



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

[REDACTED]
Docket No. 1029-25
Ref: Signature Date

From: Chairman, Board for Correction of Naval Records
To: Secretary of the Navy

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED]
XXX XX [REDACTED] USMC

Ref: (a) 10 U.S.C. § 1552

Encl: (1) DD Form 149
(2) Fitness Report for the reporting period 1 July 2022 to 9 June 2023
(3) Petitioner's 1510 RDC Memo, subj: Request for Administrative Correction to Fitness Report for the Occasion (TD) and Period (20220701) to (20230609) ICO [Petitioner], 9 March 2024
(4) CMC 1610 MMPB-21D/PERB Memo, subj: Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) Decision ICO [Petitioner], 14 January 2025
(5) MMPB-23 1610 MMPB-23 Memo, subj: Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) Advisory Opinion ICO [Petitioner], 2 August 2024

1. Pursuant to the provisions of reference (a), Subject, hereinafter referred to as Petitioner, filed enclosure (1) with the Board for Correction of Naval Records, hereinafter referred to as the Board, requesting modification of the fitness report (FITREP) at enclosure (2).

2. The Board, consisting of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 11 June 2025, and pursuant to its regulations, determined the corrective action indicated below should be taken on the available evidence of record. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of the enclosures, relevant portions of Petitioner's naval records, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies.

3. Having reviewed all of the evidence of record pertaining to Petitioner's allegations of error or injustice, the Board found as follows:

a. Before applying to this Board, Petitioner exhausted all administrative remedies available under existing law and regulations within the Department of the Navy.

b. Petitioner was issued the To Duty (TD) FITREP at enclosure (2) for the reporting period 1 July 2022 to 9 June 2023 for his duty assignment of "Future Force Management Planner." The report constituted the fifth of five total reports written on grade by the Reporting Senior (RS) at processing, and the report average of 5.38 generated a cumulative relative value of 86.11 based on the "E" and "F" attribute markings. The FITREP also constituted the seventh report reviewed on grade by the Reviewing Officer (RO) at processing.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED]
XXX XX [REDACTED] USMC

c. Petitioner contends that “due to an administrative oversight by the [RS] while completing the original report,” three attribute markings should be increased from “E” to “F”: (1) Section D (Mission Accomplishment), Item 2 (Proficiency); (2) Section F (Leadership), Item 2 (Developing Subordinates); and (3) Section G (Intellect and Wisdom), Item 2 (Decision Making Ability). As an endorsement to Petitioner’s request at enclosure (3), the RS concurred and offered the following explanation as summarized below:

1) Section D (Mission Accomplishment), Item 2 (Proficiency): Petitioner was tasked to deal with “Service Level Problems – more specifically those issues dealing with the Service issues for retention and employment of 0372s and 0370x, SOF interoperability and employment with the MEUs, and the never-ending issue of Amphibious Ship Readiness.” The RS further noted Petitioner was “PP&O’s ‘point Marine’ for those issues at the Field Grade level below the executive level” and his “findings and results were consistently reported to the Deputy Commandant, Plans, Policies, and Operations (PP&O) – a direct impact to the Corps’ manpower and funding, directly influencing CMC’s decision making.”

2) Section F (Leadership), Item 2 (Developing Subordinates): Petitioner, with a limited number of Marines, made time weekly for “discussions on how to improve the G35,” and “his actions were instrumental in improving the G35 and the flow of information to DC, PP&O.”

3) Section G (Intellect and Wisdom), Item 2 (Decision Making Ability): Petitioner “dealt with Service Level issues that required not only fact finding, but a mental outlook of 7 to 10 years – this is an attribute of a Marine Officer that has true intellect and wisdom.” Further, the RS explains that the issues Petitioner “dealt with were those that will see outcomes in the 2030s” and his “outlook and foresight [was] well above the average Major and one that must be exploited.”

d. On 14 January 2025, the Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) considered Petitioner’s application at enclosure (1). The PERB considered the Advisory Opinion (AO) at enclosure (4) provided by Headquarters Marine Corps (MMPB 23) on 2 August 2024, and denied Petitioner’s request to modify the contested report. Although the AO starts by stating Petitioner’s “request should be approved,” after the analysis and summary of the facts, the AO concludes by recommending disapproval because the “modification would cause negative repercussions to 80% of peers in the profile.” Specifically, in keeping with the Performance Evaluation System Manual, the AO noted the PERB may approve a revised assessment “based entirely on facts about the Marine that were unknown when the original report was prepared.” Further, the AO stated, “the perceived competitiveness of a report’s relative value or comparative assessment mark is not a basis for removing or modifying a report.” The PERB’s decision letter specifically notified Petitioner of his opportunity to comment on the PERB report, but Petitioner did not avail himself of the opportunity. Enclosures (4) and (5).

CONCLUSION

Upon review and consideration of all the evidence, the Board determined Petitioner’s request warrants relief. The Board, stating the RS has an obligation to grade the individual because a FITREP is about a Marine’s individual performance and opining it is rare for a RS to change his

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED]
XXX XX [REDACTED] USMC

grading, relied on the RS's decision to maintain his dynamic profile by increasing the three stated attribute markings despite the negative repercussions noted by the MMPB-23 AO. The Board discounted the absence of a RO endorsement by interpreting the RO's evaluation that placed Petitioner as "one of the few exceptionally qualified Marines" as an indication the RO viewed Petitioner's performance as deserving "top tier" vice "bottom third" in the RS's evaluation of his performance.

Based on the available evidence, the Board concluded the FITREP is in error and, noting it is reasonable to believe the RS's attribute markings/comments, determined there is sufficient evidence of an error/injustice warranting Petitioner's requested modification of the contested report.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the above, the Board recommends the following corrective action.

Petitioner's naval record be corrected by modifying the TD FITREP for the reporting period 1 July 2022 to 9 June 2023 at enclosure (2) to reflect the markings and comments captured in the RS's endorsement at enclosure (3).

That any material or entries inconsistent with or relating to the Board's recommendation be corrected, removed, or completely expunged from Petitioner's record, and that no such entries or material be added to the record in the future. This includes, but is not limited to, all information systems or database entries that reference or discuss the expunged material.

4. It is certified that a quorum was present at the Board's review and deliberations, and that the foregoing is a true and complete record of the Board's proceedings in the above entitled matter.

5. Pursuant to the delegation of authority set out in Section 6(e) of the revised Procedures of the Board for Correction of Naval Records (32 Code of Federal Regulation, Section 723.6(e)) and having assured compliance with its provisions, it is hereby announced that the foregoing corrective action, taken under the authority of reference (a), has been approved by the Board on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy.

6/26/2025

