



Work-Product

## UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

### RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-20Work-Pr...410

Work-Product

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING REQUESTED: YES

### APPLICANT'S REQUEST

Reinstatement to the rank of first lieutenant (O-2) as a non-rated officer and her record be corrected to reflect no break in service and she receive all back pay and entitlements.

### APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

The decision by the Initial Skills Training (IST) Board to discharge her stems from an inaccurate and entirely untrue perception of her work ethic and character. These perceptions are from individuals who have never met or worked with her, and are contrary to testimonies from Air Force personnel who know her professionally and personally. She did not desire to be discharged and has never received any disciplinary action nor has she received an Unfavorable Information File.

In support of her application, she provides letters of support from retired and currently serving Air Force officers.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

### STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is an Air Force first lieutenant (O-2).

On 18 Aug 23, according to AF Form 143, *Record of Commander's Review Action (ABM/CSO)*, Section I, *Initiating Authority*, reflects the Wor... Flying Training Squadron Commander (Wor... FTS/CC) recommended she be eliminated from training for Flying Deficiency. Section II, *Reviewing Authority Recommendations*, reflects the Wor... Flying Training Group Commander (Wor... FTG/CC) recommended she be eliminated from training with the following comments/justification: "After conducting an interview with Work-Product, I recommend elimination per Work-Product Flying Deficiency. She has not shown potential to complete the program and Per AETCI 36-2605v5, I recommend Work-Product not be reinstated and not retrained into another career field."

On 25 Aug 23, according to AF Form 143, Section IV, *Approving Authority*, reflects the w... Flying Training Wing Commander W... FTW/CC) decided she should be eliminated from training and should not be considered for reinstatement in this course at a later date. In addition, it reflects the following comments/justification: "I recommend elimination per Work-Product Flying Deficiency. She has not shown potential to complete the program and Per AETCI 36-2605v5, I recommend Work-Product not be reinstated and not retrained into another career field."

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-20Work-Pr...410

Work-Product

Work-Product

On 28 Aug 23, according to Aeronautical Order **Work-Product** dated 28 Aug 23, she was permanently disenrolled from primary Undergraduate Combat Systems Officer Training (UCT) Course **Wor...** **Work-Pro...** and Advanced Combat Systems Officer Training course **Wor... Work-Product** Class **Work-Pr...** due to flying deficiency.

On 17 Oct 23, according to memorandum, *Recommendation for <applicant>*, the **Wor...** Student Squadron Commander (**Wor...** STUS/CC) recommended she neither be retained or reclassified into a new Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC).

On 7 Mar 24, according to memorandum, *Initial Skills Training (IST) Reclassification (ISTR) Decision*, dated 7 Mar 24, provided by applicant, she was notified that on 26 Feb 24 the IST reclassification panel convened and recommended she be discharged. Further, she was notified the AFPC Commander approved the panel's recommendation and decided she would be honorably discharged with no scholarship recoupment requirement.

On 2 Aug 24, according to DD Form 214, *Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty*, she was honorably discharged. Block 30, *Narrative Reason for Separation*, reflects: Failure to Complete a Course of Instruction and Block 28, *Separation Code*, reflects: JHF.

For more information, see the excerpt of the applicant's record at Exhibit B and the advisory at Exhibit C.

#### APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE

Air Education and Training Command Instruction (AETCI) 36-2605, Vol 5, *Formal flying Training Administration and Management – Combat Systems Officer (CSO)*, 5 Jan 21, Attachment 3:

A3.1. The Initiating Authority (IA) will: A3.1.4. Complete AETC Form 143, Sections I and V.

A3.2. The Reviewing Authority (RA) will: A3.2.1. Review the student's training and recommend elimination from or retention in training. A3.2.2. Complete AETC Form 143, Sections III, and forward the form with all applicable records to the AA for final decision. Include a written summary of significant facts and specific rationale used to arrive at the recommendations.

A3.3. The Approving Authority (AA) will: A3.3.1. Review the student's records and RA's recommendations; A3.3.2. Decide whether the student is retained in or eliminated from training; A3.3.3. Complete AETC Form 143, Sections IV, including remarks on the student's officership and, in the event of elimination, recommending a follow-on career field; A3.3.4. Inform the student, upon elimination, of the opportunity to indicate personal desires for retention in service and future training according to AFI 36-2110. Explain the possibility of reassignment action or release from extended active duty under the separation policies.

#### AIR FORCE EVALUATION

AFPC/DPMLT, recommends partially granting the request. Based on the applicant's retention and career history memos provided in the ISTR package, and the justification noted on the AETC Form 143 by the **Wor...** FTG/CC and **W...** FTW/CC, there is a perceived unfairness when comparing the applicant to other CSO trainees and the specific responsibilities of a Flight Training Student. The

Wor... STUS submitted an IST Reclassification package noting the applicant's elimination due to flight training deficiency. Within the ISTR package, the applicant requested reclassification into a non-rated career field which was not supported by the Wor... STUS/CC. Additionally, the reclassification request was not supported by either the Wor... FTG/CC or the W... FTW/CC, who noted on the AETC Form 143, the applicant had "not shown potential to complete the program and per AECT 36-2602v5, I recommend <applicant> not be reinstated and not retained into another career field." Due to the chain of command non-recommending the applicant for retention, the applicant met the ISTR panel in accordance with Air Force Personnel Center Instruction (AFPCI) 36-112, *Line Officer Initial Skills Training Reclassification Procedures*, paragraph 2.2.1, which states "The Division Chief will determine when the contents of an elimination package require review by the ISTR Panel." The five-board member panel unanimously agreed to recommend discharge and on 6 Mar 24, the Air Force Personnel Center Commander approved the panel's recommendation.

The recommendations noted on the AETC Form 143, based on AETCI 36-2605v5, to not retain the applicant were generalized and did not provide detailed supporting justification. Additionally, the Wor... STUS/CC provided opinions on the applicant "while assigned at Undergraduate Combat Systems Officer Training" and did not observe the applicant and their "inability" outside of flight training.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit C.

#### APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 1 Jul 24 for comment (Exhibit D), and the applicant replied on 23 Jul 24. In her response, the applicant contended the recognition of the generalized and unsupported comments made by the Wor... STUS/CC, Wor... FTG/CC, and W... FTW/CC are a crucial detail to her case. She was never afforded the opportunity to fly with the Wor... STUS/CC or Wor... FTG/CC during training and her first interaction with either was during the Commander's Review process. Further, as the Wor... FTG is geographically separated from the wing, she never spoke with the W... FTW/CC during the elimination process. She humbly requests the Board to review the letters of support which are endorsements from military professionals of varying backgrounds which bear witness to her potential as an asset to the Air Force.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit E.

#### REVISED AIR FORCE EVALUATION

AFPC/DPMLT recommends denying the request. There is no evidence of an injustice. On or about 23 Oct 23, the Wor... STUS provided this office with an ISTR package noting the applicant's elimination from CSO UCT due to flight training deficiency. The package contained a request by the applicant to be reclassified into a non-rated career field. However, this request was not supported by the Wor... STUS/CC who in their recommendation noted "I do not believe <applicant> can excel in a non-rated AFSC based on patterns established while assigned at Undergraduate Combat Systems Officer Training." In addition to the squadron commander, the applicant's request was not supported by the group commander (Wor... FTG/CC) or the wing commander (W... FTW/CC) noting on the AETC Form 143, *Record of Commander's Review Action, (ABM/CSO)*, with "not shown potential to complete the program and per AETCI-36-2605v5, I recommend 2d Lt Work-Product not be reinstated and not retrained into another career field." Due to the chain of command non-recommending the applicant for retention, in accordance with AFPCI 36-112, *Line Officer Initial Skills Training Reclassification Procedures*, paragraph 2.2.1 "The Division Chief

will determine when the contents of an elimination package require review by the ISTR Panel”, the applicant’s ISTR package met the ISTR panel which convened on 26 Feb 24. The five-board members considered the whole person concept, the needs of the Air Force, and the applicant’s ability to meet or exceed those needs when determining if reclassification or separation is appropriate, and agreed to recommend discharge. On 26 Mar 24, the AFPC/CC approved the ISTR Panel’s recommendation.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit F.

## APPLICANT’S REVIEW OF REVISED AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 3 Oct 24 for comment (Exhibit G), but has received no response.

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed.
2. The applicant exhausted all available non-judicial relief before applying to the Board.
3. After reviewing all Exhibits, the Board concludes the applicant is not the victim of an error or injustice. The Board concurs with the rationale and recommendation of the revised AFPC/DPML opinion and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant’s contentions. The applicant contends the decision to discharge her is based on inaccurate and untrue perceptions, and that this decision was made by individuals who were never met or worked with her. However, the Board disagrees. The Board determines the procedures contained within the governing directive, Air Education and Training Command Instruction (AETCI) 36-2605, Vol 5, *Formal flying Training Administration and Management – Combat Systems Officer (CSO)*, was correctly followed and the ISTR panel properly considered the recommendations for discharge by both her group and wing commander, who were in the best position to make those recommendations. The Board, while commending the applicant’s desire to continue to serve, notes her situation is no different to similarly situated officers. Therefore, the Board recommends against correcting the applicant’s records.
4. The applicant has not shown a personal appearance, with or without counsel, would materially add to the Board’s understanding of the issues involved.

## RECOMMENDATION

The Board recommends informing the applicant the evidence did not demonstrate material error or injustice, and the Board will reconsider the application only upon receipt of relevant evidence not already presented.

## CERTIFICATION

The following quorum of the Board, as defined in Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, paragraph 2.1, considered Docket Number BC-20<sup>Work-Pr...</sup>410 in Executive Session on 19 Nov 24:

Work-Product

Panel Chair

Work-Product

Panel Member

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-20<sup>Work-Pr...</sup>410**

Work-Product

Work-Product

Work-Product

Panel Member

All members voted against correcting the record. The panel considered the following:

- Exhibit A: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 15 Apr 24.
- Exhibit B: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Advisory opinion, AFPC/DPMLT dated 26 Jun 24.
- Exhibit D: Notification of advisory, SAF/MRBC to applicant, dated 1 Jul 24.
- Exhibit E: Applicant’s response, dated 23 Jul 24.
- Exhibit F: Advisory opinion, AFPC/DPML dated 30 Sep 24.
- Exhibit G: Notification of advisory, SAF/MRBC to applicant, dated 3 Oct 24.

Taken together with all Exhibits, this document constitutes the true and complete Record of Proceedings, as required by DAFI 36-2603, paragraph 4.9.

8/11/2025

X Work-Product

---

Work-Product

Signed by Work-Product