



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SECRETARIAT FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY SELECTION BOARDS
1600 SPEARHEAD DIVISION AVENUE
FORT KNOX, KY 40122

AHRC-PDV-S

23 March 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR Director of Military Personnel Management, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff G-1, 300 Army Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20310-0300

SUBJECT: Field After Action Report – Fiscal Year 2016 (FY16) Regular Army (RA) and Army Reserve Active Guard Reserve (AGR) Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board

1. References.

- a. AR 600-8-19, Enlisted Promotions and Reductions, dated 18 December 2015.
- b. Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-25.
- c. DAPE-MPE-PD, Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) dated 17 February 2016, Subject: Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) for the Fiscal Year 2016 (FY16) Regular Army (RA) and Army Reserve Active Guard Reserve (AGR) Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board.

2. General: The FY16 RA and AGR MSG Promotion Selection Board convened at the DA Secretariat, Fort Knox, Kentucky on 1 March 2016, to select the best qualified noncommissioned officers for the purpose of promotion to Master Sergeant (MSG).

3. Board Issues and Observations.

- a. DA Photo – Missing or Outdated.

(1) Discussion: Board members identified numerous board files with either missing or outdated DA photos. Missing DA photos led board members to meticulously examine board files to determine plausible explanations for why the photo was missing. There were very few cases where a Soldier's deployment or assignment to a remote location prevented them from updating their photo. Several Soldiers had outdated photos where they were wearing SSG rank or the Army green uniform.

(2) Recommendation: All leaders must ensure that they maintain a current DA Photo as required by AR 640-30. Supervisors should review DA Photos with their Soldiers during periodic counseling sessions and prior to validating their board files. Soldiers should update their DA Photo when it is not in compliance with AR 640-30, whether the Soldier considers themselves competitive for promotion or not.

AHRC-PDV-S

SUBJECT: Field After Action Report – Fiscal Year 2016 (FY16) Regular Army (RA) and Army Reserve Active Guard Reserve (AGR) Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board

b. DA Photo – Uniform.

(1) Discussion: 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.

(2) Recommendation: Leaders must take the appropriate time to prepare their uniform to ensure it is in compliance with AR 670-1 and that all awards worn on the uniform match the Soldier's ERB. Supervisors should inspect their Soldier's uniforms prior to taking their DA Photo.

c. Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) and Enlisted Record Brief (ERB).

(1) Discussion: 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. Academic transcripts fail to reflect total credits indicated on AMHRR.

(2) Recommendation: NCOs should review and ensure that their ERB and AMHRR are updated to properly depict their career accomplishments, in addition to correcting documents which are not legible. In the event issues were identified, a letter to the president of the board explaining missing documents if corrections were not attainable would be appropriate.

d. Letters to the Board President.

(1) Discussion: 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.

(2) Recommendation: Letters to the board should be clear and concise. These letters must be relevant to the Soldier's file in order to provide clarification for any

AHRC-PDV-S

SUBJECT: Field After Action Report – Fiscal Year 2016 (FY16) Regular Army (RA) and Army Reserve Active Guard Reserve (AGR) Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board

discrepancy between the ERB and photo such as a recent completion of a degree/military schooling.

e. Issue. Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) scores.

(1) Discussion: 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.

(2) Recommendation: The rated NCO should take pride and personal responsibility in their fitness level. Recommend that raters include a bullet on the NCOER to outline how well the Soldier did on the most recent APFT and if the APFB was earned. Unit goals and platoon averages are often misleading.

f. Inconsistencies with Army Body Composition Program (ABCP).

(1) Discussion: Several files had height/weight inconsistencies over several NCOER rating periods. At times there was a twenty to thirty pound discrepancy between what was depicted in the ERB and NCOER. Additionally, some files showed the NCO progressively getting taller with each rating period.

(2) Recommendation: Rater/Senior Rater and Rated NCO should pay particular attention to the administrative date of his/her report.

g. NCOER – Rater and Senior Rater Comments.

(1) Discussion: 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). 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) Recommendation: Soldiers and leaders should put more effort into their counseling sessions and in writing the NCOER. Raters, senior raters and reviewers must ensure all bullets are observable, qualitative or quantifiable in nature and that they do not duplicate remarks from one report to the next. Reviewers must ensure that rater comments/ratings are consistent with senior rater comments/ratings and vice versa.

AHRC-PDV-S

SUBJECT: Field After Action Report – Fiscal Year 2016 (FY16) Regular Army (RA) and Army Reserve Active Guard Reserve (AGR) Master Sergeant (MSG) Promotion Selection Board

4. Conclusion or general comments.

a. SFCs who pursued a civilian education above the high school level concurrent with exemplary military duty clearly demonstrated to the board their dedication to self-improvement, effective time management, and potential for future academic success. Those that completed 60 semester hours or more were considered more competitive.

b. NCOs who excelled in demanding leadership positions were viewed as more capable of leading at the 1SG/MSG level. NCOs that served for a minimum of 24 months in leadership positions in at least two different types of positions within their MOS were viewed as very competitive. For CMFs that require NCOs to complete platoon sergeant time, it is imperative that NCOs successfully complete a minimum of 24 months or time required for their respective CMF, to be more competitive for promotion.

c. 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. When drafting evaluations the box check descriptions, as mentioned in AR 623-3 and DA Pam 623-3, and the promotion word picture, can be found on the Selections Page of the HRC website: <https://www.hrc.army.mil/TAGD/Selection%20Boards>. Be sure to avoid using the numbers of the promotion word picture, as using those scores is prohibited.

d. In closing, looking into the future in regard to the new Select-Train-Educate-Promote (STEP) policy it will be crucial for NCOs to complete their Professional Military Education (PME) to be promoted.

//Original Signed//
RANDALL A. MCINTIRE
Brigadier General, U.S. Army
Board President