



Work-Product

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2023-00929

Work-Product

COUNSEL: NONE

HEARING REQUESTED: NO

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

Correction of elimination from Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT) and to be able to apply for a flying position with the Air National Guard unit.

APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS

On 3 November 2022, she met a Commander's Review Board (CRB) where she was informed that the CRB recommended she be eliminated from UPT. On 20 April 2022, the living conditions in her dorm room went from disruptive to unlivable. The humidity and resulting dampness in her dorm room at [Work-Product] became extremely distracting despite running an issued dehumidifier 24 hours a day. Due to the humidity and dampness, she was struggling to sleep and study. She reached out to dorm maintenance on 11 May 2022 and was issued a second dehumidifier. The National Library of Medicine states that the majority of negative health effects caused by humidity are minimized by maintaining indoor levels between 40-60 percent. She purchased a humidity gauge that read 82 percent. On 19 May 2022, she spoke with her first sergeant, who told her there was nothing she could do and to speak with the [Work-Product]. The commander told her that there was nothing he could do but he would investigate the situation. He also indicated that she could "ghost" her dorm room and move to a new location. Her commander failed to equip her with an adequate living space. She could not study sufficiently or get eight hours of uninterrupted sleep, per AFI 11-202v3, due to her situation. She further states that AF Form 475, *Education/Training Report*, for the period 22 January 2022 thru 29 November 2022, Section III. Comments, is contradictory and evidence of bias, stating that she "displayed average work ethic and officership" and Section III. Professional Qualities, states "Her personal pride and motivation to excel are evident in every task she performs." She was also informed that despite the medical recommendation from the [Work-Product] to move out of the dorm, the ETP was rejected. Approving her to be reinstated in pilot training will allow her to continue to serve in the Air National Guard.

The applicant provided a letter of support from the [Work-Product], dated 22 August 2022, indicating she recommended "allowing the member to move out of the dormitories as it would be in her best interest healthwise."

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is a currently serving Air National Guard second lieutenant (O-1).

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2023-00929

Work-Product

Controlled by: SAF/MRB

Work-Product

Limited Dissemination Control: N/A

POC: SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil

On 30 September 2021, according to AF Form 133, *Oath of Office (Military Personnel)*, the applicant was appointed second lieutenant in the Reserve of the Air Force.

On 3 November 2022, according to AETC Form 139, *Record of Commander's Review Action (Undergraduate Pilot Training)*, the applicant's commander recommended the applicant of class 23-03AU for elimination from training due to flying training deficiency. She had been briefed on the ramifications of the situation to include ineligibility for future flight training (AFI 36-2205, AETCI 36-2205V4, and AFI 11-402 for rated students), reclassification, and/or retention in the Air Force (active duty) (AFI 36-2110). The reviewing authority recommended the applicant be eliminated from training. If recommended for elimination, the student should not be considered for reinstatement in this course at a later date.

Aeronautical Order (PA) Aviation Service reflects the applicant was terminated from aviation service. Remarks reflect "member has been disenrolled from UPT class 23-03AU. Member lacks good task management skills and situational awareness deficiencies were identified as the root cause of errors during training sorties. **Work-Product** previously ordered member to aviation duties. Member may not be considered for entry into future flying training courses."

On 29 November 2022, AF Form 475, Section III, Comments reflect the applicant "displayed average work ethic and officership, but she was unable to meet the flying progress standards required for continued flying training. During training, she maintained a 96% academic average and flew 37.7 simulator hours and 81 hours in the T-6 aircraft. She will make an outstanding officer in any other career field." Section III, Professional Qualities reflect the applicant's "personal appearance, military bearing, and fitness level met standards. Her personal pride and motivation to excel are evident in every task she performs." The applicant "has a great attitude and will continue to be a valuable asset to the United States Air Force."

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

AIR FORCE EVALUATION

NGB/A3O states they cannot make a recommendation for approval or denial. NGB/A3O is not the authority on living conditions and how they affect flight training. NGB/A3O can only validate flying training. This office would not be able to make any recommendations without the applicant submitting her UPT training records.

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 20 July 2023 for comment (Exhibit D), and the applicant replied contending that the previously submitted information is in regard to the government's inability to provide adequate living conditions which affected her ability to perform to standards in UPT. If the Board is unable to provide corrective action, please advise on the best way to proceed. She has since completed her instrument and commercial ratings as an attempt to stay current in the hopes of returning to UPT. Please note, the syllabus which sent her to a Commander's Review has now been revised to include further remedial rides. Had this been the case for her class syllabus or had she been provided appropriate living conditions or the

opportunity to move off base, she does not believe she would have gone to a Commander's Review.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit E.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION

AF/A3TM recommends denying the application. Based on the documentation provided by the applicant and analysis of the facts, there is no evidence of an error. In accordance with Air Force Manual 11-402, *Aviation and Parachutist Service*, an aeronautical order was published assigning aviation service code "06" (Flying Requirement Terminated) based on the outcome from the Commander's Review Process. The AETC Form 139 indicates that the applicant was recommended for elimination from training and should not be considered for reinstatement in the course at a later date. The commander recommended retention and reclassification into a non-rated career field.

The complete advisory opinion is at Exhibit F.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION

The Board sent a copy of the advisory opinion to the applicant on 14 September 2023 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 AF/A3TM and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. Moreover, the Board concurs with the **Work-Product** Commander's assessment for the applicant's elimination from training. Specifically, the applicant's flying performance was below average due to her lack of good task management skills and situational awareness deficiencies. While the applicant contends her living conditions and inability to move off base led to her Commander's Review, the Board believes she was in a controlled humidity environment at the time of her unsatisfactory rides. According to the applicant, she moved into her own place on 4 July 2022 and over a month later - on 10 and 12 August 2022 she had unsatisfactory check rides which led to being placed on the flying commander's awareness program. 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

Work-Pr...

Work-Product

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-2023-00929 in Executive Session on 7 November 2023:

Work-Product

, Panel Chair

Work-Product

, 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 23 March 2023.

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

Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, NGB/A3O, dated 5 July 2023.

Exhibit D: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 20 July 2023.

Exhibit E: Applicant's Response, w/atchs, not dated.

Exhibit F: Advisory Opinion, AF/A3TM, w/atchs, dated 14 September 2023.

Exhibit G: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 14 September 2023.

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.

8/12/2025

X

Work-Product

Work-Product

Signed by:

Work-Product

AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2023-00929

Work-Product

Work-Product