

Coast Guard Pay & Personnel Center Advancements Branch Newsletter



Summer 2012 Edition
Serving our customer needs in SWEs, Advancements, EERs & Personnel Data Corrections

July 2012

Discipline EERs for Alcohol Incidents and NJPs

Ref: COMDTINST M1000.2, Art 5.E.2.c.



We often receive questions regarding discipline EERs. They are required, regardless of the submission date of the previous EER, on the date the member receives NJP, conviction by a Courts-Martial, or a conviction by a civil court.

The EER date should match the date on the Disciplinary Action. We do compare the date of the EER to the date on the Disciplinary Action to ensure they match. If they do not, we return the EER for correction. Remember, changing the effective date of the EER erases all the competency ratings from the EER so it is essential that the correct date is used.

The only exception to the above rule is when an Alcohol Incident is involved. A Discipline EER is

required for the date the Alcohol Incident was awarded. If the member is later taken to NJP, a Discipline EER is not required if there are no additional charges brought against the member. If the member receives other charges outside of the Alcohol Incident, then a second Discipline EER is required on the date of the NJP.

Also keep in mind that an observance period of 92 days for E-6 and below employee reviews and 184 days for E-7 and above reviews must be established before a regular EER can be submitted on a member. Therefore, if member receives a Disciplinary EER on a date close to a period ending date for a Regular EER, the Regular EER is not required if the observance period has not been established.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call me at 785-339-3410.

Deleting NJP in DA

We receive many requests to delete NJP actions in DA and, quite frequently, the SPOs forget an important upfront step. Whenever a Disciplinary Action needs to be removed from Direct Access, the SPO should enter a deletion transaction in DA. You do this by going to the Action Taken tab, and clicking the button in the Initial Action row to insert a new deletion row. Complete the Action Taken with the deletion information and hit Save.

You should always use the Initial Action row to start a deletion. Clicking another row (the Correction row, for example) will result in an error when you try to save it. Once you have deleted the event, you should submit a help ticket to PPC Customer Care so that the Personnel Data Integrity team can have all background data removed. We will notify you once you can reenter the Disciplinary event in DA.

By Ginger Farmer

Requesting a Marks Change

Ref: COMDTINST M1000.2, Art 5.J.2.b.

Once an EER is marked Final by the Approving Official, it is no longer accessible by the field - only ADV can change a mark on an evaluation. If you contact us within five days of submitting the EER Final, we can return the EER to the Approving Official for change. Outside of that five-day window, the EER must be corrected by us.

If the marks need to be changed by us, a memo signed by the Approving Official must be provided stating the following information:

- (a) The member's name, rate, and employee ID.
- (b) The period ending date.
- (c) The specific competencies being changed.
- (d) The original numerical mark, conduct mark, or CO's recommendation for advancement.
- (e) The revised numerical mark, conduct mark, or CO's recommendation for advancement.
- (f) A statement the member has been advised of these changes.

Always advise the member to check their EER through Self-Service to verify the change.

If you send the memo by e-mail, I can enter the correction within 1 to 2 business days.

By YN1 David Chenlo

Transfer Season Is Upon Us!! Transfer DPT Error

A member is due to depart your unit to their next assignment. Everything has been completed and the member is departing today. You (the SPO YN) pull up his Transfer DPT orders in DA and input today's date in the Actual Depart Date field after you have entered all other required fields. Then save. GOOD, the member is on his way.....

Oh wait!! DA gives me an error that reads: Member has not been reported in from PCS Order Number 1001234. You go to that order sequence number and see the orders are cancelled. Ok, what now, why am I getting an error that tells me the member has not reported???

What has happened? When researching this issue, you notice the expected effective date of departure for the Transfer DPT Order sequence number 1001234 is 07/01/2011. You go to JAG Archive and see a DPT Transfer Order (8C) effective 07/01/2011 has processed with no delete action associated with this departure or a corresponding RPT order. This means this Transfer DPT Order sequence number 1001234 should be in a status of Enroute.

Action the SPO should take when this happens: Submit a Trouble Ticket to PPC requesting the Transfer DPT Order be set back to the status of Enroute. When PPC notifies the SPO this has been completed, the SPO will then go to the order and remove the Actual Depart Date from the order and save. This will create a delete action and set the order back to a status of Ready. At this point the order can be cancelled and the SPO can proceed with the original PCS departing event to the member's next assignment. NEVER cancel an order in the status of Enroute.

By Pam Flewelling

SSIC Number

Ref: COMDTINST 5210.5.D

The Advancements Branch receives EER change requests from units using all kinds of different Standard Subject Identification Codes (SSIC) on their memos. So many choices - what to do? Throw a dart at a dartboard? Get a copy of the last memo that was done incorrectly? Look in the SSIC Manual? (perish the thought) Following is the answer, once and for all - the correct SSIC that should be used is **1616**, Performance and Conduct Enlisted.



Deadlines and Waivers

We are often asked to relax deadlines and eligibility rules to allow a member to participate in the advancement process, and we normally say no unless there are extenuating (e.g., operational, emergency, or truly unique) circumstances. The most common justifications offered are: it wasn't the member's fault (blame it on the unit, the SPO, the YN, etc), or he/she is a great sailor and deserves a break on this rule. Our governing philosophy is that the only way we can ensure the advancement system is fair to everyone is to ensure everyone plays by the same rules. No one gets a special break because they have timely access, because they know someone, or because they cry extra loud. Everyone should meet the same deadlines, pass the same courses, and have their record in Direct Access correct and up to date.

There is no such thing as a benign waiver or exception in advancements. If one person is granted special access to get on a list, it pushes other members down that list and can force someone below a cut. The member afloat for three months or serving in PATFORSWA has to know they are being afforded the same advancement opportunities as the member ashore with full computer and phone access. And everyone in a support role has to understand there are ramifications if they fail to provide the proper level of support to the members they are responsible for serving - It can cost the member an advancement opportunity.

The member has the final responsibility to make sure they are ready to advance. But they do need the help and guidance of their Chief, their CO, and the administrative support staff to ensure everything is in place for them to compete. When the member does their part and gets the proper support, the system works. When a part of that process breaks down, it is part of our role to ensure that any exceptions from deadlines or waivers are granted only in truly special circumstances and with the full knowledge of the impact of that waiver or exception on that member and others competing for that advancement.

By David Lynch

Common Errors with EERs

With transfer season here, there will be new members throughout the Coast Guard who may be completing EERs for the first time. Completing EERs requires several steps and it is easy to make an error.

Some of the more common errors are:

1. The most common error by far is not marking the evaluation type Approved prior to checking Final. Under the Reviewers tab the evaluation type Approved must be selected and the EMPLID of the approving official entered in the Reviewer ID block. Once the EMPLID is entered, click over to the Comments tab to see if the correct name of the AO is displayed. If the AO's name does not display, go back to the Reviewers tab and complete the step again. After you are done click Save, then Final and submit if the EER is completed.

NOTE: If you are completing the EER by proxy (YN, XO, etc.) ensure you entered the approving official's EMPLID and not your own.

2. The effective date of the EER does not match the submission schedule. Always ensure the correct period ending date for the member's pay grade is entered.

3. Please ensure the correct rating scale is selected for the member's rank. Changing the rating scale after the EER has been completed will erase all the data from the EER.

4. Comments must always be provided for any 1, 2, or 7 in any competency. Comments are also required for an Unsatisfactory Conduct and Not Recommended for advancement. Comments are always required for recommendations for advancement on EERs for E-6 and above.

5. Special is not a valid type of EER. Please select a more specific EER type.

For a full list see <http://www.uscg.mil/ppc/adv/typicalEERerrors.pdf>. |

By YN1 David Chenlo

Update to the Supplemental and Striker Programs

There have been some significant changes to the supplemental program over the past year. ALCOAST 138/12 reopened BM2 as an active duty supplemental rating. ALCGENL 052/12 clarified procedures for placement on the BM2 supplemental advancement eligibility list. The most current reserve supplemental advancement list guidance may be found in ALCOAST 339/12.

There are currently five rates open for placement on active duty striker lists - BM3, DC3, FS3, MK3, and SK3. ALCOAST 171/12 announced the requirement to pass a new BM3 course. There hasn't been a striker added to the FS3 list in months and the MK3 list has only a couple of members on it.

Delays in receipt of message traffic continue to be an issue for supplemental/striker placement, with the common problem being non-receipt due to communications interruptions. I can't over-stress the importance of following up on message receipt. ALCOAST 023/12 and previous editions all indicate a five day follow up if an acknowledgement is not received by the requesting unit from PPC. Please contact the Advancements Branch directly by e-mail or phone if you suspect we may not have received your message. List placement is based solely upon DTG and placement cannot be back-dated. Engaging us within five days lets us know that an issue exists so both parties can begin working on a resolution quickly. If you feel your message system may not have transmitted the traffic cleanly, you can e-mail me immediately after transmission to ensure I've received your request.

By David Lynch

Example of Supplemental List Request

R DDZZZZ MM YY
FM COGARD UNIT SENDING
TO COGARD PPC TOPEKA KS
INFO COMCOGARD PSC ARLINGTON VA//PSC-EPM// (OR RPM FOR RESERVE)
ANY ADDITIONAL UNIT PLADS AS INFO
BT
UNCLAS //N01430//
SUBJ: ACTIVE DUTY (OR RESERVE) SUPPLEMENTAL ADVANCEMENT ELIGIBILITY REQUEST
A. ALCOAST authorizing placement
B. Second reference if necessary
1. Rate (such as BM1)
2. Member rate, name, and employee ID (BM2 John L. Smith, 1234567)
3. Date of rank in current pay grade
4. Completion dates for:
 A. EPQ
 B. E-PME Performance Requirements
 C. Rating EOCT
5. Statement certifying members eligibility to access classified information (REQUIRED FOR ET, GM, ME, PA, OS, IT, IS, IV). (ART 3.a.10.B)
6. Effective date of member's last EER in current rate/grade along with a statement indicating whether the member meets the standards and retains the CO's recommendation for advancement.
7. A statement that all relevant Direct Access data for the Supplemental Advancement Eligibility List has been verified and is viewable in direct access.
8. Unit POC, contact e-mail, and phone number
9. Released by (name of CO or OIC)
BT
NNNN

Help Save the Coast Guard Time and Money

The SWE Announcement Message contains procedures for members and their commands to follow to ensure a successful SWE cycle. Unfortunately, two of those procedures are often not followed, resulting in wasted Coast Guard time and money. Correcting the problem starts with the member reviewing their online PDE and simply reporting the situation to their commands. The commands must then take the final step to prevent the problem.

The first situation involves a member who is eligible to take the SWE but will not be at their unit on the date of the SWE due to leave, medical, TDY, or PCS. The online PDE has two units listed at the top of the form. The top one is labeled "Perm Unit", and the second one is labeled "Exam Board". The exam board is the unit where the SWE will be shipped to and administered. Also, in the large comments block in the bottom third of the PDE it will further state something like:

"YOUR SERVICE WIDE EXAM WILL BE MAILED TO THE EXAM BOARD DEPTID: 000555 - CG AIRSTA ELIZ CITY LOCATED AT: 1664 WEEKSVILLE ROAD, BLDG 49, ELIZABETH CITY, N.C.

IF YOU WILL NOT BE AT THE EXAM UNIT LISTED ABOVE ON THE SCHEDULED SWE DATE DUE TO PCS/TDY/LEAVE/MEDICAL, PLEASE NOTIFY PPC (ADV) PRIOR TO THE PDE CORRECTION DEADLINE SO THAT YOUR EXAM CAN BE SHIPPED TO YOUR LOCATION."

For the May 2012 SWE over 250 exams were forwarded by units to the member's actual location. When you review your PDE, please remind your command that you need to have your exam sent to another location if you won't be there. If ADV is informed during the



PDE correction period, we can send it directly to that location rather than have your command forward it. A single FEDEX package containing a single exam and answer sheet can cost the Coast Guard anywhere between \$4.00 up to \$30.00 depending on where it's being shipped

The second situation is when a member reviews a PDE that shows a status of "eligible", but the member actually isn't eligible because they did not complete their EPQs by the deadline. EPQs are currently not tracked in DA, so "eligible" shows on your PDE if all other requirements are met. When you see this, inform your command so they can inform us during the PDE correction period to prevent an exam from being shipped.

If these two simple steps are taken by you and your command, it will save the Service time and money, which in turn will make more time and money available for the important things the Coast Guard does. Thanks for your help.

By Doug Rose

SWE Answer Sheets

Approximately 9500 answer sheets were scanned and scored by ADV for the May 2012 SWE. After we scan we run two reports to ensure all answer sheets are scored correctly.

The first report lists the answer sheets that did not scan at all due to an incorrect SSN or exam ID number filled in by the tester. There were approximately 200 of these that required manual corrections by the ADV staff in order to scan. The second report contains a list of answer sheets that did scan and score but had some ovals that could not be read because they were colored too lightly, left blank, or had erasure smudges. There were approximately 1000 of these requiring review of the answer sheets, determining the intended answer, then manually entering that answer into each member's scanned test file and rescored. To help prevent these errors, please mark the ovals correctly, make them dark, don't leave blanks (you might guess right), and erase thoroughly. Thanks!

By Carolyne McInnes

MAY 12 SWE Statistics

The next two pages contain statistical data from the recent May SWE . The marks and awards points were computed up to the 1FEB12 SWE Eligibility Date (SED) and the TIS and TIR points are computed up to the 1JAN2013 Terminal Eligibility Date (TED).

Exam	Number of Candidates Tested	Average Final Multiple Score	Average Raw Test Score	Average EER Points	Average Award Points	Average Time In Service	Average Time in Rate	Average Sea/Surf Points
AET1	97	113.7742	78	41.3653	3.75	9.0718	8.94	0.72
AET2	69	103.5472	65	38.3282	1.69	5.9231	6.72	1.27
AETC	194	124.0786	77	43.3037	7.03	13.62	9.07	1.16
AETCM	13	127.4315	91	44.993	5.76	20	6.65	0.01
AETCS	48	131.6141	82	44.0912	8.79	19.1664	8.52	0.76
AMT1	175	120.7265	88	42.0355	5.95	12.3711	9.1	1.34
AMT2	158	107.3098	80	38.6487	2.27	6.9272	8.11	1.49
AMTC	285	128.5811	87	43.6368	8.17	16.5227	8.77	1.42
AMTCM	23	131.026	94	45.5904	8.21	20	7.02	0.19
AMTCS	59	130.5355	86	44.4588	8.45	19.181	7.91	0.74
AST1	39	121.8561	78	41.9446	7.58	11.7902	8.59	1.5
AST2	46	108.4478	76	39.5913	3.3	6.8826	7.92	0.91
ASTC	38	125.951	82	43.245	7.21	16.9342	7.41	1.14
ASTCM	5	132.416	79	45.698	9.4	19.95	6.86	0.5
ASTCS	8	126.56	84	44.28	6.5	18.4475	6.58	0.75
BM1	318	116.2627	77	41.8317	3.84	8.9495	7.9	3.65
BMC	710	129.8485	51	43.7338	7.47	13.096	8.56	6.58
BMCM	70	139.3691	65	46.3012	7.97	18.6187	7.52	8.08
BMCS	43	136.5827	79	45.6616	7.95	16.2906	7.32	9.01
DC1	40	121.0505	94	41.1297	5	9.8085	8.44	6.72
DC2	56	107.9783	81	39.8998	1.82	5.6475	6.74	3.58
DCC	115	129.99	88	42.516	7.05	14.2387	8.34	7.88
DCCM	8	140.1237	84	44.9762	8.87	19.4162	7.5	9.35
DCCS	21	136.9723	86	44.4623	8.57	17.3771	7.93	9.35
EM1	37	116.7337	75	40.9551	3.81	9.0045	7.59	5.13
EM2	116	104.5299	71	40.1173	1.02	4.8112	5.91	2.79
EMC	180	126.9266	77	43.102	6.28	12.1286	8.16	7.51
EMCM	18	139.86	80	44.9811	7.88	18.4394	7.28	11.26
EMCS	33	141.0578	78	44.2781	8.81	16.7654	8.17	13.01
ET1	145	114.6946	69	41.2038	3.6	8.4716	7.84	3.65
ET2	206	105.0366	64	39.9043	1.23	5.2228	6.78	1.91
ETC	222	128.6639	66	42.4756	6.86	13.1299	9.05	7.06
ETCM	23	135.0673	77	44.2365	7.43	19.6339	7.11	6.92
ETCS	26	135.75	71	43.4319	8.57	17.3461	7.85	8.54
FS1	85	117.5805	64	41.018	3.2	8.9191	8.12	6.83
FSC	160	133.028	71	42.8454	7.08	14.3265	8.15	10.64
FSCM	16	133.9556	82	44.6306	6	18.9893	6.1	8.23
FSCS	23	140.3017	77	43.7386	8.56	17.9278	7.42	11.89

Exam	Number of Candidates Tested	Average Final Multiple Score	Average Raw Test Score	Average EER Points	Average Award Points	Average Time In Service	Average Time in Rate	Average Sea/Surf Points
GM1	23	118.17	76	40.9695	4.65	9.7221	7.72	5.1
GM2	20	102.944	77	39.71	1.25	4.522	5.25	2.85
GMC	84	128.0644	80	42.686	6.72	12.795	8.92	7.05
GMCM	6	128.1183	89	43.6316	5.66	19.4016	6.11	3.3
GMCS	9	141.0022	79	42.4533	9.55	17.9722	8.98	12.04
HS1	71	114.7973	82	41.357	3.84	10.0253	7.71	1.82
HS2	62	103.5209	72	39.5069	1.66	5.484	5.18	1.61
HSC	130	127.467	78	43.4373	7.52	15.076	8.35	3.13
HSCM	6	122.7033	79	37.415	7	19.7633	6.58	1.97
HSCS	32	136.3446	81	44.774	8.71	19.4193	8.34	5.08
IS1	35	104.9885	75	40.8211	1.4	6.7005	4.74	0.61
IS2	16	98.3168	83	39.2181	0.87	3.8281	2.95	1.43
ISC	55	116.8463	72	42.504	4.78	10.4912	6.89	2.2
ISCM	4	131.895	81	44.07	6.25	19.625	6.04	1.2
ISCS	2	135.335	69	43.545	10	16.875	10	4.91
IT1	79	112.0688	79	41.0836	3.13	8.1765	7.25	2.4
IT2	51	101.1749	61	38.9278	1.01	4.7733	4.57	1.87
ITC	124	123.7474	75	42.4658	6.68	12.4478	8.45	3.45
ITCM	6	122.9733	86	44.0683	4.16	19.5983	5	0.13
ITCS	21	128.9895	91	44.0471	7.14	17.0276	7.42	3.35
ME1	83	118.5655	89	42.1248	5.19	10.0054	8.13	2.99
ME2	133	109.0276	83	40.7166	2.55	6.4072	7.49	2.27
MEC	82	127.1952	83	44.046	7.58	12.9217	8.44	4.15
MECM	9	121.5711	84	45.9288	2.44	18.3988	4.74	0.05
MECS	12	128.6641	79	45.0583	6.16	16.7425	7.26	3.43
MK1	166	119.888	81	41.8897	4.84	9.7001	8.4	4.94
MK2	344	107.4459	78	40.6021	1.59	5.4465	6.81	2.92
MKC	482	127.2076	89	43.0323	6.81	13.0848	8.03	6.24
MKCM	37	138.5089	85	44.4654	7.59	19.581	7.09	9.71
MKCS	86	137.4296	84	44.4215	8	17.3447	7.79	9.6
MST1	123	111.6076	100	42.265	3.78	8.1917	6.45	0.88
MST2	99	104.9353	86	41.3996	1.51	4.8185	5.95	1.16
MSTC	204	120.4898	89	43.6423	6.49	11.671	7.6	1.06
MSTCM	15	129.5953	90	45.1466	8.8	18.3006	6.94	0.83
MSTCS	22	127.4668	91	44.2122	8.04	15.8145	7.69	1.69
OS1	42	108.7864	74	41.3247	2.21	6.5947	6.31	2.33
OS2	173	100.2174	66	39.2736	0.47	3.9219	4.72	1.92
OSC	252	123.1046	79	42.16	5.75	11.2074	8.83	5.1
OSCM	33	136.6121	79	44.4936	8.15	19.0709	7.79	7.09
OSCS	55	134.0229	82	43.3789	8.92	15.8756	8.6	7.24
PA1	3	108.09	104	42.34	2.66	7.8033	5.28	0
PA2	9	111.9322	88	41.6	3.33	7.4455	8.68	1.07
PAC	3	118.9	106	41.1233	5.66	12.5	8.16	1.44
PACM	1	116.64	76	40.97	1	20	4.67	0

Exam	Number of Candidates Tested	Average Final Multiple Score	Average Raw Test Score	Average EER Points	Average Award Points	Average Time In Service	Average Time in Rate	Average Sea/Surf Points
SK1	137	113.8624	76	41.7872	3.57	8.8175	7.29	2.29
SK2	83	102.5557	70	39.8179	1.33	5.1254	4.38	1.68
SKC	275	125.7909	78	43.3841	6.94	13.3276	8.29	3.74
SKCM	7	129.1985	86	45.6971	6.42	19.4757	6	1.59
SKCS	25	131.222	78	44.7108	7.36	17.7032	6.96	4.48
YN1	230	111.8227	76	42.4592	3.63	8.3625	6.55	1.04
YN2	148	102.2417	69	40.2571	1.12	4.6829	4.9	1.27
YNC	262	124.1642	80	43.8586	7.08	13.5612	7.78	1.77
YNCM	23	132.423	76	44.3134	8.65	19.9347	6.73	2.78
YNCS	44	132.0134	81	44.6829	8.45	18.1215	7.56	2.82

Recommended for Advancement vs Not Recommended

Ref: COMDTINST M1000.2, Art 3.A.6. and 5.G.

We often receive questions on whether a member should be recommended for advancement on a regular EER when the member has been at the unit for only a short time or has a short time in current pay grade. A member should be recommended for advancement unless their performance indicates they are not ready. Recommending a member for advancement now does not mean they will advance tomorrow because they still need to go through the entire process to become eligible, but at least they will have that chance. Because a Not Recommended is viewed as a negative mark on the member's record, the more desirable way of approaching this is recommending the member for advancement now and if their performance goes downhill, a Change of Recommendation (CORC) EER can be done by the command, which takes away the recommendation.

For example, AMT3 Smith recently graduated A-School and arrived at his new unit. He has been there for just over 92 days so a regular set of marks for 31 March 2012 will be completed for him. He has been performing well since reporting. Should this member be recommended for advancement? Yes! This member is probably not eligible for the SWE in May because he is new to the rate and unit and probably has not completed the required EPQs and EOCT, so the earliest he can compete would be on the Nov 2012 SWE, which means the earliest he can advance is Jul 2013. If this member is a good performer now he will most likely continue to grow in his rate and be ready to advance around that time. Even if he made himself eligible for the May SWE, the earliest he could possibly advance is Jan 2013 and most likely he would advance later in the cycle, if at all.

A mark of Not Recommended on the March 2012 evaluation will affect the member's eligibility for the Nov 2012 SWE. A change in recommendation on the next regular evaluation, 30 Sep 2012, would come too late to qualify him for the Nov 2012 SWE. That is because the EER window for the Nov SWE goes from 2 Feb to 1 Aug, during which time he received a Not Recommended. Furthermore, a SWE set of evaluation cannot be done just to change an advancement recommendation.

Lastly, not recommending a member impacts a member's assignment consideration, application for special programs, and overall career performance summary. An advancement recommendation should not be withheld solely because a member is junior in rate, but should be applied to poor performers who require counseling and extra attention.

By YN1 David Chenlo

Another Perspective

Did you know that one of the guiding principles of a Servicewide-based exam process and advancement system is generating separation between candidates? The clearer the separation, the greater the confidence we can have that the system has selected the best members to advance. The SWE process includes values for various elements of a member's career, including the SWE exam score, and assigns final multiple point values which act to distribute the competing group in a rank ordered advancement list.

One vital part of the computation is the Marks Factor. As members become eligible to participate in the SWE process, the EER final multiple points play a pivotal role in separating members based upon performance standards. When a command minimizes the difference between members by compiling averages and using those averages to establish norms, it's not only contrary to policy but it ultimately hurts the members by minimizing the separation between candidates. This unauthorized use of performance averages could have drastic effects on a rating's health and may eventually destroy the integrity of the evaluation system.

The enlisted performance evaluation remains one of the basic tools the fleet has for impacting the quality of future petty officers and enlisted leaders. The impulse or tendency to mark against peer groups can be significant but must be resisted. One simple tool to use is to scan the competency descriptions and the narratives provided for the factors and a natural score distribution should develop. A thoughtful appraisal of performance should yield a mixture of marks as most people will have areas in which they are stronger and areas where they can improve. Submitting an EER with straight marks of 4 paints as much a picture of the rating chain as it lacks in describing the member. Concentrating on factor descriptions individually is a sure way to avoid any pitfalls and ensures accurate appraisal of the member along with the integrity of the advancement process.

By David Lynch

SWE Officers



A special thanks to all SWE officers who made the 2012 May SWE a success. You administered over 9,500 exams. The role you play in counseling members on advancement policy and procedures and SWE administration is vital to the success of the advancement system. Thank you for your continued dedication and excellent work!

EER Schedule:

E-1 Jan (all) & Jul (AD only)	E-8 Nov (all)
E-2 Jan (all) & Jul (AD only)	E-9 Jun (all)
E-3 Feb (all) & Aug (AD only)	
E-4 Mar (all) & Sep (AD only)	
E-5 Apr (all) & Oct (AD only)	
E-6 May (all) & Nov (AD only)	
E-7 Sep (all)	

PPC ADV STAFF

Bill Patterson: Branch Chief
Doug Rose: Assistant Branch Chief, Servicewide Exams (SWE)
YNCM Lori McNaught: SWE and SWE Waivers, PPC Silver Badge
YNC Luke Strittmatter: Monthly EPAA/ERA (ADV)
Pamela Flewelling: Personnel Data Integrity (PDI)
David Lynch: Supplemental Advancements (SUP)
Carolyne McInnes: SWE
YN1 David Chenlo: Enlisted Employee Reviews (EER)
Ginger Farmer: PDI

Contact Information

Email: PPC-DG-ADV (in Global) or PPC-adv@hrsic.uscg.mil
Phone: (785) 339-3400
FAX: (785) 339-3765
MSG: COGARD PPC TOPEKA KS//ADV//

ADV on the WEB:

<http://cgweb.ppc.uscg.mil/ppc.asp>

Check out our helpful information on our web page including:

- SWE Advancement Lists
- Supplemental Advancement Lists
- Striker Lists
- Advancement Statistics
- EER Documentation and Worksheets
- SWE Marks Factor Computation Form
- Advancement Requirements for each Rating
- Links to Advancement Instructions/Notes/Pubs
- Previous ADV Newsletters

Letters to the Editor:

If you have comments or suggestions concerning the contents of this newsletter or suggestions on future content, please send them to:
Lorrele.M.McNaught@uscg.mil.