



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
2 NAVY ANNEX
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

BAN
Docket No. 02505-11
1 November 2011

[REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of 10 USC 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 22 August 2011. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies. The Board also considered information furnished by the Navy Personnel Command and the Naval Education and Training Professional Development and Technology Center pertaining to the relevant exams.

In September 2010, while participating the Navy-wide advancement cycle, you were erroneously administered the E-6 examination for the MM rating vice the MME rating. You were not advanced from that cycle. In March 2011, you participated again in the Navy-wide advancement cycle. This time, you were properly administered the E-6 examination for the MME rating. You did not achieve the required cutting score for advancement from the March 2011 cycle to advance in the MME rating.

In light of the error made during the September 2010 cycle, you requested advancement from the September 2010 cycle. In an effort to ascertain whether you would have advanced or not from the September 2010 cycle (if you had taken the MME exam), the raw exam score that you achieved on the March 2011 MME exam was applied to the remainder of your profile for the September 2010 cycle. Unfortunately, even when applying your March 2011 exam score to the September 2010 cycle, you would not have made the cutting score necessary for advancement from the September 2010 cycle, but you did receive "Passed but Not Advance" (PNA) points of (0.5). Thus, your request for advancement from the September 2010 is denied.


In an effort to afford you the most favorable consideration possible, the Board then examined whether you would have advanced from the March

2011 cycle given your additional 0.5 PNA points from the September 2010 cycle. Unfortunately, review of your scores reveals that even if you had been awarded the appropriate number of PNA points from the September 2010 cycle, you still would not have achieved the required cutting score to advance from the March 2011 cycle.

Therefore, after careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is also important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,


W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director