PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Published by Dewon Chaney ⏰ · May 8 at 8:55 AM · 🔄

Keeping it on the green side here...having a GRGB moment. What would you do to change how we manage careers?
- Some asked for more money with the bonus ✓
- Some asked for career flexibility (In progress via S2F)
- Some asked for the ability to take a pause ✓

Give us some constructive, actionable thoughts here!

Pers-43 actual sends

See insights

62 likes 432 comments 1 share

All comments

(b) (6)
Probably will be deleted, but this is fun to watch

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) no going to delete this. I hope this is fun and informative.
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PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6)
1. Take a look at the reserve "JO apply" system. Move into the 21st century and post open billets Navy-wide with AQDs and rank associated with them, instead of letting the Pers sorting hat (aka detailer/placement officer combo) manage it in secret with the front offices. Officers apply, and gaining commands can select from application candidates. 2. 7th fleet and or operational Navy wide leadership needs to have the courage (officer-like quality) to admit to their bosses that there
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I think many issues could be solved with career flexibility. I know you mentioned in the post that something is in progress for that, but I'm not sure what that is. I hope there are some significant adjustments happening. Allowing aviators to stay in certain points of their career longer or allowing them adjust the order of their tours could help folks with issues of dual military location, having/staring a family, going to grad school, etc, while still meeting requirements of the navy. My understanding is many of our allies use a model like this. I don't fully understand the law with how long people can stay in rank, but I think being forced to promote and being on the “golden path” ends up negatively affecting many talented folks. I think it also causes them to be slaves to timing. I think moving away from the mentality of “timing is everything” would be beneficial to both service members and the needs of the community. All that being said, I understand this is a big problem with a lot of things that factor into it, and I don’t come close to understanding the entire picture. However, there is a clear issue of talent retention in the Navy and aviation community. There are both people choosing to leave because they don’t like the future they see in their career in the community and at the same time many talented, smart aviators that still want to serve being forced to leave when FOS-ing for O-4. If nothing else, to help with overall Naval retention, could the community start allowing people to transition out of aviation before their initial obligation if the writing is on the wall that they aren’t going to promote within aviation? Allow people to start looking at lateral transfer before they are no longer competitive or eligible to switch communities. I understand that no community wants to let go of people until they are absolutely sure, but in my opinion, I think setting up aviators for success for a full 20 year career if they want it should be a priority. Too much talent is lost in the Navy as a whole when aviators are forced out.

Thanks for asking the question and for reading my thoughts if you got this far!

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

Adjusting tour order is an option in some cases. Talk with your detailer.
The Navy cannot compete with the commercial aviation market from a monetary standpoint. The commercial market pays much more and gives employees the option of where they want to live rather than assigning orders without regard for personal circumstances. Until the Navy fixes its culture problem, there will continually be aviation officers resigning at 18+ years due to the broken promotion system that’s based off politics rather than performance, geographical uncertainty with orders, and financial comparison to the commercial market. Stop giving fitrep rankings based on who’s willing to go to the boat for their disassociated tour (VP-30) and start actually valuing your top performers. Quit pushing the golden path and actually consider each individual’s circumstances to fit people into billets that are mutually beneficial.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) good point. COs should be doing that. Any thoughts on the geo uncertainty piece?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) and this is why milestone AvIP does not work. Milestones are not unequivocally met based on merit.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) hmm...so what should be done when compensation has been raised repeatedly as a concern? Curious to your thoughts.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I didn't say it's not a concern. I'm saying you have to take a hard look at the metric by which you are using to change it. As well intentioned as it may be the selections to the milestones are still completely subjective, and political as [b] pointed out. By monetizing that, you've essentially stuck your head in the mud of the deficiencies within which we operate all to save a couple hundred bucks.

I did not make a milestone billet as an O-4 and still was selected for O-5, so did my contributions matter $160/mo less to the Naval Aviation??? Besides aren't the milestones the reason you are paying the AvB?

For now, while you have an inventory problem and an imperfect system, keep it simple. You fly the aircraft you get the AvIP. It's all about the unintended messages you are sending to those who haven't reached the milestones and know there's far less certainty looking up the ladder than down from your seat.

I am currently on my post command sea duty tour and I can tell you that all of my JOs who are on their disassociated sea tour are getting out. They all site quality of life (time away from family, location stability) and job assignment flexibility as the reason why they are leaving. They want geographic stability for their families and not to be pegged into a predetermined career path. I know you have already stated that there isn't a "golden path" but we all know that once you take a job that isn't fully valued, then you are off the path. As someone who has had an extremely diverse career and had been forced to move every tour, I see where they are coming from. The current generation of JOs reasons for serving are weighted differently than ours and we are not adjusting fast enough to meet their needs.

I have talked to them about the recent bonus and all have said that the money, unless it was substantially more, isn't enough to convince them to stay.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

But how do we adjust when doing so would only further cause problems. Ok...you can stay in Norfolk, Lemoore, etc but you're going yo do multiple sea tours to stay there. Is that the right answer? Open tou your thoughts here.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments you would provide options to people, allowing them to take control of their life and career. You'd have an honest conversation with them saying, “If you want to homestead for your family it has to be Lemoore and it would require back-to-back sea tours.” They can then decide as a family and prioritize their life. It allows them to make the decision on whether a cross country PCS to shore tour is better or worse than homesteading back-to-back sea tours. Some people would rather continue deploying while their spouse builds a career and their kids go to school. Either way, it gives them a small amount of ownership and they'd feel like the Navy cares even a little about their happiness.

I told my old detailer what was important to keep me in the Navy, even offering to do back-to-back sea duty. He told me directly that he was looking out for my career and keeping me competitive for O4 by giving me orders I didn’t want in a location my spouse didn’t want because it was on the golden path. He believed he knew what was better for me than I did and as a result I’ve decided to get out.

Would it be possible to present people with options that align with their goals while also meeting your requirements? “Family is your priority? I can homestead you but it’ll involve more sea duty and you may not fly as much.” “You want command? Well if I give you the orders you’re requesting you won’t be competitive.” “You only care about flying? What if I roll you to a CVN tour now then get you setup with VT orders on the backend to help you be competitive for VT SELRES or TAR as you hit your MSR.”

There has to be a solution we can come up with to allow people a small amount of control over their career within the needs of the Navy. We all know certain billets need filled and not everyone can get station pilot in Italy, but if you really want to retain people and make a difference that is within the capacity of PERS-43 is it possible to at least have a real discussion with people to understand what’s important to them and attempt to line up something that helps meet THEIR goals, not the goals the detailer thinks they should have?
we do that for a small number of folks and are trying to get to that point for a larger percentage of constituents. Needs of the Navy and opportunities to fly is the other head hurter. I could go on and on about that but know Im trying to make things better despite being called tone deaf by others here. I really care! If anyone doesn't believe that come visit Pers and see for yourself.

sir we all know there's a golden path. Even my community flag officers openly admit it. We end up with COs who have all done basically the same thing, which I think is a level of groupthink that can stifle innovation.

I'm trying to challenge that narrative but that requires a lot. Too much to get in on this forum but happy to discuss.
Full disclosure: I was a 2x FOS back in 2014 who had an extremely frustrating transition off of Active duty. I will say, however, I found a great home in the Reserves, have managed to promote, and am currently recalled to Active Duty. Things were rough, but they've turned out well!

All that to say, ever since my transition, I've become convinced that we need some type of formal Officer Career Counseling program to give JO's guidance on many of the things that have already been discussed here.

JO's need to know fairly early on how important it is to leave their first sea tour with an EP. And let's be honest, not all JO's are going to be the #1 EP, but I bet they've got skills sets that the Navy can still use, and desperately needs to retain.

When I've brought this question up in formal venues, I've been told that it's the job of CO's / XO's / DH's to do this. I agree, but these days those folks are extremely busy, and moreover, we can't expect them to be experts on everything like Professional Flight Instructor, Career Intermission, TPS/AEDO, etc.

Maybe more PERS roadshows are the answer, I'm not sure. But what I do know is that our JO's deserve to know all their options. Yes, putting bodies on the pointy end of the spear will always take priority, I fully understand. But for the folks who strive for something else, or who've decided they want a different change of pace, let's make sure we're not letting that talent just walk out the door.

In my Reserve job, while I don't get to fly, I still get to wear a bag, directly contribute to Naval Aviation, hang out with fellow aviators, and have a great time.

There's lots of options out there. I appreciate that at the end of the day, there's a business aspect to detailing and assignments, but taking care of our people has to be just as much of a priority.

If we get real with our folks about what the road ahead looks like for them and what their options are, I feel confident that will build trust and camaraderie which will inherently help us get better.

(b) (6)
not every EP wants to stay in (or be CO). Unfortunately the statutory board sees MP(s) and decides the navy would be better off with out them.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
that's not always true. One's performance as an MP makes them less competitive but not none competitive. Again total record and performance carries the day.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I think that depends on how well the briefer does with the record. That said, you might as well say "5% is not 0%" and call it good. I don’t recall the last road show’s numbers of how many MPs promoted, but “best, most qualified” doesn’t usually lend itself to MPs being chosen, advanced quals or no, total record or no, when there's a single MP in a stack of otherwise great paper. Instead it turns into MPs attempting the Monty Python "I'm not dead yet!" and the boards playing the part of "you'll be stone dead in a minute, be quiet!"

The option to fly your entire career. Could be sea/shore rotation but the taxpayers invested millions of dollars for us to be the best aviators in the world. Let the aviators be aviators.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments Are you referencing the Flying Warrant Officer program or the Professional Flight Instructor program? Those are the only two I've heard of. If not, what is the program or trial you are referencing?

Yes the Warrant program.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments completely disagree with that assessment. The PFI program has given the TRACOMs highly valuable assets from the IP and ground jobs because of their longevity and continuity. They have time to earn quals and use them for years, all while giving the individual exactly what they want, continuity in their flying jobs and limited PCSs.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments Did the Navy really try it? Did they put a real effort into making it work? Or did they pull the plug when someone decided they weren’t interested in it anymore? The Aussies and Brits have career flying programs that have been working for decades. Our very own Army has a flying CWO program. You can’t tell me it doesn’t work when it does elsewhere.

There’s a lot of actionable suggestions here that I think are right on the money, but I think most can be distilled simply. People first.

We have to stop acting as though people aren’t the primary enabler of our combat effectiveness. Transparent and published business rules. Open and immediate access to billets lists. Genuine 1v1 care for the people on the other end. Transparency and compassion. Sunlight is the best disinfectant of what ails us.

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) thanks for this. I'm trying to get there. We've certainly missed the mark there on more than a few occasions. All of our business rules are published...MPM, Insts, etc. The billet list os a challenge given our current IT structure but I can say there are no hidden lists. Appreciate the feedback.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments when I was a JO circa 2010 the billet lists were available to anyone with a CAC card. It got taken down I think circa 2012-13 because the detailers didn't like us non-detailer folks having visibility (an actual quote). It took away our ability to see what was out there and we could only rely on what the detailer told us was available.
completely agree. I transitioned to FAO post Aviation DH, and my new community posts a complete billet list out to 5 years sortable by rank. There’s no reason PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments can’t do something similar given that they have in the past. It would go a long way towards increasing transparency and forcing detailers to have honest discussions about available billets.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

good points there were more reasons behind not posting them other than that and our timeliness of keeping that list accurate.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

FAO is a much smaller community with little no outside taxes for officers. I can post all the aviation billets I own right now but variability lies in the other billets we’re REQUIRED to fill.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments that’s a valid point and I completely acknowledge that FAO has a simpler problem set. However, even posting just the aviation billets you own would go a long way towards addressing some of the concerns in this thread about transparency. I realize it’s a tax on the detailers in that it may force more tough conversations, but it helps to know what’s out there when it comes to discussing your career options. People can’t be truly informed if they don’t know billets exist.

Beyond the billet list, I’ve found the FAO detailing conversations (which also involve filling billets in low quality of life locales) to be much more of a professional give and take than the “you’re going here” conversations I had with my PERS 43 detailers. Don’t get me wrong, I loved my time in aviation and had the luxury of choosing to lat transfer. It’s in that vein that I’m approaching the issues I’ve seen.

Also, I just finished reading through the thread and noticed what you said about the difficulties of keeping the billet list updated. The FAO detailers have the same issue, so it’s only released quarterly, with some pretty strong standard caveats that a conversation with the detailer is required to confirm billet availability.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

will take a look at it again. Thanks.

4d Reply

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments appreciate you being willing to pitch into the tough conversations!

4d Send message Hide

It seems from the comments here that what you're really looking for is feedback on how your particular department can make an impact. If this is what you're looking for, then anonymous satisfaction surveys should be implemented at the end of every PCS cycle or detailer turnover. You could ask questions about transparency, billet availability, the orders process, and interactions with the detailer.

Yes, there is a lot of dissatisfaction within the Navy around the golden path and the promotion process but there is also a lot of dissatisfaction with the way that PERS handles orders and PCSs.
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PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

that's a great idea!

5d Reply

Track when people get bad deals and make it up on the back end. If someone gets a hard job in a not great location that was their dead last choice on a slate, they should get preferential detailing over the guy who is trying to set up to homestead for the 3rd tour in a row.

5d Send message Hide Edited

we try to do that when it's truly a bad deal.

5d Reply

My suggestion is that PERS-43 should invest more time in outreach and educating the AD members and their spouses on responses to manning challenges and how the Navy works, especially with developing career tracks. The once-a-year visits to the bases clearly aren't enough. My husband did a tour at PERS-43 and liked the EON. But she was still rectified to it.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Thanks. We try but between boards and giving detailers time with THEIR families it’s a challenge to get around the world more than once a year. As you know there are a little over a dozen detailers in -43 for 14,000 aviation officers. About 30ish when you add in placement officers.

Author
(b) (6)
bahaha. The response is, “great idea, but we won’t do that”.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) that’s not what I said. I said it’s a challenge for detailers. If an acceptable alternative is for placement officers to visit vice detailers then that could work.

PERS 43: After reading the comments on the original post, it is clear some people just don’t get why the Navy can’t accommodate everyone’s personal program. Education could go a long way in managing expectations, for both spouses and the AD member, which I think could be beneficial when it comes to retention. Not that it’s the panacea, or close, but I think it could be very helpful.

(b) (6)
I presume this question surrounds current retention levels and their effect on manning in the mid-grade disassociated sea-tour billets. If this is the case then you need to look beyond the AD force complement during times of high attrition as a result of outside economic forces. There are plenty of airline guys in the reserves who would be willing to fill these billets for the right set of incentives.

1. Waive sanctuary. For example, you bring a 14 YOS individual into the billet then they will receive AD retirement if and when they achieve 20 YOS.

2. Waive post 9/11 VA education transfer requirements. So long as the member has more than 4 YOS let them immediately transfer their VA benefit to include adding dependent children born or adopted post resignation from AD. This is a ridiculous rule on it own account. Transfers should have always been automatic at 4 YOS and include the ability to add children after the fact.

3. Pay a bonus for the activation. Less than the AD retention but something on the order of $1500/month.
I vote 🙅 on your #2!

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
will pass this to Pers-46.

Remember USERRA only gives you up to 5 years per employer, that said they could allow for early retirement already approved at the Secretary level through TERA if someone was willing to come back. It’s a win-win.

Seconded on abolishing GI Bill transfer requirements. Someone who has given their life to the Navy for 10+ years should not have to sign up to obiserv for an entitlement they have already earned at 4 years.

Little changes can go a long way in personnel retention and morale: stop making officers pay for meals while on deployment.

If geo-batching on sea duty, allow a service member to retain the higher BAH when there's a difference between their duty station and where their family resides.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments can't control the meal piece. The sea duty BAH piece is already a thing.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments the statement about sea duty BAH you made is misleading. Sea duty BAH retention at dependents location is only applicable to certain commands. I am on sea duty, geobaching, and was specifically turned down for dependents bah due to my sea duty not being “arduous”. PHIBRON staff at homeguard is no more arduous than spending 15 days out of each month away from home in a VP or VR squadron.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I understand the paying for meals on a deployment isn't within PERS control but the ability to try to institute change with others is. PERS can lobby peer commands and get the support to push for the recommendation if it wanted to. From a spouses' perspective, the most frustrating thing about the military is that the easiest answer is always, "No, that's not my job."

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments double check that, please. My husband's currently on a 7+ month carrier deployment that's also not "arduous" and we took a $1,500/mo pay cut to geobatch. Exceptions from PERS were not granted.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I can see how you'd feel that but there is still a way to get to yes there although that is with N13 in Arlington.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments we do advocate for items like this but for BAH that request package doesn't even come through our office for an official endorsement.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments again that is a N13 function. Also, geobatching is a family decision. DoD doesn't have an entitlement allowance for unaccompanied tours CONUS although you should be entitled to Family Sep in some cases.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments it's not an unaccompanied tour. I'll let my husband weigh in if he's able.
(b) (6) there are few things that grind my gears as much as paying for meals in a wardroom that I can never eat in because I’m flying while knowing that Maritime pilots are getting per diem for their meals on deployment... not something Pers can fix (he can beat the drum of that being a WILD inconsistency) but absolutely frustrating.
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(b) (6) 100% - they can’t fix it, but could certainly raise the red flag about it if they wanted to.
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Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) I agree but the DoDI allows for it. Will ask to see if a change can be made but I’m not holding my breath since Enlisted Sailors lose money too for meals on the ship.

5d  Reply

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) that flag has been raised in the past but I will do it again. See my comment above though.

5d  Reply

(b) (6) Detailers should be required to communicate in writing. Most of the time when emailing a question I would get back a “call me” response so there was no paper trail on their verbal promises.
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Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) not going to "require" that. Would recommend if there is a conversation follow with an email to them recapping the conversation. If your recap is incorrect they will correct it so everyone is on the same page.

5d  Reply

John An
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments “Not going to require” promises in writing. My experience has been detailers will ignore such emails and then claim it never happened.
LDO retired. Pay O4 LDOs for pinnacle sea tours just like O4 DH pilots. Also take a hard look at new accessions sea shore flow rotation prior to being commissioned. If they had back to back sea tours as an enlisted prior being commissioned then make shore duty a priority for them during their first 2 tours as an officer in order to decompress a bit. Often time a sailor would have been completed a back to back sea tour and possibly redirected to a sea-going command because of low manning and not once that’s taking into a count to why you can’t get most LDOs to stay pass their 10 year commitment. Often time we are burned out and feel like it’s all about plugging that hole before deploying.

Agreed. It didn’t make any sense for me to stay on sea duty as an O-4 LDO even if it was a pinnacle tour. I’m now in the private sector making close to my active duty pay while on sea duty—not including retirement pay and disability.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

We can’t see enlisted records in our system so new accessions are detailed based on needs of the Navy and most times that’s sea duty because some other LDO needs to roll to shore duty.

Same thing for prior enlisted flight suits. Had a Detailer tell me they didn’t care about my time in service or dual military and just wanted to plug in a billet.
I think it's important to recognize that the pilot you are trying to retain at their MSR is a totally different person from who signed up initially. Usually pilots (along with everyone else) starts a family sometime around the end of sea tour or on shore tour. Currently, unless you get very lucky, your final tour before your MSR is going to involve a PCS to a boat somewhere, followed by a PCS to whatever duty station we have for a DH tour. Knowing that we have no agency in where we go for our DH tour drives folks toward the door. Even if the money was the same, the lack of ability to compete for a spot to choose a squadron or a coast hurts retention. I know for VP nearly every squadron on both coasts have gapped DH billets. Perhaps consider letting folks deemed high performers choose their duty station or coast for DH. This might let you at least retain more of the top community talent.

You could tie this to meritorious reorders, "NAE Valued"/golden path performance, or some other metric. We have been told we have enough O4s at the last road show, so I think we should ensure we maximize their quality however we can.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

There is discussion in the office about competing for DH spots and locations. To do that though I need to have teeth to keep enough people in to go to the none #1 spots. The team and I are brainstorming this with the bonus. What I can't have is all 300+ DH selects want to go to location X for 20 spots and the the other 280 say "I'm getting out". Eager to hear additional thoughts her but Im open to the idea just need to flesh it out so leaders above me will give a thumbs up.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments another option could be to reward top performers based on ACTC level.

I know the community wants to quality spread people across both coasts, but if you can incentive people who were FRS-Is or WTLs to return post disassociated tour with a financial reward above and beyond the normal that could also help. The civilian sector rewards employees based on qualification, if choice of next duty station isn’t an option like Alan Murdock suggested, financial compensation would also help keep quality people in the community.
PERS PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I think you could use this to solve two problems at once. You could tie it to NAE valued jobs that are clearly linked to making OP DH that you are having a hard time filling.

For example, when I was negotiating for orders GW OPS ADMIN was a hard fill that nobody wanted but the person in those orders needed to depart. You could consider advertising them and include some sort of pick your coast clause.

If someone gets hard filled in they might be more inclined to stay if they know that they have more agency on their next orders.

Additionally, and I'm clearly biased here, offering SMTIs coast choices might help too (unlikely but I had to try 😂)

(b) (6)

Have community bubbas do their own community's records briefing at stat boards. Sure they stand up and say what their community "values" ahead of time, but when a SWO briefs an aviator, or an EOD briefs a sub record, or maybe even if a tailhook guy has a VP record, it's a crapshoot whether they really know what they're talking about and can put any sort of positive spin on things.
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4 Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

PERS-43 has no input on Stat boards but we try to influence it by educating all senior officers on the latest and greatest in Naval Aviation. That some have seen the same old Pers brief because we're trying to be standard to a degree.

5d Reply

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments perhaps no direct input, but you guys are positioned in Millington already, and could get the conversations going; this can't be a concern unique to aviation. But outside concerns would likely just sound like sour grapes, since they would probably primarily come from FOS'd individuals — you guys are impartial. It likely wouldn't even require legislative change, just more briefers brought in.
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Reply to PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Follow the British/Aussie model of terminal FltLt’s. Ask a senior JO if they want to be CO and, if so, then they go the DH/XO/CO and beyond track. Those that don’t, stop promoting at O-3 but stay flying and tactical for however long they choose to stay. If that had been an option, I would probably still be flying in the VFA world. Works for our allies. They seem to have enough bodies to get all the billets filled and the mission accomplished.

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Current law doesn’t allow that. If we could, those folks would be on permanent sea duty. Who would sign up for that?

(b) (6)
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Acknowledged that policy and law might be hard to change. How might retention look like if we could change the policy? We live in cages of our own making.

(b) (6)
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
It’s not OUR making. We embrace the change that is given to us by law and policy makers. The question we get asked with any change we request, ie bonus, prove with data that this will change retention!

(b) (6)
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
You have all the data to prove the current model is not meeting retention objectives. It is naive and irresponsible to demand data of something that hasn’t happened to be the basis for it to happen. Data is always a lagging metric and that is why as VADM Burke put it in 2018, the Navy is shooting behind the duck on pilot retention. Not your doing but the aim has not changed.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Current law requires you to promote to stay past certain wickets—partially agree. There are exceptions and exemptions to the current policy on a case by case basis. No exceptions to statutory length of service mandates but those can and should be changed. Permanent sea duty—disagree. There are plenty of flying billets that are non-sea duty that require tactical skills. You could easily find a path from deployment to production (using your most current and competent talent) and back. Even if the option was only deployable squadrons there are ways to detail individuals to squadrons who are not deploying. Is it guaranteed? No. But you might just keep more talent than forcing them into a non-flying staff tour without any hope of staying current or doing the thing that they joined the Navy to do. PFI was a great start. The British/Aussie model bouncing back and forth from deployable squadrons to production would kill two birds with one terminal LT. My two-cents.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
What about an Army model where Warrant Officers are able to stay in the cockpit and are the technical experts?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
they wouldn’t have to be on permanent sea duty, they could rotate to shore instructor roles as well. Similar to what the Army does with their WOs. All it takes is a policy change and a true willingness from Big Navy to retain the skills we pay a lot of money to build in our aviators. As hard as it may be to believe, not everyone wants to be a Flag Officer.

The Navy tried the flying warrant program, but did away with it just as quickly and converted them all the 1310's. I hear a lot that most aviators just want to fly and that's it, but that's not how it goes, as we know.
(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I'm on my fourth back to back to back Sea Duty, voluntarily. If the mission matters, we feel validated in doing so.

When you uproot families to fill some lousy billet on a ship in the yards, encouraging someone to geobach and drop their retirement papers on day two of the job (gotta meet that one year on station) we know where your priorities are.

I have had multiple terminal O-4's/O-5's get trapped by making the mistake of acknowledging the detailer and getting "put in the system" for orders, thus abrogating their ability to retire.

The system is rigged in favor of Millington, which is why you see so much distrust of PERS-43.
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(b) (6)
PFI seems to be the closest we've gotten, and it serves our needs of filling our underfilled VT jobs. Wish there was more opportunities like it for folks who just want to fly and not worry about paperwork or gates.

The AF heavy community tried the pro pilot track and abandoned it pretty quick. Sounded like it could have been great.
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(b) (6) concur. We have TAR as well.

5d  Reply

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments or combine the Aussie way and PFI. Let people do 3 years in their fleet squadron then go do 3yrs at the VTs and just keep that rotation. Solves the problem of sea duty forever
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(b) (6)
It's telling that their first knee-jerk reaction was, "if we did that, you'd just be on sea duty the whole time." Very dismissive.
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WHY are Slates so ironclad? Why can't swaps happen, especially when it makes complete sense regarding career progression? I'm wrapping up a DH tour, geo-baching in San Diego just to end up retiring. The DH that relieved me in Whidbey CAME from San Diego, and the job I'm doing now would have given him a much better chance for promotion/O5. We tried to swap, but alas the Slate is apparently set in stone despite a few different requests to make this common sense swap.

I'm sure there's a backstory here that is unknown. I know slates can be changed.

Sorry, but this is hard to believe. If there's a "backstory" we were not informed or "educated" on that. We went through 2 detailers (turnover) and my DCDRE inquired as well. All were told "not happening, Slate is final". That's it. No explanation, nothing else communicated. I'm making it work, at the expense of my family. THESE kind of decisions are why people are bailing. THIS was the final decision point for my retirement plans.

Sorry to hear this. There should have been an explanation especially if the slate couldn't be changed.

Post the number of available billets for each job on the JO slate. This would allow front offices to have realistic conversations with their JO's regarding their performance and their chances of getting selected for an available job. In the current MPRA slate construct, instructor pilots and NFO's on both coasts usually rank FRS, Weapons school, and the wing as their top 3 and when there are only 1 or 2 spots available at each, it pushes everyone further down into their lower choice options. From the JO perspective, what is so secretive about the number of billets available for a certain job? We have no interest in trying to "game" the slate as has been suggested by some detailers and placement officers, we would just love some transparency in a process that has major repercussions on future career prospects and personal/family lives. I think a little transparency could go a
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

We don't post the number of billets because it's not always set in stone. Commands know what is requested by the shore commands. They should have conversations with their JOs.

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments If billet numbers are not known by PERS-43 then how would they be known by individual commands? Not sure I'm tracking this logic... Understand that it isn't always set in stone but even providing projections of numbers of billets available when the slate is published would still add a layer of transparency to the process that would allow CO's/XO's to have real conversations with their JO's. Currently, conversations are centered around past trends and experience of the individual front offices which is very constructive, but at a time where the shape and nature of MPRA is changing significantly, it's anyone's guess as to what the landscape of the slate will be without even a baseline idea of how many billets are going to be projected for each job.

(b) (6)

Detailing needs to be more transparent. Be open and honest about how a FITREP ranking combined with the navy's value for the billet your sitting in impact follow on orders. Then, post all the jobs available in your PRD timeframe and let officers rank them, knowing how their current/past jobs make them competitive or not for follow on jobs, and show how competitive that next job is as well. Could even assign a score. FDNF plus .5 points, CVW over Exped plus .5, ROTC -.5. FRS over VTs plus .5. WTI plus .5. Lemoore, plus .5. Right now FDNF is "valued" a grad degree is "valued" but it's nebulous. Make it transparent, what you are doing now makes you more or less competitive by this exact much, therefore you are or are not the leading candidate for this next job because the other person did more of Y. Choosing this next job is a positive or negative career impact of exactly Z amount. Let us choose how much career impact we're willing to accept rather than PERS choosing.

There's no career benefit to moving. You can homestead in one duty station for 12 years vs moving 4 times in 12 years, and no cares about the differential impact on a personal/family life of those two officers.

(b) (6)

Interesting concept but what about timing and one that is potentially disadvantaged by it?
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments  Thanks for opening up a forum. 

If I understand your question in this part correctly, I think it highlights a different problem. For clarity, if you are going into a DH billet 2 months behind another strong performer, there is no easy way for both to get a long ticket EP. So the fact that we value long ticket EPs, as stated in the most recent ACSB that you should have a 10+ month EP, already limits your chances of being successful in the eyes of the Navy. PERS must make a decision for who to put in a billet that already limits a career because there is a low chance of good FITREP. This requires a change in how the FITREP cycle works. We need a way to signal who are strong performers and who aren’t that is not dependent on other factors such as when other people showed up and when a CO’s COC, which again is based on other external factors. We look at JO timing and are moving people around to ensure the strong performers are in a position to get good FITREPS but if they have to extend it may impact other JOs or their future timing. 

I understand FITREP structure is outside of PERS 43 but it is all built on how records are adjudged at the board.
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(b) (6) also I don’t think some billets should be ranked over others. I believe performance should carry the day.

5d  Reply

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments. There’s certainly some nuance I’m not perfectly describing, and I’m not an expert. However, billets are valued over others. It’s a fact. Boards prefer WTI to ROTC for a first JO shore tour. There are better and worse disassociated sea tours for promotion, ANAV/CVV Staff/Flag Aide. Making that established rather than opaque would help officers understand the career tradeoffs that result from job selection and help PERS explain, explicitly, the career impact of going to station SAR or Naval Academy LEAD or ROTC, or C-12s over a production tour. Hot Fills could also get you “bonus points” for both follow on orders and boards.

That’s only one way to do it, generally more transparency in detailing would be helpful. Here’s what’s available, here’s what’s best for your career, and if you don’t do that valued job, here’s the career implications.
While it may create significant disruption initially, could the AD side work similar to the RC side? All available billets are posted, each officer ranks their preference knowing full well which ones are career enhancing and which ones are not. Then the applicants are ranked and matched with the billets. Weeds out the low performers (as they are last to be paired with a billet) and gives flexibility to the service member to weigh all elements of service. For example as discussed above, perhaps a member is willing to take less impactful orders to accommodate family. They place all the local billets at the top of the list. Again, I realize there is more complexity to AD detailing, but the old way of doing it seems to be in distress.

I'm sold.

Helicopter JO shore detailing adopted that structure a few years ago. I was given 43 options to rank when I was up for submitting preferences. The number of options ebbs based on billets and the number of JOs in the selecting class.

Commenting as another spouse here, but some of my thoughts/observations:

As others have mentioned, detach the command track from the promotion track. How do you tell a post-DH/non-CO-select “you’re still valuable!” when there’s no further opportunity for promotion and likely no other opportunities to fly again. What it translates out in the fleet is that “you have a pulse so you’re valuable to us in doing the jobs WE need.” I understand that the Navy has jobs it needs to fill and not everyone is going to get to do exactly what they want all the time. BUT—there should still be an opportunity to excel in those positions and potentially get screened for promotion again, or to head back to a flying bullet. Because if not, how exactly are you showing value to these aviators? Plus you end up having an imbalance of work ethic; those that care pull the weight of those who are just riding it to retirement, leading to further dissatisfaction. There’s no incentive to delineate what is currently known as terminal O5s.

I imagine the concern here is more the bottom of the organization than the top. You need to keep the LTs from getting out. But providing a decent path forward for both command and non-command aviators is pivotal to that. If a LT calls up a former DH who didn’t select and asks, was it worth it, what do you think many
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

a lot to unpack here. Can we setup a time to chat next Friday? 901-874-3974

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments sure, I'd be happy to. What's the best way to coordinate time? I'm OCONUS in Bahrain.

Recognize civilian spousal employment as collocation. My wife isn't a teacher, Nex employee, fast food worker, or other "job" that can be worked anywhere... She has a defined career in line to become a Senior Vice President but it requires her to stay in a certain city with DOZENS of billets for me available.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments that's above the pay grade of anyone in Pers-43. Good comment and recommend adding that to the Navy survey for CNO.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments failing to bring it up to the above pay grades makes you complicit in the problem. The answer cannot always be "that's above my pay grade". Every O4 and above in Pers 43 has a voice and a position of privilege to use it in front of the right people. The CNO won't listen to a survey, but he will listen to Chief NavPers.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments FYI, as the husband of a teacher I can tell you that it is not easy to relocate...especially during a mere 3 year tour. Also, they make a lot less than an executive so any gap in pay is far more significant. As a former PERS guy, I can tell you that taking this into account is impossible...and frankly, my opinion is that it shouldn't even be taken into account for active duty...it isn't fair and so is paying people with dependents more (unmarried people miss their families too)...just an opinion though.
PERS-43’s job is meeting the needs of the Navy, doing the best to find a happy match with the needs of the service member and the needs of commands. Assisting in your wife's career progression is NOT their responsibility, unless she is also AD. Would you expect a civilian organization to prioritize you over others based on your wife's job?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments while spouse career Colo may not be possible, this is still an issue at the heart of many frustrations for service members, especially those who have not had the opportunity to experience some kind of homesteading during their career. Where the Navy falls short is both in providing resources to help families manage career disruptions for their spouses as well as advertising existing services or resources that are available. Maybe not a PERS specific responsibility, but worth awareness that this contributes to significant dissatisfaction with detailing by forcing folks to have to choose between cutting short opportunities for their spouse or geo-batching or taking a hit in the budget which detracts from quality of life and overall satisfaction with continued service. I've yet to take a CNO survey that effectively measures this particular topic, but maybe they've added some new questions.

To me, this issue is simple, logically:
*Like you said, PERS job=meeting needs of the Navy.
*Needs of the Navy ARE NOT being completely met (clearly) due to retention issues.
*The #1 concern affecting retention is SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT....for almost half of the respondents in the lasted BSF survey!
Therefore, spouse employment NEEDS to be considered!!

I don't think anyone is suggesting that a spouse's career progression become a PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments responsibility, or that they should prioritize anyone based on their spouse's career. But there should be pathways for those who choose to homestead to allow their spouses to have a decent career progression, even if it risks their own.

I'm saying this as someone who has a flexible/remote job and who has been a stay-at-home mom for a majority of my husband's tour. I just know that this is a big reason why aviators get out.
actually, that's exactly what the OP said... he wants his wife to promote and he wants the Navy to accommodate him and his wife at the expense of others. That's absurd.

I am fully behind all efforts to streamline things like transferring licenses and establishing partnerships with military-friendly companies, improving access to childcare on base, and all the other things the Navy currently does to assist spouses in finding jobs in their new duty station. But it is pure entitlement attitude to think that the military should be factor civilian spouse jobs into the orders equation. If the Navy really did operate this way, what do you think would happen to retention when people realized that it is Navy's policy to pick winners and losers for orders based on personal family decision making?

This whole "whose career comes first" dilemma is not unique to the military... many civilian families have the same struggle, and it's a difficult decision the married couple has to arrive at and work around on their own.

The military is called service for a reason. There is always going to be some element of sacrifice, and sometimes it's a lot. There's no denying that.

you're entire argument is a logical fallacy. This idea that by accommodating to the location requirements of my wife's career would negatively affect other service members is outrageous. There are plenty of spots for 13xx officers among the big 3 (Jax/Norfolk/San Diego).

Let's be very clear, I volunteered to join the navy... my wife and kids did not. To knowingly move a servicemember to a duty station that negatively affects his family's morale and wellbeing is bad for retention.

Military children have highest rates of mental health disorders... Divorce rates are sky high, suicide sky high, etc etc...
While the "whose career comes first" dilemma is not unique to the military, being forced to move every couple of years to keep your career certainly is unique to the military. Being told the only job available to you is in the middle of the desert in CA is unique to the military. Being told you're moving to Japan in 3 months is unique to the military. These are places it's virtually impossible for a spouse to keep/find a decent job. It becomes not a matter of whose career comes first, but one of having to forfeit a career entirely.

I don't know a single aviator or aviator spouse who doesn't feel strongly about a call to service or isn't willing to make sacrifices, but the writing is on the wall: The Navy is losing talent. The problems are known. One of the main factors is spouse employment.

to your point about meeting the needs of the Navy, if PERS cannot retain the officers they want to retain to fill billets the NAE values, such as first look O4 selects or first tour EP's, and they are leaving because of these reasons, which they very clearly are, then why is this not their responsibility to synthesize this idea? Now, is this precise thing plausible and scalable? Likely no, but there are adjacent and relevant solutions within that space that impact a great deal of people. Other services have managed to incorporate homesteading on some levels to address this, why dismiss it as out of scope because PERS 43 is only focused on the needs of the Navy?

The Navy needs to stop bleeding talent they have paid to educate and train to the civilian world, what this person brought up is a real reason that happens. That makes it, in fact, a need of the Navy. Is it the number one need of the Navy today? Maybe, maybe not; I don’t presume to know. But I do know it is growing more and more acute. Acute enough that PERS is posting to Facebook asking what people want to see in career management...

But hey, I left the navy so I could hang out with my family every day, make more money, have total autonomy over my career, leave bad bosses whenever I feel like it, and live near my extended family, so what do I know about the needs of the Navy... not a whole lot anymore. But I know a ton about my needs and why I left the Navy because there was no way to meet them in the system as it exists today.
career autonomy was the number one reason cited by first tour JOs as why they left the navy.

Study was conducted in 2021.

This is one of the main reasons that led to my transition out of the service prior to my DH tour. Despite voicing my preferences during the detailing process for my shore tour—preferences that were shaped by the fact that my spouse held a state-specific professional license and admission, making it very difficult for her to move her career with mine—I was detailed to a billet on the other side of the country. What resulted, was my decision to be a geo-bachelor for the following 4 years on shore duty. My spouse's career is important to her, and it's important to me. Frankly, by not taking into account spouse employment during the detailing process, the Navy is forcing people to, in some instances, alter the entire trajectory of their lives. My family is blessed to have her income, and her career arc is far higher than mine would have been had I continued in the service. Failing to take these factors into account leads to disenfranchised service members who will look to leave service at the first available opportunity. If the goal is to strengthen the force, meets the needs of the Navy, and provide opportunities for the service-members career progression, I ask, how is the current process working to achieve such aims? The first step here would be, instead of saying, "it's above my pay grade," acknowledging there is a measurable, real problem with retention, identifying the causal factors (of which my story is one of), and changing the existing regulations to allow for new solutions to be implemented, leading to a more sustainable, healthier Navy in the long-run. There must be a willingness to change in order to fix the problem.
(b) (6)

That's not what I'm saying... but my wife's job literally cannot be worked in another city and her company was ready to file a congressional inquiry and start writing letters when they found out we could've ended up in another city.

I ask that you put yourself in my wife's shoes. Imagine landing a career that pays 250k plus and then have the Navy threaten all of it because they couldn't find a spot in the second largest naval base in the world.

And miss me with the "geobach" nonsense. Children deserve their parents and to separate them is only contributing to the mental health pandemic ailing military spouses and children.

Let's get real about who can live anywhere and who can't. Until then... We'll be gladly taking the offramp and laugh at the dumpster fire that is Navy Retention.
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(b) (6)

except we're no longer in a world where one spouse can normally not afford to work. Our families already make great sacrifices while we're away - why should a spouse's career be one of them. The spouse isn't in the Navy - we should avoid situations where there is a clear path for co-location with a spouse. Otherwise you're just going to create a disaffected service member who will either have to geo-bach or force their spouse to give up on their career prospects. Or the member is just going to get out at the earliest opportunity.
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(b) (6)

Got it. All single officers get orders to Lemoore, Fallon, Guam, Japan, etc. That will really help retention as they try to navigate those super hot dating scenes in an attempt to start a family of their own....
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(b) (6)

I think the general point is that we all have family Colo considerations, including single people, not only dual-mil families.

5d  Send message  Hide
I agree with you as I'm potentially being forced out of my career that I have worked hard for because of our new assignment location. Whether your career be in the corporate world or at home, both are extremely valuable and needed to support our service members and family. Of course I could always stay stateside, raise our daughter alone, and separate our family unit for the needs of my career but how is that helpful in keeping people in the navy? As it's not per's priority to place spouses, the least we can do is advocate for our service members to the higher powers that be to put in some sort of protections or accommodations for these situations. The reality is single income is not as doable as it used to be.

This... People constantly say to me "Well you signed up for this".... They are absolutely right.. We did sign up for it. But our spouses and children did not.

There is extensive research out there that demonstrates military spouses and children suffer from extensive mental health and career troubles due to their spouses service. There has to be a better way. And when the detailer tells us there is "nothing" available in San Diego... we're calling BS. It's not like we're asking to be put in the one officer spot in Chicago or Houston...

The spouses did volunteer for it to some degree if you got married after commissioning. If you were married before, then that may be a communication issue, or perhaps life circumstances have just changed, and there really isn't much that PERS 43 can do about that while being fair to all officers.

Listen to how tone deaf you are.

If your wife was making 250k a year in a big 3 navy city and you were forced to move because of "needs of navy" you just gonna tell your wife "sorry needs of the navy?"

You're probably incapable of empathy because the above situation is unfathomable for you. But please continue to be a part of the problem.
Your situation is unique, and it sounds like everything ended up working out for you; however, painting with broad brush strokes and providing preference to married officers will just lead to an exodus of single officers. The Navy has to treat each person fairly, and I suggest that it’s you who lacks empathy for your single shipmates, because this issue is an emotional one for you and has led to a loss of perspective.

I’m not "being part of the problem," I’m simply pointing out that following your suggestion doesn’t solve the problem, it just makes it different.

Lol an exodus of single officers? On what relevant information is that based on... totally conjecture laced with Stockholm Syndrome and groupthink. Where was the exodus when BAH rates went up for married couples? Where was the exodus when the EFMP program went to effect? Mil 2 mil colo?

We have all these exceptions but extraordinary spousal careers are not one of them.

We are HEMORRHAGING junior officers. We have done an excellent job at identifying major problems for retention. One of them is spousal employment and that spans ALL ranks. Yet any solution is met with denial and whataboutisms. We’re so preoccupied with making it “fair” for all those that volunteered we’re completely neglecting the mass of people who DID NOT volunteer (spouses/children)

Your attitude is part of the problem... your unwillingness to embrace a new change. Not every spouse is this hopeless dependent who makes it their entire identity.

For everyone concerned (rightfully so) about spouse employment bc it’s a real issue:
Please reach out to your representatives to let your voice be heard. The work opportunity tax credit is up for renewal and MOAA is advocating to include military spouses with other groups such as veterans (and felons) that are incentivized to hire.
Your reps are not reading this thread so let your thoughts actually be heard by someone who might be able to do something about it.

https://moaa.quorum.us/campaign/46431/
Not having to move every 20–24 months, and paying attention to where people have moved to/from keeping them from executing overseas moves back to back to back (unless they want to).

Being more open and letting people choose where they would like to go vice having a CDRE choose for them.

Have the detailer advocate and speak to the member prior to cutting orders.

Author
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The move piece is part of our business but I agree not in every case. Members can always call their detailer even if they are being detailed on a slate.

(b) (6)

There is a lot lost in translation between initial slate offering and what transpires for orders. There needs to be more transparency as the slate progresses, which needs to be initiated by the detailer because the SVM doesn’t know what is going on in the background.

"Off slate" detailing needs a completely different level of communication initiated by the detailer because the service member is completely blindsided when the slate is released, as we are typically not notified of this off slate job.

Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6)

Need more details here to understand how to help.

Author
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(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments it would be a long one. Do you have another avenue where you’d like me to lay it all out?

Author
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(b) (6)

Send me an email.
Your responses seem to indicate that you’re only interested in low-hanging fruit actionable at your own level, which will only silence the canary in the retention and career management coal mine—it won’t get anyone out of danger before it’s too late.

I left the Navy, so you may not care one bit what I have to say. Or you may care a lot, because I left.

There was no amount of change siloed to just within the aviation community that could move the needle on career management. A complete step change in culture and organizational operation is required to bring what is needed to career management and to retain talent in 2024 and into the future.

The Navy and most certainly Naval Aviation’s ready rooms were created for white men who flew jets with wives at home who could support their families.

That is no longer the ecosystem in which Naval Aviation exists— it is a more diverse Navy, with broadened policies on who is included, but the scaffolding upon which career management, compensation, scheduling, timelines... everything is built largely remains unchanged.

People need to be able to exist as whole people and families however that looks for them in order to manage their careers:
- have a spouse who can maintain stable employment
- have a spouse in the military with them and meaningfully see them
- not have to miss out on substantial financial opportunity to remain in the military
- not have to owe 2:1 time back for a pause

And I presume to know your response: that’s not the way the way the Navy works; that won’t ever be the case. We can’t just flip everything on its head.

But, the question is not how the Navy works. The question is what would we change within career management.

So yes, that’s not how career management works in the Navy. It’s out of scope for you. It’s a big project, but it’s why we are leaving. We’re buying forever homes and never moving again, getting huge pay raises, seeing our families every day, getting flexibility within our careers, getting to stay in the cockpit, the list goes on and on.

The Navy is a fabulous job, but if it doesn’t adjust to a more modern mindset it’s going to be a fabulous first job for all of these JO’s who can have their cake and eat it too in the civilian world.

Anyway, now I’m one of those veterans ranting on a military page.
Cool of you to ask for ideas.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I'm not saying we can't or don't need to flip everything on its head. I'm just responding the way I am to get folks energized to advocate for those changes at the appropriate levels and give me ideas for things I can advocate for at my level. All the feedback received is great!

Every single valid comment made by someone on this thread is met with “yeah, but...” from PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments.

Until you actually accept the feedback, and define what can and cannot be done, you will never solve the root problems of retention and quality of “our” service. Get Real, Get Better isn’t about shoving an answer back at the commenter. What you are doing is actually attempting to invalidate the feedback you wanted in the first place.

I've sat in countless number of these “calls” for feedback and change. If you are actually seeking to solve the problem, identify solutions that people are bringing up that are within your authority to change, identify the problems you don't have authority to change and provide a recommendation to that authority for the change - and more importantly make the CHANGE to the process. Otherwise, this is the same empty call for feedback that goes unanswered.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I'm confused! You say here "define what can and cannot be done" but are critical of me telling folks what's outside my lane to affect and the appropriate way to advocate for the change they presented. I should just say "ok" and not act on what was presented? I'm not trying invalidate ANY feedback as I've liked almost every comment I've responded to. I'm trying to EDUCATE so that folks, like me, who didn't know now do.

I haven't seen a PERS-43 roadshow in a while. I bet some up and coming JO's that are very likely not on Facebook have great ideas. They're your primary target for retention.

Reach out to your detailer. Can let you know when one is heading your way.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Does PERS 43 "Actual" do road shows or is this just the community road shows? Tailhook panels aren’t quite achieving the engagement with leadership required for an effective solution.
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A little personal rant here, but I'd just say take care of your people. Have some empathy and think about the stress that falls on a person's shoulders particularly when moving families across the country. I have 2 high-school aged kids and I'm making my 2nd coast to coast move in 12 months. Detail earlier to help alleviate this stress. PRDs are known when orders are filled. It should not be a suprise when people are searching for orders. For 2 moves in a row, I haven't recieved orders until inside 8 weeks from PRD. This is unsat and I know I'm not the only person this has happened to. HHG moves require a bigger window to get scheduled as well as housing applications/house hunting.
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I was given orders 2 weeks out from when I had to execute them, during peak PCS season. A big part of that was timing of the DH board results, but PERS, you let the SWO detailer sit on my orders for WEEKS while they were in routing.
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we try not to do that. In most cases when that happen the placement officer is on travel or leave. That one of our limitations writ large in Pers with having such small staffs...1 deep in a lot of places. The other issue could have been funding. Most times I've seen this happen is our orders release posture which isn't dictated by any of the URL detailing shops.

5d  Reply
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concur and we do our best to accommodate. Remember there was a CR for quite some time this year and that is still affecting us with orders funding from OSD to the Navy.

5d  Reply
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments tracking, but like I said previously, PRDs are known at the beginning of a tour. The next move should be budgeted for already knowing that a given number of PCS movements can be predicted from PRDs falling within a FY. This number may change slightly due to early rotations and extensions, but shouldn't change very much. Also, it's almost June. I'd expect the budget excuses at the end of the FY, but not in the middle of it, CR or not. Bottom line, stop the excuses, be transparent and take care of the "customers".

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
that would accurate if we were given the money upfront but we're not. We're given quarterly allocations and in most cases it's not enough to release all the orders budgeted for. PRDs also change quite a bit affecting this quite a bit too. If you had trying in your orders, that's a smaller pot of money that is allocated even more tightly causing orders delays.

Unfortunately, throwing money at this problem is treating the symptom not curing the disease. The Navy has spent the last several decades burning down readiness for questionable reasons, on the tail end of the whip of an endemically rotten acquisition process, the solution to which appears to be solved through higher optempo.

"Flying is cool" runs out of juice eventually, quicker than most of us thought. At some point you look around and see shorter or non-existent shore tours, a family you barely know, a mission set that is tough to get behind, and it's time to go.

I think the new bonus schedule is about as good as anyone could expect, and it will likely push a handful of people over the edge to stick around. The only other thing I could think of is Lemoore. Is that recognized as a hardship tour? It's a really tough place for a JO to think they want to come back to.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
great comment. VADM Chebi is getting afternoon of this and VADM Cheever some as well as Air Boss. Their discussions inspired me (Pers-43 actual) to jump on here and start this discussion. I'm not here to constantly push back but i want folks to understand the handcuffs that are
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

It goes without saying, the issue is multi-faceted... totally agree that throwing money at the problem is temporary solution. We (and I mean PERS/CNAF should be

1. Looking to identify what the Navy’s “competitors” (whether it be the airlines or whoever) and what else they are offering and providing our Flyers that we are not and do their absolute best, given the “handcuffs” to get that to our people.

I have seen our Wing make a push for physical and mental resiliency training. This is huge in my opinion.

2. Provide a streamlined method (not CSA or Culture Workshop) of communicating what we want/need directly to PERS/CNAF (phone app, online, etc) and utilizing a platform to compile the data in such a way that, at any moment, the top 3,5,10, etc. wants / needs are visible to everyone.

These are the first two that immediately come to mind.

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I like that idea. Will look to see if we can do that.

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
We do that but officers want guarantees which can't do.

Reply

(b) (6)
Let non command track O4s and O5s continue to fly in squadrons. There is a lot of experienced tossed aside and waisted. Utilize the talent pool that exists within the enterprise.

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
how do I do that when there are other valid requirements for those talented individuals in our Navy?
I guess I would ask is it better to let folks go who are unwilling to stand battle watch on a staff or do a DC tour when they know there is not a clear path to command or O5 or would it be better to find ways for them to continue to contribute in a manner that benefits their desire to serve? I would argue that for those folks who desire to make command and would benefit from a tour on staff or in DC they should be assigned as such. If there are those that for any number of reasons do not desire to hold command but continue to support through means as senior instructors within a squadron or wing there should be a pathway that supports that.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments - that's a fight for you and your peer Pers codes to have. Are senior Naval Aviators the commodity staff officers to fill uncoded billets, or do we represent a unique value proposition based on the cost & time to generate replacements? Rhetorical and loaded question of course...but also one that ought not be turned around on the Fleet bubba sharing an idea.

Personally I hope it's a fight you pick and win (within reason)!

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I hate that I am saying this but injecting the aviation culture and way of thinking about complex problems is NEEDED at the Ech III and Ech II level. In my experience at my current command, aviators tend to be the voice of reason when it comes to assessing risk, which is basically what a staff AO does. We are taught risk assessment and the ability to critically think much different than other communities and the major staffs do rely on our approach to complex problems.

That said, there should be better flexibility.

shortages EVERYWHERE, including control grade officers.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, the British Royal Air Force and other nations' militaries have a program called “Professional Aviator” where you choose the cockpit rather than command. Certain stipulations apply.

The model exists. Please spend some time looking into this option as many aviators would stick around to share their wealth of knowledge with the next generation (or even continue to fly operational sorties) under these conditions.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, so the solution is to discourage people from staying in by telling them “you didn’t select for CQ/O5 so you’ll never get close to an airplane again; go sit on this watch floor?” Some might go for that, especially if there is a squadron after the pain tour, but when people love to instruct and/or fly, and the airlines are hiring, you’ll lose more than you keep.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, Convert them to CWO4/5 flying positions, if possible?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, not in aviation but we are being asked to fill many billets

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, that's not what we're doing. We just have very few options for O-4+ to fly if not on the DH or command track. PFI was designed for that but now the LTs want in on that so that may be less of an option.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, no legal way to do that plus that's a pay cut with no opportunity to recover that pay via time in service.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments that's kind of the original point: more billets in squadrons or squadron-adjacent commands (Wing WTUs, Weapons Schools, etc.) that can be dedicated to training and/or flying. Sort of like PFI is for CNATRA, but in Fleet squadrons. Safety and basic flight instruction are great, and we need that job done, but experienced O3+ also have the wherewithal to teach advanced tactics that would be largely lost on a new CAT-1 who’s still learning how to fly and has yet to actually deploy.

4d Send message Edit

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
that is something we can push to the 3* for support. Don't know if we'll be successful given the current environment.

4d Reply

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments all you can do is ask, and that's all we can ask of you. Good luck!

4d Send message

Author
Reply to PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I totally agree and am one of those who would happily chose this if it were an option. As an OP-T O-4 I would find much greater fulfillment being reattached to a squadron or even augmenting deployed squadrons than taking random billets that offer little opportunity to promote.

5d Send message

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I don't know how we get to yes here but I'll look into it.

5d Reply

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
actually my predecessor did...PFI isn't funded. He just did it and Im still supporting and defending it. The IRE is another that Im supporting with limits.

5d Reply

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Agreed. Hard to do but the team is trying...
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6), we tried something similar that didn't work. I will take another look at it though.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments a good start would be not sending production first shore LTs IA. I realize this problem doesn't come directly from PERS 43, but support from the PERS side to discourage this from happening would be a big step forward. Or if it is going to happen, at least relieve the individual who was sent IA from a dissociated sea tour. A real quick way to kill morale/burn retention is for shore duty to not be honored. A person who checks into a shore production tour, is sent IA within their first year at the command, leaves for a deployment length of time, and comes home only to be detaching a year and a half later is a lot for someone to bear. Both HSM FRS' have been forced to provide several bodies year round for IAs that are in excess of 8 months. Shore Duty should be shore duty. If IAs have to be filled, the bodies shouldn't come from LTs that were high performers during their initial sea tour. Any ENS/LTJG waiting to class up for flight school can support those roles. Additionally, three year shore duty orders should be three years. People need time to reset and take care of their families. Issuing 36 month orders with the auto reset to less than 30 months after a year on shore doesn't give anyone incentive to stay. An additional 6 months in a production role is way more beneficial for long term health of the community than learning how to be a shooter on the carrier. I think it would go a long way for JOs coming off sea tours to have the peace of mind that they can have ample time to reset. If the golden path doesn't exist as you say, then what is the reason for early detachment from shore for career timing? I'm not an expert on filling billets, but it feels like something that could be improved.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6), we have discouraged IAs as far back as my first time in Pers. I still don't like them now but we have no visibility on folks being sent IA at Pers.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments is it possible to detail those sent on IA in a manner at which still gives them 2.5 years on shore

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments in most cases no because members don't want to agree to stay past their MSP for the extension.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments Of course they don't want to extend - because they've lost trust and now want to get out.

There's a request out now for an IA in an Asian nation. Can you look into that and make sure no one will be forced to go? Asking for volunteers is fine but once they started ordering FRS instructors (at already low staffed commands) to go, the whole JOPA saw a promise broken and could no longer promise their families or themselves what a shore tour would look like.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Air Boss is going to look into the effects of IAs. Pers has zero visibility on these but concur they aren't good for maintaining trust. That message has been relayed directly to CNAF and PACFLT actual.

I'm not active duty anymore, but the VFA community has to loosen their hold on people's future. The golden road isn't for everyone. Maybe make some time for people to get to grad school? Maybe be ok with guys doing PEP tours? Maybe let folks stay in Test? Maybe promote people who go to the training command? Pretty much every other community allows for stuff like that. Y'all (VFA) tend to shoehorn people into places they don't necessarily want to be for the sake of their 'career'.

You treat people like they're humans instead of bodies making your red boxes turn green you might have people stay in longer.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Concur but we have a mission to do, right! It's kind of a chicken and the egg scenario. If we had more people we could allow for all the things you mention in more abundance. We already allow some of that even for VFA. There is no golden path...there's tours that the NAE values.

Our goal is to be as transparent as possible with our constituents as we help them manage their careers while meeting the mission of our Navy.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments completely concur! Most testers take time to get up on step and earn all of their qualifications to be productive testers. I have seen plenty of instances when as soon as a tester is starting to stroke, they are pulled to go to DH tours.

The Navy in general is not getting the full return on investment for the significant efforts made to train a test pilot.

Agreeing with everything said here. Taking opportunities to broaden your education and skill set (TPS, Olmsted, etc.) seem to be regarded with disdain in the VFA community when the point is to create more well rounded thinkers and leaders.

NAE leaders are taking a hard look at that. Won't go into details here but it is in work. If they get it right, there will be more space to do "more" of that. There are VFA officers that are doing some of those just a little later than they probably want. Interestingly though that goes against one of the other recommendations here of keeping pilots in the cockpit, period.

All about choice. Give folks a choice of whether to stay in the cockpit or branch out. If they veer off the NAE value track "golden path" they incur risk for command and promotion but should still have a pathway back into the squadrons so we don't lose the experienced gained through years of study and exercises.

we currently allow that choice bit it is limited because we still have a mission to accomplish for our Nation. I can't let everyone choose to not go to sea, stay on shore, or continously do things not valued by the NAE. If you can quantify your thoughts with specific numbers, that would help potentially create an actionable plan here.
I am an O5 WTI from the MPRA Community. When I was passed over for Command there was no pathway back to a fleet combat squadron. I'm not advocating for folks who don't wish to go back to sea. in fact, I am advocating for allowing folks like me to go back to sea in a squadron as a senior instructor. There are also other folks who punch out prior to their 20 year mark who may have been encouraged to stay if, after serving their time on a staff or in DC would have loved and opportunity to return to a squadron and deploy at sea again.

The main reason I can see why so many JOs are getting out is due to quality of life issues. When you lose good people, who do you have left?

Myself and multiple other JOs at my current command offered to be the first ones in the Navy to start an Instructor Naval Flight Officer to Instructor Pilot (INFO2IP is what they called it) to not only improve retention, but to retain the TALENT AND EXPERIENCE that you cannot shell out money/bodies to replace. The goal was for INFOs to be CNATRA-only IPs. Those of us that would have helped start this have multiple ratings and hundreds of hours of civilian flight time. The USMC has already done this with their ECMOs/WSOs and they are very successful. The Navy could have adopted their instructions, training pipeline, and commitments for this but no, admirals didn't bother talking to each other (to include PERS actual). When will the admirals wake up and stop saying "we don't have a "retention problem" when the fact you absolutely do, especially at your Junior Officer level. Instead of being reactive to situations within the Navy retention and personnel, why not be proactive and strive to retain these good men/women that would continue to serve and mentor the next generation with opportunities such as INFO2IP? Listen to your people. If you take positive action, I think you'll be very surprised on what will happen.

Pers actual, me, did talk with CNATRA actual on this issue. I did not support it because of inventory concerns in certain NFO communities.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments copy that. The inventory concern you mentioned will still be a concern because JOs will continue to leave the navy and not return to the fleet. I truly think your decision to not support this incredible opportunity for both professional officers and the Navy talent retention initiative is a mistake and shortsighted. The Navy’s value on tac air NFOs is pretty dismal at best. Based on the latest retention bonus for VFA and VAQ, that is pretty evident. What will happen when the Navy doesn’t have any DHs to support a fleet squadron? Continue to pull people early from their well-deserved shore tours? Extend fleet tours? Extend deployments? Put another way, you have an opportunity to retain strike NFOs in a flying role or they will get out. 1 or 0. None of the affected group is staying to return to the fleet. That may not change the calculus, but hopefully it can put the decision into focus. Looking forward to your reply, Sir.

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments The inventory issues have been the excuse since at least 2018 when I was working on this more full time... and yet things have only gotten worse because of what Tanner is saying.

The PERS/admiral position is you need these bodies to go back to the fleet, the reality is the bodies are just leaving the Navy anyways and not going back because no one is willing to change.

(b) (6)

(b) (6) big fan of him referring to us as “inventory” rather than “manning”. Tomato/tomato but he thinks of us as a number rather than people.

(b) (6)

(b) (6) At least you know where you stand in the eyes of leadership.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments To just add a data point to Tanner's response, I'm one of the JO NFOs that was interested in this program. Since it was shot down, I'll be separating at the end of the year. And I'm far from the only one. Like Tanner said, this is a question of 1 or 0. Millions of dollars of training and years of fleet experience
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments If there's inventory concerns with some NFO communities, why don't we pull NFOs from communities that don't have the issue (VP/VAW, as evidenced by the bonus) and let them do a platform transition?

Lots of folks have been caught up in flight school "drafts" over the years who would jump at the chance to go fly in a pointy nose jet for 4 or 5 years. They would know full well that they would never make command, and they'd be alright with that.

5d Send message Hide

✍️ Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) agreed but how do I request a change that's applicable to all? I lot of the recommendations given while good could have the 2nd/3rd order effect of creating haves and have lots. I need to avoid that.

4d Reply

✍️ Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) Manning has a different connotation in some circles. Trust me, I'm a people person!

4d Reply
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments in regards to your response to Tony's comment: That is the beauty Sir, it does not have to apply to all. You can incorporate different types of retention opportunities within respective communities. Professionals officers are telling you how to make it better. Rather than responding with "reasons" on why certain things are "the way they are," why not take what we are telling you into account and push these initiatives forward? From my time in the Navy, I have seen leadership time and time again kick this can down the road on how to fix retention. Positive changes start in small increments and continue from there. The monetary incentives to remain in active duty are for those people (I do not know with 100% certainty) who were planning on staying in anyways, so that is not fixing the retention issue. Why not be the one that changes things for the better? Why can it not be you? Please be different from all the other admirals that have come and gone without trying to fix this issue. Those stars you've earned can carry a lot of pull and YOU can change many lives for the better. I cannot tell you how many hours of work I have prepared to brief the INFO2IP program to my wing leadership (of whom were highly motivated to make this idea a reality), even having an opportunity to discuss it face-to-face with CNATRA after briefing him personally on revamping a syllabus at my command. Like I said earlier, the USMC has already done the work on this program and it would need to be put into NAVADMINs for implementation. Training Wing commodores are on board with this program. Let's take it from merely an idea to a reality for those that want to continue to serve. Feel free to message me directly and we can discuss further.

I think personnel feel like their career doesn't matter to Big Navy when they see over 50 people pulled up 2 year groups for selection to O4. They are being told "we lost buy in along the way and in order to fix the now forming gaps, I have to cut your shore tour or your follow-on-tour from shore tour really short so you can fill a DH spot you're not ready for." I think a valid point I saw was for O4/O5 personnel not on the path to command that want to continue to serve in aviation billets should be allowed to do that instead of shuffled away into CVN staff billets with zero job satisfaction. How do you expect to fix retention if you make job satisfaction zero? This also seems to fix the "I have gaps in DH billets." We have "super-JO" billets, throw a bonus at an off track O4/O5 to sign back up for X amount of years and do a "Super-DH" tour.
that's actually not true. Big Navy is thinking I want to keep you and instead of trying to work an unreal bonus we'll just promote you earlier and pay you more SOONER.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

ah! So they'll promote to O4 on their first shore tour, stay the full length of their first shore tour, do their disassociated/training officer tour, then select for DH and be slated 32-40 months after selecting O4? If that's the case I think that will help retention until O4 but then the O4 numbers at a squadron are going to get messy. How would commands ensure their O4s have competitive FITREPs for follow on?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

Again, not a great response. The crux of the comment is that people don't like getting pulled (especially from a shore tour) early. It disrupts our families' lives and makes us move more often. Your response dismisses the hardship and pretends that it is actually a positive.

my response wasn't meant to be dismissive but rather give you a peak behind the curtain on what leadership is thinking. I understand early shore rolls are disruptive but we have to accommodate needs of the Navy as best we can. We gap billets when we can as well.

Bundle detail: when I had US Air Force officers working for me in Korea, they knew exactly what their follow on orders would be before they took orders to Korea.

They had a much better structure for mapping out family life; no surprises - OLD PERS43 Dude!
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(b) (6) you remember we tried that with GSAs and how much churn that caused. Life details, command requirements, etc. make that very untenable.

Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments true! But somehow the USAF figured it out...
You have to change the temperature inside of a room (climate) before you can change the temperature inside a building (Culture).

(b) (6) valid point. Will take another look at this.

Author

This is certainly not aviation specific, or even officer specific, but since the Pandora's Box has been opened and we are talking retention, I would love to see some leadership attention put toward being brilliant at the basics. Or at least adequate.
Specifically:
-Sailors are seeing extreme delays in processing PCS travel claims. Gov't travel card helps, but still a huge stressor and financial burden
-Pay issues are complicated and lengthy to get resolved. Often related to BAH rates when moving from one duty station to another. Despite extremely engaged CPPAs, almost always takes multiple trouble tickets which are usually closed with no resolution or engagement with the member.
-Sailors are getting orders later and inside the timeline required to schedule a mover before NLT date. (Also driven by mover availability.) This drives either a full DITY, leaving spouse and family to deal with the move or leave stuff behind (paying for that house/apt) and having to essentially move twice when a mover can be scheduled.

Personally, I would love to see at least some PSDs return in person. Sure, there is a cost with that, but I think there is a good chance there would be a huge return on investment there. I know, I know—not a PERS 43 specific issue, but I couldn't let the opportunity pass without foot stopping these types of issues.
The orders lead time issue is causal from operating under multiple CRs. Pers previously would issue orders ahead of the funding then sequestration and CRs caught them off guard and they had to go to CNO and ask for money to pay for them.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, thanks. Glad to see solutions are being pushed, as it is very much still an issue on the flight line. (And I’m guessing all the communities.)

Tangential issue, but one that goes to quality of service and institutional integrity: change the flight pay instruction to remove the flight status and fiscal penalty that comes with seeking mental healthcare. We already know that over 70% of all military aviators demonstrate health care avoidance behavior. We have to be guarded around our flight docs, our flight docs distrust NAMI, and the punitive nature of our flight pay instruction is a significant reason why.

Specifically, change OPNAVINST 7220.18A paragraph 7.h to read:

“Aviation officers who are medically incapacitated will be considered qualified for aviation service for the purposes of AvIP unless such incapacitation is determined to be due to the officer’s own misconduct while not in the line of duty buy a JAGMAN or substantially similar investigation.”

We don’t stop being Naval Aviators when we’re hurt. This is particularly true when such a grounding injury is service-related. The current regime of penalizing Naval Aviators because they seek mental health care inside our lifelines is inconsistent with our brand new Mental Health Playbook and is prejudicial to the trust required to maintain a cohesive team. No amount of bonus can buy that back.

https://academic.oup.com/milmed/article/188/3-4/e446/6761438

great point. PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments let’s raise this to N13.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments thank you! No$ie knows some of the details of the specific situation that motivates my recommendation, and I'm confident there are many affected by this issue.

As a related issue outside of your AOR but probably worthy of your awareness, there are a number of mental health intervention tools that are currently auto-downering until a waiver is centrally reviewed and approved by NAMI, usually months or years later (e.g. prescription of SSRI medication). I think BuMed ought to seriously consider relaxing the centralized execution of waivers and allow delegation forward to our medical professionals embedded in our CVW/CVN teams and elsewhere closer to the flight line. The future fight could be violent, chaotic, and disaggregating. If we want to keep aircrew in the fight in the presence of extreme psychological stress we'll need to empower and trust our flight docs and ship's psychs more.

I was going to comment similarly - while on LIMDU for a injury that occurred during PT (no fault of my own), I still served in a Post-DH aviation position at a major command and actively conducted training as an Aviator in the simulator. I had met my gates but ultimately lost out on about $7,000 of flight pay before retiring.

Sorry that happened and thanks for sharing. The current flight pay instruction seems to have two unfortunate presumptions built in:

1) injured aircrew are malingering

2) getting healthy is a “fix yourself” problem, rather than a teamwork approach between aircrew and their medical providers.

It’s important to note too that this is all within OPNAV’s policy discretion to fix, because the authorizing statute has no such negative assumptions; rather it is intended for officers “...who engage and remain in aviation service on a career basis.”

A focus on collocation of active duty spouses in different services would greatly help with retention. Also, service-wide better access to reliable and timely child care and less reliance on unrealistic family care plans would extend careers. Thanks for asking.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) CNO is advocating on the childcare front. We've made changes at NPC regarding collocation but it's a continued challenge based on career fields and basing options.

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments thanks for the continued advocacy regarding dual Military co-location. I get it, it's hard under the best of circumstances, and even harder working cross service.

Question: how do you measure success of this policy goal? Are there any publicly available stats on the number of co-lo requests each year, how many are fulfilled, and if not fulfilled what if any other mitigation options were brought into play?

I had a standing co-lo request with a cross service military spouse a few years back. Unsurprisingly, it could not be honored when I was up for O-5 duty. As a “press to test” I filed a FOIA request for records of the policy required Flag-level approval of my non-colo orders, but it seems no records were kept. Why is that? [1]

Last year, the DoD IG made it clear that there's still work to do across the joint force on this issue. I hope our Navy can continue to be in a position of leadership on this issue.


I was able to take advantage of the Career Intermission Program after my Test Pilot tour and came back to serve my Department Head tour. The biggest weakness we have in retention is forcing officers to remain on the golden path even though there is clear professional advantage for a member to deviate. An example would be an officer that completes Graduate school immediately after undergrad and puts them “behind timeline” for their career progression. I did CIP after the detailer refused to endorse my application for the Olmstead program because it would adversely affect my O4 promotion. It’s absolutely ridiculous to
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6)

On the flip side, if you didn't promote you'd be upset. A recommendation is to advocate for legislation to expand promotion deferrals.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

How about this as a solution? Why don't you make these professional development programs that result in a NOB FITREP result in a corresponding slide in an individual's lineal number and relative year group placement? The effect would keep these people in a relatively even seniority with peers that have executed the same amount of aviation community service. Certainly details would need to be worked out but in the end it would solve the problem. This would have to come from the PERS end to change this. Also FYI, I really appreciate you opening up a forum to seek options and changes.

While what you are saying is logical, what he is saying is that the law doesn't allow for this. What I'm saying is the laws as they are written are hurting Naval Aviation a whole lot more than helping mend and create a sustainable future.

(b) (6)

we looked at that for other ideas...grad school, etc. That is a legislative restriction. So not at the Pers level but something that we could support.

(b) (6)

I appreciate your future advocacy to make this change.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments is there a statutory limit on promotion deferrals? I'm the case study of how they can work out swimmingly so I'm curious. For context, I did Olmsted in lieu of my disassociated tour and was able to defer my first O-5 look twice to remain competitive as a DH. For me the process worked great.

If anything I think the promotion deferral option could be messaged better by PERS to front offices, as mine didn't know it existed. Also, I found that even my detailers weren't really conversant with it.

4d  Send message  Hide

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
Pers-43 (me) sent a note to all Major CDRs explaining nuance of promotion vs admin board deferrals. Stat boards have law associated with them so that is a legislative issue.

4d  Reply

He's saying he wanted to assume the risk to personally better himself and the detailer wouldn't let him. Maybe he was ok not promoting, or maybe the stat board is not valuing the right things in Naval Aviators to make someone who is selected for Olmstead seen as valued? And in the end the Navy lost the manning, albeit temporarily.

5d  Send message  Hide

Agreed! We're adults who know and understand the risk. I would prefer if PERS didn't argue a 1 year CAG staff tour is more valuable to the Navy than studying abroad and learning a second language just to make timing work.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

it's also about priorities. Remember needs of the Navy is sometimes primal in our detailing triangle. I don't always get a vote there.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments then be honest about what is valued.

You can't make a masters requirement for promotion and command and then also make it impossible for people to do it. The fact that JO's can't even apply for opportunities poisons the whole narrative. The fleet hears these stories.

As far as what we value, look here:

https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Boards/Active%20Duty%20Officer/documents/FY25_Promotion%20Board_Materials/FY-25_AC_LINE_Community_Briefs.pdf?ver=VXrZT83aglEZkSH0q5Am0w%3d%3d

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments "I did CIP after the detailer refused to endorse my application for the Olmstead program because it would adversely affect my O4 promotion."

Happened before you were in the seat...maybe times have changed but the culture is something you inherited.
(b) (6)

**PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments** The brief said multiple times that masters is desired for top tier officers prior to O-5 and all’s saying is that he wanted to get a masters but his detailer wouldn't endorse him trying to meet that objective by even applying for a highly selective program.

In the end... putting the needs of the Navy first was a loss because he bugged out on CIP anyways and the needs of the Navy still went unfilled. So how did the precedence work out??

It's the same argument you gave to (b) (6) the NFO.. the needs of the Navy needs you back in the fleet as an NFO so you can't be a pilot.... so he bugged out.. and the needs of the Navy went unfilled in two seats instead of one.
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(b) (6)

Nothing you can really do unless the law is changed. Goldwater-Nichols and Title 10 put too many restrictions on military promotion. In essence, the law requires one golden path and lessens diversity of thought by ensuring everybody does the same thing. I think the effort is noble, but it's all for naught if Congress doesn't act.
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PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) ..great comment!

6d   Reply   3

(b) (6)

...shore tours, especially at NROTC units. Short-touring and not filling billets hurts both morale and the program.

6d   Send message   Hide

(b) (6)

At a minimum the bonus should keep up with inflation. It's still not worth what it was in 2000 adjusted for inflation.

6d   Send message   Hide

Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) Great idea. We tried for that but we're approved by leaders for what we have. Our team works hard with OPNAV each year to get better compensation for Aviation.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I only quickly scanned the bonus message this year so I could be off here...but if approved for up to $50k/year, why is the max bonus available this year only $40k/year?

5d Send message  Hide

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) it is $50k per year for certain TMS and locations.

5d Send message  Hide

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) we had to fight and fight even for the current plan!

5d Reply

Reply to PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6)

I'd recommend more transparency with available assignments. The USMC monitors publish a list of billets that everyone can download which shows all available billets, their fill date, and required qualifications to take the job.

6d Send message  Hide

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) that would be great but that list would change faster than we can publish it. That was done for Helo Sea Assignments years ago. The list was updated monthly. Constituents were routinely frustrated when they called to ask about billets on the list but told it was unavailable. The other piece here is Pers-43 doesn't own all the billets required for fill and, if we did post, could only post the ones that were made available to us. That would again cause the frustration mentioned above.

Not saying no here but just giving you a different perspective.

5d Reply

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments The beauty of databases and IT infrastructure is that this list could be updated in real time, negating that issue.
this is definitely doable, something with read-only access for us (the customer) while the PERS folks actually manipulate the data. The biggest drawback is that we're too cheap to invest in a good, useable system. Look at NSIPS in general and the new eFITREP system. Some contractor got paid beaucoup bucks to make a system with a very narrow field of view, which may work fine for the few people that deal with it intimately and get adequate training. The rest of us either fumble through it (if we even have access) or just have to look at PDF printouts from the system provided by those with access.

maybe when can get there when N16 updates our antiquated DOS orders management system.

smaller community with fewer billets that cross codes. Much more of a challenge for us as the largest URL community.

 Shoot, even a list like the Commander Detailers put out would go a long way.
Just a spouse weighing in here, but we all know spouse input counts A LOT in career decisions! 😊

As MANY of our friends/peers have transitioned out recently (and with it being a consideration of ours), a lot of the same factors come up. Here are a few ideas that would likely help retention in the VFA community, at least:

**Allow aviators – particularly DHs – in squadrons to "just fly" and not have an additional ground job (OPS/O/M/Admin) Instead, shift to a set up similar to the Air Force. The DH tour has been stressful enough that *really awesome* aviators/leaders have gotten out at 15-16 years.

**Destigmatize non-command career paths. Also, as much as it's said that it doesn't hurt promotion, personally + anecdotally, that's not the case.

**Find better ways for pilots to keep up currency in shore jobs, when/where possible...and formalizing that somehow (not just saying it's possible to fly at 106 while in a shore job if you figure it out yourself, only for that not to actually happen because they can't support it). Create some program for this?

**More consideration for spouse employment/"co-locating" with civilian spouses who have careers that require homesteading...or just allowing more homesteading in general (for high school-aged kids, etc.), if desired (I realize this is difficult and a Navy-wide issue).

**Better transparency with available billets/timelines...not suggesting your spreadsheets to be made public and updated by the minute. Just BETTER transparency. It would be great to have some idea of what's out there.

**Editing to add – do some symposiums of some sort in which spouses are invited. As a veteran, I have a tiny bit better idea of the detailing process, timelines, what billets are available and when, but most spouses don't fully understand this stuff (I mean, honestly, many service members don't either). I can't tell you how many people I talk to that have no idea what their/spouses's career path looks like or what it COULD look like. Like I noted earlier, spouses often play a HUGE part in decision-making, as they should. It would be nice if they (we) could be better informed (directly) and have the chance to ask questions.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I appreciate your thoughts here. I'd ask that you flip it. Your spouse did all the hard jobs at sea to include OPS or MO and was not promoted nor screened for a command opportunity. Instead the ones promoted were the ones that did the things you've advocated for. How would you feel? What would think the Navy feels about your sacrifice and the work of your spouse?

I put this out to you this way because there are others reading this.

Most VFA pilots do nothing but fly and have a better chance at promotion than other aviators who do other tours that the Navy requires.

The DH tour is the "crucible" for command. Someone has to do those jobs. If not, the Navy doesn't need to promote as many O-4s. With that though, current law states you either promote to O-4 or get separated. That would be at odds with what you suggest.

Again...appreciate the comments...keep 'em coming!

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments What about when a pilot does the hard DH jobs (OPS/MO) and flies more than most peers (forward deployed) for 3 years, does a SECOND DH tour (flying + deployment + ground job), has excellent FitReps, and STILL doesn't get promoted (until 4th look) after a "non-golden track" shore tour in between?...hypothetically. I can absolutely tell you ALL about how that sacrifice feels!

The "flipped question" addressed a different issue but serves my point about destigmatizing non-command career paths. There needs to be a disassociation between promotion and command screening. Post-DH O-4s who wish to continue to serve in non-golden pathway jobs shouldn't get penalized. It may not be intentional, but again, personally + anecdotally, it 100% happens and I'm not sure if anyone is tracking it. I can also say with confidence that this is a retention issue (knowing several aviators who got out because of this). Those who don't want command feel like they'll get suckered into less-than-desirable jobs and won't get promoted if they stay in.

To your point about separating the DH ground jobs from purely flying, I may need some clarification on what you're saying. All I am saying is that the AF has somehow figured out how to let their pilots fly without having to worry about effectively doing two full-time jobs at once. And my suggestion wasn't to split the ground/flying jobs among pilots, but for pilots to not be required to do the ground jobs at all (like the AF).

I'd like to add that I sincerely appreciate this question being asked
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I agree with everything said. You say somebody has to be MO, OPSO, etc. It shouldn't have to be a pilot. The Air Force has already figured this out. Maybe that requires the law to be changed...then so be it and advocacy outside DOD would need to take place. This is just a discussion and unfortunately the fine details of the solution won't come from these posts. But if the Navy is serious about creative solutions, then thinking outside the box and abandoning the way things were done for decades need to be considered.

Unfortunately, we can't give data that XYZ will improve retention *before* its implementation. I know that won't satisfy some decision makers, but the reality is that this type of data will lag.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments we got LDO's that will and can do the MO job at any platform squadron. You shouldn't have to worry about that ground job if you have a senior LDO 6330 LT.

R/6330 CDR

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments let's chat. I feel I'm losing something in translation here. Will be available next Friday after the DH Board to chat. 901-874-3974

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

concur but not the OPS job potentially? That's a question. The other piece is if a DH cannot or doesn't run the big Dept how do I know they can run a squadron?
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I agree, OPs/Skeds/Training/Safety are off limits for LDO's. I would however argue the point that I have served with plenty of 1310/1320's that were awesome XO/Skippers without being a MO.

Also, when MPA/AMI, PPMAP, and Safety Center inspections come through any squadron; it is the Senior LT LDO sitting in the Skippers office with the Master Chief. The Pilot MO is more of a figure head then a 4790 SME and the Skipper holds those Pounders/Chief Mess responsible more than the pilot. Just my observations.

Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

the collocation piece is hard when we have to prioritize billets based on demands of the Navy. We do our best and have made improvements there. The billet transparency is hard as well. The timeline piece is on our website of when to reach out to theDetailer.

Author

Instead of bonuses to recruit or retain Sailors, how about making all sea duty tours tax exempt? The economy could support the reduction of income from the less than 1% of the population who are serving in the military. The next step would be to make all military members tax exempt, but sea duty tours would be the first step towards getting better.

Author

that's an interesting idea. FYI...that's a DOD issue [tax free]. Will take that up but please add that in the Navy survey as well.

Author

this is how you solve sea billet shortages!

Author

For Pilots: Good luck. Get real, Get better. For NFOs: Stay the course.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I think they're suggesting that pilots should "get real" and "get better" by getting out, taking advantage of their talents in other markets (airlines or other flying outside the Navy), while most NFOs aren't able to make the same move, so they have a greater incentive to stay Navy and take the open billets (and any available bonuses) to reach retirement.

Maybe I'm wrong and Isaac will correct my interpretation.

I guess I'm assuming this is a retention-targeted question? - after the bonus amounts that are aimed at pilots... Value performance, plain and simple, pilots do feel valued outside of the Navy. Too often the ones put on the pedestal are not the performers at all.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
(and everyone else here...I would love to have paid $50k/yr to everyone for the DH Retention Bonus. Civilian leaders would not allow that because it's a retention bonus so areas with lower rentention get higher amounts. I also listened to spouses who discussed challenges with living in certain locations hence the location incentive we were able to get approved this year.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments a few of those amounts are basically a slap in the face to folks who have to go grind out the same DH tour. I'm specifically referencing VP/VAW NFO here. This (in addition to the move in 2018 to put bonus eligibility to after O-4 selection) is absolutely going to backfire.

I agree with you but those decisions were made before I got here. The bonus is again a retention tool so more money goes to TMS+D with lagging retention. It shouldn't be seen as a slap in the face. If you use that argument we would either pay everyone the same or no one. Trust me some leaders would agree with the no bonus
How about letting pilots spend a career doing what they trained to do: fly planes.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

what about the oath you took before your wings?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I can honor both. Defending the constitution can involve doing one job your entire career. Or do you think the Brits/Aussies/Army Warrants somehow care less?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I do appreciate you questioning my loyalty because I dared to question the almighty Devil's Detailers...matches my opinion of your shop...

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I know you are trying here but this comment does not build trust in PERS

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments We're talking about people who have already served 8-10 years here. They have done their duty to their nation. They can walk away with their heads held high, as honorable veterans. You're asking how to keep these people in the military and they are answering you. It really doesn't matter if the Navy likes their answer or not. We need to incentivize staying. Appealing to their sense of duty, while not addressing their concerns, is a non-starter: they've already served their nation well.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments pretty sure my oath of office was "to protect the Constitution of the united states against all enemies foreign and domestic "....... What better way to do that than in a gray jet for my whole career?!?!?!
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

You asked for feedback which is great and appreciated. But dropping tone deaf comments like this, while we constantly see the nepotistic behavior from PERS, is laughable. Please show a single officer that went to PERS 43 and didn’t get their #1 choice of orders..... ...you know, oath and all that.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

Sir, I never questioned your loyalty. I was trying to highlight you took an officer's oath before you got wings. Hence your obligation is to what the Navy/Nation needs and not JUST flying airplanes.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I see my follow up comment.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I didn't get my #1 choice coming out of Pers. Probably won't again when I leave this time.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

The Navy isn't structured that way. I like some of the earlier comments about career changes but some of the ideas really only apply to individuals. Good feedback though as we will look at it from a holistic perspective to see how we can recommend changes to leadership.

I've always wondered why we (Navy) spend so much money training a pilot to just put them on a ship or some other non-flying job where they're not getting better at what we trained them to do. You can look at the Army helo pilots who get to be really good because that it all they do. Our allies can often run circles around us at ASW because that is what they have done their entire careers. What does an MPRA guy bring to the fight as a shooter? I get that it's a more varied career experience for them, but wouldn't a senior ABH or LDO be able to do that job just as well? Give them upward progression while keeping more of our pilots in the aircraft.

Full disclosure, I dodged the boat, so I'm working off second hand
you aren't wrong. MPRA guy who took the Shooter tour as part of my “due course/career progression.” Had a blast as a shooter, but it set me two years back as an aviator.

I can personally attest to the fact our adversaries are running circles around (under) us in the ASW realm because that is what they do. We still have yet to make up ground lost to the Russians between the end of the Cold War and today...and it shows.

I wouldn't say it set you back as an aviator as most aviators do SSTs. I'd argue you're a better leader because of your shooter tour.

I'd say experience and leadership that an ABH may not have and development that the aviator may need.
You've asked, and I have some ideas.

Make career management easier.

- Overhaul and revamp personnel management online sites. We "own our record" for boards, but the records management system is broken. Between BOL, NSIPS, NDAWS, and FLTMAPS ... they all have different and partial information. It's confusing and not easy for those outside of PERS to make sure everything is in alignment ... let alone feeding the Officer Data Card. Consolidate and simplify for the front-end user (your customers).

- Take a look at the Air Force Officer Manning system, which is as transparent as I could ever imagine a system (https://www.afpc.af.mil/Assignment/). It allows officers to "bid" on open jobs within a specific timeframe of their PRD; on the back end, it enables locations needing people to bid on prospective officers. PERS can open and close jobs ... advertise for needed jobs etc. From there, you could incentivize hard-to-fill billets or priority billets via locality pay, guaranteed next duty station, choose between two or three-year orders, etc. A revamped system would demystify the process and give ownership to the Officers, and you would probably find people who want to do the jobs you can't get filled otherwise.

- Revamp the ADHRB. The ADHRB should be broken into two different bonuses. A Department Head Bonus where everyone (within community) gets the same bonus regardless of pilot or WSO/EWO/NFO because we are doing the same jobs (OPSO, MO, Safety, Admin), and it's equally demanding regardless of the wings on your chest ($25k sounds about right to me). Then, there should be an Aviation Career Critical Skills Bonus - a bonus to take aircrew through 20 years of service specific to the wings they wear and the community they are in. This bonus should be available to anyone within 2 years of their winging commitment. Don't make people wait until they already have an opportunity to get out. Also allow them to take the bonus at any point until the 20 year mark. The point is enticing them to get to 20 without screwing them by taking a bonus away within the 4 years prior to retirement.

- Recognize the valuable skills and experience of our O-4s and O-5s who otherwise have no path if they aren't on a golden path. I propose to provide opportunities for them as 'permanent staff pilots/WSO/NFO'. This pipeline, consisting of 2 years of sea duty followed by 2 years of shore / FRS duty, will be open until 20 years of service. It's a chance for those who don't aspire to be DH or CO but still want to fly gray jets to contribute and retain their skills within the Navy. We can't afford to spend so much time and resources training these people only to put them on CO tracks; we must provide other opportunities to keep them in the cockpit, this does that.
Agree with everything said about records management. PERS 43: you mentioned the DH-Tour being the “crucible” to CO. Records management and updating is the crucible to the promotion process. These programs are not user friendly or intuitive, they don’t talk to each other, and once you figure out where to go/what to do, it can take weeks or even months to populate changes. Compounded if you are on a busy tour or even worse on boat internet. If the goal is to retain, then recommend we find a way to update promotion records that doesn’t require a PhD and unlimited time.

Taking this one step further, and roughly mentioned above, the vast majority of pilots I have served with don’t even know when they are up for promotion or how to find that out. Historically, PERS doesn’t send any correspondence notifying folks that they are going to be looked at. Worst case, pilots get looked at and they were unaware it even happened. Or, they catch wind that they are in zone, and it’s too late to have the month required to update the record. Again, if the goal is to retain, we could do a better job with customer service and assisting people through the promotion process. In zone looks should be clearly communicated to the member via PERS; shouldn’t be a mystery.

agree with the promotion timing list. MPRA had (has?) the "Bubba List" that tracks this within the community, but it’s only sent within certain circles (hence the name, I presume). I had no clue that existed until a DH mentioned it one day and showed me when I should anticipate getting my first look.

Why can't PERS make such a list covering all communities? Or at least have the community manager (or whoever maintains the list) share that within their community and not just certain groups? Transparency helps.

that bonus idea – I’ll take a look at it! Very interesting!

I’m not sure your role in the process but happy to connect to discuss further.

I’m the bonus program manager at pers right now!
That's a pretty good response from PERS!
Haha!

I've been saying it for years now, changing the bonus eligibility period to after selecting O-4 is going to be one of the worst decisions for JO retention the Navy has ever made. Especially for NFOs, who generally have anywhere from 2-4 years of no obligation and no bonus.

I think better pairing of skill sets to billets for non-CO path O4 and O5s. Give opportunities for folks with TPS and WTI training to continue developing and executing tactics. TPS does have the AEDO route but there isn't as much of a pathway for NAWDC grads to be senior SMEs in certain areas.

Author
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
we have done some re-tours for folks at NAWDC but that doesn't negate the sea/shore requirement.

Reply
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I think that's the point though... The AEDO model works within its necessary confines only because there is not a sea/shore rotation. It is a permanent, institutional investment in a specialty skills area. Is something like this necessary and appropriate in the tactics development arena? Not for me to say. But if it existed, I bet it would be desirable. ❓

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments What requirement? Something mandated by Congress or PERS? I'm on my 4th sea tour in a row. Perfectly happy. If people want to fill a requirement, why not let them?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments Bring back the WTI bonus.
When you talk to JOs, three things are obvious: 1) they want to fly; 2) they don't see senior officers as the guys who won; and 3) if they want to stay in at all, it's VR, VT TAR, or reserves.

Of course, there are essential jobs that quality officers and aviators must fill. Get creative and reward a successful department head tour (and the disassociated tour that precedes it) with a promised VR tour or some other good deal.

Pentagon tours, instead of being straight pain, could be an opportunity to let career-minded O-4s who complete successful DH tours fly VR out of Andrews.

Recognize and reward longevity in service by offering officers who complete a quality twenty (O-5 sea duty) the opportunity to serve a promised twilight at a VR, VT, or orders of their choice.

Evaluate all non-flying jobs and determine what can be reduced among aviators.

Create a program where, if you complete a Quality 20 (O-5 sea duty) and then retire, you can be promoted to O-6 in the reserves and continue to serve until 30. I think the UK does this.

We should incentivize loyalty, longevity, and performance, which used to be associated with rank and responsibility, but that's not what this generation wants.

GRGB
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I've emailed you offline with the map I made 5 years ago... Big picture from where you sit, there are two things that need to occur, you need to create a bridge to the point where the Navy is operating within a sustainable model and it's a 7-10 year plan that involves some big cultural changes.... in addition to that, the policies which created the environment must be fixed to prevent history from repeating itself. The cost to train in both time and money/asset life has risen exponentially in the last 30 years and the way that Naval Aviation operates and manages talent/people must be adapted and agile enough to sustain the days until the man/woman in the box is no longer necessary.

5d  Send message  Hide

Great ideas Don! Holding back my opinion on the response from PERS 43. Hopefully you have time to talk to PERS-46.... 😊

5d  Send message  Hide

I think we have reached the point of thinking out of the box.

5d  Send message  Hide

I agree.

4d  Commented on by Dewon Chaney  Edited
This thread is everything you need to take a long look in the mirror. You asked for feedback and instead of trying to find ways to make improvements, every response is an excuse why the processes and policies which put Naval Aviation in the current mess can’t be fixed or change.

1. Transparency with how bad the problem really is.

The fact that Naval Aviation has lost the ability to self regenerate in the VTs without having to pay contractors 3x to access the talent the Navy grew means it’s past the dead canary in the coal mine.

There needs to be some open and honest conversations with what you are asking people to do and to say the leadership wouldn’t authorize $50k bonus but will pay contractors $350k a year to do the same job, clearly there is a messaging disconnect that everyone outside of the trenches with half a brain can logically put together.

Today’s JOs are smart and it would be wise to recognize them as such.

You did not create this problem, but failing to openly admit the scope only widens the gap between the fleet and Pers.

2. Utilize incentives (ie TERA) and restructuring the ability to slide billets to reserves temporarily to get healthy. You need blue bodies in green flight suits to regrow the force to a healthy level and Contract IPs is not it. The force only allows for new/replacement talent to come from the bottom of the pyramid. It is cheaper to pay a reservist 4 years of active duty and exhaust their USERRA availability upfront plus a reduced reserve retirement, than it is to pay contractors.

How many sorties are spent on getting reservists recurrent every other month and at what cost.

The whole thing needs an Enterprise model where all the money that comes from one spigot lives in one bucket. It’s a matter of being the most efficient with the top level resource supply and right now the Navy is very far from it.

The mission is a simple time/value/money problem where the end goal is to produce the most lethal force with the resources available. Period.

Lethality=measurable profitability

If this means letting people fly at the VTs without DH the pathway must be expanded. Capture the talent in any way possible to bridge the gap. And before you say there is a waiver in PFI the program is far too narrow in scope for what is really needed. And for gosh sakes, those people deserve to know they are valued by Naval Aviation too doing 2-3 X’s a day even if they aren’t Department Heads.

3. Fix policies to allow Naval Aviation to be able to react at the speed of 2024.

IF the training pipeline was even capable of producing up to expectations street to fleet. The amount of asset life/flight hours wasted on forced attrition is no longer a bill the Navy can afford to pay.

The cost to train Naval Aviators has grown exponentially in dollars and time, and
And the beauty is there's no guarantee this will work. But there is plenty of history to show the current policies have produced a declining force size trend over 30 years and without trying something radically different, I assure you the results will never improve and asking what PERS-43 can do better only to explain why you can't is not going to win the hearts and minds that you NEED to retain if Naval Aviation is to have any hope of getting healthy enough to sustain itself again.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I respectfully disagree. I asked for feedback. My responses are given to highlight that there are some things I CANNOT affect. I want folks to know that so they and others can advocate at the right levels. You don't know how hard the Pers-43 team works to support the over 14,000 aviation officers and their families! In terms of being transparent, you must have not seen a recent roadshow brief or even looked at the info on our website. Appreciate your response and happy to chat through each these bullets in an effort to achieve transparency and a way we can help make things better for those we serve.

This entire thread is a swing and a miss. They asked for raw feedback then proceeded to combat almost every single post.

I can count on one hand the number of JOs I know that are considering staying in past their initial MSR. Almost all of those getting out are doing so for many of the reasons listed in this thread.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I'm not trying to combat every single post. I, Pers-43 actual, made this post and I am trying to be responsive to the feedback received. Just because I'm saying something is not in my lane or there's a law that prohibits something doesn't mean I'm not going to take that as a data point feedback. I just want the individual to know specifically what I own and what I do not as it relates to the feedback they gave me.

I could easily just hit a thumbs up and say nothing. To me that's akin to past Navy surveys where you get no response to the open ended comments you took the time to provide. That just my 2 cents here.

$350K? I wish...
Look at the live IP contract in Kingsville and Meridian. The pilots don’t see all the $.

kinda like having 3 ex wives

That’s a whole other arena.... 😞

Don’t reset lineal numbers for guys that got out and then jumped back in after COVID so they can screw over people that stayed in and kept producing for the NAE!

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
not tracking this. Is that happening?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
yes it is unfortunately. Can you DM me your email for details?

Dewon.m.chaney.mil@us.navy.mil

Bonuses for LDOs going into pinnacle tours past might entice them to go beyond the 10 years required to retire as an Officer.

interesting but DoD won’t allow us to do this. I’m happy to support if the policy is changed.
Specialty Career Paths for aviators enabling specific skill sets in the plane (maybe outside milestones) and then on shore. Sort of like PFI on steroids.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

That would be limiting to a point because I would have to set an arbitrary time limit for those folks to keep new officers coming in (currently against law). We also kind of have something like that already...TAR. Good comment that should be added to the Navy survey.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I appreciate you taking the time for direct feedback!

Any thoughts on opening up the NFO to Pilot program to be an actual incentive program? As an MPR NFO the results are pretty discouraging. Having the ability and flexibility to switch to Pilot would probably go a long way to boost the Pilot population via NFOs.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

Not understanding the ask here. Please elaborate.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

the NFO to Pilot program is an incentive program intended to keep NFOs in. It tends to select VFA and VAQ NFOs. NFOs from other communities have a very poor selection rate (the board selects 12 each year). NFOs in a lot of cases are willing to stay in if they can transition to Pilot. So why not open up the NFO to Pilot selections to select more NFOs and pull from all aviation communities? Full disclosure, I've applied for every board for the past 3 years.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

Thank you for your willingness to apply. I'm aware of the board but don't view it as an incentive program. Other community NFOs have been selected but that also depends on NFO community YG health.

4d Reply

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

YG health wouldn't have mattered 3 years ago. Those NFOs are now pilots and in the fleet. Early selection to pilot would have prevented many NFOs from dropping their "get out" letters. This is one example of these incentive programs failing (retention programs, whatever term applies to these programs).

4d Send message Hide

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

I appreciate your point of view here. I don't see this initiative as a failure. The OCM allocates a specific number of NFO to Pilot transitions in the yearly accession plan and we've met that target. I'm curious as to your insight on YG health 3 yrs ago.

4d Reply

Reply to PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments, what is S2F? Having trouble finding any information on it besides the old Grumman aircraft... Interested in anything that provides a modicum of stability. I've moved cross-country every tour to include an unmentioned homeport shift when detailed for my dissociated tour. My family is very supportive of my career, but I owe them a break and some stability. One back to back tour in the same locale would go a LONG way.

5d Send message Hide

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

It's Street to Fleet. It's an internal CNATRA initiative at this point designed to get pilots to the Fleet faster. That in turn will decompress the career path to allow for options for officers.

5d Reply

I just received an ad for a contractor AFROTC instructor job. IF NAE doesn't value NROTC instructor THEN remove it from the billet base (contract out, give to CSUs, etc). One for PERS 6-7: pilots. It's a job that billet is there to do, that
b (6) It is important to understand that we are in a competitive organization. Some billets are more valued than others based on the job. They are on the list because it is available. The counsel you receive is just that. You have to be ok with the consequences of your billet choice. The other services have "A" and "B" billets although we don't classify them that way because look at the whole body of work in a career.

b (6) I really like the SRB and the additional bonuses that just came out. I wonder if you did sea duty incentive pay and increase sea pay if that would motivate people to go to sea.

b (6) It is not sure if that's possible for aviators.

b (6) PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments what about on the aviation LDO and CWO side?

b (6) Great suggestion. In the French Navy, you make the most money while at sea. Always thought that was a great motivator.

b (6) Get better with graduate education. Aviation does not make it possible for a young JO to get an in person graduate degree from Naval Postgrad School and remain competitive for mid career milestones. Other officer communities have figured it out!

b (6) PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments can work if we can fix time to train in CNATRA. Air Boss is laser focused on that.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments not just a CNATRA problem...the FRs are ill equipped in manning and quals to handle 100% CNATRA production.

5d  Send message  Hide  2

(b) (6)

And ~90% of the JOs at the FRs are running for the hills!

5d  Send message  Hide

Fix the DH/O4 board schedule. I FOS'd last year so up for my last chance at promotion and first chance at DH this month. Even if I make DH, I still have to cross my fingers and wait for stat board results. Why not move the DH board a few weeks earlier so that if someone like me selects for DH, there is time to stick a note to signal the stat board as such to effectively guarantee promotion? That, or at least offer continuation to selected DHs.

I'm also looking at a navadmin that says I won't qualify for the bonus because I wasn't selected on last year's stat board. I know I can route an exception to policy, but why should I have to? Seems simple enough to write into the message that above-zone LTs selected can qualify, payment pending stat board results.

4d  Send message  Hide

Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6)

DH board timing was later and now fits nicely after the command board.

If you select on the board then you're eligible. The ADHRB program language was approved above CNP.

4d  Reply

(b) (6)

Bring back high-3 retirement.

5d  Send message  Hide  6

Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6)

that would be good but DoD departed from that for a reason.

5d  Reply

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments They departed from it before (REDUX) and brought it back after the results weren't good. That's not
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments I do think the BRS will have second order effects that no one is talking about (at least publicly). BRS is more of a recruiting than a retention tool, which clearly isn’t having an impact in this environment. And with everyone with 6.5 years of service or less being BRS instead of legacy retirement, I personally think there will be a mass exodus starting in 3 or 4 years...

This has always been a fear of mine for the Navy, and the Reserves. The decision calculus is different if you can leave the Navy at any time and take your 401k retirement with you. Vice weighing getting nothing for your service unless you hit 20 or get to 20 by serving in the reserves. We’ll see....

maybe even more than just high-3 in todays fiscal environment. They need to revamp the carrot at the end of your career/retirement. The govt at the time deciding BRS was a great thing to save money is the source of some of retention problems today. The fact one can walk away with their TSP nest egg and not have to stay 20yrs makes the decision for people to leave easier. Its not just Naval Aviation, but DoD wide. Also, the incentive to stay in for 20 is less, as the annuity is 40%, not 50% like high-3. Add in job locations, work hours, pay, peacetime/patriotism, inflation, decreasing tricare benefits, college loans being paid off by the govt making GI bill worthless, young adults not wanting to work, MHS Genesis, handling of Covid, etc, the list goes on. Makes this a complex self licking icecream problem to solve and your not going to make everyone happy. I commend PERS-43 for actually reaching out (Step 1 is to first acknowledge you have a problem). IMO, probably not a popular opinion, but in reality an easier solution is have a bigger hook with your bait for future Naval Aviators. Make the MSR 9 or 10 years. A few years ago the Army saw its pilot pool jumping for the airlines. With one quick stroke of the pen the head of Army general of aviation made all Army aviators AD and National guard/Reserves MSR 10 years. Airforce has been 10 years for a while. This would put people over the hump for 20 year retirement. Shore tours would have to be filled based on timing.
12-18 months before you meet your minimum service requirement, contact the Foreign Area Officer Community Manager to see about opportunities for Flying FAOs. You get to keep flying and nearly all billets are accompanied, shore duty.

(b) (6)

Author

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

(b) (6) not sure if that's still applicable. If so, then concur.

5d  Send message  Hide

5d  Reply

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments still applicable!

Reply to PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

To add to what (b) (6) said, you can fly for up to 10 years after transferring as a FAO. I'm not saying every billet you get will have a flying opportunity, but it's worth knowing.

4d  Send message  Hide

(b) (6) Slight correction... you can return to flying as long as your last time in the cockpit was fewer than 10 years. Once you start flying again, there is no restriction on how long you can continue. Applies to Rotary or FW. Just ask CAPT (b) (6)

4d  Send message  Hide  Edited

(b) (6) Good to know, and thanks for the correction!
Fix OP-T Flight Pay/Milestone pay. I serve with a couple O4s in their DH tours like myself, but they are “ineligible” for Flight Pay+DH pay due to missing their gates. I see this as nothing other than a penalty, further enticing an exodus. (Congrats on making DH! Sorry, we’re not going to pay you for it)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I don’t know that this is an issue anymore. Should have been fixed last year in terms of the DH pay. If they missed a flight pay gate submit a waiver. Pers-43 doesn't approve them as those go to ASN.

5d  Reply

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I am on my OP-T DH tour right now and just lost my flight pay this month. I submitted my waiver request 12 months ago, it still hasn’t gotten reviewed because there’s 1 poor person who has to review the waivers for all bonuses across all the branches. So there is still something broken about the system. I am 3 months short because I got pulled from my VT shore tour 3 months early to get to my disassociated. So I am getting money taken away from my family because I met the needs of the Navy. How is that okay?

5d  Send message  Hide

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
THIS RIGHT HERE!!!

(b) (6)

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I tried but was not eligible to submit the waiver.

5d  Send message  Hide

I have two fellow OP-T DHs who submitted waivers that were not approved. Both are only short 1-2 months.

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Thanks – I'm one of the guys that jumped ship (now an MSO) in my OP-T DH tour. I didn't get credit for my CVN tour and my detailer forced me to take non-qualified / non-flying orders. If PERS requires
Meet our service member’s basic needs. My husband has been stationed in multiple places with no functioning air conditioning when it is over 90 degrees outside. His current command is infested with raccoons and he recently had a sailor attacked during a shift. His office leaks any time it rains and is most likely full of mold.

If we can’t give our service members a safe and comfortable environment to work in, we can’t expect them to perform well or have good morale.

Additionally, as was stated, when my husband deploys my family loses money each month as his OMESS bill is greater than the family sep pay. It seems outrageous and disrespectful to families who are sacrificing so much, to earn less money while going through a deployment.

BLUF, I think the Navy needs to change how their Reserves do business.

I was a prior E, so I had some active duty time from that. After my JO sea tour and shore tour I was looking at about four more years before an active duty retirement. My options were to stay in for a DH tour (“DH tour was my favorite!” said no one ever.) or bail to the airlines and join an Air Force Guard or Reserve squadron that was willing to get me to an active duty retirement. Navy Reserve wasn’t even considered because unless I was lucky enough to get FTS, they’d never let me get an active duty retirement. Oh by the way, going to the airlines and then dropping mil leave until I hit an AD 20 also locked in my seniority number with my airline. The decision was a no brainer.

Now, if I could have gone into the Navy Reserves, get my number punched at my airline, then get activated to a fleet squadron until I hit my active duty retirement, I would have gladly done that. There were four other VFA guys in my AF Reserve squadron that felt the same way.

My AF Reserve squadron was totally on board with letting me get off probation at my airline because they knew they were going to get me for almost four years. I was willing to commit to them because they were going to get me to retirement WITHOUT giving me a bunch of ground jobs.

Here’s your formula; let Navy Reserve dudes join fleet squadrons until they retire. Don’t make them switch squadrons. Don’t give them crappy ground jobs. Don’t worry about promoting them. Just let them keep flying while chasing the retirement. Oh by the way, if they’re on Title 10 (active duty) orders, it doesn’t count towards their 5 year max of USERRA protection. You’re welcome.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

It's not exactly specific to Pers 43, but one more "actionable thought" is to look into the Army's new Commander 360 program if something similar hasn't already been considered in the Navy. Unfortunately, toxic leadership can play a role in retention and how all service members make decisions about their careers. The Army's program seems to help with weeding out potential COs who look great on paper but in reality don't inspire confidence in their leadership from those under it. In general, it aims to ensure the right people are screened for command through a more comprehensive process.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments

that has been considered in concert with the new MyNavy Coaching initiative and the new fitrep system that is forthcoming. I don't have a timeline on that though.

One more suggestion - there are some PEP tours that need a re-evaluation, specifically inter-service tactical instructor tours with the USAF or USMC.

I'll use myself as an example - I am an E-2 WTI but I did my WTI tour as the exchange instructor at the USAF Weapons School. In addition to completing CAEWS, I also had to complete the USAFWS Instructor Course and then instructed on staff at Nellis for two years. For a period of time, I was the only USN instructor on the staff in any capacity. However, because it was considered a PEP tour, I was unable to get any sort of hard breakout and instead had 2.5 years of 1-of-1 FITREPs from my USAF O5 CO. I am sure that hurt me on boards compared to peers who were ranked. And before I continue - I didn't volunteer to go to Nellis - that is where I was slated once I was accepted for the WTI program - I had to accept the billet or not be a WTI. I loved the job, and I was able to instruct for both USAF and USN weapons school students, but I still feel like it hurt my career to accept the orders.

There should be some mechanism for allowing ranking either with a home unit or home weapons school. We already have many instances where officers are getting FITREPs from reporting seniors they are not co-located with. There might still be bias but I would argue a #2 or #3 ranked EP from a Navy reporting senior still looks better to a board then a 1 of 1 and shows that we really do value some of our PEP tours that have tactical impact.
There should be an incentive for officers to pursue professional certifications relevant to their designator—industry uses them and the certification programs provide a continuous learning path that’s relevant.

For example, why are CVNs requiring Aviation Maintenance LDOs to get OOD afloat qualifications?

I know SWOs aren’t pursuing the qualification like they did in the past.

Why wouldn’t Aviation Maintenance LDOs be incentivized to pursue their PMP certification or even DAWIA certs instead?

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I think that is a leadership driven vs community driven. Let me look into that.

Put wifi on the boats
HST rocking it rn
I missed it by a single deployment!

#nfosmattertoo
Increase Milestone AVIP to keep pace with inflation. Milestone was already authorized up to $1500.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments So, advocacy inside DoD is needed. Can't push for outside advocacy if they already did their part to raise the rate.

The fact the the Navy is the only service to have "milestone" AVIP at all when the whole thing is based as much on timing as anything else to save $160/mo on a volunteer and his/her family to the Navy, says everything about how petty the looking glass can be from the ivory tower.

And before you tell me that process is the fairest it can be, you are asking people to commit their family's future to an unknown, based on being put in the right job at the right time, and then only if a secret board of superiors selected them based on reviewing 15+ years of loyal service in 45 seconds are they worth an extra $160 per month on a metric that hasn't been adjusted in decades.

It has to be simpler from the PERS level. Don't trip over trillions in talent to save some pennies.
But they don't like our reasoning at this moment for AViP.

Ok.

But that's also why it took 2 yrs to finally but it in a bonus.

Keeping pace with inflation isn't reason enough? If you're looking for the source of retention issues, might I suggest looking it the most obvious location. Purchasing power is on parity with my previous rank. Bonuses aren't bonuses when they just cover the cost of living changes.

It took 2 years because of the NDAA cycle....and what you are talking about with AViP is OSD policy nothing more than "Ink on paper." The reality that the submarine force seems to be able to find ways to make it happen, and what you are telling us is that the PERS-43 team can't come up with any reason to advocate successfully to compensate aviators fractionally commensurate with the value they bring to the nation? The whole argument is lost when the contractor IPs are flying Navy airplanes for 3x pay to the contractor (not necessarily the IP).

Correct. OSD does not believe that AViP is for retention. That total compensation is retention - has not made any sway to allow us to use $1500.

So what do they believe it's for then? If it's not for retention let them take it away completely and see what happens...it's peanuts but without it retention would be a whole lot worse.
it's unfortunate and short sighted of OSD.
Reasonable man theory all compensation is retention issues. They believe at is core - it is only to incentivize aviators to stay in the cockpit during their career and offset whatever hazards pull members to something else. Bonus is specifically set to combat retention. That's why CAPT is saying to mention it above our pay grade because we've been told pre-emptively told no (all the services have) as to $1500 for avip right now. So our efforts are in to rewriting the avip instruction in the meantime to come from a different angle.

I'm pretty sure if any of the past PERS-43's had listened closely, most pilots already want to stay in the cockpit their entire careers..... And if there was a road for me to fly for my entire career OSD could have kept their money, but there isn't. It's an INCENTIVE pay to put up with the job as a whole, flying and non. The hazards of T-45 OBOGS, T-6 seat sequencers were not remotely covered by AvIP.

The only data you need to show money matters is the 2018 Command Bonus Restructuring, drastic improvements overnight linked only to tripling the command bonus... it's not just COs who have kids with grocery and college bills. Compensation will always matter be it AvB, AvIP, etc.

I'll say the same thing to you as I sent him personally, you already have the data that business as usual is not working. And data is always going to lag. The only way to get healthy is to aim in front. While you have no control over BRS vs High-3, the incentives become MUCH less in a few years as BRS only aviators reach MSR.

Pers-43 actual here, I'm listening closely and while some pilots think they want to stay in the cockpit others need a break. As a former FRS CO, I saw that in the FRS as well...some thought they were flying too much and others were ok. The Professional Pilot track is something I will take another look at but that track will likely receive pushback for incentives from civilian leaders.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments  It is your job to explain to the civilian leaders who don't know how dire the situation is, and why the outdated current policies which have eroded the force must be changed to be commensurate with the cost and time it takes to train Naval Aviators in today's era, to a level they can proficiently employ more advanced weapon systems. Happy to second chair that conversation any day.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments  I have and it has fallen on deaf ears in some respects. Would appreciate any outside advocacy in this effort.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments  who do I need to talk to? And to be technical it's really your boss's boss's boss's job.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments  The last time I contacted that office (different guy in the seat) they not so politely told me to do things to do things to myself. I don't have the horsepower to make the call, but like I said I can be there for the meeting.

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments  also recommend advocating outside DoD for support.

"Get real" and recognize that the check mark next to "ability to take a pause" isn’t completely accurate. The 1 for 1 payback for CIP is a good start, but the program still isn’t a viable option for many people. I have written a white paper on the topic... PM me if you’re interested in reading it.
PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments sent!

5d Send message Hide

Reply to PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
I'm periodically engaging with chatGPT to see what they say. Here is their initial response:

It sounds like you're already making strides in addressing some key concerns! Here are some additional actionable ideas to enhance career management:

1. **Customized Development Plans**: Foster an environment where career paths are not one-size-fits-all. Encourage employees to work with their supervisors to create personalized development plans that align with their career aspirations and the organization's needs. This could involve special projects, cross-training opportunities, or rotational assignments.

2. **Mentorship Programs**: Establish a formal mentorship program where employees can be paired with mentors who can provide guidance, feedback, and support. This can be particularly effective in fostering career growth and providing networking opportunities within the organization.

3. **Transparent Communication**: Regularly communicate available career opportunities and the criteria for advancement. This transparency can help demystify the process and encourage employees to be proactive about their career progression.

4. **Flexible Work Arrangements**: Beyond the S2F initiative, consider expanding flexible work policies where feasible. This might include part-time positions, telecommuting options, or compressed workweeks, allowing employees to better balance work and personal life.

5. **Leadership Access and Involvement**: Facilitate sessions where employees at all levels can have open discussions with leadership about their careers. This could be in the form of Q&A sessions, town halls, or even informal coffee chats. Leadership's visibility and accessibility can boost morale and trust.

6. **Skills Development**: Invest in continuous learning and upskilling programs. This could include access to courses, workshops, certifications, and conferences that help employees stay relevant in their fields and potentially open up new career opportunities within the organization.

7. **Recognition Programs**: Develop or enhance recognition programs that not only reward high performance but also acknowledge employees who are innovative, improve their skills, or go above and beyond in ways that may not necessarily be tied to traditional performance metrics.

8. **Career Re-Entry Support**: For those who take a career pause, create a structured program to help them reintegrate into the workforce smoothly. This could include refresher training, updates on changes during their absence, and a designated buddy or mentor to help them get up to speed.

Implementing these suggestions can help build a more engaged and motivated workforce, with clear paths to personal and professional growth.
get him back in the JO chat

this reply needs more attention, chatGPT never fails

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
this is interesting. I think we do most of this but obviously have room for improvement. The formal mentoring program has been tried numerous times and officers balked at having to do it. I believe in mentoring as well as many of the other items listed here

PERS 43: Aviation Officer Assignments
while I realize this was super generic, I do genuinely use chatGPT a lot, and would recommend taking some of the ideas posted here and conversing with GPT about strategies that could potentially work. The power in AI is in how you prompt it and communicate with it.

thanks.