," sometimes "A Company," and sometimes "Company A." On efficiency reports, "Company A" is preferred.

- Watch out for apostrophes. They should not be used, for example, with abbreviations or acronyms that are made into plurals—"two NCOs." When an abbreviation is possessive, however, the apostrophe is used—as in "The NCO's platoon . . ." Apostrophes are not used in possessive pronouns—*his*, *her*, *their*, *its*, and the others. Frequently, however, *its* (no apostrophe) is confused with *it's* (with apostrophe), which is the contraction for *it is*.

- Watch spelling. Few of us are good spellers, but a report loses some of its credibility when it contains misspelled words. The raters who spell the best are those who have been at it the longest and who look up words when they are in doubt.

## USE REFERENCES

There is no substitute for a dictionary, a style manual, a thesaurus, experience, and plain hard work in preparing satisfactory ratings. And if a rater knows a few areas such as these in which there are repeated shortcomings, he can avoid making the same errors and concentrate on making meaningful comments.

Raters, indorsers, and reviewers must also pay attention to the way they prepare their draft reports. Both the drafts and the final copies of efficiency reports are put into proper format and typed by the battalion PAC. But the typists type what

they see. If the draft comments from a company are illegible, misspelled, or incomplete, that is what will appear on the output back to the company. It saves time to give the PAC a good product to start with, so that retyping can be kept to a minimum.

If a rater's input is provided in long-hand, it should be on lined paper, not on a blank evaluation report. Too often, a typist has to try to decipher handwriting that has been crammed into the blocks on a blank form.

Occasionally a rater is so eager to write the best possible remarks that he writes too much, and when the form is typed the *remarks block is so crowded that it is hard to read*. This defeats the rater's purpose of praising the soldier. A rater should say what needs to be said and stop.

Everyone who must sign a report (rater, indorser, and reviewer) should proofread the same draft report and make corrections before it is prepared in final format. *For an enlisted efficiency report, this technique takes advantage of three pairs of eyes to catch all the mistakes and make all the corrections at the same time*. If the corrections are made separately

after each person reviews it, the report must be retyped three times instead of one. Each retyping delays a report and the length of the delay is extended by the time it takes to track down the different people who must sign it again. The same holds true for officer reports, although most such reports are signed by two people, the rater and the senior rater.

If an indorser does not want the rater to read his comments, the indorser can be shown the rater's corrected draft. The reviewer is going to see everyone's comments eventually, though, and it is best if he can edit the earlier draft without having it retyped. The reviewer should at least see the first typed, corrected draft, and then signatures should be obtained only after each section is retyped.

An excellent aid in preparing efficiency reports is a home computer. More and more people are getting computers, especially senior NCOs and officers, the same people who are most involved with efficiency reports. The ease of editing, spell checking, and legibility provided by a word processor make it much more effective in supporting good writing than handwriting on lined tablets.

Two more benefits of the word proces-

sor are its file storage and "cut and paste" capability. Once an efficiency report (or any other document) is on a disc, it is available for further use or reference. Cut and paste allows a rater to take well-written duty descriptions (or awards narratives) and transfer them to another document without rethinking and retyping. And if a rater's input is somehow lost, he can easily print out another copy. (In the past couple of years, the U.S. Military Academy has required every cadet arriving at West Point to purchase a "home" computer.)

Since we can't escape writing efficiency reports, we must tackle them and expend the effort necessary to do them correctly the first time so we can get on to other things. We owe professional appraisals to our soldiers. We also owe them to the Army, and particularly to the people who must make decisions on those soldiers' promotions and assignments.

---

Major Harry D. Stumpf is executive officer of the 1st Battalion, 36th Infantry in Germany. He previously served in infantry, maintenance, and logistics assignments in the 82d Airborne Division, the 3d Infantry Division, and the 3d Armored Division.

---

## The Warrior Spirit In The Reserve Components

LIEUTENANT COLONEL DUNCAN M. THOMPSON

The "Warrior Spirit," along with the "Warrior Ethic," is an ingredient that is essential to a soldier's overall mental and physical commitment to accomplishing his mission and surviving on the battlefield. While some soldiers may have been born with the Warrior Spirit, most have to learn it through experience and association with professional soldiers, through

membership in well-disciplined and well-trained units, and through tours of duty in combat assignments.

If our soldiers are to survive on the battlefield and accomplish their assigned missions under the constant stress of battle, tactical skills must become instinctive. Soldier technical skills and the Warrior Spirit are the most important

requirements for the Reserve Component (RC) soldier, regardless of rank or position.

Until now, the expectation has been that when he put on his uniform the "civilian" underwent a mental transformation and became a soldier; that was the best we expected of him. This can no longer be an acceptable standard. In light