



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

23 June 2016

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

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 16 Master Sergeant Selection Board

1. Purpose. To provide information to the Chief of Armor on the results of the FY 16 selection list to Master Sergeant (MSG).
2. Summary. The MSG Board convened on 01 March 2016 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 2 MAR 14 AND EARLIER AND WITH A BASD BETWEEN 2 SEPT 94 AND 02 MAR 08 (BOTH DATES INCLUSIVE).” The reference is MILPER Message 15-340.
 - a. Primary Zone. DOR IS 11 FEB 12 AND EARLIER.
 - b. Secondary Zone. DOR is 12 FEB 12 THRU 2 MAR 14.
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 850; number selected for promotion was 136. Armor selection rate was 16%; the total Army selection rate was 11.4%. 19K had a selection rate of 16.1% (56 out of 348) and 19D had a selection rate 15.9% (80 out of 502).
 - b. The average age of those selected for promotion within CMF 19 was 36.3 years. The oldest was 50.8 years and the youngest was 30.1 years.
 - c. The average Time In Service (TIS) for those selected for promotion was 15.8 years. The highest TIS was 21 years and the lowest was 11.10 years.
 - d. The average Time in Grade (TIG) for those selected for promotion was 5.3 years. The highest was 11.7 years and the lowest 2.10 years.
 - e. All of the NCOs selected for promotion were high school graduates or equivalent. Of the 136 Armor NCOs selected for MSG, 86% had some college. The following is the level of education for SFC selectees:

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List to Master Sergeant

- (1) No college: 13.9% had no college (19 of 136).
- (2) Some College: 50% had some college. (68 of 136).
- (3) Associates Degree: 22.7% had the equivalent of a two year degree (31 of 136).
- (4) Bachelor’s Degree: 9.5% had the equivalent of a four year degree (13 of 136).
- (5) Masters Degree: 1.4% attained a Masters Degree (2 of 136).

f. The average GT score for those selected for promotion was 110.7. The highest GT score was 140; the lowest GT score was 90. There were a total of 14 NCOs who had a GT score below 100.

g. 10 of 136 of the selectees (7.3%) had converted from 19K to 19D.

h. Professionally developing assignments:

	Master Gunner	Drill Sergeant	Recruiter	Instructor	O/C	NCOA	AC/RC	ROTC
19K	23	27	11	15	9	7	7	4
19D	5	25	7	32	13	4	12	15
TOTALS	28	52	18	47	22	11	19	19
Percentage	20.5%	38.2%	13.2%	34.5%	23.6%	8.0%	13.9%	13.9%

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

	Sniper	Battle Staff NCO	Airborne	Air Assault	Pathfinder	Ranger	EIA
19K	0	16	5	8	0	1	16
19D	7	22	30	38	6	7	13
TOTALS	7	38	35	46	6	8	29
Percentage	5.1%	27.9%	25.7%	33.8%	4.6%	5.8%	21.3%

4. Critical Leadership Time. The following chart below outlines the amount of critical leadership time as a PSG that each selectee completed upon selection to MSG. The average time spent as a Platoon Sergeant was 36 months, with the highest being 78 months and the lowest being 12 months. There were 13 NCOs that had less than 24 months PSG time, however, all 13 had served in increased positions of responsibility as 1SGs, completing the required 24 months critical leadership time as outlined in DA PAM 600-25 (Chapter 10, 10-4, para 3). In addition, 61 of those selected for promotion had served in positions as 1SGs (34 of 80 19Ds 42.4% selected) and (27 of 56 19Ks 48.2% selected), with 31 serving over 12 months successfully. Those serving

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List to Master Sergeant

successfully in positions of increased responsibility as 1SGs were looked extremely favorably upon by the board.

Platoon Sergeant time	< 24	24-36	37-48	>49
19K	5	29	14	7
19D	8	38	23	11
TOTALS	13	68	37	18
Percentage	9.5%	49.2%	27.2%	13.2%

5. General observations.

a. OCOA believes the selection board voted our best Sergeant's First Class for promotion to Master Sergeant. It is our opinion that the promotion board did fully follow the Branch guidance written in DA Pam 600-25 (Chapter 10, 10-3, para 4) (Chapter 10, 10-4, para 4) (Chapter 10, 10-7, para 4) which clearly states that a Sergeant First Class needs to have 24 months critical leadership time to be eligible for promotion to Master Sergeant. 100% of SFC's completed their critical leadership time. A SFC that is serving in an increased level of responsibility as a 1SG is completing the required critical leadership time necessary to be competitive for promotion to MSG.

b. There were 14 of 136 of the selectees (10.4%) 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, Recruiters, Observer/Controllers, Instructors, and in many other important assignments. NCOs that continue to excel in critically demanding assignments and also compete for the Sergeant Audie Murphy/Sergeant Morales award and competitions such as NCO of the Month/QTR/Year will continue to separate themselves from their peers.

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.

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List to Master Sergeant

e. The Armor board AAR comments highlight the following:

(1) The NCOER captures the rated NCO's current performance and potential for promotion. Therefore, the NCOER must clearly articulate the promotion potential to the members of the board. Raters should be concise, yet descriptive, in their comments by using enumeration and exclusive narrative comments

(a) Repeating/copying rater and senior rater bullets from one evaluation to the next made it difficult for board members to assess a Soldier's actual performance and showed a lack of interest on the part of the raters/senior raters. Negative comments from raters and senior raters without supporting documentation or elaboration were also found regularly (i.e. "do not promote" in SR comment but all success blocks checked and 3/3 rating).

(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) Excellence bullets were often not validated by measurable data, or supporting narrative. Conversely, many raters and senior raters provided superior comments that were not reflected in the ratings marked (i.e. "promote ahead of peers" with fully capable rating and all success blocks). Additionally, mandatory Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) comments were often missing.

(2) Soldiers who displayed a high level of fitness set themselves apart from their peers. NCOs who worked diligently to earn or maintain the Army Physical Fitness Badge (APFB) were seen in a positive manner. This effort speaks to their discipline and concern for their well-being.

(3) Letters to the board were valuable when they highlight recent achievements that the ERB did not reflect, such as impact awards or degree completion. Helpful examples included highlighting major accomplishments such as induction into the Sergeant Audie Murphy/Sergeant Morales Clubs or anomalies in records, such as prolonged periods of injury. On the contrary, letters that were not helpful explained why NCOs could not update their records in a timely manner, indicating late attention to managing the file, or trying to explain away derogatory information in the file.

(4) Several Soldiers' awards and decorations on their uniform did not match their ERB. In a few cases, Soldiers justified this discrepancy via a letter to the board president. Board members also identified several violations of the proper wear of awards and badges that were not in compliance with AR 670-1 to include branch and US Army insignia reversed, Combat Service Identification Badge on the wrong side, ribbon rack upside down, etc.


ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY16 Selection List to Master Sergeant

(5) The ERB is the primary format to achieve a snapshot of the individual. On many occasions the ERB was not updated, educational items were omitted, required certifications for MOS Qualification expired or missing. Awards, educational certificates, and NCOERs were missing or not readable in the AMHRR. Additional Skill Identifiers were not consistently updated.

6. POC is MSG Valvano, Steven D. Jr. Office of the Chief of Armor, (706) 545-1921.

2 Encls



MICHAEL S. QUIBAN
SGM, USA
Office Chief of Armor