

Work...



Work-Product

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

### RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2022-01670

Work-Product

COUNSEL: Work-Product

HEARING REQUESTED: NO

### APPLICANT'S REQUEST

1. He receive a commission as an officer in the Michigan Air National Guard.

Or,

2. Reinstatement to USAF Officer Training School (OTS) and granted graduation status from OTS Class 20-05.

### APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

He passed all graduation metrics for OTS, but he was removed from the class based on peer reviews that should not have factored into the final assessment. He was counseled by his OTS Instructor who advised him that although he has passed all required OTS measurements he could still be dismissed from the program. During this counseling session, he was provided with a peer Morale Report which criticized him. He was not afforded the opportunity to rebut the allegations contained within the peer report nor did his OTS Instructor conduct an investigation to verify any of the derogatory comments contained within the report. After being told he would be recycled there was no indication that the decision had been approved by a higher authority and he was not afforded the opportunity to rebut the recommendation. Even after being told that he was being recycled, he participated in a field exercise from which he received another feedback assessment, where he was failed based entirely on the inputs from his flight members. Additionally, this feedback assessment initially indicated that he received a passing grade for communication skills, but inexplicably, this grade was changed to reflect he failed, but with handwritten versus typed notes. After leaving OTS, he filed an inspector general complaint and in response to his complaint, the OTS Commandant determined that the OTS recycle procedures were not followed correctly nor was he provided the opportunity to respond to the Commander's Review before he was removed from the class. The refusal to graduate him despite admittedly achieving passing scores on all graduation metrics constitutes an injustice that the Board is empowered to correct.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

### STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is an Air National Guard staff sergeant (E-5).

According to the OTS Commandant, the applicant was assigned as an Officer Trainee (OT) in OTS Class 20-05 for the period of 29 Mar 20 through 27 May 20.

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-01670**

Work-Product

Work...

Controlled by: SAF/MRB

Work-Product

Limited Dissemination Control: N/A

POC: [SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil](mailto:SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil)

On 8 May 20, according to the 217 Training Squadron Echo Flight Instructor (TRS/OTS) memorandum for record (MFR), the applicant was counseled regarding his shortcomings as a leader and Airman while he was in the position of Flight Leader. The applicant both acknowledged receipt and reviewed the contents of the MFR on the same day.

On 22 May 20, according to the OTS Commandant, the applicant was disenrolled from OTS Class 20-05.

According to documentation provided by the applicant:

On 8 Jul 20, the 217 TRS/CC MFR entitled *Commander's Decision, Recycle Trainee*, documents the TRS/CC's final decision to recycle the applicant, and welcomed the applicant to attend a future OTS class and to coordinate with his Guard unit for procedures.

On 15 Jul 20, according to the *Referral Completion Report*, signed by the OTS Commandant, it was determined the OTS recycle procedures were not followed correctly. During the process, the applicant's commander was on convalescence leave and the Flight Commander was unfamiliar with the process, which resulted in the applicant not being afforded the opportunity to respond properly under the Commander's Review. However, the report further states, upon the commander's return, the applicant was afforded the opportunity to respond. The commander reviewed the response and the final decision stood to recycle the applicant. Additionally, the applicant was provided an MFR which stated the commander's final decision stood to recycle him and he could reenter the program after following the appropriate procedures.

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

#### **APPLICABLE AUTHORITY/GUIDANCE**

Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 36-2032, *Military Recruiting and Accessions*, 27 Sep 19, Chapter 7, *Officer Training School*:

Paragraph 7.4.3. Elimination of Line Officer (non-JAG) Trainees. The OTS/CC is the disenrollment decision authority and should consider eliminating a trainee from training for any of the following reasons: Summary Disenrollment. A summary disenrollment is either a military training deficiency or a lack of adaptability; A military training deficiency is a failure to achieve a passing grade/score on graded measurements. A military training deficiency disenrollment can be triggered by a single failure and may warrant a military training deficiency

Paragraph 7.4.7. Reinstating Line Officer (non-JAG) Trainees. A trainee eliminated due to medical disqualification, academic failure, physical fitness assessment failure, or extended absence may request reinstatement in his or her original utilization category. ANG: Coordinates the trainee's reinstatement with the member's military personnel section or NGB/A1Y for civilian reinstatements for processing through the MEPS. Coordinates with NGB/A1D, NGB/A3 for rated, for new training line number.

#### **AIR FORCE EVALUATION**

OTS/CC recommends denying the applicant's request for a commission in the Michigan Air National Guard. Based on the applicant's overall performance at OTS and the recommendations of his instructor, flight commander, director of operations, squadron commander, commandant, he did not adequately demonstrate his readiness to serve and lead Airmen as an Air Force Officer. The applicant attended OTS Class 20-05 and was disenrolled for military training deficiency. Specifically, he failed to pass the final feedback in the areas of leadership and communication. An Officer trainee must pass their final feedback to graduate. The applicant's final feedback was the culmination of his overall unsatisfactory performance marked by his inability to internalize feedback necessary for leadership growth. He was formally counseled for failing an academic assessment, a writing assignment, and for failing one of three leadership evaluations. He was also entered into special monitoring status (SMS) for both of his failed academic graded measures. Each SMS included an individualized plan with specific goals designed to assist him in improving his academic skills. He was also given an additional opportunity to demonstrate his leadership ability. He was placed on a team responsible for leading a group of 70 students over a two-day period. Multiple staff members observed him struggle to communicate clearly with the other students as well as complete the required tasks. On two separate occasions, he failed to accurately account for students during a combat training scenario. In addition to his leadership evaluations, he also failed to earn the respects and approval of his peers and the confidence of his instructor. During his time at OTS, he was consistently ranked in the bottom of his flight by his peers. Though this is not grounds for disenrollment, peer leadership is a key indicator of leadership ability and potential.

Although he was not given the opportunity to provide a written response to the Commander's Review prior to his dismissal, this error does not change the fact that he failed two assessments, one evaluation, and his final feedback. His instructor, flight leadership, Squadron Commander, and OTS Commandant all determined that he was not prepared to serve and lead as an Air Force Officer. Finally, he was given the opportunity to return to OTS in order to further develop his leadership abilities and earn his commission in the United States Air Force.

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 16 Sep 22 for comment (Exhibit D), 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 applicant contends that he passed all graduation metrics for OTS, but he was removed from the class based on peer reviews that should not have factored into the final assessment. However, the applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence that contradicts the recommendations of his instructor, flight commander, director of operations, squadron commander, and OTS commandant that he did not adequately demonstrate his readiness to serve and lead Airmen as an Air Force Officer. Therefore, the Board concurs with the rationale and recommendation of OTS/CC and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the

Work...

Work-Product

applicant's contentions. The Board takes note that he was extended the opportunity to return to OTS and earn his commission in the United States Air Force and encourages him to do so. Therefore, the Board recommends against correcting the applicant's records.

## 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 Air Force Instruction (AFI) 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, paragraph 1.5, considered Docket Number BC-2022-01670 in Executive Session on 8 Nov 22:

Work-Product

Panel Chair  
Panel Member

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 3 May 22.

Exhibit B: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.

Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, OTS/CC, w/atchs, dated 15 Aug 22.

Exhibit D: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 16 Sep 22.

Taken together with all Exhibits, this document constitutes the true and complete Record of Proceedings, as required by AFI 36-2603, paragraph 4.11.9.

4/13/2025

X

Work-Product

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR

Work-Product

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-01670**

Work-Product

Work...