

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 2 December 2024

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240002165

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- removal of the referred Officer Evaluation Report (OER) from 2013 from his Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR)
- change constructive credit to equivalent credit for Intermediate Level Education (ILE), Advanced Operations Course (AOC) and ILE Common Core (CC)
- instruct the U.S. Army Human Resources Command (AHRC) to conduct a Special Selection Board (SSB) under Fiscal Year 2023 (FY23) lieutenant colonel (LTC) Promotion Selection Board (PSB)
- a personal appearance before the Board

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

- DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record)
- Email from the applicant
- DA Form 67-9 (OER)
- Headquarters (HQs), U.S. Army Reserve Command (USARC) Memorandum, Subject: Show Cause Recommendation – Captain (CPT) W-K- (the applicant)
- Master of Science transcript
- National Intelligence University (NIU) Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) Program, letter, Subject: JPME Phase I Credit for Major (MAJ) W-K- (the applicant)
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff (DCS) G-3/5/7 Memorandum, Subject: Request ILE CC and AOC Constructive Credit for MAJ W- K- (the applicant)
- Communication with Army Reserve Careers Group (ARCG)
- Officer Record Brief (ORB)
- AHRC Memorandum, Subject: SSB Results, FY23 LTC Army Promotion List (APL), Army Reserve (AR) Non-Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) PSB
- DA Form 1059 (Service School Academic Evaluation Report)
- Office of the DCS G-3/5/7 Memorandum, Subject: FY24 RC LTC APL Non-AGR PSB – MAJ W-K- (the applicant)
- Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff (DCS) G-3/5/7 Memorandum, Subject: Endorsement for reconsideration of promotion for MAJ W- K- (the applicant)

- HQS, USARC Memorandum, Subject: Endorsement for Reconsideration of Promotion for MAJ W-K- (the applicant)
- Timeline of events
- Army Regulation (AR) 350-1 (Army Training and Leader Development)

FACTS:

1. The applicant states he received a referred OER for the rating period of 29 March 2012 through 28 January 2013. In 2017, it was recommended that he go before a Show Cause for Retention board by a Position Vacancy Board (PVB) due to this OER; however, the Commanding General of USARC disapproved this recommendation and the case was closed. This OER has remained in his AMHRR which unduly prejudiced the FY23 SSB. Therefore, he requests this OER be removed from his AMHRR.

a. In 2021, he received JPME 1 credit from the NIU which is recognized as a JPME 1 granting institution in accordance with AR 350-1, paragraph 3-69 (Joint Professional Military Education and Training Institutes). The Office of the DCS G-3/5/7 granted him constructive credit for JPME 1 /Military Education Level (MEL) 4 for this education which is reflected on his ORB. He requests this be changed to equivalent credit as he attended an equivalent school of the Command and Staff College. This incorrect entry on his ORB incorrectly informed the FY23 SSB of his lack of military education qualification and prejudiced their decision.

b. He requests the Board to instruct AHRC to conduct a SSB for reconsideration for promotion under the FY23 RC LTC APL Non-AGR PSB due to the material error of the absence of his DA Form 1059 to prove he is military educationally qualified for promotion. NIU is a recognized institution for granting JPME 1. The university was not aware of the requirement to provide a DA Form 1059 for the successful completion of the course in accordance with AR 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System), paragraph 3-15 (DA Form 1059 and DA Form 1059-2). A memorandum was furnished by NIU which documented his course completion. The NIU rectified this error on 7 June 2024. This material error of the missing DA Form 1059 is present in his board file for the FY23 and FY24 RC LTC APL Non-AGR PSB. The absence of the DA Form 1059 was due to external factors which were out of his control.

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

a. With prior Regular Army (RA) enlisted service, on 6 March 2008, the applicant executed his oath of office and was appointed a RA commissioned officer in the Air Defense Artillery Corps in the rank/grade of second lieutenant (2LT)/O-1.

b. On 1 May 2011, the applicant was promoted to the rank/grade of captain (CPT)/O-3

c. DA Form 67-9 for the rating period of 29 March 2012 through 28 January 2013, the reason for submission was for Relief for Cause shows the applicant was rated as a Battery Commander. In part II (Authentication) shows the evaluation was a referred report. His rater rated his performance as unsatisfactory and do not promote. The rater stated he lost confidence in the applicant's ability to continue in command. An official investigation revealed he engaged in inappropriate and unprofessional behavior. The investigation also determined the applicant created a negative and counter-productive command climate. He failed in his duties of command. The rater stated his potential for promotion was not to be promoted as he required significant mentorship. The applicant's senior rater rated his potential for promotion as do not promote. His potential compared to his peers was below center mass, do not retain. The senior rater stated he directed the applicant be relieved for cause due to inappropriate and unprofessional behavior. His actions created a negative command climate and he should not be promoted or sent to advanced schooling.

(1) In the letter of referral, it stated the specific reason for the referred OER was a result of the outcome of activities of the applicant's behavior was not in accordance with the Army Values, misconduct towards the officer and Soldiers under his command and a poor command climate.

(2) The applicant's rebuttal to the OER, he stated he was under the impression the inquiry into his actions had been resolved at the battalion level as he settled the issued with his officers and Soldiers in an agreeable fashion which made the organization stronger. He further stated he cared deeply for his officers; he repeatedly counseled them about what they wished to be which was excellent officers. However, their performance did not reflect that early in his command tenure. To make them better officers, he had to make them care about their assigned tasks and duties. Unfortunately, their behavior did not improve until the consequences became public. In regard to the night of the incident, he drank with some of his officers and Soldiers. He did not realize they felt offended or disrespected. Those who he drank alcohol with, did not give him any negative feedback afterwards. However, the officers and Soldiers elevated the issue to his battalion command and did not give him the opportunity to settle the misconceptions at his level. During a field exercise, he did not provide his Soldiers the opportunity for showers, though his first sergeant told him the showers were needed, which was told to him even 3-days before the event. He dismissed the attempts to coerce him to allow the battery to leave the tactical area to go to the rear to take showers prior to the accomplishment of the training exercise. The Soldiers were asked if they needed or wanted a shower and they responded that they needed a shower. He could not comprehend that. He then explained to them in a formation the difference between necessities and luxuries; however, it did not go over well. He then lost his pride in his unit and Soldiers then as to his concept of their resiliency was shattered. He did not treat the female Soldiers any different than the male Soldiers, treatment was always based on the merits of their performance. If it was possible he could have shaped the

situation in which he had found himself more favorably to avoid these issues; however, he stood by his actions. If he was to be relieved, he wanted it done publicly for he was not ashamed of what he had done.

d. On 1 September 2013, the applicant was honorably released from active duty and assigned to the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) Control Group (Reinforcement). DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows the applicant completed 5-years, 5-months, and 26-days of active service.

e. On 19 December 2013, Orders Number C-12-317224, issued by AHRC, the applicant was assigned to a USAR Troop Program Unit, effective 19 November 2013.

f. On 24 January 2014, Orders Number T-01-400977, issued by AHRC, the applicant was ordered to active duty for training to attend the Captain Career Course (CCC), effective 26 January 2014.

g. DA Form 1059 shows the applicant achieved course standards for the CCC during the period of 27 January through 17 June 2014.

h. DA Form 1059 shows the applicant exceeded course standards for the Functional Area (FA) 30 (Information Operations Qualification Course) during the period of 3 September through 21 November 2014.

i. HQs, 99th Regional Support Command Memorandum dated 13 July 2015, Subject: Branch or Skill Identifier Redesignation, shows the applicant was awarded Functional Area (FA) 30.

j. DD Form 214 shows the applicant was ordered to active duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom effective 8 August 2015. He was honorably released from active duty on 6 August 2016 after the completion of 1-year of active service.

k. HQs, USARC Memorandum, Subject: Shows Cause Recommendation – CPT W-K- (the applicant), dated 17 January 2017, shows the deliberation of the FY15 PVB, the board recommended the applicant required a show cause for retention on active status due to the misconduct which resulted in a referred OER with the through date of 28 January 2013. After reviewing the matter regarding a show cause for retention of the applicant, the commander of USARC disapproved the recommendation. The case was closed and the matter was returned to the originating agency.

l. On 22 September 2017, Orders Number B-09-705750, issued by AHRC, the applicant was promoted to the rank/grade of MAJ/O-4 in the USAR, effective on with a date of rank of 25 August 2017.

m. Columbia University in the City of New York transcript shows on 20 May 2020 the applicant was awarded a Master of International Affairs with a minor in United Nations Studies and a concentration in International Security Policy.

n. NIU transcript shows on 31 July 2020 the applicant's Master in Science and Technical Intelligence was conferred. The degree in JPME was not conferred.

o. Office of the DCS G 3/5/7 Memorandum (undated), Subject: Request ILE CC and AOC Constructive Credit for MAJ W-K- (the applicant) shows his request was approved. He completed the resident JPME 1 program at the NIU in conjunction with his Master of Science and Technical Intelligence in accordance with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 1800.01F, NIU is qualified to provide JPME 1. He received credit for FA 30 which meets the Command and General Staff College AOC requirement and is fully Key Development qualified as a FA 30 with 12-months as the Deputy of Information Operations Plans Chief at European Command. AHRC will update the applicant's ORB awarding him JPME 1/MEL 4 credit. This memorandum was entered into the applicant's AMHRR on 29 December 2022 with the effective date of 1 January 2022.

p. FY 23 RC LTC APL PSB Results that were released on 14 June 2023 does not show the applicant was selected for promotion to LTC.

q. FY 24 RC LTC APL PSB Results that were released on 23 May 2024 does not show the applicant was selected for promotion to LTC.

r. Soldier Management Services - WEB Portal shows the applicant completed the Commissioned Officer Basic Course and the CCC for his military education.

3. The applicant provides:

a. Communication with ARCG shows on 11 December 2023 the applicant was advised his board file would be updated to reflect he was educationally qualified.

b. ORB dated 20 February 2024 shows in:

- Section VI (Military Education Level (MEL)) Command and Staff College constructive credit
- Section VII (Civilian Education) Master in Science and Technology Intelligence completed in 2020

c. AHRC Memorandum, Subject: SSB FY23, LTC, APL, AR Non-AGR, PSB, dated 20 February 2024, informed the applicant he was reconsidered and not selected for promotion to the rank of LTC under the FY23 criteria.

d. DA Form 1059 showing the applicant attended and completed the JPME at the NIU resulting in a Master of Science in Strategic Intelligence from 24 August 2018 through 30 July 2021.

e. Office of the DCS G 3/5/7 Memorandum, Subject: FY 24 RC LTC APL Non-AGR PSB – MAJ W-K- (from the applicant), dated 19 June 2024, he requested reconsideration for promotion under the FY 24 board criteria due to the material error of the absence of his DA Form 1059 to prove he is MEL qualified. The NIU was not aware of the requirement to provide him a DA Form 1059 for his successful completion of the JPME 1 course. The NIU rectified this error on 7 June 2024, despite his repeated inquiries since 2021. The NIU originally provide him a memorandum that documented the course completion. The Office of DCS G 3/5/7 provided MEL 4 constructive credit. He was proactive and diligent in his efforts to receive the appropriate education credit and DA Form 1059 from the NIU. The absence of the DA Form 1059 was due to external factors beyond his control and was a material error in his promotion board file. He requested reconsideration for promotion by a SSB.

f. Office of the DCS G 3/5/7 Memorandum, Subject: Endorsement for Reconsideration for Promotion for MAJ W-K- (the applicant), dated 1 July 2024, stated the author enthusiastically endorsed the applicant's request for reconsideration for promotion under the FY 24 RC LTC APL Non-AGR PSB criteria due to a material error in the absence of his DA Form 1059 to prove he was MEL qualified. The applicant served as his Executive Officer since 4 February 2024 and proactive and diligent efforts to update his personnel records and to receive the DA Form 1059 from NIU. He attested the absence of the DA Form 1059 was due external factors beyond the applicant's control and was a material error in his promotion board file.

g. HQs, USARC Memorandum, Subject: Endorsement from Reconsideration of Promotion for MAJ W-K- (the applicant), dated 1 July 2024, states the USARC Deputy Commanding General strongly endorsed the applicant's reconsideration for promotion under the FY 24 RC LTC APL Non-AGR PSB criteria due to a material error in the absence of his DA Form 1059 to prove he was MEL qualified. The applicant served under his command at the 75th Innovation Command during the period of 1 August 2019 through 3 February 2024. He took proactive and diligent efforts to update his personnel records and to receive the DA Form 1059 from NIU. He attests the absence of the DA Form 1059 was due external factors beyond the applicant's control and was a material error in his promotion board file.

h. Timeline of events: The applicant has taken proactive and diligent efforts since 2021 to update his MEL, receive a DA Form 1059 from NIU, and be considered for promotion. This process began in earnest to update his records for the FY22 (PSB) for his below-the-zone consideration. However, a DA Form 1059 was not provided by NIU due to NIU mistakenly believing a DA Form 1059 should only be provided to

administratively assigned personnel. He attended the school as a reservist, not on active duty. NIU did not rectify this error until 7 June 2024. The applicant provided a timeline to show his efforts to correct the error. The entire timeline is contained in the supporting documents for the Boards review.

i. AR 350-1 in whole, the respective paragraphs for this case are available in the references of this record of proceedings.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

After reviewing the application and all supporting documents, the Board determined relief was not warranted. The applicant's contentions, the military record, and regulatory guidance were carefully considered. Based upon the available evidence, the Board made the following findings and recommendations related to the requested relief:

- Removal of Officer Evaluation Report (OER): DENY, based upon the comments on the applicant's OER being based upon a legally conducted investigation and had a supplemental review completed by the Commanding General finding the OER is complete and correct as written
- Constructive credit to equivalent credit for ILE: DENY, based upon the available evidence showing that Human Resources Command took favorable action on this request previously
- Special Selection Board (SSB): DENY, based upon the available evidence in the record shows the applicant was notified in February 2024 that he was reconsidered for the requested promotion and was not selected, and a lack of evidence showing any error or injustice the Board concluded there was there was insufficient evidence that the reconsideration was improper or conducted in error.

BOARD VOTE:

Mbr 1 Mbr 2 Mbr 3

:	:	:	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
■	■	■	DENY APPLICATION

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The evidence presented does not demonstrate the existence of a probable error or injustice. Therefore, the Board determined the overall merits of this case are insufficient as a basis for correction of the records of the individual concerned.

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. AR 15-185 (ABCMR) prescribes the policies and procedures for correction of military records by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the ABCMR. The ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing or request additional evidence or opinions. Additionally, it states in paragraph 2-11 that applicants do not have a right to a hearing before the ABCMR. The Director or the ABCMR may grant a formal hearing whenever justice requires.

2. AR 600-8-104 (Army Military Human Resources Records (AMHRR) Management), prescribes Army policy and procedure for the creation, utilization, administration, maintenance, and disposition of the AMHRR. Paragraph 3-7 (Authority for filing or removing documents in the AMHRR folders), only documents pertaining to a Soldier's military career will be filed in the AMHRR. Once properly filed in the AMHRR (as defined in table 3 – 1), the document will not be removed from the record unless directed by one of the following:

- Boards of the Army Review Boards Agency such as the Army Board for Correction of Military Records
- Army Discharge Review Board
- DA Suitability Evaluation Board, Army Special Review Board
- Army Physical Dis-ability Appeal Board
- Chief, Appeals and Corrections Section of the Evaluations, Selections, and Promotions Division

The ORC for the following reasons:

- Administrative purposes; this includes but is not limited to deleting or moving mistakenly filed documents
- document was never authorized for filing in the AMHRR
- corrected copy of an already filed document may be added to the record at the discretion of the ORC; however, this does not require the original document be deleted
- Upon end of retention period for non-permanent documents

3. AR 623-3 (Evaluation Reporting System), prescribes the policy for completing evaluation reports and associated support forms that are the basis for the Army's Evaluation Reporting System (ERS).

a. Paragraph 3–15 (DA Form 1059 and DA Form 1059–2), DA Form 1059 and DA Form 1059–2 are used to document the performance, accomplishments, potential, and limitations of students while attending military schools and courses of instruction or training. The reporting official will be responsible for the qualitative and quantitative assessment of students' abilities and the accuracy of the information in the completed DA Form 1059 and DA Form 1059–2 (Senior Service Academic Evaluation Report). In accordance with AR 350–1 and AR 350–10, Army Training Requirements Resource System (ATRRS) is the Army's system of record for training at Army and non-Army schools. All training requirements, schedules, quota assignments, student reservations, enrollment, and completion entries are required to be documented in ATRRS. All Academic Evaluation Report (AER) submissions to Headquarters Department of the Army (HQDA) failing validation against ATRRS may result in a delay and/or failure to process the AER to the Soldiers AMHRR. The reasons for submitting a DA Form 1059 and DA Form 1059-2 will be rendered for course completion, will be submitted after successful completion of a DA Form 1059 producing course. For courses consisting of multiple phases, this type of report will only be completed for a course phase that finalizes the completion of all phase requirements of a multiphase course. Course completion academic reports that signify a military education level advancement must annotate the military education level achieved.

b. Paragraph 4-7g (10), removal of an evaluation report for administrative reasons will be allowed only when circumstances preclude the correction of errors, and then only when retention of the evaluation report would clearly result in an injustice to the Soldier.

c. Paragraph 4-9f, when the board grants an appeal, in whole or in part, resulting in the removal or substantive alteration of an evaluation report that was seen by one or more promotion boards that previously failed to select the appellant, the ASRB will decision whether promotion reconsideration by one or more special boards is justified. The reviewing agency will notify each appellant by memorandum of the appeal decision and promotion reconsideration eligibility, if applicable.

4. AR 350-1 (Army Training and Leader Development), prescribes policies, procedures, and responsibilities for developing, managing, and conducting Army training and leader development.

a. Paragraph 3-20 (Course credit), DCS, G-3/5/7 delegates authority to approve or disapprove all RA/RC Officers requests for constructive and equivalent credit requests for CGSOC and nonresident CGSOC to the Director of Training, G-37/TR. This delegation of authority does not inhibit the DCS, G-3/5/7 from reviewing all decisions. The DCS, G-3/5/7 maintains authority to approve or disapprove all RA/RC Officers requests for constructive and equivalent credit for SSC/MEL 1. Individuals who meet the applicable course prerequisites and are otherwise eligible to attend a course may qualify for the following types of course credit:

(1) Constructive credit may be granted to individuals in lieu of course attendance based on previous leadership experience and/or past academic/training experiences. In all cases TRADOC or the proponent school will assess the individual's past comprehensive military or Civilian experience against established course Terminal Learning Objectives/Learning Objectives. Individuals must possess the same skills and qualifications as course graduates.

(2) Equivalent credit may be granted to individuals in lieu of course attendance based on courses possessing comparable Terminal Learning Objectives/Learning Objectives. Terminal Learning Objective/outcome assessments are performed by TRADOC or the respective proponent school. Individuals must possess the same skills and qualifications as course graduates. Personnel awarded course credit will be considered for promotion, assignment, or other personnel actions on the same basis as graduates of the course concerned.

b. Paragraph 3-26 (Academic evaluation report), Army students completing leader training, education, and development courses will be evaluated in accordance with AR 623-3, using the appropriate academic evaluation report form for Service school, DA Form 1059 (Service School Academic Evaluation Report), or civilian institution, DA Form 1059-1 (Civilian Institution Academic Evaluation Report).

(1) The academic evaluation report provides a qualitative and quantitative assessment of student's abilities. Therefore, input is required from all instructors and evaluators who have had professional contact with the student.

(2) Entries will reflect the student's performance and potential for absorbing higher levels of training, education, and development and performing more complex duties with greater responsibilities. School commandants and commanders will ensure the objectivity and accuracy of academic evaluation report ratings and supporting comments.

(3) Graduates will be provided a copy of their academic evaluation report.

c. Paragraph 3-29 (Officer Education System (OES)), subparagraph j, Army OES complies with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs (CJCS) officer professional military education policy, Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 1800.01E. The CJCS advises and assists the Secretary of Defense in JPME matters, including the Joint curricula at Service schools. Intermediate and senior staff college Army institutions are accredited by the Chairman, JPME programs. Graduates meet the requirements for JPME. Subparagraph g, CJCSI 1800.01E defines CJCS objectives and policies regarding the Army educational institutions that comprise the officer PME and JPME systems. CJCSI 1800.01E also identifies the fundamental responsibilities of the major military educational participants in achieving those objectives. The Army provides officer PME and JPME to eligible armed forces officers students. The Army operates its officer PME system primarily to develop officers with expertise and knowledge appropriate to their grade, branch and occupational specialty. Incorporated throughout PME, officers receive JPME.

d. Paragraph 3-37 (Intermediate level education (ILE)), ILE prepares field grade officers for leadership, staff and technical roles at the battalion level and higher. A standardized common core is followed by branch or functional area credentialing, area of concentration (AOC) or technical follow-on phase. ILE courses include the Army CGSC and WOILE. The Army Command and General Staff College program consists of the CGSOC, CGSOC satellite, and CGSOC non-resident.

e. Paragraph 3-39 (Army Command and General Staff College (CGSC), Army CGSC Program of PME instruction is ILE. ILE educates and trains leaders to conduct Decisive Actions in a unified action environment; and advances the art and science of the profession of arms to support the operational requirements of the Army. The CGSOC consists of a common core curriculum that includes JPME Phase 1 requirements and the required Branch or Functional Area credentialing course. Officers participating in credentialing programs approved in lieu of CGSOC Advanced Operations Course not included in the selection board process will continue to receive ILE credit and be considered by the ILE Selection Board for CGSOC Common Core Satellite attendance only. ILE is attended by all Army officers in the rank of CPT (if promotable) or MAJ who are CCC graduates. Army officers will complete CGSOC by their 15th year of commissioned service and by no later than the 5th year of time in grade rank of MAJ. Army Officers who complete CGSOC common core and an approved credentialing course are JPME I, ILE, and/or MEL 4 complete. The credentialing course for basic branch officers is the CGSOC Advanced Operations Course (AOC) and is completed immediately following the CGSOC Common Core at Fort Leavenworth. The functional area credentialing courses are designated by the proponents. The functional area credentialing courses range from 3 to 179-weeks. For

some functional area and special branch officers, the tailored educational experience will also include advance civil schooling. Army officers may also become JPME I and/or MEL 4 complete through completion of a resident Joint School, or completion of a credentialing program approved in lieu of CGSOC Advanced Operations Course. Subparagraph j, (Course credit), Army officers may request for ILE constructive, equivalent, or operational credit per AR 350-1, paragraph 3-20. The records of ILE graduates are coded by HRC Ft. Knox to reflect PME completion and an award of JPME Phase I / MEL 4 credit.

f. Paragraph 3-69 (Joint Professional Military Education and Training Institutes), Army's accredited JPME institutions are the CGSC (JPME I), the ASLSP (JPME II) and the U.S. Army War College Resident Program (JPME II), Distant Education Program (JPME I and working on JPME II). JPME institutions include National Intelligence University (JPME I).

g. Appendix B-2 (Joint Professional Military Education and Training Institutes),

- National Defense University, consists of the National War College, Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy and College of International Security Affairs (MEL 1 JPMEII)
- Joint Forces Staff College, a part of NDU consists of: the Joint Advanced Warfighting School a SSC equivalent and JPME II qualification; the Joint and Combined Warfighting School, a JPME II qualification; the JCWS-hybrid, a JPME II qualification for RC officers.
- National Intelligence University
- Human Intelligence Training-Joint Center of Excellence
- Joint Counterintelligence Training Academy
- Joint Special Operation University

5. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 1800.01G (Officer Professional Military Education Policy). provides policy guidance for the Professional Military Education (PME) of officers in the Armed Forces of the United States, with particular emphasis on Joint PME (JPME). Appendix B (JPME Programs), e (National Intelligence University (NIU)) NIU is a Federal degree-granting institution authorized by Congress to offer accredited graduate and undergraduate degrees and graduate certificates. While pursuing their graduate degree, select qualified students may also participate in the JPME Studies Program and receive JPME I credit upon graduation.

6. AR 135-155 (Army National Guard and Reserve Promotion of Commissioned Officers and Warrant Officers), prescribes the officer promotions for officers on the Reserve active status list.

a. Paragraph 2-7 (Promotion Eligibility) b (Promotion Selection), commissioned officer must complete the military educational requirement in table 2-1 and paragraph 2-9 no later than the day before the selection board convenes.

b. Paragraph 2-9 (Military Educational Requirement), subparagraph a. for selection to LTC, officers must complete the Intermediate Level Education (ILE) – Common Core course. An ILE equivalent course listed in AR 350-1 in which an officer attended in residence as a military officer as a result of a centralized DA selection board will also meet the military educational requirement for promotion to LTC. Subparagraph b (Equivalent Credit), for promotion consideration only, officer enrolled and actively participating in an authorized resident course or final phase of a non-resident course at the time they are considered for promotion will be deemed military educationally qualified for promotion consideration and selection. Equivalent credit for completion of a lower level course will be awarded by the respective selection board if the officer has either graduated from a resident course that is higher than that required or if at the time the board convenes, the officer is enrolled and satisfactorily participating in a resident course that is higher than that required. Table 2-1 (Time in grade and military educational requirements for officer promotion consideration), for promotion from major to LTC the minimum time in grade is 4-years with a maximum time in grade of 7-years and the minimum military education level is completion of the ILE common core.

c. Paragraph 6-2, Special Selection Boards (SSB) are convened to consider or reconsider commissioned officer on the RASL for promotion when HQDA determines that one or more of the following circumstances exist:

- Administrative error, an officer was not considered by a regularly scheduled board because of administrative error
- Material error, the action of the promotion board was contrary to law in a matter material to the decision of the board or involved material error of fact or administrative error or did not have before its material information for its consideration

d. Paragraph 6-7 (Information provided to the SSB), an SSB will consider the record of the officer as it should have been considered by the original board. The SSB will use the recommended selection criteria established for the regularly constituted promotion board that originally considered the officer.

e. Paragraph 6-8 (Effect of non-selection) for consideration cases, a commissioned officer considered by the SSB and not recommended for promotion has failed selection for promotion. For reconsideration cases, the commissioned officer who was considered but not selected for promotion by a regular selection board incurs no additional failure of selection if not selected by the SSB.

f. Paragraph 6-10 (Effect of selection for promotion), officer selected for promotion by an SSB will as soon as practicable, be appointed to that grade. An officer appointed the next higher grade as a result of the recommendation of the SSB will have the same date of rank, same effective date for pay and allowances and the same seniority as the officer would have had if recommended for promotion by the board which did consider him.

g. Paragraph 6-11 (Cases not considered), an officer will not be considered or reconsidered by the SSB when the following occurs:

- Officer pending removal from promotion list
- Administrative error was immaterial or the officer in exercising reasonable diligence could have discovered and corrected the error in his record, it is the officer's responsibility to review his record before the board convenes and to notify the board in writing of possible administrative deficiencies
- Letters of appreciation, commendation or other commendatory data for awards below the Silver Star are missing
- Promotion selection board did not see a non-mandatory evaluation report submitted to AHRC after the suspense established for the board
- Required promotion selection board did not considered correspondence to the board president delivered after the cutoff date for such correspondence

h. Paragraph 6-13 (Processing requests for SSB promotion reconsideration), officer who discover that a material error existed in their file at the time they were non-selected for promotion may request reconsideration if:

- Record erroneously reflected an officer was ineligible for selection for educational or other reasons, in fact the officer was eligible for selection when the records were submitted
- One or more evaluation reports seen by the board were later deleted from the record
- One or more evaluation reports that should have been seen by the board were missing based on the cut-off date
- Officer's military or civilian educational level as constituted in the officer's records as seen by the board was incorrect

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//