



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ARMOR
1 KARKER STREET, ROOM 6600
FORT BENNING, GEORGIA 31905-5000

ATZK-AR

1 March 2021

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

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 21 Sergeant First Class (SFC)
Evaluation Board

1. Purpose: To provide information to the Chief of Armor on the results of the FY21 SFC Evaluation Board and Most Qualified (MQ) personnel.
2. Summary: The Department of the Army SFC Evaluation board convened on or about 13 October 20 at Fort Knox, KY to evaluate eligible SFCs, 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 20-193*. The Board considered and evaluated the Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) of all RA and USAR AGR Soldiers meeting the following criteria:

RA/AGR Rank	SFC
RA/AGR DOR	21 APR 19 or earlier
RA/AGR BASD	30 JUN 00 and later
RA/AGR DOB	30 JUN 64 and later

3. SFC Evaluation Information. The following is a profile of the SFCs identified as Most Qualified during the SFC Evaluation Board.

a. 987 Armor SFCs were considered during the board proceedings, with 101 being selected as Most Qualified (1 additional MQ identified was selected on a prior list and was omitted during the AAR); 15 SFCs were selected as Not Fully Qualified (NFQ). Armor Most Qualified selection rate was 10.4%, 58 of selectees (56.4%) had a 19D background, 43 of selectees (43.6%) had a 19K background. For comparison, Infantry SFC MQ selection rate was 4.01%, and Quartermaster SFCs were .4%, respectively. Three of the selectees (2.9%) had prior service. Four of the selectees (3.96%) reclassified from outside CMF 19. As the OML criteria is new, there can be no comparison to previous selection rates, though it is noted that MQ selections are considered valid until the new OML is published annually.

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 21 Sergeant First Class (SFC) Evaluation Board

b. The average age of those identified as MQ within Armor Branch was 37 years, 6 months. The oldest was 50 years of age and the youngest was 30 years of age. There is no significant difference between the FY21 and FY19 average age.

c. The average Time in Service (TIS) for those identified as MQ was 16 years 6 months. The highest TIS was 21 years, 8 months and the lowest was 11 years 8 months. The difference in the average TIS of selectees of FY21 (16 years 6 months) and FY19 (15 years 4 months) is in keeping with historic TIS.

d. The average Time in Grade (TIG) for those identified as MQ was 4 years 3 months. The highest was 10 years 1 months and the lowest was 1 years 9 months. There was no difference in the average TIG of FY19 (2 years 7 months) and FY21 (2 years 7 months).

e. All of the NCOs identified as MQ were high school graduates or equivalent. The following is the level of education for selectees:

- (1) No college: 16/101 had no college (16%)
- (2) Some College: 63/101 had some college (63%)
- (3) Associates Degree: 10/101 had the equivalent of a two year degree (10%)
- (4) Bachelor's Degree: 9/101 had the equivalent of a four year degree (9%)
- (5) Master's Degree: 2/101 had the equivalent of a six year degree (2%)

f. The average GT score for those identified as MQ was 115. The highest GT score was 135; the lowest GT score was 92.

g. Eight of the 101 MQs (7.9%) either currently or had previously served in Security Force Assistance Brigades (SFAB).

h. Though not taken into consideration this year, the Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) of the selectees had an average of 258. The highest score recorded was 300 (3), with the lowest three being a 93, 83, and 67, respectively. One SFC identified as an MQ was an identified PT failure (158 with no profile) prior to the board convening.

i. Professionally developing assignments:

	MG	DS	REC	Instructor	O/C	NCOA	AC/RC	ROTC
19K	11 (10.9%)	14 (13.8%)	11 (10.9%)	17 (16.8%)	6 (5.94%)	5 (4.95%)	6 (5.94%)	3 (2.97%)
19D	7 (6.93%)	26 (25.7%)	11 (10.9%)	29 (28.7%)	8 (7.92%)	4 (3.96%)	5 (4.95%)	7 (6.93%)
TOTALS	18	40	22	46	14	9	11	10
Percentage	17.8%	39.6%	21.7%	45.5%	13.8%	8.9%	10.8%	9.9%

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 21 Sergeant First Class (SFC) Evaluation Board

j. The data below is representative of the total schools attended by all SFCs selected as MQ. All SFCs selected had attended two or more of the above schools, or served in at least one or more Temporary Duty Assignments (TDA). Two selected had back to back TDA assignments not in keeping with DA PAM 600-25 guidance.

	Battle Staff	Airborne	Air Assault	Pathfinder	Ranger
19K	14 (13.8%)	3 (2.97%)	8 (7.92%)	0 (0%)	1 (.99%)
19D	12 (11.8%)	17 (16.8%)	22 (21.78%)	11 (10.8%)	2 (1.9%)
TOTALS	26	20	30	11	3
Percentage	25.7%	19.8%	29.7%	10.8%	2.97%

	Jump Master	CLC	SLC	MRT	Master Fitness	EO	SHARP (80 HRS)
19K	0 (0%)	3 (27.3%)	1 (18.2%)	14 (54.5%)	4 (9%)	21 (18.2%)	13 (9%)
19D	8 (31.3%)	14 (50%)	22 (31.3%)	26 (18.8%)	9 (6.3%)	15 (37.5%)	14 (31.3%)
TOTALS	8	17	23	40	13	36	37
Percentage	7.92%	40.7%	22.7%	39.6%	12.8%	35.6%	36.63%

k. Career Developmental Time: The chart below outlines the amount of career developmental assignment time as a PSG that each selectee completed upon being identified as MQ. The average time spent as a PSG was 26 months, with the highest being 57 months and the lowest being 12 months. The SFC with 12 months served the remainder of his Career Developmental time as 1SG, in keeping with DA PAM 600-25 guidance. One SFC was selected with only 18 months of PSG time. **With one exception, no MQ SFC spent more than 12 months as a member of staff, or in positions not considered critical to career development.**

PSG Time	<24	24-36	37-48	>49
19K	22	19	1	1
19D	19	34	4	1
TOTALS	41	53	5	2
Percentage	40.6%	52.4%	4.95%	1.98%

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 21 Sergeant First Class (SFC) Evaluation Board

4. General observations.

a. OCOA believes the selection board identified and selected some, but not all, of our best Sergeants First Class for the first FY21 Evaluation Board as MQ. It is our opinion that the evaluation board followed Proponent guidance written in DA Pam 600-25 (chapter 10) to a degree, but relied heavily on key points only, as NCOER enumerations and 1SG time were identified as critical markers only, with little attention to the variety of successful performance in different positions. Some had developmental backgrounds not in keeping with the Talent Development Model (TDM) specified for lifelong learning. For example, one SFC spent his SPC to SSG time in a nontraditional position, which is considered a critical time in an Armor Soldier's career.

b. Goals for development. The majority of MQ NCOs did the tough, demanding assignments, with one or more developing assignments throughout their careers. They served the Armor Force well as Master Gunners, Drill Sergeants, Recruiters, Observer/Controllers, and in many other important assignments, validating the "performance over position" mentality expected of capable and well-groomed NCOs.

c. Armor NCOs across all brigade combat teams formations compete equitably for promotion. **The key for selection remains excellence in leadership positions as evidenced by multiple NCOERs with high enumerations, supported by sustained performance in the generating force.**

5. The Armor proponent highlights the following from the CMF 19 field After Action Report:

a. Force Design updates and additional emphasis in areas outside the warfighting enterprise have reduced the time NCOs have to develop in Career Developmental positions and the grade at which this should occur. For example, NCOs serving in generating force assignments for extended periods of time created the issue for many NCOs promoted to SFC unable to serve in traditional career developmental positions. This seemed to put these NCOs at a potential disadvantage when compared to those NCOs promoted to SFC and serving in the operational force assignments.

b. MOS Compatibility within the CMF. The operational forces needs to better manage the Master Gunner population, often moved to another position before they have completed this critical part of their development. DA PAM 600-25 guidance is for every SFC to serve at least 24 months in a critical developmental assignment in order to be considered branch developed.

c. CMF leaders must ensure their Soldiers take a thoughtful interest in managing their individual development and career. Through the process of the

ATZK-AR

SUBJECT: Information Paper – Results of FY 21 Sergeant First Class (SFC)
Evaluation Board

established development model, this will ensure that NCOs are fully developed to their potential for service in the Armor Community and Army overall.

d. Utilization and assignments. There were many NCOs spending four or more years in broadening assignments and not returning to the operational force in a timely manner. This creates the environment where the subordinates are tactically and technically superior to the leader and that was apparent in some of the files reviewed during the board.

6. Point of contact is the undersigned at christopher.r.carey2.mil@mail.mil, or DSN (706) 545-7725.



CHRISTOPHER R. CAREY
SGM, USA
Office of the Chief of Armor