



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

██████████
Docket No. 994-25
Ref: Signature Date

██████████
██████████
██████████

Dear ██████████,

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Section 1552 of Title 10, United States Code. After careful and conscientious consideration of relevant portions of your naval record and your application, the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board) found the evidence submitted insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. Consequently, your application has been denied.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 15 April 2025. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, relevant portions of your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, as well as the 14 January 2025 decision furnished by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB), and 2 October 2024 advisory opinion (AO) provided to the PERB by the Manpower Management Division Records and Performance Branch, and your rebuttal dated 31 March 2025.

You request the Board to remove a fitness report from your record, covering the period 12 June 2021 to 1 July 2022. You contend that the reporting senior (RS) did not document an 84-day period of non-availability in Section I comments. The Board noted the PERB agreed that this was in error, and directed modification by adding a comment in Section I, "Directed Comment: RS period of non-availability from 20220409-20220701 due to participation in the Skillbridge Program and terminal leave." The Board concurred with the AO that it did not impact the RS's ability to meet minimum observation requirements as the RS had 301 days of observation during the reporting period.

You also contend the end date of the report was incorrectly altered from the original date resulting in the omission of the required Annual Report. However, the Board concurred with the AO that the Performance Evaluation System (PES) Manual permits the omission of the Annual Report if it is known that another reporting occasion will occur within 30 days, and there was evidence that both you the reporting senior (RS) were aware.

You further argue that the report was unjust because of negative bias due to the results of the Defense Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS) and that the Reviewing Officer (RO) used the report as a counseling tool in conjunction with the DEOCS debrief. You contend the RO admitted that the DEOCS results influenced his decision not to recommend you for command on the report. The Board, however, noted the report was not adverse, does not reference the DEOCS results, and does not imply any lack of capability or substandard performance. The Board thus concluded there was insufficient evidence to show an unfair evaluation. In this connection, the Board substantially concurred with the comments contained in the aforementioned AO and determined the fitness report is valid and shall remain in your official military personnel file.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new matters, which will require you to complete and submit a new DD Form 149. New matters are those not previously presented to or considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

4/26/2025

