



Work-Product

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

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**DOCKET NUMBER:** BC-2022-01890

Work-Product

**COUNSEL:** NONE

**HEARING REQUESTED:** YES

**APPLICANT'S REQUEST**

His corrected AF Form 707, *Officer Performance Report (Lt thru Col)* (OPR), signed 12 Nov 21, be substituted for the original OPR, signed 29 Jun 21.

**APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS**

The original OPR was missing important information. A week or so after receiving and signing the original OPR, he spoke with his senior service representative and was informed that his stratification had been discussed and his rater had mistakenly omitted it from the report. This was immediately corrected, and the updated OPR with stratification was staffed and signed. He was then informed that to get the original OPR replaced with the updated OPR, it had to meet and be approved by the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB). The ERAB denied his request. It is critical to his career that the updated OPR be added to his record prior to the Oct 22 Colonel promotion board.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

The applicant is an Air Force Reserve lieutenant colonel (O-5).

On 29 Jun 21, according to AF Form 707, the applicant acknowledged and signed his OPR for the report period from 1 Oct 20 thru 1 Jun 21. The report contains no stratification.

On 5 Aug 22, in a letter to the applicant, SAF/MRBC informed him that he had failed to exhaust or that he did not indicate that he exhausted all other administrative avenues of relief. Specifically, he had not identified whether he had submitted his request to the ERAB, his first avenue of relief. The applicant responded and provided a Discussion Thread (myPers – Total Force Center), dated 9 Mar 22, stating that "the March 2022 ERAB has considered your appeal and denied your request to substitute your old 2021 OPR with a new 2021 OPR that contains a Stratification Bullet."

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

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-01890**

Work-Product

Work-Product

## AIR FORCE EVALUATION

ARPC/DPTS recommends denying the applicant's request to replace his original OPR with a corrected OPR that contains stratification. The applicant states that the stratification on the original OPR was mistakenly omitted by the Rater and it is important for career progression. The applicant signed his original OPR on 29 Jun 21. In accordance with the Department of the Air Force (DAFI) 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Promotion Systems*, paragraph 1.4.3, *When an Evaluation Becomes a Matter of Record*, states an evaluation is considered complete when all applicable signature elements are signed or completed. Completed evaluations become a matter of record once they are uploaded into Automated Records Management System/Personnel Records Display Application (ARMS/PRDA). Evaluations transmitted to the Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC) or the Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC) are presumed to be complete yet will undergo a final review before processing into ARMS/PRSDA. Correction requests made after an evaluation becomes a matter of record must be submitted through the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board.

DAFI 26-2406, Attachment 2, *Appeal Guidance for Applicants*, paragraph A2.5, *Common Appeal Reasons and Related Documentation Requirements*, paragraph A2.5.2, *Impact on Promotion of Career Opportunity*, states that an evaluation is not erroneous or unfair because the applicant believes it contributed to a non-selection for promotion or may impact future promotion or career opportunities. The board will focus on the evaluation only. The simple willingness by evaluators to upgrade, rewrite, or void an evaluation is not a valid basis for doing so. Example: Requests to add optional statements such as Developmental Education/Professional Military Education, assignment/job/command "push" recommendation, add an omitted award or stratification to an evaluation or PRG will normally not form the bases for a successful appeal. These statements are not mandatory for inclusion and their omission does not make the evaluation inaccurate. It must be proven the evaluation is erroneous or unjust based on its content.

The applicant applied for relief to the ERAB to have his original OPR replaced with a corrected OPR that contains stratification and the Mar 22 ERAB denied his request.

Based on the documentation provided by the applicant and analysis of the facts, there is no evidence of an error or injustice.

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 13 Sep 21 for comment (Exhibit D), and the applicant replied on 13 Sep 21 and on 21 Sep 21. In his response, the applicant takes issue with the pertinent facts and the recommendation of the advisory writer. First, the advisory lists as the alleged error or injustice: "Stratification on the original OPR was mistakenly omitted by the Rater and is important for career progression." He submits additional information for this statement as follows: "The error I am alleging is that my Rater mistakenly left out my stratification." The reference to "important for career progression" is not specifically relevant. He is specifically focused on the error that omitted the stratification and requests to re-accomplish and replace the OPR with an updated evaluation.

Secondly, whereas the advisory lists as pertinent facts that he signed the original OPR on 29 Jun 21, and that the ERAB denied his request on 5 Aug 22, he believes that the fact his Rater signed a

memo stating that he mistakenly omitted stratification and that he provided an updated OPR with the corrected stratification are also pertinent facts to this case and should have been listed as such.

Thirdly, the advisory recommends that the application be denied and the stated reason refers to DAFI 36-2406, A2.5.1 which states that “an evaluation is not erroneous or unfair because the applicant believes it contributed to a non-selection for promotion or may impact future promotion or career opportunities.” The reason for him seeking relief from the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) is due to the erroneous omitting of a stratification by his Rater. The possible effect on his career due to that error is secondary and not the main concern of this case. He submits that DAFI 36-2604, A2.5.23, “Reaccomplishing an evaluation,” is more in line with his desired outcome as the substitute evaluation has been furnished and was signed by all those who signed the original evaluation.

The applicant’s complete response is at Exhibit E.

## 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 the victim of an error or injustice. While the Board notes the recommendation of ARPC/DPTS against correcting the record, the Board finds a preponderance of the evidence substantiates the applicant’s contentions. Specifically, the Board finds that the applicant’s rating chain, to include the Air Force Advisor, agreed that the original OPR was incorrect as they mistakenly omitted stratification from the report. His rating chain then took immediate action, corrected, staffed, signed, and submitted an updated OPR. Therefore, the Board recommends correcting the applicant’s records as indicated below.
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 pertinent military records of the Department of the Air Force relating to APPLICANT be corrected to show that his Air Force Form 707, *Officer Performance Report (Lt thru Col)*, for rating period 1 Oct 20 thru 1 Jun 21, which includes the ratee’s acknowledgment signature dated 29 Jun 21 be declared void and removed from his records and the attached OPR, which includes the ratee’s acknowledgment signature dated 12 Nov 21, be accepted for file in its place.

## 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-2022-01890 in Executive Session on 11 Oct 22:

Work-Product

Panel Chair

Work-Product

Panel Member

Work-Product

Panel Member

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-01890**

Work-Product

*Work-Product*

All members voted to correct the record. The panel considered the following:

- Exhibit A: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 18 Jul 22.
- Exhibit B: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, ARPC/DPTS, w/atch, dated 6 Sep 22
- Exhibit D: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 13 Sep 22.
- Exhibit E: Applicant's Response, w/atchs, dated 13 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.

7/3/2025

X

*Work-Product*

*Work-Product*

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR

Signed by: USAF

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2022-01890**

*Work-Product*

*Work-Product*