

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 20 June 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20230014785

APPLICANT REQUESTS: removal of the DA Form 67-10-1 (Company Grade Plate (O1-O3; W01-CW2) Officer Evaluation Report (OER)) covering the period 1 June 2021 through 31 May 2022 from his Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR).

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING DOCUMENT(S) CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- Applicant's Memorandum to Human Resources Command (HRC) (OER Appeal), with 22 enclosures –
  - Enclosure 2 – DA Form 67-10-1A (OER Support Form)
  - Enclosure 3 – Memorandum (Commander's OER Inquiry)
  - Enclosure 4 – Index of Enclosures and Exhibits, including –
    - I – Memorandum (Inquiry Officer Appointment)
    - II – Memorandum (Applicant's Preliminary Inquiry concerning OER)
    - III – 15 Exhibits –
      - A through D – 4 versions of his OER (A and B are identical)
      - E – DA Form 4856 (Developmental Counseling Form)
      - F – DA Form 67-10-1A (additional copy)
      - G – DA Form 2823 (Sworn Statement)
      - H – Applicant's Memorandum (Rated Officer Referral Comments), 2 November 2022
      - I – Applicant's Memorandum (Office Call with Reviewer, Senior Rater and Rater)
      - J – Orders 209-05
      - K through O – Applicant's email correspondence about his OER
- Enclosure 5 through 13 – 9 versions of his OER
- Enclosure 14 – Applicant's Memorandum (Rated Officer Referral Comments), 10 April 2022

- Enclosure 15 – Applicant's Memorandum (Acknowledgement of Receipt of OER Referral)
- Enclosure 16 – Human Resource Command Evaluation Entry System, webpage printout
- Enclosure 17 – DA Form 4187 (Personnel Action)
- Enclosure 18 through 20 – Applicant's email correspondence
- Enclosure 21 – 6 Consecutive OERs covering the periods from 3 October 2017 through 3 March 2023
- Enclosure 22 – 4 DA Forms 638 (Recommendation for Award)
- 3 Support Letters to the Army Special Review Board (ASRB)
- Applicant email correspondence with former commander
- ASRB Docket Number AR20230007719

#### FACTS:

1. The applicant states, his appeal is based on administrative and substantive errors, primarily focused on derogatory rater comments in Part IV (Performance Evaluation – Professionalism, Competencies, and Attributes) c.3 (Intellect), c.4 (Leads), c.5 (Develops) sections and Part VI (Senior Rater) comments.

a. The derogatory comments are not supported by counseling or documentation. These comments are unfounded, deceptive, and fabricated to retaliate against him and his request to transfer from the G9 Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) to the G1 OPR after disagreements and disrespect from the senior rater. These derogatory comments are in violation of Army Regulation 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System), Department of the Army Pamphlet 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System), and Army Regulation 600-20 (Army Command Policy).

b. He notes his ratings were changed after the rating period and due to influence of the rater's leadership. His rater had positive comments and changed them to support a referred OER after the senior rater made negative comments with no evidence or counseling to substantiate the changes. He requested an office call to address the comments and that did not go well when he expressed his disagreement.

c. Further, his rating chain was unable to provide an accurate description or realistic comments about his performance and potential during this rating period due to negative emotions. This was a personal and emotional evaluation with unrealistic comments about his performance or potential with a harmful intent to impact his career. A Commander's Inquiry (CI) sustained his allegations.

2. The applicant provides:

- an appeal to HRC with the 22 noted enclosures (including 9 versions of the contested OER covering the period 1 June 2021 through 31 May 2022 [all versions show this is a referred report])
  - on 21 September 2022, his rater signed the contested OER (version 1 and 2) showing:
    - Part IV c.3 (Intellect) –
      - the applicant approaches new challenges with an intent to master the subject matter
      - he applies critical thinking, questioning all aspects of his programs as he works to learn the material
      - he is willing to take on difficult tasks that both facilitate his understanding and support organizational requirements
    - Part IV c.4 (Leads) –
      - the applicant sets an example, consistently maintaining a professional military appearance and bearing
      - his leadership and proactive coordination was instrumental in the successful test of hybrid training delivery of high quality instruction to both in person and on line students
    - Part IV c.5 (Develops) –
      - as the applicant worked to learn the important aspects of his programs and how to address them with the field he applied his critical thinking skills, recommending refinements and streamlining to develop a better understanding he fostered a learning work environment by monitoring and supporting task assignments within his teams
    - Part VI (SR Comments) –
      - the applicant is one of the lowest performers I have ever senior rated.
      - his experience is not suited for the G-9
      - the applicant needs more time to mature at the company grade and to develop as a staff officer at the unit level
      - he needs to learn to seek out opportunities to grow, communicate effectively with his coworkers and come across less adversarial when he does not understand a situation

- on 13 October 2022, his rater signed a draft copy of the contested OER (version 3) showing the following changes:
  - Part IV c.3 (Intellect) –
    - the applicant approaches new challenges with an intent to master the subject matter
    - however, in one instance the applicant exercised questionable judgment when in May 2022 he decided to not attend or present at a training event that he was scheduled for
    - in person counseling was conducted by the G-9 Chief, Division Chief, and Branch Chief
    - subsequently the applicant completed the initial steps directed by the counseling
  - Part IV c.4 (Leads) –
    - the applicant consistently maintained a professional military appearance and bearing
    - his leadership and coordination assisted the successful test of hybrid training delivery of high-quality instruction to both in person and online students
    - he should better consider teammates approaches and perspectives
  - Part IV c.5 (Develops) –
    - as the applicant worked to learn the important aspects of his programs and how to address them with the field, he applied critical thinking, recommending refinements and streamlining to develop a better understanding
    - he monitored task assignments within his teams
    - he needs to develop an understanding of how to accept, incorporate, and leverage capabilities of more knowledgeable teammates
  - Part VI (SR Comments) –
    - the applicant needs to pursue company command at the earliest opportunity for the experience to develop his skills and build a foundation for his professional military career
    - Continue to seek out challenging assignments of increased responsibility and grow as an Officer
    - recognize opportunities to learn from subject matter experts and communicate effectively with his coworkers

- on 29 November 2022, his rater signed the contested OER (version 4 and 5) showing the following changes:
  - Part IV c.3 (Intellect) –
    - the applicant approached challenges with an intent to master the subject matter
    - however, in one instance the applicant exercised questionable judgment when in May 2022 he decided to not attend or present at a training event that he was scheduled for
    - in person counseling was conducted by the G-9 Chief, Division Chief, and Branch Chief
    - subsequently the applicant completed the initial steps directed by the counseling
  - Part IV c.4 (Leads) –
    - the applicant consistently maintained a professional military appearance and bearing
    - his leadership and coordination assisted the successful test of hybrid training delivery of high-quality instruction to both in person and online students
    - he should better consider teammates approaches and perspectives
  - Part IV c.5 (Develops) –
    - as the applicant worked to learn the important aspects of his programs and how to address them with the field he applied his critical thinking skills, recommending refinements and streamlining to develop a better understanding
    - he monitored task assignments within his teams
    - he needs to develop an understanding of how to accept, incorporate, and leverage capabilities of more knowledgeable teammates
  - Part VI (SR Comments) –
    - the applicant needs to pursue company command at the earliest opportunity for the experience to develop his skills and build a foundation for his professional military career
    - continue to seek out challenging assignments of increased responsibility and grow as an Officer
    - recognize opportunities to learn from subject matter experts and communicate effectively with his coworkers

- on 5 April 2023, his rater signed the contested OER (version 6 through 9) showing the following changes:
  - Part IV c.3 (Intellect) –
    - the applicant approached challenges with an intent to master the subject matter
    - however, in one instance, in early May 2022, the applicant did not attend a required training event where he was assigned to lead a block of instruction
    - in person counseling was conducted by the G-9 Chief, Division Chief, and Branch Chief
    - subsequently the applicant completed the initial steps directed by the counseling
  - Part IV c.4 (Leads) –
    - the applicant consistently maintained a professional military appearance and bearing
    - his leadership and coordination assisted the successful test of hybrid training delivery of high-quality instruction to both in person and online students
    - he should better consider teammates approaches and perspectives.
  - Part IV c.5 (Develops) –
    - as the applicant worked to learn the important aspects of his programs and how to address them with the field he applied his critical thinking skills, recommending refinements and streamlining to develop a better understanding
    - he monitored task assignments within his teams
    - he needs to develop an understanding of how to accept, incorporate, and leverage capabilities of more knowledgeable teammates
  - Part VI (SR Comments) –
    - rated Soldier refuses to sign
    - the applicant needs to pursue company command at the earliest opportunity for the experience to develop his skills and build a foundation for his professional military career
    - continue to seek out challenging assignments of increased responsibility and grow as an Officer

- recognize opportunities to learn from subject matter experts and communicate effectively with his coworkers
- On 2 March 2023, a CI was conducted in accordance with Army Regulation 623- 3, paragraph 4-5i to investigate alleged errors, injustices, or illegalities pertaining to the applicant's OER:
  - this inquiry focused on derogatory rater comments in the "Intellect," "Leads," and "Develops" sections and senior rater comments
  - the CI determined the derogatory comments were not supported by counseling and should be amended or removed from his OER
  - the CI also recommended this OER be administratively corrected prior to submission to his AMHRR
- three support letters to the ASRB attesting to character professional attributes
- ASRB Docket Number AR20230007719, 15 August 2023

3. A review of the applicant's service records shows:

- After having prior enlisted service in [REDACTED] Army National Guard ([REDACTED] ARNG), the applicant was appointed as a Reserve commissioned officer in the [REDACTED] ANG on 1 June 2016
- On 5 April 2023, his rater signed the contested OER covering the period 1 June 2021 through 31 May 2022, showing:
  - Part IV c.3 (Intellect) –
    - the applicant approached challenges with an intent to master the subject matter
    - however, in one instance, in early May 2022, the applicant did not attend a required training event where he was assigned to lead a block of instruction
    - in person counseling was conducted by the G-9 Chief, Division Chief, and Branch Chief
    - subsequently the applicant completed the initial steps directed by the counseling
  - Part IV c.4 (Leads) –
    - the applicant consistently maintained a professional military appearance and bearing

- his leadership and coordination assisted the successful test of hybrid training delivery of high-quality instruction to both in person and online students
- he should better consider teammates approaches and perspectives.
  
- Part IV c.5 (Develops) –
  - as the applicant worked to learn the important aspects of his programs and how to address them with the field he applied his critical thinking skills, recommending refinements and streamlining to develop a better understanding
  - he monitored task assignments within his teams
  - he needs to develop an understanding of how to accept, incorporate, and leverage capabilities of more knowledgeable teammates
  
- Part VI (SR Comments) –
  - rated Soldier refuses to sign
  - the applicant needs to pursue company command at the earliest opportunity for the experience to develop his skills and build a foundation for his professional military career
  - continue to seek out challenging assignments of increased responsibility and grow as an Officer
  - recognize opportunities to learn from subject matter experts and communicate effectively with his coworkers
  
- his AMHRR shows the OER filed in the performance sections contain the corrections recommended by the CI

4. On 15 July 2023, the ASRB considered his request to remove the contested OER in Docket Number AR20230007719, the Board stated the evidence presented did not establish clearly and convincingly that the report under consideration was untrue, unjust, or that action was warranted to correct a material error, inaccuracy, or injustice. Therefore, the Board determined the overall merits of this case do not warrant the requested relief.

5. He is currently assigned in the Active Guard Reserve to the U.S. Army National Guard Readiness Center, in the rank of Captain/03.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

After reviewing the application, all supporting documents, and the evidence found within the military record, the Board found that relief was warranted. The Board carefully considered the applicant's record of service, documents submitted in support of the petition and executed a comprehensive and standard review based on law, policy and regulation. Removal of an Officer Evaluation Report (OER) is generally not warranted unless it is factually incorrect. However, upon review of the applicants petition and available military records, the Board determined that the applicant demonstrated by a preponderance through the Commander's OER Inquiry which determined the derogatory comments were not supported by counseling. The Board agreed there is sufficient evidence that a procedural error occurred that was prejudicial to the applicant and by a preponderance of evidence that the contents of the OER are substantially incorrect and support removal.

2. The purpose of maintaining the Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) is to protect the interests of both the U.S. Army and the Soldier. In this regard, the AMHRR serves to maintain an unbroken, historical record of a Soldier's service, conduct, duty performance, and evaluations, and any corrections to other parts of the AMHRR. Once placed in the AMHRR, the document becomes a permanent part of that file and will not be removed from or moved to another part of the AMHRR unless directed by an appropriate authority. There does appear to be evidence the contested OER was unjust or untrue or inappropriately filed in the applicant's AMHRR. In the best interest of the Army and the applicant's continued service, the Board granted relief.

**BOARD VOTE:**

Mbr 1      Mbr 2      Mbr 3

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
:	:	:	DENY APPLICATION

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Board determined the evidence presented is sufficient to warrant a recommendation for relief. As a result, the Board recommends that all Department of the Army records of the individual concerned be corrected by removing the DA Form 67-10-1 (Company Grade Plate (O1-O3; W01-CW2) Officer Evaluation Report (OER)) covering the period 1 June 2021 through 31 May 2022 from his Army Military Human Resource Record (AMHRR) and replacing it with a statement of nonrated time.

X 

---

CHAIRPERSON

I certify that herein is recorded the true and complete record of the proceedings of the Army Board for Correction of Military Records in this case.

REFERENCES:

1. Army Regulation 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System) prescribed the policies for completing evaluation reports that support the Evaluation Reporting System. It also provides guidance regarding redress programs, including commander's inquiries and appeals. The regulation provides that:

a. Evaluation reports are assessments of how well the rated Soldier met duty requirements and adhered to the professional standards of the Army Officer or Noncommissioned Officer Corps. Performance will be evaluated by observing action, demonstrated behavior, and results from the point of view of the values, leadership framework and responsibilities identified on the evaluation forms, counseling forms, and as explained in Department of the Army Pamphlet 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System). Consideration will be given to the relative experience of the rated officer, the efforts made by the rated officer, and the results that could be reasonably expected given the time and resources available. Potential evaluations will be performance-based assessments of the rated officers of the same grade to perform in positions of greater responsibility and/or higher grades. Assessment of potential will apply to all officers, regardless of their opportunity to be selected for higher positions or grades.

b. The senior rater is the senior rating official in the military rating chain or as officially designated by the academic institution. Senior raters use their position and

experience to evaluate the rated Soldier from a broad organizational perspective, military program of instruction, or civilian academic course standards. Senior raters will ensure support forms are provided to all rated Soldiers they senior rate at the beginning of and throughout the respective rating periods; use all reasonable means to become familiar with a rated Soldier's performance; assess the ability of the rated Soldier; ensure that rating officials counsel the rated Soldier individually and throughout the rating period on meeting their objectives and complying with the professional standards of the Army; consider the information on the applicable support forms when evaluating the rated individual; evaluate the rated Soldier's potential relative to his or her contemporaries; and ensure that all reports, which the senior rater and subordinates write, are complete and provide a realistic evaluation in compliance with procedures established in Department of the Army Pamphlet 623-3.

c. Each report will be an independent evaluation of the rated Soldier for a specific rating period. It will not refer to prior or subsequent reports. It will not remark on performance or incidents occurring before or after the period covered.

d. When a commander or commandant discovers that an evaluation report rendered by a subordinate or a subordinate command may be illegal, unjust, or otherwise in violation of this regulation, he or she will conduct an inquiry into the matter. The Commander's or Commandant's Inquiry will be confined to matters related to the clarity of the evaluation report, the facts contained in the evaluation report, the compliance of the evaluation with policy and procedures established by Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the conduct of the rated Soldier and members of the rating chain. The official does not have the authority to direct that an evaluation report be changed; command influence may not be used to alter the honest evaluation of a rated Soldier by a rating official. The procedures used by the commander or commandant to process such an inquiry are described in chapter 4.

e. Paragraph 3-37 stated modification to previously submitted evaluation reports provides an exception to a completed evaluation report filed in a Soldier's AMHRR be altered, withdraw or replaced with another evaluation report will not be honored will only be granted when:

(1) Information that was unknown or unverified when the evaluation report was prepared is brought to light or verified.

(2) This information is so significant that it would have resulted in a different evaluation of the rated Soldier; the following actions will be accomplished in an effort to modify the evaluation report:

(a) If the information would have resulted in a higher evaluation, the rated Soldier may appeal the evaluation report, and rating officials may provide input to support this point.

(b) If the information would have resulted in a lower evaluation, rating officials may submit an addendum to be filed with the evaluation report.

f. The burden of proof rests with the appellant.

(1) Accordingly, to justify deletion or amendment of an evaluation report, the appellant will produce evidence that establishes clearly and convincingly that:

(a) the presumption of regularity will not be applied to the report under consideration; and

(b) action is warranted to correct a material error, inaccuracy, or injustice.

(2) For a claim of inaccuracy or injustice of a substantive type, evidence will include statements from third parties, rating officials, or other documents from official sources. Third parties are persons other than the rated officer or rating officials who have knowledge of the appellant's performance during the rating period. Such statements are afforded more weight if they are from persons who served in positions allowing them a good opportunity to observe firsthand the appellant's performance as well as interactions with rating officials. Statements from rating officials are also acceptable if they relate to allegations of factual errors, erroneous perceptions, or claims of bias. To the extent practicable, such statements will include specific details of events or circumstances leading to inaccuracies, misrepresentations, or injustice at the time the evaluation report was rendered. The results of a Commander's or Commandant's Inquiry may provide support for an appeal request.

g. Paragraph 4-7 stated an evaluation report accepted for inclusion in the rated Soldier's AMHRR is presumed to be administratively correct, have been prepared by the proper rating officials, and represent the considered opinion and objective judgment of the rating officials at the time of preparation. An appeal will be supported by substantiated evidence. An appeal that alleges an evaluation report is incorrect, inaccurate, or unjust without usable supporting evidence will not be considered.

2. Department of the Army Pamphlet 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System) provides procedural guidance for completing and submitting to Headquarters, Department of the Army, evaluation reports and associated support forms that are the basis for the Army's Evaluation Reporting System.

a. Section IV (DA Form 67-10-1), paragraph 2-3 (Part I, Administrative Data), states Part I of the DA Form 67-10-1 is for administrative data, including identification of the rated officer, unit data, the period covered, number of rated months, nonrated time codes, and the reason for submission of the DA Form 67-10-1 (see Table 2-24 for a list of codes and reasons for submitting OERs and Table 2-25 for the codes and reasons for nonrated periods). Table 2-1 details instructions for completing part I of the DA Form 67-10-1.

b. Table 2-6 (Part IV, Performance evaluation—professionalism, competencies, and attributes) states in:

(1) Part IV, block c.3 (Intellect):

(A) Intellect draws on the mental tendencies and resources that shape conceptual abilities applied to one's duties and responsibilities. Conceptual abilities enable effective problem solving and sound judgment before implementing concepts and plans. They help one think creatively and reason analytically, critically, ethically, and with cultural sensitivity to consider unintended as well as intended consequences, helping leaders anticipate the second- and third-order effects of their actions. The conceptual components affecting an Army leader's intellect include mental agility, sound judgment, innovation, interpersonal tact, and expertise.

(B) Mental agility: a flexibility of mind, an ability to anticipate or adapt to uncertain or changing situations. Agility enables thinking through second- and third-order effects when current decisions or actions are not producing the desired results.

(C) Sound judgment: the capacity to assess situations shrewdly and to draw rational conclusions. Consistent good judgment enables leaders to form sound opinions and make reliable estimates and sensible decisions. Good judgment includes the ability to assess subordinates, peers, and the enemy for strengths and weaknesses to create appropriate solutions and action.

(D) Innovation: the ability to introduce something new when needed or as opportunities exist. Being innovative includes creativity in producing original and worthwhile ideas. Innovative leaders tend to be inquisitive and good problem solvers. Innovative leaders prevent complacency by finding new ways to challenge subordinates with forward-looking approaches and ideas by relying on intuition, experience, knowledge, and input from subordinates.

(E) Interpersonal tact: interacting with others depends on knowing what others perceive. It relies on accepting the character, reactions, and motives of oneself and others. Interpersonal tact combines these skills, along with displaying self-control, balance, and stability in situations.

(F) Expertise: the special knowledge and skill developed from experience, training, and education. Domain knowledge is what leaders know about application areas used in their duties and positions. Leaders create and use knowledge in at least four domains. Tactical knowledge relates to accomplishing a designated objective through military means. Technical knowledge consists of the specialized information associated with a particular function or system. Joint knowledge is an understanding of joint organizations, their procedures, and roles in national defense. Cultural and geopolitical knowledge is awareness of cultural, geographic, and political differences and sensitivities.

(2) Part IV, block c.4 (Leads):

(A) Leads encompasses five competencies: leads others, extends influence beyond the chain of command, builds trust, leads by example, and communicates. Rating officials may provide additional comments, if needed, evaluating the rated officer on how well the rated officer promoted a climate of dignity and respect and adhered to the requirements of the SHARP program.

(B) Leads others: measures the ability to influence Soldiers and DA Civilians in the leader's organization. Leaders apply character, presence, and intellect to the core leader competencies while guiding others toward a common goal and mission accomplishment. Direct leaders influence others person-to-person, such as a team leader who instructs, encourages hard work, and recognizes achievement. At the direct level, a platoon leader knows what a battalion (BN) commander wants done because the lieutenant understands the commander's intent two levels up. The intent creates a critical link between the organizational and direct leadership levels.

(C) Extends influence beyond the chain of command: involves influencing others when the leader does not have designated authority or when the leader's authority is not recognized by others. Influence refers to how people create and relay their messages, behaviors, and attitudes to affect the intentions, beliefs, behaviors, and attitudes of another person or group of people. Influence depends upon relationships where leaders build positive rapport and a relationship of mutual trust, making followers more willing to support requests. Examples include showing personal interest in a follower's well-being, offering praise, and understanding a follower's perspective.

(D) Builds trust: encompasses reliance upon others, confidence in their abilities, and consistency in behavior. Trust builds over time through mutual respect, shared understanding, and common experiences. Communication contributes to trust by keeping others in-formed, establishing expectations, and developing commitments. Sustaining trust depends on meeting those expectations and commitments. Trust forms and fosters when leaders create a positive command climate by identifying areas of

common interest and goals. Teams develop trust through cooperation, identification with other members, and contribution to the team effort.

(E) Leads by example: living by the Army Values and the Warrior Ethos that best displays character and leading by example. It means putting the organization and subordinates above personal self-interest, career, and comfort. For the Army leader, it requires putting the lives of others above a personal desire for self-preservation.

(F) Communicates: ensures there is more than the simple transmission of information. It achieves a new understanding and creates new or better awareness. Communicating critical information clearly is an important skill to reach shared understanding of issues and solutions. It conveys thoughts, presents recommendations, bridges cultural sensitivities, and reaches consensus. Actions can speak louder than words and excellent leaders use this to serve as a role model to set the standard. Leaders communicate to convey clear understanding of what needs to be done and why.

c. Part IV, block c.5 (Develops): Developing people and the organization with a long-term perspective requires leaders who –

- Create a positive environment that fosters esprit de corps and teamwork, promotes cohesion, and encourages initiative and acceptance of responsibility, a leader maintains a healthy balance between caring for people and their Families while focusing on the mission
- Seek self-improvement to master the profession at every level, a leader must make a full commitment to lifelong learning, self-improvement requires self-awareness and leads to new skills necessary to adapt to changes in the leadership environment
- Invest adequate time and effort to develop individual subordinates and build effective teams, success demands a fine balance of teaching, counseling, coaching, and mentoring
- Act as stewards of the profession, making choices and taking actions that ensure that leaders in the future sustain an Army capable of performing its core functions
- The rater will comment on how well the officer promoted and supported a healthy workplace environment conducive to the growth and development of personnel when completing the OER
- Rating officials may provide additional comments, if needed, evaluating the rated officer on how well the rated officer promoted a climate of dignity and respect and adhered to the requirements of the SHARP program

d. Part VI (Senior Rater) –

(1) Part VI of DA Form 67 – 10 – 1 is the senior rater's assessment of the rated officer's potential. Part VI is intended to capitalize on the senior rater's additional experience, broad organizational perspective, and tendency to focus on the organizational requirements and actual performance results. Information on the rated officer's DA Form 67 – 10 – 1A is intended to assist the senior rater and supplement more traditional means of evaluation, such as personal observation, reports and records, and other rating officials.

(2) To ensure that the senior rater is a senior official qualified to evaluate the rated officer, he or she must meet the minimum requirements in AR 623 – 3.

(3) In evaluating the whole officer, the senior rater makes an assessment of the officer's potential for promotion to the next higher grade when compared with other officers. In doing so, a senior rater must carefully manage the per-centage of their "MOST QUALIFIED" ratings and must, therefore, be aware of when an officer will be in a zone of consideration for promotion, command, or school selection in order to render "MOST QUALIFIED" ratings accordingly. A senior rater's subsequent statement that he or she rendered an inaccurate "HIGHLY QUALIFIED" or lower evaluation of a rated officer's potential in order to preserve "MOST QUALIFIED" ratings for other officers (for example, those in a zone for consideration for promotion, command, or school selection) will not be a basis for an appeal.

(4) Senior raters who meet minimum qualification criteria established in AR 623 – 3 will complete part VI, block a. An officer whose rank on DA Form 67 – 10 – 1 is a "P" (a promotable officer serving in an authorized position of the next higher rank) receiving a rating in part VI, block a will be profiled against the senior rater's profile for the next higher rank. For example, a 1LT(P) serving in an authorized CPT position will be profiled against the senior rater's CPT profile population. If the 1LT(P) is not serving in an authorized CPT position, they will be profiled against the senior rater's 1LT profile population.

6. Army Regulation 600-8-104 (Army Military Human Resource Records Management) governs the composition of the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) and states the performance folder is used for filing performance, commendatory, and disciplinary data. Once placed in the OMPF, the document becomes a permanent part of that file. The document will not be removed from or moved to another part of the OMPF unless directed by certain agencies, to include this Board. Appendix B states the DA Form 67-10-1 is filed in the performance folder of the Soldier's OMPF

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//