



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

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**DOCKET NUMBER:** BC-2024-01882

**COUNSEL:** NONE

**HEARING REQUESTED:** NO

**APPLICANT'S REQUEST**

To receive 35 points for Inactive Duty Training (IDT) and Annual Tour (AT) for Fiscal Year (FY) 21.

**APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS**

She was serving as an Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) in **Work-Product**. She was initially approved for funding to compete in a NATO event to serve as her IDT and AT for FY21. She was then told there was no funding. She tried to schedule her IDT and AT for the FY21, but the deadline had passed, so she wrote a memorandum for record for the days. However, it was not approved. She also asked to perform her duty for points only and was still denied by her unit. She filed an Inspector General (IG) and Congressional complaint about this and other issues involving her unit.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

The applicant is an Air Force Reserve technical sergeant (E-6).

On 20 Sep 21, according to [REDACTED] dated 1 Oct 21, the applicant was relieved from assignment to **Work-Product** and voluntarily reassigned to **Work...**

On 23 May 24, ARPC responded to a Congressional Inquiry submitted on behalf of the applicant. In their response, ARPC noted they could not locate any evidence of scheduling, approval, performance, or certification of duties as described, which the applicant states were performed 2 – 13 Sep 20. Also, they determined the nature of her inability to complete her duties to achieve enough points for a satisfactory year of service was not a result of COVID-19 restrictions. The applicant had four opportunities, 1 Dec 22; 31 Mar 23; 20 Jun 23; and 30 Sep 23, to submit a request for a good-year relief with supporting documentation to her Readiness and Integration Organization (RIO) Detachment. These opportunities were communicated to the IMA population beginning in Oct 22, through various official and unofficial means until the final suspense for this relief program. It outlined the attached criteria in accordance with the Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1215.07, *Service Credit for Non-Regular Retirement*, paragraph 3.6, which states the Air Reserve Component members may be granted up to 35 points in a one-year period of previously scheduled active service or period(s) of drill or equivalent instruction that were

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2024-01882**

Controlled by: SAF/MRB

Limited Dissemination Control: N/A  
POC: [SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil](mailto:SAF.MRBC.Workflow@us.af.mil)



[REDACTED]

unable to be performed due to travel or duty restrictions from 1 Mar 20, through the date upon which the national emergency declared Proclamation 9994 is lifted.

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

### **AIR FORCE EVALUATION**

HQ/RIO (Readiness and Integration Organization) recommends denying the application. Per the applicant's own statements, IDTs were scheduled to be performed between 18 Jul – 8 Aug 21 in support of NATO Military Competition (MilComp) events. Her request for orders was denied by her unit of assignment in Germany. At their discretion, her unit opted to require the member to complete AT with her unit, rather than MilComp for readiness and training purposes. Her unit of assignment had no record of the applicant completing IDTs or AT during FY21 or of approved late orders request from HQ RIO. 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 6 Jan 25 for comment (Exhibit D), and the applicant replied on 9 Jan 25. In her response, the applicant contends she believes the decision as a denial was still unjust. She submitted all the email communication and stated her case but feels it was most likely skipped over and not read in its entirety, otherwise, a different outcome may have been determined. While she does agree she did not perform any IDT/AT days for FY21, this was not her fault. She did everything within her power to perform her duty, even offering points without pay, but she was denied by her former unit. Her new chief even stepped in and asked if there was anything she could do to work for points only.

She was originally approved by her unit to attend a NATO event. After this was approved, she was told there was no funding. At this time, she tried to work with them to get her IDT/AT days in for FY21. However, she was told it was past the deadline, and they were out of funding. She offered to do points without pay and was denied. In addition, she is aware that many military members were awarded points during the COVID-19 pandemic without performing their duty days. She was not informed by any of her leadership this was an option, even though they knew her situation. She submitted an IG complaint against her unit and leadership as she was treated unjustly.

She is asking the board to review all the documents previously sent again so they can see the unjust way she was treated. She knows other service members were awarded these points and does not understand how she would not be treated the same. She has always performed all of her days each FY towards a good year and should not be denied the points due to the failure of her leadership.

The applicant's complete response is at Exhibit E.

### **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION**

1. The application was timely filed.
- [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

2. The applicant exhausted all other available administrative remedies 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 HQ/RIO and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. By the applicant's own admission, she scheduled her IDTs to be performed between 18 Jul – 8 Aug 21 which was ultimately denied by her unit of assignment as there are no travel and per diem funding associated with IDTs. Additionally, there is no record of an approved late orders request from HQ RIO. The Board notes that based on the documentation provided by the applicant as well as analysis of the facts, there is no evidence of an error or injustice. 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 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-2024-01882 in Executive Session on 27 Feb 25:

[REDACTED] Panel Chair  
[REDACTED] Panel Member  
[REDACTED] Panel Member

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

- Exhibit A: Application, DD Form 149, w/atchs, dated 22 May 24.
- Exhibit B: Documentary evidence, including relevant excerpts from official records.
- Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, HQ/RIO, dated 16 Dec 24.
- Exhibit D: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 6 Jan 25.
- Exhibit E: Applicant's Response, dated 9 Jan 25.

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.

10/20/2025

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Associate Director, AFBCMR  
Signed by: USAF

**AFBCMR Docket Number BC-2024-01882**

[REDACTED]