

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-00025

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING DESIRED: NO

THE APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

She be considered for promotion by a Special Board (SB) for the Calendar Year 2012 (CY12) Air Force Reserve Major Position Vacancy (PV) Promotion Selection Board.

THE APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

Her promotion recommendation form (PRF) was not submitted by the submission deadline due to an administrative error; as a result, her record was not considered for promotion. This correction will allow her PRF to be considered for PV promotion.

In support of her appeal, the applicant provides a copy of the missing PRF.

The applicant's complete submission, with attachment, is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The relevant facts pertaining to this application are contained in the letter prepared by the appropriate office of the Air Force.

THE AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

ARPC/DPB recommends denial since the CY12 Air Force Reserve Major Position Vacancy (PV) Promotion Selection Board (U0412A) has already adjourned. In addition, they note, if a complete nomination package is received, her record can be evaluated for retroactive PV eligibility.

They provided the following analysis on this package:

The PRF is the nominating vehicle for an officer to meet a PV board. All PRFs for the U0412A board were due to HQ ARPC not

later than 9 Dec 11 (ARPCM 11-32, 2 Sep 11, atch 2). The applicant's PRF was received on 4 Jan 12--well after the suspense date. HQ ARPC contacted the individual noted as "counsel" on the application, explained the process for nomination, the missed suspense date, and what the organization and officer could do to request consideration for a special board (SB). If, and when, a complete nomination package (to include a PRF with a position number indicated) is received at ARPC, the request for SB will be evaluated, and the officer's eligibility for PV consideration will be reviewed.

On examination of the PRF, a key factor for the PV nomination is missing: the position number for which the officer is nominated. The nominated officer must occupy (as an incumbent) a specific, higher graded, and fully funded position that must also be funded for 1 year after the board from the PRF suspense date. Absent the position number, they cannot verify the officer occupies a higher graded position, nor can they verify the position is funded for one year. Additionally, there is nothing in the applicant's package to demonstrate what position she occupied on 9 Dec 11, the PRF suspense date. Absent that, they cannot begin to establish retroactive eligibility.

The complete ARPC/DPB evaluation, with attachments is at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF THE AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

A copy of the Air Force evaluation was forwarded to the applicant on 1 March 2012 for review and response. As of this date, no response has been received by this office (Exhibit D).

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has not exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
2. The application was timely filed.
3. Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of an error or injustice. The applicant has not provided evidence of actions on her part to obtain the relief she seeks through the proper administrative channels. The AFBCMR process is not intended as a substitute for the utilization of proper established administrative channels. We note that the Air Force office of primary responsibility has explained the steps the applicant should take to request consideration for promotion by a special board. As pointed out by the Air Force OPR, the applicant should complete a nomination package to ARPC, to include a PRF with a

position number and her request for a SB will be evaluated, and her eligibility for PV consideration will be reviewed. Until such time as she has exhausted all available administrative remedies, as noted above, we find no basis to recommend granting the relief requested.

THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT:

The applicant be notified the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of material error or injustice; the application was denied without a personal appearance; and the application will only be reconsidered upon the submission of newly discovered relevant evidence not considered with this application.

The following members of the Board considered AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2012-00025 in Executive Session on 18 July 2012, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 28 Dec 11, w/atc.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, ARPC/DPB, dated 7 Feb 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 1 Mar 12.

Panel Chair