

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

FEB 12 1999

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: 97-01546

COUNSEL: None

HEARING DESIRED: No

---

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

The Request for Decoration Printout (RDP) date of his Air Force Achievement Medal (AFAM) be changed from 14 Aug 96 to 6 Mar 96.

---

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

Because of administrative error, two packages with RDP's prior to 14 Aug 96 were lost. The third DECOR-6 produced had a 14 Aug 96 RDP. All previous and current DECOR-6's were destroyed by his unit's Orderly Room and not available for submission.

In support of his appeal, the applicant provided a personal statement, a chronology breakdown of events, four letters of support, and other documentation relating to his appeal.

Applicant's complete submission is attached at Exhibit A.

---

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant's Total Active Federal Military Service Date (TAFMSD) is 6 Jul 92. He is currently serving in the Regular Air Force in the grade of staff sergeant, effective, and with a date of rank (DOR) of 1 May 98.

Applicant's Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) profile since 1994 follows:

<u>PERIOD ENDING</u>	<u>OVERALL EVALUATION</u>
5 Mar 94	5
5 Mar 95	5
1 Jan 96	5
1 Jan 97	5
2 Jan 98	5

Air Force officials indicate the applicant's present commander submitted a request through administrative channels to the original approval/disapproval authority requesting the RDP date be changed to 6 Mar 96. The original approval/disapproval authority disapproved the request.

The applicant received the Air Force Achievement Medal (AFAM) for meritorious service at the 56<sup>th</sup> Equipment Maintenance Squadron, Luke AFB, Arizona, for the period 6 Mar 94 - 18 Mar 96, which is dated 25 Sep 96. The DECOR-6 was dated 14 Aug 96.

---

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

The Recognition Programs Branch, AFPC/DPPPPRA, reviewed this application and indicated that applicant has not submitted any documentation to show that the first two recommendation packages submitted by the superintendent were actually placed in official channels (signed by the recommending official and the next higher official in the chain of command). Reconsideration is contingent on the presentation of credible evidence that the recommendation was officially placed in military channels or was submitted, but not acted on, through loss or inadvertence. There is no documentation to support the presumption that any recommendation package was officially placed in military channels until after 14 Aug 96. DPPPPRA recommends disapproval of the applicant's request.

A complete copy of the Air Force evaluation, with attachment, is attached at Exhibit C.

The Chief, Inquiries/BCMR Section, AFPC/DPPPWB, also reviewed this application and indicated that the policies regarding the approval of a decoration and the credit of a decoration for promotion purposes are two separate and distinct policies. Current Air Force promotion policy (AFI 36-2502, Table 2.2, Rule 5, Note 2) dictates that before a decoration is credited for a specific promotion cycle, the close out date of the decoration must be on or before the promotion eligibility cutoff date (PECD), and the date of the DECOR-6, must be before the date of selections for the cycle in question. Each promotion cycle has an established PECD which is used to determine in which AFSC or Chief Enlisted Manager (CEM) code the member will be considered, as well as which performance reports and decorations will be used in the promotion consideration. The PECD for the promotion cycle in question was 31 Mar 96. In addition, a decoration that a member claims was lost, downgraded, etc., must be verified and fully documented that it was placed into official channels prior to the selection date. This also includes decorations that were disapproved initially but subsequently resubmitted and approved. This decoration does not meet the criteria for promotion credit during the 96E5 cycle because the RDP date is 14 Aug 96, after selections were made on 19 Jul 96 for the 96E5 cycle. This

policy was initiated on 28 Feb 79 specifically to preclude personnel from subsequently (after promotion selections) submitting someone for a decoration with a retroactive decoration effective date (close out) so as to put them over the selection cutoff score. Exceptions to the above policy are only considered when the airman can support a previous submission with documentation or statements including conclusive evidence that the recommendation was officially placed in military channels within the prescribed time limit and conclusive evidence the recommendation was not acted upon through loss or inadvertence. In accordance with AFI 36-2803, paragraph 3-1, a decoration is considered to have been placed in official channels when the decoration recommendation is signed by the initiating official and indorsed by a higher official in the chain of command. Documentation in the applicant's case file reflects the decoration was not officially placed into military channels until after selections for the 96E5 cycle were accomplished. The orders are dated 25 Sep 96, with an RDP date of 14 Aug 96, which was after promotions for the 96E5 cycle were completed (19 Jul 96) and announced (31 Jul 96). To approve his request would not be fair or equitable to many others in the same situation who also miss promotion selection by a narrow margin and are not permitted to have an "after the fact" decoration count in the promotion process.

DPPPWB also indicated that the applicant's total promotion score for the 96E5 cycle was 231.42 and the score required for selection in his Control Air Force Specialty Code (CAFSC) was 232.18. He missed promotion selection by .76 points. An AFAM is worth 1 weighted promotion point. This decoration would make him a selectee to staff sergeant during cycle 96E5, pending a favorable data verification and the recommendation of his commander. Promotions for this cycle were made on 19 Jul 96 and announced on 31 Jul 96. He was selected for promotion to staff sergeant the next cycle, 97E5, with promotion sequence number 7139.

A complete copy of their evaluation, with attachment, is attached at Exhibit D.

---

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

Applicant reviewed the Air Force evaluations and provided a three-page response indicating, in part, that he is concerned that the recommendations to the Board by AFPC are not based on the correct facts of his case (see Exhibit F).

---

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
2. The application was timely filed.
3. Sufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of probable error or injustice. After a thorough review of the applicant's complete submission, including the supporting statements from his former superintendent and indorsed by his former commander, the Board was sufficiently persuaded that the flight chief had not forwarded the original DECOR-6 for recommendation. The superintendent indicated that, had he not been on temporary duty (TDY), he would have submitted the applicant for a decoration. It appears that the superintendent submitted a total of three packages of which two were lost. Had the recommendation not been misplaced, we believe the RDP would have been requested in sufficient time for the award to be credited for promotion consideration during cycle 96E5. We, therefore, conclude that the RDP date should be changed as indicated below and the applicant provided supplemental promotion consideration to the grade of staff sergeant, with inclusion of the above cited AFAM. While we note the applicant was selected for promotion to staff sergeant for cycle 97E5, we recommend that the RDP date be changed in order for the award to be considered by the 96E5 promotion cycle. The applicant will then receive fair and equitable consideration based on an accurate record.

---

THE BOARD RECOMMENDS THAT:

The pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to APPLICANT, be corrected to show that the RDP for award of the AFAM for the period 6 Mar 94 to 18 Mar 96 was prepared on 6 Mar 96.

It is further recommended that he be provided supplemental consideration for promotion to the grade of staff sergeant for all appropriate cycles commencing with cycle 96E5.

If AFPC discovers any adverse factors during or subsequent to supplemental consideration that are separate and apart, and unrelated to the issues involved in this application, that would have rendered the applicant ineligible for the promotion, such information will be documented and presented to the Board for a final determination on the individual's qualification for the promotion.

If supplemental promotion consideration results in the selection for promotion to the higher grade, immediately after such promotion the records shall be corrected to show that he was promoted to the higher grade effective and with a date of rank as established by the supplemental promotion and that he is entitled to all pay, allowances, and benefits of such grade as of that date.


---

The following members of the Board considered this application in Executive Session on 8 October 1998, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Ms. Charlene M. Bradley, Panel Chair  
Ms. Patricia D. Vestal, Member  
Mr. Joseph G. Diamond, Member  
Mrs. Joyce Earley, Examiner (without vote)

All members voted to correct the records, as recommended. The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 19 Dec 97, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPPPR, dated 6 Jan 98, w/atch.
- Exhibit D. Letter, AFPC/DPPPB, dated 7 Jan 98, w/atch.
- Exhibit E. Letter, AFBCMR, dated 2 Feb 98.
- Exhibit F. Letter from applicant, dated 11 Mar 98, w/atchs.

  
CHARLENE M. BRADLEY  
Panel Chair