

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBERS: BC-2012-00404  
COUNSEL: NONE  
HEARING DESIRED: NO

---

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

His numerical rating in Section IV, of his DD Form 785, *Record of Disenrollment from Officer Candidate - Type Training*, be changed from a "3-Should Not Be Considered Without Weighing the Needs of the Service Against the Reasons for Disenrollment," to a "1-Highly Recommended."

---

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

He has graduated from college with a bachelor's degree, but has been unable to pursue a commission in the Armed Forces because of this rating. The Director of Admissions at the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) has encouraged him to pursue other commissioning sources, but a "3" rating has limited his options. He believes his rating was directed at the severity of his mistake rather than reflecting his officer potential. He made a serious error in judgment, one that warranted the punishment given, but he still has the potential to become an officer in the Armed Forces.

In support of his appeal, the applicant provides copies of his USAFA Disenrollment Form; his DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*; and several character references.

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

---

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

On 26 June 2008, the applicant entered the USAFA to begin basic cadet training. In the spring of 2010, he was placed on aptitude probation after he admitted to providing alcohol to cadets who were under the legal age of 21. While the Commandant of Cadets was considering his case for a hearing officer review and possible disenrollment, the applicant elected to resign before sanctions for his admitted offense. The applicant was honorably discharged effective 27 May 2010, and was assigned a rating of "3" on his DD Form 785.

The remaining relevant facts, extracted from the applicant's military service record, are contained in the evaluation provided by the Air Force office of primary responsibility at Exhibit B.

---

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

USAFA/JA recommends denial. JA states the applicant's DD Form 785 correctly states the circumstances surrounding his situation at the time of his disenrollment from the USAFA. The applicant seems to believe that a simple change of a numerical rating on his DD Form 785 is going to automatically make him eligible for future commissioning. A rating of "1" in Section IV of the DD Form 785 is reserved for cadets that have exceeded the standards. The applicant's offense was particularly egregious and not considered an average candidate's actions. His rating was assigned by the Superintendent after having considered the circumstances surrounding the applicant's misconduct along with all the other entries in the applicant's personnel folder.

The complete JA evaluation, with attachment, is at Exhibit B.

---

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

He resigned because his Squadron Air Officer Commanding (AOC) and Academy Military Trainer (AMT) repeatedly told him that if he tried to stay and fight the charges, he would be punished with a "5" rating, *"Definitely Not Recommended,"* which would ban him from serving in the military again. He has dreamed of serving in the military ever since he was a child. He realizes that if he stayed and chose to contest his charges he would no longer have a chance at serving this great nation; therefore, he resigned in hopes of being able to serve later in his life. The provided definition of a "2" rating, *"Recommended as an Average Cadet,"* states that this rating is generally given to cadets with a grade point average (GPA) above a 2.0. His cumulative GPA was 3.5; therefore, a rating of "2" is more appropriate than a rating of "3." He begs the Board to consider raising his rating from "3" to "2." He has completely internalized the lessons learned from his mistakes and has suffered the consequences for the past two years. Simply put, he is a hard working kid who just wants to be able to serve.

The applicant's complete rebuttal is at 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. We took note of the reasons why the applicant believes his numerical rating should be changed, however, we are not persuaded by the evidence provided that the rating he received was an error or constitutes an injustice. 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 AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2012-00404 in Executive Session on 9 August 2012, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Panel Chair  
Member  
Member

The following documentary evidence was considered in connection with AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2012-00404:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 2 Feb 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Letter, USAFA/JA, dated 6 Mar 12, w/atch.
- Exhibit C. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 27 Mar 12.
- Exhibit D. Letter, Applicant, not dated.

Panel Chair