



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE RD
ARLINGTON, VA 22204

██████████
Docket No. 2885-25
Ref: Signature Date

████████████████████
████████████████
██████████████████

Dear Petitioner:

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 26 November 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 7 February 2025 advisory opinion (AO) provided to the PERB by the Manpower Management Performance Branch (MMPB-23) and the 13 March 2025 PERB decision letter. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a rebuttal to the AO, you chose not to do so.

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

The Board carefully considered your request to remove from your record your fitness report for the reporting period of 27 July 2023 to 29 February 2024. The Board considered your contentions that: (1) Your evaluation did not accurately reflect your performance due to both procedural omissions and system challenges within your command that were beyond your control, (2) Your Reporting Senior (RS) admitted the challenges you identified in a PowerPoint presentation to the command, including the challenges of a steep learning curve resulting from the nuanced structure, policies, and processes of the command, uneven work distribution among civilian and active duty workers, little concern for fitness report writing knowledge or profile depth, heavily restrained employment opportunities for spouses, and insufficient concern from

MOS monitors for gauging Marine family situations, career paths, or long-term plans prior to assignment at the command, (3) Your RS implied, through the PowerPoint presentation, that the command did not foster an environment conducive to career development, growth, or the achievement of broader Marine Corps objectives/goal of developing field-grade officers into leaders who can handle significant responsibilities and be prepared for promotion, (4) Your RS decision to assign you to a new billet as Deputy Branch Head, where your tasks were primarily provided by a civilian Branch Head, added to the problem, resulting in you being excluded from meaningful responsibilities and a lack of developmental opportunities, (5) That relying on a civilian branch head perpetuates the underutilization of the 3002 Major and reinforces the challenges that have hindered career growth and development, while directly contradicting the goal of creating a fair evaluation environment where Marines can grow in leadership roles and meet promotion criteria.

The Board, however, substantially concurred with the PERB's decision, in its entirety, finding that you did not meet the burden of proof, or show by preponderance of evidence, probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting removal of your fitness report. Specifically, the Board concurred with the PERB that insufficient evidence exists to invalidate your RS's evaluation of your performance. The Board determined that, although you contend your RS acknowledged issues that led to discrepancies in your report, you provided no valid evidence of such. Further, although you offered the PowerPoint presentation as proof, the Board noted there is no evidence showing that your RS authored the PowerPoint presentation. Rather, the Board noted that another name appears on the byline. Additionally, regardless of who authored it, your assumption that it implied the command was not fostering an environment conducive to career development, etc., is speculation and not dispositive to the issue of whether your fitness report is valid. Regarding your contention that the civilian Branch Head, under whom you served as deputy, lacked sufficient data to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of your leadership, innovation, and project management skills, your initial counseling worksheet made clear your RS remained military and you did not report directly to the civilian Branch Head. Regarding your contention the RS could not observe you due to proximity, the Board concurred with the PERB that co-location is not required for observation sufficient to evaluate performance. The Board further found that your RS's comments in the fitness report appear well-informed with no adverse information noted. For the above reasons, the Board, in concurrence with the AO, found insufficient evidence of error or injustice to warrant removal of the fitness report in question. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined that your request does not merit relief.

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,

12/10/2025

[REDACTED]

Executive Director

Signed by: [REDACTED]