

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-00351
COUNSEL: NONE
HEARING DESIRED: NO

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

1. Her separation code of JHJ, which denotes, "Unsatisfactory Performance," be changed.
 2. Her Reenlistment Eligibility (RE) code 2C, which denotes "Involuntarily separated with an honorable discharge; or entry level separation without characterization of service," be changed to allow reentry in the military.
-

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

The RE and separation codes she received are an injustice.

She lasted seven months in technical school and after her fourth failure was notified that she would be discharged from the Air Force.

She is currently maintaining an "A" average in college.

She re-took the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) and scored higher than her previous scores.

Other services will not see her full potential because of the RE and separation codes.

In support of her request the applicant provides a personal statement, copies of her DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*; AETC Form 125A, *Record of Administrative Training Action*; AF IMT 100, *Request and Authorization for Separation*; AFRS Form 1415, *Waiver Request/Authorization*, college transcripts and a Notification Memorandum.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

On 21 Sep 2010, the applicant enlisted in the Regular Air Force.

On 27 May 2011, according to AETC Form 125A, her commander concurred with the recommendation to eliminate the applicant from the Geospatial Intelligence Analyst Course due to her struggles with the curriculum. She failed; Block I "Fundamentals of Geospatial Intelligence Analyst Course" scoring 68 percent; Block XI "Air Order of Battle" twice with scores of 68 percent and 73 percent, and Block XIII "Integrated Air Defenses Order of Battle." She "washed back" twice, once after the Block I failure and once after the second Block XI failure. She did not have any derogatory information in her file.

On 17 Jun 2011, her commander notified her he was recommending her discharge under the provisions of AFI 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, for Unsatisfactory Performance, specifically failure to progress in military training required to be qualified for service with the Air Force or for performance of primary duties.

On 17 Jun 2011, the applicant acknowledged receipt of the discharge notification and provided a response.

On 30 Jun 2011, the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged for "Unsatisfactory Performance" with an honorable character of service.

On 7 Jul 2011, she received an honorable discharge from the Air Force. The narrative reason for separation was "Termination of Initial Active Duty Training." She served 9 months and 17 days of total active service.

The following is a résumé of the applicant's ASVAB scores:

<u>Subject Area</u>	<u>First ASVAB</u>	<u>Second ASVAB</u>
Mechanical	38	47
Administrative	78	78
General	72	72
Electronics	60	70

The minimum ASVAB "General" score required to qualify as a Geospatial Intelligence Analyst, AFSC 1N1X1, is 66.

THE AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

HQ AFPC/DPSOA recommends denial of changing the applicant's RE code. DPSOA states her RE code of 2C is required per AFI 36-2606, *Reenlistments in the USAF*, based on her involuntary discharge with an honorable character of service.

The applicant does not provide proof of an error or injustice in reference to her RE code, but is asking for leniency. Personnel who are involuntarily separated from the Air Force with an honorable character of service receive a RE code of 2C.

The complete DPSOA evaluation is at Exhibit C.

HQ AFPC/DPSOS recommends denial of the applicant's request to change her separation code. DPSOS states the applicant's discharge was based on her unsatisfactory progress in training based upon her academic elimination from technical training school. She was given ample opportunity to improve her academic performance and was counseled on several occasions regarding her academic deficiencies. She stated she is in school making A's in all her classes and has retaken the ASVAB and scored better than the previous time. The four test failures were evidence of her lack of motivation. The discharge record reveals she was counseled and afforded an opportunity to improve her performance, but was met with negative results.

The complete DPSOS evaluation is at Exhibit D.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF THE AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

While it is true she was counseled multiple times for her failures, she would like to make it clear that her academic deficiencies are not because of her lack of motivation. In fact, many people would say that she was so motivated that she studied all day and night to improve her grades.

The reason she failed these tests were because of her academic struggles. She failed the first test because she was not able to retain a large amount of information in the short amount of time she was given to study. Three months later she failed the second test, which was the same time she began her on-the-job training. She failed by one question because she did not read the question correctly. It was a mistake on her part, but it does not indicate a lack of motivation. After two weeks of studying, she again re-tested and passed the test.

The tests progressively became more difficult and she studied constantly and managed to pass the next test. Her failure does not show a lack of motivation on her part, it merely shows a lack of aptitude for that particular job.

She wants to change her reenlistment and separation codes because they are preventing her from joining any branch of the military. She failed this course, but it does not mean she would fail out of every course of study in the military.

Her complete submission is at 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. Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of error or injustice. We took notice of the applicant's complete submission in judging the merits of the case to include her response to the Air Force evaluations. However, we agree with the opinions and recommendations of the Air Force offices of primary responsibility and adopt their rationale as the basis for our conclusion the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice. We note the applicant's assertion that she did not lack motivation; however, there is no error in her record and we do not find she has been treated any differently than others similarly situated. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.
-

THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT:

The applicant be notified that the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of material error or injustice; that the application was denied without a personal appearance; and that 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 Docket Number BC-2012-00351 in Executive Session on 25 Jul 2012, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Panel Chair
Member
Member

The following documentary evidence was considered in AFBCMR BC-2012-00351:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 26 Jan 2012, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPSOS, dated 5 Mar 2012.
- Exhibit D. Letter, AFPC/DPSOA, dated 4 Apr 2012.
- Exhibit E. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 10 Apr 2012.
- Exhibit F. Letter, Applicant, not dated.

Panel Chair