

Issues

Concern: There is a sense of entitlement with regard to ARNG warrant officer promotions. More emphasis needs to be placed on the importance of a promotion reflecting potential for increased responsibility. We need to work at removing the perception of a WO promotion being an award for past performance. A key point discussed within the ARNG WO LDS workgroup is the importance of professional development (training, education, experience) and changing the legacy mindset.

LIFE CYCLE MANAGEMENT:

Concern: Initial appointment of technical warrant officers is based on a set level of skills and experience they bring to the assignment. Newly appointed aviation warrant officers do not have that depth as experts or leaders. There is a concern (AC and RC) that aviation warrant officers are being promoted too soon after graduating from flight school and have not demonstrated the skills and qualifications they should have as a CW2.

Current ARNG promotion policies do not reflect the changing expectations and professional development of today's warrant officer. The LDS workgroup looked at the timelines (TIG) rules and recommended they be adjusted. A thorough study is needed to support the proposed changes. If approved, this would require a formal policy change to adjust criteria in NGR 600-101.

a. PROMOTIONS TO CW2:

TECHNICAL WARRANT OFFICERS (recommend no change from current policy):

SFC and above with two years TIG at time of appointment:
If fully qualified, promote to CW2 upon completion of WOBC.

SSG or below and SFC with less than two years TIG at time of appointment:
If fully qualified, promote to CW2 at two years TIG.

AVIATION WARRANT OFFICERS-RATED AVIATORS (policy change):

If fully qualified (ASI/SQI not required), promote to CW2 with three years TIG.

b. PROMOTIONS TO CW3 & CW4 -

Concern: Current policy authorizes accelerated promotion of warrant officers occupying a senior graded duty position. This policy is unfair for those warrant officers who are exceptional performers but have no opportunity to be assigned to a higher graded duty position. Some warrant officers are promoted ahead of others simply due to the fact they are fortunate enough to be assigned to a higher graded assignment. Moving warrant officers around simply to promote them early does not recognize exceptional performance or potential. Need to address how warrant officer assignment positions can be better managed with a focus on junior WO in lower graded positions and higher graded WO in senior grade positions.

The expectations (roles and responsibilities) of warrant officers assigned to senior warrant officer assignments need to be better recognized. It is important we retain overgrade promotion authority due to the assignment limitations within the ARNG; however it should come with expectations not an entitlement.

Current policy: CW3 - Requires 4 or 5 years TIG as a CW2. CW4 - Requires 5 or 6 years TIG as CW3.

Recommendation: Eliminate all accelerated promotions. Establish 5 year TIG rule for promotions to CW3 and CW4. Conduct a national level review to determine if the distribution of WO grade groups (CW2, CW3 and CW4) are equitable and does not establish too many WO at the senior grade level.

c. PROMOTIONS TO CW5 - No change