

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

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF: DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2025-00221

Work-Product COUNSEL: NONE

**HEARING REQUESTED:** YES

## APPLICANT'S REQUEST

- 1. Her Enlisted Performance Report (EPR), for the period of 1 Dec 21 through 30 Nov 22, be voided and removed from her record or in the alternative, a substitute report be completed by her current unit.
- 2. A reevaluation of her records to ensure a fair and accurate assessment amongst her peers (Outside of Board's authority to adjudicate; request not in compliance with Department of the Air Force (DAFI) 36-2603, Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)).

## **APPLICANT'S CONTENTIONS**

The ratings on her EPR do not accurately reflect her performance and contributions. Upon assuming noncommissioned officer in charge (NCOIC) duties, she experienced conflicts with her supervisor due to differing leadership styles. Tensions escalated after she expressed concerns about her supervisor's personal and professional actions towards her. She sought guidance but faced reprisal from her chain of command. Due to these conflicts, she quickly transferred units. Upon receiving her EPR late, she noticed her ratings did not match the content or what was discussed during feedback and was given no chance to discuss the results. This report is inconsistent with her prior perfect record and various accolades.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

The applicant is a currently serving Air Force technical sergeant (E-6).

On 11 Feb 21, AF From 910, *Enlisted Performance Report (AB thru TSgt)*, for the period of 1 Feb 20 thru 31 Jan 21, indicates the applicant was given an overall performance assessment of "5" which denotes exceeded most, if not all expectations.

Work-Product

On 14 Dec 21, AF From 910, for the period of 1 Feb 21 thru 30 Nov 21, indicates the applicant was given an overall performance assessment of "5" which denotes exceeded most, if not all expectations.

On 24 Jun 22, a Letter of Counseling (LOC), provided by the applicant, was issued for failing to fulfill her duties as a NCOIC noting herself and her team failed to complete tasks to which she was directed to do so. The letter goes on to list the specific tasks and actions taken and the failures from incomplete tasks, along with deviation from standards, unpreparedness, and unauthorized leave approval.

On 29 Jun 22, a response to the LOC, provided by the applicant, states there was a clear lack of respect and communication between herself, and her supervisor and her performance should not be called into question. She goes on to explain the various tasks and the circumstances with each instance and concluded she was not omitting fault to some of the situations but her frustration lies with the fact she was deploying, had various medical issues, was training an entire section to become a team, and was growing a NCO to take her place and believed she did the best she could under the circumstances.

On 4 Jan 23, AF From 910, for the period of 1 Dec 21 thru 30 Nov 22, indicates the applicant was given an overall performance assessment of "3" which denotes met all expectations.

On 4 Jul 23, the applicant was awarded the Air and Space Achievement Medal for the period of 9 Jun 22 to 30 Sep 22 for her outstanding achievement while assigned as the Funded Environmental and Morale Leave Technician.

On 29 Dec 23, the applicant's Enlisted Performance Brief (E1-E6), for the period of 1 Dec 22 thru 30 Nov 23, indicates the applicant is a technical expert and with mentorship and self-growth can develop into a leader the future Air Force and its airmen need.

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

## AIR FORCE EVALUATION

AFPC/DPMSPE recommends denying the applicant's request to remove the contested report based on insufficient corroborating evidence and the presumed legitimacy of the original crafting of the EPR. The applicant has not provided compelling evidence to show the report is unjust or inaccurate as written and to void this report would remove the accountability of the applicant for this office. Air Force policy is that an evaluation report is accurate as written when it becomes a matter of record. Additionally, it is considered to represent the rating chain's best judgment at the time it is rendered. To effectively challenge an evaluation, it is necessary to hear from all members of the rating chain-not only the support but, also for clarification/explanation. Although, the

## Work-Product

applicant states she sought guidance from leadership, there are no statements from any of the evaluators who signed the evaluation or anyone who can corroborate her claims. The applicant must be able to prove there was a personality conflict per AFI 36-2406, *Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluations*, paragraph A2.5.5. The applicant has failed to provide the necessary information/support from any rating official on the contested EPR. Without the benefit of these statements, AFPC/DPMSPE can only conclude the EPR is accurate as written. It is determined the EPR was accomplished in direct accordance with all applicable Air Force policies and procedures. AFPC/DPMSPE contends once a report is accepted for file, only strong evidence to the contrary warrants' correction or removal from an individual's record. The burden of proof is on the applicant. The applicant has not substantiated the contested EPR was not rendered in good faith by all evaluators based on the knowledge available at the time.

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 25 Mar 25 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 Board concurs with the rationale and recommendation of AFPC/DPMSPE and finds a preponderance of the evidence does not substantiate the applicant's contentions. 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-2025-00221 in Executive Session on 13 May 25:

Work-Product

Panel Chair

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

## Work-Product

# 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 16 Jan 25.

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

Exhibit C: Advisory Opinion, AFPC/DPMSPE, dated 24 Mar 25.

Exhibit D: Notification of Advisory, SAF/MRBC to Applicant, dated 25 Mar 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.

Board Operations Manager, AFBCMR
Signed by: Work-Product