## DOD IG Hotline Completion Report

1. GENERAL. Format per DoDI 7050.07

2 a/b. DoD Hotline Case Number Referral 20200917-067070-CASE-01 and 20200910-066947-CASE-01 (Priority 3)

## c. Allegation/Issue:)

| 1. | Name, rank, and organization of subject(s). SMSgt Sam | uel J | . Matthews | (Sacramento |
|----|---|-------|------------|-------------|
|    | MEPS) and (h)(6)                                      |       |            |             |

- 2. <u>Description of the violation</u>. The two asked DoD IG to investigate the matter of the USMEPCOM Air Force Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) and Stratification Process (aka, Enlisted Force Development Panel or EFDP)
- 3. When. Violation occurred 4 Sep and 16 Sep 20
- 4. Where. Occurred over telecon due to COVID Travel Restrictions
- 5. Regulation violated: AF Instruction 36-2406, Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems
- 6. Findings. Not substantiated Analysis. During the 2019 EFDP process, USMEPCOM had three Lt Cols execute the panel with (b)(6) helping prepare the initial packages. After the board, the recommendations were sent to the USMEPCOM Commander, COL Richard Brady for final Senior Rater Endorsement and Stratification decision. Although the EFDP process changed slightly in 2020 from previous years to more of an Enlisted focus with (b)(6) having a greater influence over the Commander recommendations and (b)(6) and (b)(6) supporting, it remains a seemingly solid Air Force Instruction centered fair process. The 2020 process in question had some mistakes during execution by leaving the decoration narratives out of all packages during the Panel (as required by the AFI.) This was identified shortly after the Panel on 4 Sep 20, rectified by adding them back into the complete packages, and fully reviewed on 16 Sep 20 again by the same Panel Members. All Panel Members interviewed admitted it could have been a different outcome following the second Panel, but the SMSgt who ultimately received Senior Rater Endorsement ended up being the clear #1 during both panels.

Personnel Interviewed:

| Col Brady | y (USMEPCOM Commander)                     |
|-----------|--|
| (b)(6)    |  |
| (-/(-/    |  |
|           |  |
| (b)(G)    | and SMSgt Matthews (Hotline Complainants)  |
| (b)(6)    | and Swisgi Matthews (Hottine Complaniants) |
| (b)(6)    |  |

- 7. <u>Corrective Actions</u>: No disciplinary actions are recommended to be taken. To ensure the process is transparent and by the AFI, recommend four procedural changes taken:
  - 1. Have a recorder present with the AFI available to ensure all processes are by the Instruction.

- 2. Have both Commander and Senior Enlisted expectations (if additional to the AFI) published prior to the EFDP.
- 3. As appropriate, provide timely and transparent feedback to all eligibles at the conclusion of the board so each eligible knows what they need to do to improve for subsequent boards.
- 4. Ensure all eligibles understand what the AF Advisor's (in this case Lt Col role is and how that is different from the AF SEA.

| Security Clearance Actions. N                           | None recommended   |
|---|--|
| Location of report of inquiry.                          | Included in email correspondence and maintained with the DoD   |
| Investigating officer(s) identi                         | fication data:   |
| (b)(6)  |  |
| Statement: I certify that I con<br>Instruction 7050.01. | nplied with the Quality Standards for Hotline Inquiries in DoD |
| 0)(6)   |  |
|   |  |
|   |  |

DOD Hotline Coordinator. 6), (b)(7)(C) per DOD OIG, 703-699-(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) per DOD OIG

Information Security requirements. For Official Use

## DOD IG Hotline Completion Report

1. GENERAL. Format per DoDI 7050.07

2 a/b. DoD Hotline Case Number Referral 20200917-067070-CASE-01, 20200910-066947-CASE-01 (Priority 3) and Component Case Number UPR006188-20

c. Allegation/Issue:)

(b)(6)

- Name, rank, and organization of subject(s). COL Richard T. Brady, United States Military Entrance Processing Command
- Description of the violation. The two asked DoD IG to investigate the matter of the USMEPCOM Air Force Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) and Stratification Process (aka, Enlisted Force Development Panel or EFDP)
- 3. When. Violation occurred 4 Sep and 16 Sep 20
- 4. Where. Occurred over telecon due to COVID Travel Restrictions
- 5. Regulation violated: AF Instruction 36-2406, Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems
- 6. Findings. Not substantiated Analysis. During the 2019 EFDP process, USMEPCOM had three Lt Cols execute the panel helping prepare the initial packages. After the with (b)(6) board, the recommendations were sent to the USMEPCOM Commander, COL Richard Brady for final Senior Rater Endorsement and Stratification decision. Although the EFDP process changed slightly in 2020 from previous years to more of an Enlisted focus with having a greater influence over the Commander recommendations and (b)(6) (b)(6)supporting, it remains a seemingly solid Air Force Instruction (b)(6)centered fair process. The 2020 process in question had some mistakes during execution by leaving the decoration narratives out of all packages during the Panel (as required by the AFI.) This was identified shortly after the Panel on 4 Sep 20, rectified by adding them back into the complete packages, and fully reviewed on 16 Sep 20 again by the same Panel Members. All Panel Members interviewed admitted it could have been a different outcome following the second Panel, but the SMSgt who ultimately received Senior Rater Endorsement ended up being the clear #1 during both panels. Personnel Interviewed: Col Brady (USMEPCOM Commander) (b)(6)
- 7. <u>Corrective Actions</u>: No disciplinary actions are recommended to be taken. To ensure the process is transparent and by the AFI, recommend four procedural changes taken:

and SMSgt Matthews (Hotline Complainants)

 Have a recorder present with the AFI available to ensure all processes are by the Instruction.

## DOD IG Hotline Completion Report

- Have both Commander and Senior Enlisted expectations (if additional to the AFI) published prior to the EFDP.
- As appropriate, provide timely and transparent feedback to all eligibles at the conclusion of the board so each eligible knows what they need to do to improve for subsequent boards.
- 4. Ensure all eligibles understand what the AF Advisor's (in this case Lt Col (b)(6) role is and how that is different from the AF SEA.

| Security Clearance Actions | . None recommended |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
|----------------------------|--------------------|

| Location of report of inquiry. Pentagon, | Room (b)(6) | (OSD P&R/MPP/AP) |
|--|-------------|------------------|
|  |             |                  |

| Investigating officer(s) identification data: |  |
|---|--|
| (b)(6)  |  |
| V. XX. X                                      |  |
|   |  |

Statement: I certify that I complied with the Quality Standards for Hotline Inquiries in DoD Instruction 7050.01.

| (b)(6) |  |  |  |
|--------|--|--|--|
|        |  |  |  |
|        |  |  |  |
|        |  |  |  |
|        |  |  |  |
|        |  |  |  |

DOD Hotline Coordinator.

(b)(6)

Information Security requirements. For Official Use Only