



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

24 June 2014

MEMORANDUM THRU DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ARMOR
FOR CHIEF OF ARMOR, US ARMY ARMOR SCHOOL

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 15 Master Sergeant Selection Board

1. Purpose. To provide information to the Chief of Armor on the results of the FY 15 selection list to Master Sergeant (MSG).
2. Summary. The MSG Board convened on 10 February 2015 at Fort Knox, KY. The eligibility criteria for promotion consideration to MSG were: “ALL SSD-IV AND SLC QUALIFIED SFC’S WITH A DOR OF 11 FEB 12 AND EARLIER AND WITH A BASD BETWEEN 11 FEB 90 AND 11 FEB 07 (BOTH DATES INCLUSIVE).” The reference is MILPER Message 14-307.
 - a. Primary Zone. DOR IS 23 OCT 10 AND EARLIER.
 - b. Secondary Zone. DOR is 24 OCT 10 THRU 11 FEB 12.
3. MSG Selection Information. The following is a profile of the Sergeant First Class’s selected for promotion to Master Sergeant:
 - a. The total number of Armor Sergeant First Class’s considered for promotion was 776; number selected for promotion was 72. Armor selection rate was 9.2%; the total Army selection rate was 8.4%. 19K had a selection rate of 8.3% (28 out of 337) and 19D had a selection rate 10% (44 out of 439).
 - b. The average age of those selected for promotion within CMF 19 was 37 years. The oldest was 48 years and the youngest was 31 years.
 - c. The average Time In Service (TIS) for those selected for promotion was 16.1 years. The highest TIS was 21.2 years and the lowest was 12.3 years.
 - d. The average Time in Grade (TIG) for those selected for promotion was 5.5 years. The highest was 9.4 years and the lowest 3.2 years.
 - e. All of the NCOs selected for promotion were high school graduates or equivalent. Of the 72 Armor NCOs selected for SFC, 87% had some college. The following is the level of education for SFC selectees:
 - (1) No college: 12.5% had no college (9 of 72).

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY15 Selection List to Master Sergeant

- (2) Some College: 69% had some college. (50 of 72).
- (3) Associates Degree: 9% had the equivalent of a two year degree (8 of 72).
- (4) Bachelor's Degree: 6% had the equivalent of a four year degree (5 of 72).
- (5) Masters Degree: 0% attained a Masters Degree (0 of 72).

h. The average GT score for those selected for promotion was 111.6. The highest GT score was 128; the lowest GT score was 98. There were a total of 4 NCOs who had a GT score below 100.

i. Professionally developing assignments:

	Master Gunner	IG	EO	Instructor	O/C	NCOA	AC/RC
19D/K	15	1	28	56	17	10	0
Percentage	20.8%	1.3%	38.8%	77.7%	23.6%	7.2%	0%

j. The following data depicts attendance at common professionally developing schools.

	Battle Staff NCO	Airborne	Air Assault	Pathfinder	Ranger	EIA
19K/D	14	23	28	30	5	13
Percentage	19.4%	31.9%	38.8%	41.6%	6.9%	18%

19K to 19D conversion and formation the Soldier has served in.

	19K TO 19D	ABCT	SBCT	IBCT
Total Selected	0	28	19	25
Percentage of selectees	0%	39%	26%	35%
Total Authorized	0%	315	184	105
Percentage of Force by		8%	10.3%	23.8%

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY15 Selection List to Master Sergeant

4. General observations.

- a. OCOA believes the selection board voted our best Sergeant First Class's for promotion to Master Sergeant. Armor Branch guidance written in DA Pam 600-25 (Chapter 09, AUG 11) which states that Sergeant First Class's with less than 18 months critical leadership time should not be considered for promotion to Master Sergeant. 3 SFC's considered and selected for promotion did not have the critical leadership time as prescribed, but filled additional leadership developing assignments and were promoted.
- b. There were 4 SFCs selected for promotion with GT scores below 100. Although a GT score below 100 may not have a significant impact on a MSG or SGM/CSM, it should be pointed out to young NCOs and Soldiers within the CMF it limits the options available for selecting a specialty or professionally developing assignment later in their career.
- c. 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, Drill Sergeants, Observer/Controllers, Instructors, and in many other important assignments. In addition, 26 of those selected for promotion had served in positions as 1SGs, with 14 serving over 12 months successfully. Those serving successfully in positions as 1SGs were looked favorably upon by the board.
- d. 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.
- e. The Armor board AAR comments highlight the following:
 - (1) The NCOER remains viable and is the most critical indicator of potential for promotion. Some of the things the board identified concerning NCOERs were Missing NCOERs, Administrative Errors, consecutive NCOERs having the same Senior Rater comments and NCOERs with "Among the Best" ratings during the same period.
 - (a) The board observed a number of NCOs with missing NCOERs and also NCOs who had PCS'd and were still trying to acquire their NCOER from their last unit. If found to be valid, HRC should include a memorandum in the promotion file detailing the status of the NCOER.
 - (b) Administrative errors in NCOERs included the following; missing the number of rated months, missing the height/weight information, and missing the reviewers check on the front side of the NCOER.
 - (c) Consecutive NCOERs with the same Senior Rater comments, Senior Raters need to give an honest assessment of the NCO after every rating period.

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY15 Selection List to Master Sergeant

(d) NCOERs with “Among the Best” ratings and Disciplinary Action during the same period discredits the NCOER for that period and creates concern by board members regarding the credibility of remaining evaluations from that organization.

(3) A large number of ERBs were incomplete or inaccurate. Particular attention should be given to section IX; duty title as well as the time in these positions. Numerous ERBs contained duty titles of incoming personnel for 24 months or more. It is highly recommended that NCOs take the time to ensure the accuracy of these documents prior to validating them for the board.

5. POC is SGM Michael S Quiban, Office of the Chief of Armor, (706) 545-7725.



GEORGE DeSARIO
Director, Office of the
Chief of Armor