

## INFORMATION PAPER

**SUBJECT:** Senior Warrant Officer Advisory Council (SWOAC) After Action Report (AAR).

1. **Purpose.** To provide the SWOAC Membership an AAR of the SWOAC conducted 9-11 September 2008, at Fort Lee, Virginia.

2. **Facts.**

a. On 1 Nov 05 the VCSA established the SWOAC charter with the mission to serve as a continuing body to introduce, review and address potential issues concerning Army systems, policies, and programs designed to produce ready and relevant warrant officers who are capable of supporting the Army mission in their roles as soldiers, officers, leaders, and technicians across the full spectrum of operational environments.

b. The semi-annual SWOAC conference was held 9-11 September 2008, at Fort Lee, Virginia. During this three-day period, the following occurred: pre-staffed issues were reviewed followed by a council vote for action; scheduled briefs and discussion of issues occurred; and an open discussion period was conducted which allowed bringing undeveloped or unstaffed issues to the council's attention.

3. Agenda included information briefings from all agencies that impact the 15 branch proponents, these briefings included updates from: HQDA G-1, OPMS, TRADOC, and WOCC and each of the CWOBs/RCWOs who briefed information about the state of their respective Branches concerning strengths, recruiting and attendance at warrant officer specific PME. Also, the council heard a briefing from the MG Chambers, the CASCOM Commander.

4. Old issues brought before the council for update included:

a. An update on the WO Technical/Functional needs analysis was provided by CW4 Pitsenbarger. The analysis was completed and briefed to the CAC Commander. He concurred with the recommendations. CW4 Pitsenbarger gave a detailed brief about the VTC scheduled with the TRADOC Commander for Friday, 12 September 2008. (Note – the briefing occurred after the SWOAC meeting, but the TRADOC Commander approved the recommendations and signed the included memo to HQDA G-3.)

b. An issue was raised by the SC CWOB at the last meeting concerning the current accession boards conducted by USAREC. The old system allowed all of a soldier's NCOERs to be viewed by board members. The new system only displays a soldier's last five year's worth of NCOERs. The council discussion centered on what historical information was appropriate for board members to see. No official vote was called for or taken, but most seemed to agree that more information is better.

c. A previous issue concerning active duty warrant officer education not being mandatory was revisited. There needs to be a forcing mechanism in place to make education mandatory. At a previous meeting, the motion of should WO education be mandatory for the active duty, 15 voted in favor, none were opposed and one abstained. This was an issue that had also been approved by the GOSC. The current action includes stronger wording in DA Pam 600-3. Additionally, it was brought to the council's attention that there is currently a proposal to make ILE mandatory in AR 350-1. If this happens, the council agreed that the WO community should mirror that language appropriately for WO PME.

d. The SWOAC Chairman provided an update on the ILE pilot program for WOs. The five selected warrants are currently in class and doing well. The CAC Commander sat down with them and he is very pleased with the program. His intention is to continue the initiative beyond the pilot program. CW5 Anderson asked that the CWOBs/RCWOs, along with HRC personnel, start looking at potential nominees for future classes.

e. The QM RCWO continued discussion of standardization of CWOB/RCWO duties and responsibilities. Healthy discussion occurred and regulations were mentioned where individual Branches can address appropriate changes to establish their positions and the associated duties and responsibilities.

5. New issue brought before the council for vote included:

a. Seventeen voting members out of 22 were available at this meeting. A quorum of the membership was present.

b. The first issue for vote was proposed by the TRADOC representative. The proposal concerned creating a CW5 position at an appropriate location, perhaps HRC, manage CW5s, particularly as related to assignment of senior 011A positions. Discussion centered on the fact that there are very few 011A CW5 positions. The Majority of CW5 positions are Branch specific positions and are managed by the Branch personnel at HRC. The small number of CW5 positions does not warrant a separate management system. The membership did not support this initiative.

c. The TRADOC representative raised the second issue for voting. It concerned potentially updating the SWOAC Charter with the new VCSA coming on-board. After discussion, the membership had no particular update recommendations and decided to table the issue until the new VCSA had more time to determine his desires and vision for the group.

d. The third issue for voting was raised by the TRADOC Representative. This issue concerned WO1 through CW3 pay reform and comparable O-1E through O-3E pay tables. The membership discussion centered on previous studies indicating that the "E" designation, and subsequent higher pay, is not really appropriate for warrant officers as most are enlisted prior to becoming warrants. The membership did not support the proposal as written, but did want to consider and monitor potential pay compression issues compared to NCO pay tables, which can affect accessions.

e. The TRADOC Representative raised the fourth issue for vote. It concerned a formal Army recognition of the birth day of the Warrant Officer Corps. The membership showed interest in the idea, but expressed concern that there was no precedence for the individual corps to be recognized. The council asked the TRADOC Representative to further research the issue to determine if any precedent was available to help move the issue forward. The council asked that the TRADOC representative provide results of the research either when found or at the next meeting.

f. The Fifth voting issue was raised by the National Guard Representative. CW5 Nisker is also an officer in the United States Army Warrant Officer Association (USAWOA). CW5 Nisker asked the council to consider a close working relationship with USAWOA. Council members expressed concern over legality of any type of formal relationship with a private organization. After much discussion, the council decided that appropriate issues could be shared with USAWOA in a non-formal relationship, but that any formal relationship was inappropriate.

g. The sixth and final voting topic concerned OERs for CW5s. The WOCC Deputy Commandant discussed the fact that paragraph 3-2b(2) of AR 623-3 states, "Reports are not required, but are optional, for CW5s serving in three- and four-star nominative positions, except for Relief-for-Cause reports. When

CW5s serving in three- and four-star nominative positions are reassigned to other duties and not other report has been submitted, that time will be considered nonrated and will appear on the next report submitted upon reassignment for those duties.” CW5 Wigglesworth proposed that all CW5s should get only one report per job or per rater. Much heated discussion ensued. CW5 Watts stated that a change to the regulation was already working to make the reports optional for all CW5s. From a personal perspective, the members supported that possibility. However, on the official vote, 9 concurred, 1 non-concurred, and 6 abstained. The members who abstained did so primarily because they had not discussed that possibility with their Branch Commandants prior to the meeting. Since two thirds of the members must concur to have a consensus, the measure did not pass.

6. Other open issues and briefings brought before the council for discussion included:

a. The CASCOM Commander, MG Chambers, spent 45 minutes with the council. His discussion centered on his experiences and insights on warrant officers.

b. Discussion was held between Branch members about current USAREC board proceedings.

c. Discussion was held concerning the possibility of mandatory PME for warrant officers.

d. A discussion and briefing were provided by the QM RCWO concerning proper utilization, roles and responsibilities of CWOB/RCWO positions.

e. The next SWOAC meeting time and location were tentatively scheduled for 17 through 19 March 2009 at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Members agreed to that time and location.

7. SWOAC Chairman is CW5 Anderson, Center for Army Leadership (ATZL-CLL), DSN: 585-3202 or commercial (913) 758-3202, email: [michael.anderson3@conus.army.mil](mailto:michael.anderson3@conus.army.mil)

CW5 Anderson/ATZL-CLL/585-3202