

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-00521

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING DESIRED: YES

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

Her records be corrected to show she was discharged with a reenlistment eligibility (RE) code of R1 (sic), instead of 2C (Involuntarily separated with an honorable discharge; or entry level separation without characterization of service).

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

When she enlisted in the Regular Air Force (RegAF), retraining was allowed for those individuals who did not complete their initial technical training school. She passed her basic course with an overall 90 percent grade point average (GPA) but could not complete the final evaluation requirement of presenting briefs.

She has since taken college courses to help her with public speaking and recently found out when she tried to enlist in the Air National Guard (ANG) that her RE code of 2C prohibits her enlisting in any branch of the service.

In support of the appeal, the applicant provides a personal statement and copies of Certificates of accomplishment, a letter of recommendation, and an excerpt from her Air Force training record.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant began her military service in the Regular Air Force (RegAF) on 20 Jul 10.

On 21 Jun 11, the applicant's commander notified her of his intent to recommend her discharge from the Air Force for unsatisfactory performance, specifically failure to progress in required military training.

The reason for the action was the applicant's 15 Jun 11 disenrollment from her operations intelligence apprentice training course for failure to meet Air Force standards. Further, she was found ineligible for retraining under Fiscal Year 2011 (FY11) guidance for Enlisted Initial Skills Rack and Stack as well as the Second AF Reclassification Guidance which led to the commander's recommendation for discharge.

On 22 Jun 11, the case was found legally sufficient and the discharge authority directed the applicant be discharged.

On 28 Jun 11, the applicant was honorably discharged for unsatisfactory performance and credited with 11 months and 9 days of total active service.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFPC/DPSOA recommends denial. First, the RE code the applicant requests, R1, does not exist. It appears the correct RE code she is requesting is actually 1R (First term airmen selected for reenlistment under the Selective Reenlistment Program (SRP)).

Based on Air Force Instruction (AFI) 36-2606, *Reenlistments in the USAF*, the RE code 2C is required based on her involuntary discharge with an honorable character of service. Chapter 5 of AFI 36-2606, Table 5.1, Item 7, expressly forbids using RE code 1R as a viable RE code. Further, 1R is reserved for use under the SRP and the applicant was not considered under the SRP.

While the RE Code 2C is, in fact, waiverable by the services, should the Board decide to change her RE code then it should be changed to 3K (Reserved for use by AFPC or the AFBCMR when no other reenlistment eligibility code applies or is appropriate). RE code 3K also requires a waiver from the Recruiting Services for reentry consideration.

DPSOA's complete 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 30 Mar 12 for review and comment within 30 days. As of this date, no response has been received by this office.

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. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.

4. The applicant's case is adequately documented and it has not been shown that a personal appearance with or without counsel will materially add to our understanding of the issue(s) involved. Therefore, the request for a hearing is not favorably considered.

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-2012-00521 in Executive Session on 28 Aug 12, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Panel Chair
Member
Member

The following documentary evidence was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 14 Jan 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPSOA, dated 20 Mar 12.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 30 Mar 12.

Panel Chair