

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
THE DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20310-0300

14.5.96

April 29, 1996

CSA

SUBJECT: FAO Selection Rates

- Next under is fact sheet on FAO selection rates plus a copy of the OPMS XXI proposed study sheet that you have already seen.
- Recommend you utilize as needed.

V.R.
29.4.96

THEODORE G. STROUP, JR.
Lieutenant General, GS
Deputy Chief of Staff
for Personnel

DR Noted

_____ PSM

KIM LINDAHL, MAJ, GS, ADECC

14/5

SUBJECT: FAO (FA 48) Promotion and Selection Rates

1. Purpose: To update the CSA on the current status of FAO promotion, battalion command, and school selection rates.

2. Facts:

a. Promotion: For the past three years, the FAO promotion rate to MAJ and LTC exceeded the Army average by 3.7% and 2.7%, respectively. FAO promotion rate to Colonel during this time was 35.3% while the Army average was 43.7%. Other Functional Areas with comparable Colonel promotion rates were Psyop & Civil Affairs, ORSA and Comptroller.

b. Battalion Command: During the past three years, FAOs in their first year of consideration were selected for command at the rate of 14%. The Army average for first year of consideration was 21%. The cumulative selection rates for command are of course higher for all categories.

c. School Selection: Command and Staff College (CSC) and the Senior Service College (SSC).

(1) The FAO selection rate to CSC has averaged 13.9 % below the Army average during the past three years.

(2) The FAO selection rate to SSC is below the Army average for the past three years. The Army averaged 6.6 percent while FAO averaged at 3.8 percent. Other functional areas which also experienced lower than Army selection rates were PAO, ORSA, and Psyop & Civil Affairs.

3. Discussion:

a. Selection for MAJ: The relatively high promotion rate to major is attributed to the increased accession of captains who have a high potential for promotion and future service.

b. Selection for LTC: The FAO promotion rate to LTC was comparable to the Army average in '94 and exceeded the Army average in '95 and '96. Factors contributing to this include the increased number of FAOs completing CSC (resident and non-resident) and becoming branch qualified.

c. Selection for CSC, Command, SSC, & COL: FAOs, like some other functional areas, have not competed well for selection in these categories. However, manner of performance does not appear to be an issue. Officers with functional areas that require education, training and extended utilization--Psyop & Civil Affairs, Comptroller, ORSA, PAO, and FAO--spend more time in military and civilian schools and utilization tours, as compared with FA 54 or FA 41 officers who may serve closer to their basic branch. The length of time spent preparing for and serving in these technical or hard skill functional areas, as well as the timing of this work, may make the officer less competitive for promotion, command or schooling.

LTC Wagner(703)325-2761

OPMS XXI PRECURSOR STUDY GROUP ISSUE PAPER #32

SUBJECT: Foreign Area Officer (FAO) Functional Area: Promotion and Selection

ISSUE: How does the Army best meet its need for FAO trained officers? Is it feasible and cost effective for some LTCs and COLs to enter and perform competently in the FAO field if they receive transition training and education en route to an assignment?

DISCUSSION: A subject of continued concern is the Army's ability to grow senior field grade FAOs. From time to time FAOs experience below average selection rates to CSC, SSC, and promotion to colonel. At a time when most of the Army is downsizing, the FAO requirements are actually expanding.

FAOs serve as regional specialists and politico-military advisors to CINCs, key military and civilian leaders in the Pentagon, and Army component commands. The FA 48 proponent believes that the FAO program must produce "expert" and experienced colonels. To get that experience and expertise, FAOs spend more time (1 to 3 years in the initial schooling/assignment alone) in their specialties than officers from other FA's. Assignments in FAO developmental jobs are time-consuming (3-5 years of initial training and a *large number of joint jobs*—65% of FAO jobs—with a 2-3 year mandatory tour) and make it difficult for FAO officers to get branch qualified in their basic branches.

It seems possible to access more officers into FA 48 later in their careers, provided they have acquired some of the requisite language skills and area expertise through some other venue. How does the Army best meet its need for FAO trained officers? Is it feasible and cost effective for some LTCs and COLs to enter and perform competently in the FAO field if they receive transition training and education en route to an assignment?

Recently, efforts to access higher potential officers into the FAO program should yield improved selection rates. FAOs who perform poorly or fail to attain required credentials are also being selected out of the program.

The percentage of overseas assignments of FAOs at the grade of Colonel is high. Many non-FAO but language and regionally capable officers presently fill many FAO requirements.

THOUGHTS FOR CONSIDERATION:

Scrub FA48 LTC and COL requirements closely. Determine whether some of these positions may be filled by officers who have a lower level of language and political-military training—perhaps make them branch immaterial positions or code them for some other functional area.

Consider pairing compatible basic branches with FA 48 to ensure their complementary and interdependency, thereby enhancing their chances of career success (e.g. MI, SF, Civil Affairs, and PSYOPS). Examine the impact this would have on these other branches.

ID multiple entry points into FAO training and their requisite education, training, skill, and experience requirements. Consider using a validation system to identify late comers and honor their relevant experience.

Examine how to best schedule initial FAO training.

PRECURSOR STUDY RECOMMENDATION: Refer this issue to the OPMS XXI Study as part of a larger examination of functional areas and dual tracking (the so-called "Specialist vs. Generalist" issue). In the meantime the DCSOPS and DCSPER communities should continue to monitor the health of the program and closely coordinate actions affecting the FAO community.

Action Officer: COL Hoffman
DSN: 221-4627 5 April 96

From: DENNISRE--CMSNAMES Date and time 04/24/96 18:10:18
Received: from us.army.mil by PENTAGON-HQDADSS.ARMY.MIL (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with TCP; Wed, 24 Apr 96 18:10:18 EDT
Received: by us.army.mil with Microsoft Exchange (IMC 4.1.611)
!id <01BB3209.9083C5B0@us.army.mil>; Wed, 24 Apr 1996 18:12:14 -0400
Message-ID:
<c=US%a=%p=Department_of_De%l=GEN_MAILROOM960424181211KX003C00@us.a
From: "Reimer, Dennis J." <Dennis.Reimer@US.ARMY.MIL>
To: "LTG T.G. STROUP, DAP" <STROUP@PENTAGON-HQDADSS.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: RE: Foreign Area Officer Program
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 1996 18:12:11 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.1.611
Encoding: 208 TEXT, 207 UUENCODE
X-MS-Attachment: WINMAIL.DAT 0 00-00-1980 00:00

AGREE WITH PAPER AND UR PROPOSAL FOR BRIEF---ALSO TOLD HIM WE WILL LOOK AT
IT IN OPMS

From: !LTG T.G. STROUP, DAPYSMTP:STROUP@PENTAGON-HQDADSS.ARMY.MIL"
Sent: !Wednesday, April 24, 1996 8:04 AM
To: !GEN REIMER
Subject: !FW: Foreign Area Officer Program

Subject: FW: Foreign Area Officer Program

what we will do is give you the stats on paper for promotion and school
reading the note i believe it would be better on paper
also after that believe ops and per should give him laydown at your
call
recall we intend to look at fao in opms XXI cheers

* Be all you can be *

-----Original message-----
Received: from us.army.mil by PENTAGON-HQDADSS.ARMY.MIL (IBM VM SMTP V2R3)
with TCP; Wed, 24 Apr 96 07:02:41 EDT
Received: by us.army.mil with Microsoft Exchange (IMC 4.1.611)
id <01BB31AC.70BAD910@us.army.mil>; Wed, 24 Apr 1996 07:05:37 -0400
Message-ID:
<c=US%a=%p=Department_of_De%l=GEN_MAILROOM960424070531HK004900@us.a
From: "Reimer, Dennis J." <Dennis.Reimer@US.ARMY.MIL>
To: STROUP <STROUP@PENTAGON-HQDADSS.ARMY.MIL>
Subject: FW: Foreign Area Officer Program
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 1996 07:05:36 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version
4.1.611
Encoding: 83 TEXT, 79 UUENCODE
X-MS-Attachment: WINMAIL.DAT 0 00-00-1980 00:00

PLS GIVE ME PROMOTION STATS ON FAOs

From: Reeder, Joe R.YSMTP:JRR@USAPO.army.mil"
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 1996 12:36 PM
To: Reimer, GEN Dennis
Cc: Kicklighter, LTG(R) Mick
Subject: Foreign Area Officer Program

Denny-

I share what I understand to be your belief in the enormous value of a healthy Army FAO corps. For the last two years whenever I've travelled overseas, I've met with our FAO contingent in each country, often in an informal setting. In these sessions, FAO's very often express concerns and puzzlement about the Army's treatment of FAO's. I'd like to share with you their recurring comments, which doubtless will not be revelations to you, but may be useful as one more set of data points.

FAO's have repeatedly expressed to me their concern that, year after year, FAO's are selected for resident CGSC -- perceived as the all-important

"cut" -- at a percentage significantly below the Army average. FAO's also point out to me their selection rates for battalion command and promotion to

colonel are lower than average. Junior FAO's tell me "they learned the facts too late" or became FAO's even though basic branch mentors warned them

pursuing the FAO track was hazardous. (I'm also often told anecdotes about "promising young officers" who heeded the advice and "got out of FAO.") Many of the FAO's with whom I've spoken cite as gospel that "CGSC selection boards penalize FAO's because they've spent too much time away from basic branch assignments." FAO's also

tell me they have less opportunity to serve in branch-qualifying jobs as XO's and S-3's.

I suspect these problems do not have a simple or single fix. But they seem to be systemic, so any fixes will have to be "top down." Perhaps the one fix that would yield the most significant results in the near term would

be to issue to selection boards instructions which tend to move FAO selection rates closer to Armywide averages. There are downsides to that approach, of course. I realize full well there are many legitimate, competing demands for quality officers.

But FAO's provide enormous return on investment in terms of securing national policy objectives. The recurring message I get from ambassadors and country teams is that FAO's are an invaluable asset to them because FAO's furnish an essential bridge to the host nation's military. In my view, FAO's are a significant part of what Dr. Perry has referred to as "defense by other means." Their in-country presence gives us access to and influence on host nation militaries on a day-to-day basis.

That leads me to a second issue. FAO's also greatly influence ambassadors and country teams. Since the Army presently has the only large FAO corps among the Services, the Army has something approaching a monopoly in these influential positions. As you know, a draft DoD directive is now being staffed which would require the other Services to develop expanded FAO

programs. My understanding is that Dr. White will almost certainly approve the directive.

While this will have the welcome effect of increasing the number of FAO's at a time when they are needed most, the long-term effect will be an end to the Army's dominance in these key positions. It would be prudent to ensure Army FAO representation, if possible, in those countries most important to the Army. It would also seem to me perfectly legitimate (and efficient), given its preeminent involvement in this field, for the Army to continue to oversee whatever program Dr. White signs off on. (Do we have anyone closely monitoring this process?)

I'd appreciate discussing this with you, and how we might make the Army

FAO corps as viable as possible.

Kind regards -

Joe

```
begin 600 WINMAIL.DAT
M>)\-(B8+`0:0" `S`.....!`S`0>0!@`(`Y 0`.....#H`$(@ <`
M&`..SE032Y-:6-R;W-09G0@36%I;"Y.;WIE`#$(`06 `P`.````S <$`!@`
M!P`%`"0`P`B`0$@@ ,`#@```,P`! `8``<`!0`D```,`@!$"8 !`"$`T
M,CE"-S5"03,Y.41#1C$Q034R,# P.#!#-SA!-D4X-0`?!P$-@ 0``@````(
M`@`!!( !`"$`!&5SH@1F"R96EG;B!!<F5A($"F9FEC97(@4')09W)A;0`P
M"PS#D 8`7 P`!4````#`"X`.....$`.0"0P1SWS3&Y`1X`< `!````(0`
M`$97.B!&;W)E:6=N($%R96$@3V9F:6-E<B!0<F"G<F%M`.....(!<0`!`
M%@` ``&Y,7@QQ+IUFTN=.1'/I2 `@,>*;H4` ``,`!A!+.)X`P`$+ +`>
M`@0`0` ``&4` ``!03%-`259%34504D"-3U1)3TY35$%44T".1D%/4RTM+2TM
M+2TM+2U&4D"- .E)%141%4BQ*3T524TU44#I*4E) 55-!4$"!4DU934E,4T5.
M5#I454531$%9+$%04DE,,C,L,3DY` `````,`$!` ``````P`1$` ``````"0D0
M`0` `` `(L*` ````" @` ``-A,` $Q:1G44.-T\_P`*`0` "%0*D`-0%ZP*#`% 3`U0"
M`&-H`L!S973N,@8`!L,"@S(#Q@<3`H.Z,Q,-?0J ",)\V3L5_W@R-34"@ J!
M#;$+8&YP9S$P,Q0@"PH2\@P!(F,`0"!03 7P1TD,5D4%T!M04%)/32!/5$E/
M3@8`5$&&5 7P`!%&04"S"H5!"HML:3$T- +1:9XM`G,,T!YS"UDQ-@J@Y0-@
M= 60!4 M(1<*AQ_+ZPPP()9&`V$Z(AX@E@R"!P?P"> $@2P@2F"E`0?P+EM3
M3510.@!*4E) 55-!4(1/+@K ;7DN;0,0?ETAOR+-!F ","/_)0M4H0I0<V1A
M>28P02"0"0,1,C,F,#$Y.3:1+8 R.C,MP%!*$"Y(LU4;RJ/)0T'<28A1_I%
M'!"!$"? #`!T&+M\@E@Q#8S"/)0M+:6-K&1Y09V@P"8A3%1'>"A2*070-Y$S
MCRE>==QB:B#1-:\E"8%L#)PYF<#H <096$<D W0-Y#/!) :T -@`<!A;1T?
M"RC?%"(,`2"6/X4S(GDAIC-%L4-322!S$<$F<'<1P-,%0$.P=6X$@7,!D$2P
MH"!T;R!B)G!Y"&&W17$>4 W ( N 14!H)G#7"? %L 1@=00@=@= "E#\"(&"&
M4#X`/X5&L = 1J N>1-Q)" <PB %H7!S?BY#4#U11I,+8$3P14!W/45@>3WP
M$>!$(0GP979Y/G%)TO@14 -X$0@;/9L"8 ==F"+X1'P2K F,/,"(P> !4 #
M\$: @1\!%T4ED-P(P"X!G*E%&8CWP$;!D?"$H$QP+,%T"# `Z!&<0.1_S-%
M"X "$"? !T!#P!(`3Y*"2?)1H,1\%+Q!!!I`B!Y3?<T2='40202/!11&7-
M>""05$%/<CYA!C%%$C-%\`!U>GI,T > 4 $!H`\ (8$K11K%)$E4!3' ""\10
M6 -`T5334W(G13 >4&M_3%%8$/53L)%L1UV1J%I>P7 %@!C" '$!D`29%M
M7U@"37%$,#>03N!D`&!BWG1,T 01`_!,P"!&\ 5 _T6!%@!,H4105')%0D6Q
M)C#"/X5B6($`P$CP18%0 W _G4#($JP1\!+P$Y@/6%2\F" PBR@`9!7D&\+
M@%XP+K""CTH!5.,1P$Q!@!P68' ""8!L2/!5Y4SA15$`@%S%_U9E1I%$4"8P
M2S)' \%%1'6?_2S)4MD/R$?! ,T"#@3.%2D0"=(0"0#;!0`4-`4T/O(0%7D 20
M/F!I2-!%,&!,\T:B!T!L+0=P9( `C !PY4&7(EU0=")M@D119&'Y;=(,"&%/
MX$/ /9$&D#>0"V"Q9U%&`6\`X%BV1`!+X=>Q<4GR:U1L<T5@5S9DDO".\4K1
M:#EKY%1Q72!G$00@_6QR8D10`9 >4' <17=)%$0"%$B"1!&!V\T51/X45<DO
M?V+A1 %RL3YQ:6%1L7.72K"$H%1P3R-9,DRQ:$(B1J%_2/!,T K 2\!%,4:Q
M/X5FWP#07C!%045@8`%E<&!WLO\%D#YP)G!4US011H((8#?@-W?1`)!C17 -
```