

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-00996
COUNSEL: NONE
HEARING DESIRED: NO

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

His Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC) of 9A100, which denotes "Airman Awaiting Retraining - Disqualified for Reasons within his Control" be changed back to Special Duty Identifier (SDI) 8R300, which denotes "Recruiter."

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

1. He was a third tier recruiter, supervising recruiters in Manhattan and the Bronx. When his flight failed to make its recruiting goal, he was removed as a supervisor.

2. Two months prior to his removal, his superintendent was relieved of her position. During that same year, the squadron missed its quota.

3. After being removed, he was sent to the Fort Dix Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS), where he worked as an Air Force Liaison for six months. He was given a "9A100" AFSC in an effort to push him to retire. Up until this point, he had a good record and performed well in recruiting.

4. He completed his CCAF degree requirements prior to retirement; however, he cannot receive his degree because of the "9A100" AFSC. The loss of a degree can cost him job opportunities.

In support of his request, the applicant provides a personal statement, copies of his DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*; AF Forms 910, *Enlisted Performance Report (AB thru TSgt)*, and other documentation associated with request.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

On 16 Mar 07, the applicant was notified of his commander's intent to detail him to the Fort Dix, MEPS for 90 days because he

had been removed from his duties as a flight chief. The commander stated "the Fort Dix MEPS was undermanned and the move was is in the best interest of the Air Force."

On 18 Oct 07, the applicant was detailed to the 314 RCS Headquarters, Support Flight until his retraining package was approved. The commander stated "the move would provide manpower to an undermanned support flight and was in the best interest of the squadron and the Air Force."

On 18 Jan 08, the 314 RCS commander recommended to the 360th Recruiting Group commander (360 RCG/CC) the applicant be continued for 90 days at the squadron headquarters. The commander stated "they were working an exception to policy (ETP) package to assign him to the squadron headquarters."

On 30 Sep 08, the applicant retired from active duty in the grade of technical sergeant.

The remaining relevant facts pertaining to this application are contained in the letter prepared by the appropriate office of the Air Force, which is attached at Exhibit B.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFRS/RSX recommends denial. RSX states since the applicant was disqualified from the 8R000 career field they do not have the authority to reinstate the SDI to allow him to receive a Human Resources CCAF degree.

The 8R SDI was removed in accordance with AFI 36-2101, *Classifying Military Personnel (Officer and Enlisted)*, which states individuals leaving a SDI without an AFSC are to be processed and identified as disqualified airman.

The applicant was removed from duty for ineffective management style. His subordinates were not being held accountable through positive and effective leadership. In addition, members were not meeting assigned production missions.

AFPC Classifications, AFPC Assignments Director and the 8R000 Functional Manager were involved with the applicant's case to ensure fairness.

The complete RSX evaluation is at Exhibit B.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

By letter dated 28 Jul 12, the applicant states recruiting being the stressful career field that it is, he served 12 years in the

northeast in what was considered a hard to fill area. Throughout his time in recruiting he received his senior Recruiter Badge twice; two time recruiter of the year and multiple monthly awards including a top liaison for the quarter award while working at the Fort Dix MEPS.

The applicant states his relief from the flight supervisor position was for two reasons: 1) ineffective management style and 2) missing the assigned quota. He could have done things differently. He was not prepared to deal with the situations he faced as a supervisor of the Manhattan and Bronx area and fell short of what was required.

Regarding his management style; he had a single female recruiter get pregnant six months after being assigned who immediately went on a profile; two recruiters that were under investigation with the Office of Special Investigations (OSI), a recruiter who was afraid to work in the Bronx. Due to his poor decision making skills he was relieved and left the Air Force. The secretary for his flight retired prior to his arrival; therefore, he never had a secretary to assist with any of the reports, unlike the other flights. He made numerous requests to have someone either detailed or hired to no avail. He struggled as a manager because he had never been in a management position until this point. While he acknowledges these are excuses; he felt hopeless and tried to do his best.

With respect to missing the assigned quota, B flight (Manhattan/Bronx) had only met their quota 5 out of the last 15 years prior to him taking over. The previous flight chief struggled as well. He did well the first year but when his top recruiter was pulled due to an OSI investigation, his numbers fell.

He was not allowed to retrain due to the number of years he had remaining in the Air Force. He was informed he could still get his degree; however, it was not until he had departed McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey that he realized he could not because of his SDI.

The applicant's response, with attachments, 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 not timely filed; however, it is in the interest of justice to excuse the failure to timely file.
3. Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of an error or injustice. The

applicant requests his AFSC of 9A100 be changed to 8R000; we find the evidence provided is insufficient to recommend granting his stated request. Therefore, 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 this relief sought in this application.

4. Sufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of an error or injustice to warrant partial relief. Although the applicant was disqualified from the recruiting career field and no longer possess the required AFSC to qualify for a CCAF degree, we do not believe this alone should prevent him from receiving a CCAF degree. In this respect, we note his AFSC was not removed due to misconduct rather for ineffective management and not meeting stringent recruiting quotas. In addition, during the period in question, the applicant received an above average EPR which reflects how his overall efforts continued to support the Air Force recruiting mission. In view of the above, we find the evidence is sufficient to provide an alternate relief. While the applicant has requested his AFSC be reinstated, in the interest of justice, we believe the more appropriate relief is to award the applicant a CCAF degree in Human Resources Management. Accordingly, as an exception to policy, we recommend his records be corrected to the extent indicated below.

THE BOARD RECOMMENDS THAT:

The pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to APPLICANT, be corrected to show that on 29 September 2008 he was awarded a Human Resources Management degree from the Community College of the Air Force.

The following members of the Board considered Docket Number BC-2012-00996 in Executive Session on 5 Nov 12, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Panel Chair
Member
Member

The following documentary evidence pertaining to AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2012-00996 was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 31 Jan 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Letter, AFRS/RSX, dated 3 Jul 12.

Exhibit C. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 17 Jul 12.
Exhibit D. Letter, Applicant, dated 28 Jul 12, w/atchs.

Panel Chair