

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-00382

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING DESIRED: NO

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

She be reclassified into a Regular Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC) like other members who met the Initial Skills Training (IST) board.

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

She was eliminated from a rated career field, Air Battle Manager, near the end of her nine month training and believes had she met the May IST board as originally scheduled, she would have been reclassified.

She was misled by the Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC) in thinking that her squadron never submitted her package; however, these statements were false as was noted in her exception to policy memo she tried to submit prior to her discharge. Because of these errors, she met the July board, which had fewer slots and was discharged. Had she met the May or October board she more than likely would have been reclassified like most of her contemporaries she knows.

She has done everything possible to have an opportunity to continue to serve and contribute as she did in the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) and the ROTC.

In support of her appeal, the applicant provides copies of letters of recommendation; email correspondence, and an exception to policy letter to the IST board.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

On 7 May 07, the applicant received a three and a half year scholarship from the Air Force to participate in the AFROTC program.

She was commissioned as a second lieutenant and on 9 May 10 entered active duty for training.

On 7 Jun 10, she entered Undergraduate Air Battle Manager Training, and on 4 Apr 11, was eliminated due to academic deficiencies. She failed BMA-29 (Block 1 Test 2) with a score of 80 percent on 8 Sep 10 and passed the retest with a 92 percent. On 17 Sep 10, she failed CCF-8 (Block 2 Test 1) with an 84 percent and passed the retest with a 98 percent. She failed LFE-12 (Block 8 Test 1) with a score of 80 percent; however, her overall academic average was 90 percent.

As a probationary officer, the applicant was eliminated from initial skills training; she was considered for reclassification, on 27 July 2011, in accordance with AFPCI 36-112, *Line Officer Initial Skill Training Reclassification Procedures*. A panel of five senior officers reviewed her reclassification application and submitted a recommendation regarding reclassification or discharge to the AFPC Commander. Throughout the process, she was counseled on the possibility of discharge.

The reclassification panel considered the applicant's request; however, the panel recommended discharge in lieu of reclassification. The AFPC Commander concurred with the panel's recommendation and the applicant was directed to be discharged. In addition, the panel asserted that her elimination was not within her control and therefore, her ability to fulfill her active duty service commitment (ADSC) was also deemed beyond her control. As a result, the AFPC Commander requested the Secretary of the Air Force waive the pro-rata share of the applicant's unserved ADSC associated with her AFROTC scholarship in accordance with 10 USC Section 2005. The estimated value of the requested waiver was approximately \$21,179.34. The waiver was approved on 3 Oct 11, thereby relieving her of any debt to the government resulting from her education.

On 7 Dec 11, the applicant was honorably discharged by reason of failure to complete a course of instruction.

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

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFPC/DPSIP recommends denial, stating, in part, it was determined that the applicant's case was handled properly and she received a fair evaluation consistent with all other officers eliminated from initial skills training. The applicant's claim that her application was submitted in time to meet an earlier panel, and an administrative error prevented earlier consideration is accurate. However, there is no guarantee her consideration on an earlier panel would have yielded a different result. She holds a degree in Community Mental Health, which is not listed on the mandatory or desired degree listing for any line officer career field in the Air Force Officer Classification Directory. The lack of an Air

Force requirement for her degree, along with her sub-standard academic performance weighed heavily in the panel's recommendation. These factors would have been the same regardless of the date of her panel. Following a review of her application, the panel did not recommend continued retention or reclassification based upon a whole-person review, which included her military records, commander's recommendation, the reason for elimination, her degree, any other special skills or experience, and her personal communication to the panel. All of these factors were weighed against Air Force requirements. In the end, her application was processed and reviewed in accordance with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies. The AFPC Commander concurred with the panel's recommendation and the applicant was directed to be discharged. In addition, the panel asserted the applicant's elimination was not within her control and therefore, her ability to fulfill her active duty service commitment was also deemed beyond her control.

The complete DPSIP evaluation is at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

A copy of the Air Force evaluation was forwarded to the applicant on 4 May 12 for review and comment within 30 days. To date, a response has not been received (Exhibit D).

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; however, we agree with the opinion and recommendation of the Air Force office of primary responsibility and adopt its rationale as the basis for our conclusion that the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice. In addition, while we note the applicant's arguments, we did not find the evidence sufficient for us to determine with any certainty had the applicant been considered by the earlier board, that she would have been retained. The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to show that she was treated any differently than others similarly situated. In view of the above and 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 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-2012-00382 in Executive Session on 21 August 2012, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 12 Jan 12.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPSIP, dated 23 Mar 12.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 4 May 12.

Vice Chair