

## OFFICER EVALUATION REPORT INFORMATION

The information below is a compilation of feedback from members of promotion and school boards, analysis from senior personnel in OER Branch and the analysis and observations of your assignment officers.

### QUICK REFERENCE LINKS

1. [Center of Mass OERs](#)
2. [COM Files versus COM reports](#)
3. [CSC and Battalion Command](#)
4. [Raters and Senior Raters](#)
5. Narratives:
  - [ACOM - Exclusive](#)
  - [ACOM - Strong](#)
  - [COM - Exclusive](#)
  - [COM - Strong](#)
  - [COM - Neither Exclusive or Strong](#)

## CENTER OF MASS OERS

Officers with center of mass (COM) reports are being selected by all boards. That's right, all boards--promotion, command, and school boards. A sufficient number and variety of boards have met since the transition to the 67-9, and clearly trends and analysis show center of mass reports as a common occurrence for many officers. The odds are very favorable that officers with center of mass reports will be promoted to major and lieutenant colonel. Officers receiving COM (67-9) OERs (with solid, well-written narratives) in battalion/brigade XO/S3 positions, as well as DDE and DPW, are sufficient for promotion to lieutenant colonel, provided the officer's entire file is not center of mass reports.

## COM FILES VERSUS COM REPORTS

There is a big distinction and difference between these two. Boards are definitely voting based on the overall file quality and they review ALL reports written on an officer. These board members are senior raters themselves and they know the constraints all senior raters work under. They know all about rating techniques and management of profiles. Based on the way the new system is designed and the constraints placed on a senior rater, board members expect to see COM reports in an officer's file. Again, they are not surprised or swayed by individual COM reports. This reality causes three things to occur as these board members endeavor to select the best-qualified officer for their particular board. First, they are going to read the senior rater narratives very closely, and especially in the case of COM reports, try to determine where the officer "fits" in terms of that senior rater's COM population (top 1/3, middle 1/3, bottom 1/3). Second, the board member will evaluate the officer's potential and formulate an overall impression of the officer by comparing COM reports with other reports in that officer's file. Trends in narratives (even between different senior raters) do emerge and allow a board member to form an overall impression and evaluation. What a single senior rater writes on an individual officer is viewed in much the same manner. When you lay out all reports on an officer, an overall file quality is evident and is the basis of the board member assessment. Finally, they judge files based on the strengths/weaknesses of the other files in the population they are reviewing. This is why when selecting the best qualified, the standard may be slightly different from board to board. This is also tied to the type of board and the selection rate associated with that board.

## CSC AND BATTALION COMMAND

This is why competition for CSC and Battalion Command is tougher. Selection by these boards has always been tougher. This is not a phenomenon of the "new OER." It is a function of a set population competing against a limited number of opportunities (class seat or command position). Typically these boards will place greater/weighted emphasis on the officer's performance in company command (CGSC board) and company command and battalion S3/XO reports for the battalion command board. It is safe to say that an officer must demonstrate above center of mass (ACOM) performance some time during his assignment in each of these key positions. Again, as stated before,