



Work-Product

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

ADDENDUM TO RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

Work-Product

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2020-02715-2

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING REQUESTED: YES

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

The Board reconsider her request to waive the recoupment of her Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (AFROTC) debt. Additionally, the applicant requests her disenrollment from AFROTC be classified as a medical disenrollment.

RESUME OF THE CASE

The applicant is a former AFROTC cadet who was disenrolled on 25 Jun 20 for failing to maintain military retention standards, specifically for failure to meet Professional Officer Corps Selection Program (PCP) board requirements.

On 29 Jun 21 and 8 Jul 21, the Board considered and denied her request for a remission of her AFROTC debt and concurred with the rationale and recommendation of AFROTC/CC. Specifically, the Board found an investigation concluded the applicant failed to maintain military retention standards, resulting in her disenrollment from AFROTC and recoupment of scholarship tuition funds. Evidence suggested she was appropriately counseled and afforded due process. The Board found the AFROTC acted within their authority and the evidence provided was not sufficient to warrant the AFROTC commander's decision be overturned.

For an accounting of the applicant's original request and the rationale of the earlier decision, see the AFBCMR Letter and Record of Proceedings at Exhibit E.

On 20 Sep 22 and 2 Apr 23, the applicant requested reconsideration of her request for a waiver of her debt and an additional request to change her disenrollment to a medical disenrollment. The applicant's father, on behalf of the applicant, contends while she was a cadet, she was subjected to harassment and prejudicial treatment which ultimately caused her to experience a mental health crisis. He claims her leadership failed to recognize the signs and her pleas for help. The callous and high-pressure environment she operated in was a catalyst for her mental health conditions for which she has not recovered due to her mistreatment and mental health crisis. She is not fit for military service and her records should be corrected to reflect a medical discharge with no recoupment sought. She was unfairly treated by the Work-Product commander through fear, ridicule,

Controlled by: SAF/MRB
CUI Categories: Work-Product
Limited Dissemination Control: N/A
POC: SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2020-02715-2

Work-Product

intimidation, and reprisal and created an environment where she was unable to complete the program. Her wrist injury did not allow her to successfully pass her fitness test and the subsequent maltreatment she endured caused her mental health condition which is directly linked to her involvement with **Work-Product**. She had 63 appointments including emergency room visits and inpatient facility admissions because of her mental health condition after being disenrolled from AFROTC. Early in her enrollment in the AFROTC program, she was diagnosed with Gastroesophageal Reflex Disease (GERD) and this diagnosis was likely a manifestation of the stress she was experiencing. Her leadership threatened to remove her from AROTC because of this condition so she had this diagnosis removed. She struggled with her fitness test and her wrist injury exacerbated her stressful situation with her leadership. She regularly worked out and her aerobic conditioning was well above standards. She was questioned by her leadership on whether she was “faking” or just “getting out” of physical training and felt her leadership was not compassionate towards her situation which caused her to withdraw and become depressed. When she was asked to provide medical documentation regarding her fitness testing, it was shared amongst all of the cadre which violated her HIPPA rights. When mental health was brought up, her Det commander informed the cadets if they sought mental help through the university’s mental health services, they would be disenrolled from AFROTC. Therefore, she did not access needed mental health treatment because of her fear of being disenrolled from AFROTC. The night before her fitness test, she went to urgent care as she was not feeling well but was determined to take her fitness test the next day. Her anxiety was further increased when a male cadet administering her fitness test, noticed she was having a panic attack and stopped the test. This incident was ignored, and no psychological evaluation was requested by her leadership. She sought help from a professor at the university who was going to report her mistreatment, but the applicant told him not to. In 2022, she reached her breaking point and sought mental health treatment. She was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, and other unspecified mental health conditions.

In support of her reconsideration request, the applicant submitted the following new evidence: (1) medical expense documents; (2) an article on GERD and anxiety; (3) copies of text messages and emails; and (4) other medical treatment documents and letters from physicians.

The applicant’s complete submission is at Exhibit F.

APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE

Per AFROTCI 36-2011, *Cadet Operations*, dated 22 Jun 18, paragraph 5.2, *Military Retention Standards*, military retention standards include, but are not limited to, moral character, bearing and behavior, physical fitness, professional conduct and relationships, dress and appearance, meeting contracted retention standards, and other standards as prescribed by Air Force directives. Failure to meet any military retention standard may result in dismissal. Refer to Table 5.4 for issuance of a Conditional Event (CE) for failure to maintain military retention standards.

Per Table 5.4, *Military Conditional Event*, military CEs apply to all cadets and are issued on a case-by-case basis depending on the severity of the offense and provides required follow-on actions by the detachment based on CEs accumulated. Depending on the severity of the behavior,

the Det/CC or Region/CC may direct scholarship suspension, temporary inactivation, termination, as well as a det drop or a Command Retention Review (CRR). This table is not all inclusive. Det/CCs can issue a CE for any conduct that does not meet military standards. Under Rule 8, if a cadet's training performance reflects official Fitness Assessment (FA) failure, issue a military CE.

Per paragraph 8.6, *Medical Recheck Status (MRS) (Contracted Cadets only)*, when a change in medical status occurs, the previously certified physical is temporarily no longer considered a "qualified/certified" physical. MRS allows a cadet temporarily not medically qualified to continue receiving monetary benefits while healing. Immediately upon notification of a change in a cadet's medical status, forward a request for MRS to AETC/SGPS. The cadet will remain on MRS until released by AETC/SGPS. Cadets cannot commission while on MRS.

Per Chapter 16, *Disenrollment*, paragraph 16.5, *Administrative Release*, does not require a disenrollment. Reasons for administrative release disenrollment includes the following 16.5.4 Medical Disqualification. AETC/SGPS has medically disqualified for commissioning a cadet for reasons beyond the cadet's control and knowledge. Immediately terminate stipend upon notification a cadet is medically disqualified for commission. The effective date is the date of medical disqualification by AETC/SGPS.

Per paragraph 16.7, *Disenrollment Procedures*, the Det/CC (or senior officer present on G-series orders, in the commander's absence) will initiate disenrollment actions per the Disenrollment Processing Guide. The investigation is a non-adversarial process to gather all the facts in the cadet's case so the Det/CC can make an informed recommendation to the Region/CC for call to EAD, recoupment, or release. The investigation is an extended opportunity for the cadet to dispute their failure(s) which triggered the investigation or to submit mitigating/extenuating circumstances.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The AFRBA Psychological Advisor completed a review of all available records and finds insufficient evidence to support the applicant's request and her father's request for a medical discharge based on her mental health condition. The Psychological Advisor acknowledges the applicant's father stated she did not seek mental health treatment when she was in ROTC due to fear of disenrollment, but the burden of proof is still placed on the applicant to submit the necessary documents to support her (or her father's) contentions and requests. There was no evidence to support any of her father's contentions she was harassed, unsupported, ridiculed, etc. by her leadership causing the decompensation of the applicant's mental health. It is possible these experiences did occur to give the applicant the benefit of the doubt, but no definitive evidence has been presented to support his allegations on behalf of the applicant. The submitted records or evidence for review were for the supposed mental health treatment she received after she was disenrolled from AFROTC. They do not reflect her mental health status or functioning during AFROTC or at the time of her disenrollment from the program. Her father reported she did not seek mental health treatment until 2022, which was about two years after her AFROTC disenrollment, and was diagnosed with PTSD, anxiety, etc. Although it is plausible she

experienced symptoms of these conditions during ROTC as claimed, there was no actual evidence these conditions existed or occurred during AFROTC or any of these conditions made her unfit for military service. There was no evidence, her mental health condition caused her to not pass her fitness test, her failure to maintain military retention standards of meeting Professional Officer Corps Selection Program (PSP) board requirements or being disenrolled from AFROTC. The applicant never enlisted or was commissioned into the Air Force and so it is not possible she had an unfitting mental health condition that would lead to a medical discharge. She was an AFROTC cadet and technically if she had these conditions during AFROTC rendering her unable to perform her military duties or complete her military training, her conditions would be considered as disqualifying for service and she would not be able to enter the Air Force because she did not meet accession standards. If she did enter the Air Force with any of these conditions, they would be considered as prior service conditions or impairment. Unfitting and disqualifying designations are different and depend on the status of the individual. Furthermore, AFROTC cadets, which was her status, are not eligible for Disability Evaluation System (DES)/medical discharge processing in accordance with DoDI 1332.18, *Disability Evaluation System (DES)*, Appendix 1 to Enclosure 3. Thus, her request for a medical discharge for her mental health condition could not be supported. There was no error or injustice identified with her disenrollment from AFROTC from a mental health perspective.

The Psychological Advisor opines liberal consideration is not applicable to the applicant's request because she never entered military service nor was discharged from the actual military or Air Force. Furthermore, this policy does not apply to medical discharge and recoupment requests. Liberal consideration applies to service discharge upgrade requests and her status and requests are not covered under this policy.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit G.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 19 Oct 23 for comment (Exhibit H), and the applicant replied on 1 Nov 24 providing additional evidence. The evidence presented included two letters, one from a medical doctor who performed an independent medical review of her records and one from a licensed psychologist with copies of billing invoices to support her claim.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit I.

ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The AFRBA Psychological Advisor completed an additional review of the new evidence presented however, finds this evidence insufficient to support the applicant's request for a medical disenrollment/medical discharge and to waive recoupment based on her mental health condition. The Board should review this supplementary advisory in addition to the original advisory, as

information provided in the original advisory is still relevant to the applicant's case file and not conducive to being reiterated in this advisory.

The available records indicated the applicant experienced trauma from her childhood/youth sexual assault occurring before she entered the AFROTC program. This experience would be considered as existed prior to service (EPTS) or her entrance into the AFROTC program. Her friend's sexual assault by another AFROTC cadet and viewing a sexual harassment training video had triggered reminders of her past/EPTS traumatic experiences causing her to experience severe anxiety and depression. Her viewing of the sexual harassment training video as part of her AFROTC training could be considered as part of her practical military training (PMT); however, there are no records that she was performing military duties or that her PMT had occurred on paid Inactive Duty Training (IDT) status. IDT status is in connection with prescribed training periods to support mission requirements, maintenance activities, and other voluntary special additional duties. Performing traditional or regular cadet AFROTC duty at a college or university is not paid IDT status. In order for the applicant to qualify for a medical evaluation board and/or medical discharge from the AFROTC program, she needed to be on an IDT pay status, and there are no records of this event. Furthermore, since she was in the AFROTC and was considered to be part of the Reserve component, a line of duty (LOD) investigation into her injury, illness, or disease (severe anxiety and depression) would be necessary for a medical discharge per DoDI 1332.38, *Physical Disability Evaluation*. There are no records a LOD investigation was completed or was required for her injury, illness, or disease. Additionally, there are no medical records substantiating her pre-existing/EPTS injury, illness, or disease was permanently aggravated by her AFROTC duties/PMT, specifically paid IDT military duties.

As stated in the original mental health advisory, there are no medical records to support the applicant's mental health condition or her harassment experience caused her not to pass her fitness test, her failure to maintain military retention standards of meeting PSP board requirements and subsequently being disenrolled from AFROTC. Since the applicant had never enlisted or commissioned in the Air Force, she did not have any unfitting mental health conditions that would meet the criteria for a medical discharge. There are no records she had any duty limitations because of her mental health condition, no records she was deemed not worldwide qualified or deployable because of her mental health condition, and no statements from her leadership her mental health condition had impacted her ability to complete AFROTC training and requirements. Her severe anxiety and depression would have disqualified her from commissioning into the Air Force, but she was not unfit for continued military service. For these reasons, her request for a medical disenrollment/discharge from the AFROTC program is not supported.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit J.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 13 Aug 25 for comment (Exhibit K) but has received no response.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

1. The application was timely filed.
2. The applicant exhausted all other available administrative remedies before applying to the Board.
3. After reviewing all Exhibits, the Board remains unconvinced the evidence presented demonstrates an error or injustice. The Board concurs with the rationale and recommendation of the AFRBA Psychological Advisor and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. Specifically, the Board finds the applicant was disenrolled from the AFROTC program for failing to meet military retention standards in several areas to include unprofessional conduct, lack of motivation, and inappropriate behavior and was not solely disenrolled for failing her fitness test. In her original submission, the applicant never once mentioned a mental health condition impacting her behavior which ultimately caused her failure to meet standards. In her original submission, her arguments focus on her failed fitness test and the circumstances surrounding her medical waiver and conditioning period. As in her original case, the applicant again claims she was coerced into taking her fitness test; however, the Board does not find the evidence she presented supports her contention. The one email from her commander is an advisory email letting her know her options but in no way constitutes coercion or intimidation. Additionally, in her rebuttal to the ROI regarding her disenrollment, not once does she mention any mental health issue or sexual trauma as a reason to explain her actions and behavior nor does the evidence she submitted support her claim she was told if a cadet sought mental health treatment, they would be disenrolled. Per AFROTCI 36-2011, paragraph 16.5 an Administrative Release does not require a disenrollment; however, the member must be medically disqualified for commissioning for reasons beyond the cadet's control and acknowledged by AETC/SGPS. In the applicant's case, this did not happen as the applicant made no claim, she could not commission due to a mental health condition. Nonetheless, the applicant's records were reviewed based on her contention mental health and sexual trauma impacted her behavior. However, the Board finds no evidence to support her contention that a mental health condition or sexual trauma impacted her behavior. The letter from Doctor G-----, a practicing family physician indicates he reviewed the previous Board's decision and the statement from her father which he perceived as an accurate statement of facts, after interviews and discussions with the applicant's father and goes on to state he had the opportunity to review a few of the pertinent clinical reports from her mental health treatment received during her time in ROTC and determined her behavior which resulted in her disenrollment was due to her mental health conditions; however, this medical evidence was not presented to the Board for review. The only additional mental health evidence presented was a letter from a licensed psychologist, indicating the applicant presented for a diagnostic interview on 8 Oct 19 and was diagnosed with a mental health disability, stating she experienced inattention, as well as other symptoms impacting her ability to focus in school and other areas of her life. The letter also indicates she was attending weekly therapy sessions. However, the only other evidence submitted was invoices but no medical session notes as to the progress/diagnosis were submitted. Without this medical documentation, the Board cannot corroborate what is stated in either of these letters. Additionally, the applicant states, through her

father, she was told seeking mental health treatment through the university is grounds for disenrollment and her father stated she did not seek mental health treatment for fear of disenrollment and did not seek mental health treatment until 2022 after reaching her breaking point when she was diagnosed with anxiety and PTSD, two years after her disenrollment. Lastly, the applicant claims, through her father, her HIPPA rights were violated and presents evidence of excerpts from the ROI and the original email sent by the applicant to her Det commander. The Board finds this is not sufficient to support her claim of a HIPPA violation. As stated in the ROI, her commander found her accusations false with no other evidence provided to show how her medical documents were released to her cadre. 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-2020-02715-2 in Executive Session on 22 Aug 25 and 14 Sep 25:

Work-Product

Panel Chair

Work-Product

Panel Member

Panel Member

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

Exhibit E: Record of Proceedings, w/ Exhibits A-D, dated 3 Sep 21.

Exhibit F: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 20 Sep 22 and 2 Apr 23.

Exhibit G: Advisory Opinion, AFRBA Psychological Advisor, dated 20 Sep 23.

Exhibit H: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 19 Oct 23.

Exhibit I: Applicant's Response, w/atchs, dated 1 Nov 24.

Exhibit J: Advisory Opinion, AFRBA Psychological Advisor, dated 12 Aug 25.

Exhibit K: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 13 Aug 25.

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2020-02715-2

Work-Product

Taken together with all Exhibits, this document constitutes the true and complete Record of Proceedings, as required by DAFI 36-2603, paragraph 4.12.9.

10/3/2025

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR
Signed by: USAF

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2020-02715-2

Work-Product