Audit Report

ALLEGATIONS ON THE AIR FORCE
PROMOTION PROCESS FOR OFFICERS WORKING
ON SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAMS

Report No. D-2000-076 February 16, 2000

Office of the Inspector General
Department of Defense

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this audit report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Audit Followup and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or fax (703) 604-8932 or visit the Inspector General, DoD Home Page at: www.dodig.osd.mil.

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Audit Followup and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8940 (DSN 664-8940) or fax (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General, Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, VA 22202-2884

Defense Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to Hotline@dodig.osd.mil; or by writing to the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronym

AFBCMR	Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884

February 16, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Allegations on the Air Force Promotion Process for Officers Working on Special Access Programs (Report No. D-2000-076)

We are providing this draft report for your information and use. This audit was performed in response to a DoD Hotline referral claiming that Air Force officers working on special access and other highly classified programs are at a disadvantage during the promotion process because their performance reports cannot include classified information. We considered management comments on a draft of this report when preparing the final report.

The Air Force Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel comments conformed to the requirements of DoD Directive 7650.3; therefore, additional comments are not required.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. For additional information on this report, please contact Mr. Robert K. West at (703) 604-8983 (DSN 664-8983) (rwest@dodig.osd.mil) or Mr. James B. Mitchell at (703) 604-8918 (DSN 664-8918) (jmitchell@dodig.osd.mil). See Appendix E for the report distribution. The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

Robert J. Lieberman
Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. D-2000-076 **February 16, 2000**
(Project No. 9AD-8010)

Allegations on the Air Force Promotion Process for Officers Working on Special Access Programs

Executive Summary

Introduction. This audit was performed in response to a DoD Hotline referral. The overall allegation was that Air Force officers working on special access and other highly classified programs were at a disadvantage during the promotion process because their performance reports could not include classified information. In addition to the overall allegation, the referral also included seven specific allegations. Each specific allegation is summarized and responded to in Appendix C.

Air Force officers are initially considered for promotion to the grades of captain through major general by Central Selection Boards, which select officers based on their potential to successfully serve in the next higher grade and in positions of greater responsibility. Factors considered include the officer's job performance, leadership, professional qualities, depth and breadth of experience, job responsibility, education, and specific achievements. Officers may appeal to correct or remove performance reports through either the Air Force Personnel Center or the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records. The corrected records of officers who had met a board and who were subsequently nonselected are usually sent to the Special Selection Board for supplemental consideration. However, in rare cases, the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records may recommend that an officer be promoted directly instead of sending his corrected record to the Special Selection Board. This situation usually occurs when several performance reports have been removed and, as a result, the officer cannot receive fair consideration from the Special Selection Board. Since March 1985, the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records has also made five direct promotion recommendations where the applicants claimed that, due to the classified nature of their jobs, the Central Selection Boards did not receive complete and accurate information on their duties and accomplishments. See Appendix B for a discussion of those five cases.

Objectives. Our objective was to determine whether Air Force officers working in special access programs were at a disadvantage during the promotion process and to evaluate seven specific allegations. We did not review the management control program because the scope of the audit was limited to the hotline allegations. See Appendix A for discussion of the audit process.

Results. The overall allegation that Air Force officers working on special access and other highly classified programs were at a disadvantage during the promotion process

because their performance reports could not include classified information was not substantiated. Based on the procedures and criteria that the promotion boards use to evaluate records and select officers, omitting classified information from officers' performance reports did not significantly affect their chance of being promoted. A full discussion of promotion board procedures and criteria is provided in the Finding section of this report. In addition, officers working on special access programs were promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate from 1997 through 1999. See Appendix D for a full discussion of these promotion rates.

Six of the seven specific allegations were unsubstantiated. The allegation that the Air Force holds special classified promotion review boards to review the classified accomplishments of Air Force officers was partially substantiated. Each specific allegation is summarized and responded to in Appendix C.

Management Comments. The Air Force Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel concurred with the finding and recommended four technical corrections to the final report. The complete text of the management comments is in the Management Comments section of this report.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Introduction

Background 1
Objectives 2

Finding

Direct Promotion of Officers Working on Special Access Programs 3

Appendixes

A. Audit Process
Scope 6
Methodology 6
Management Control Program 7
Prior Coverage 7
B. Other Matters of Interest 8
C. Summary of Allegations and Audit Results 10
D. Promotion Rates of Officers Working in Special Access Programs 13
E. Report Distribution 15

Management Comments 17

This audit was performed in response to a DoD Hotline referral. The overall allegation was that Air Force officers working on special access and other highly classified programs were at a disadvantage during the promotion process because their performance reports could not include classified information. In addition to the overall allegation, the referral also included seven specific allegations. Each specific allegation is summarized and responded to in Appendix C.

Background

Central Selection Boards. Central Selection Boards are convened under the authority of the Secretary of the Air Force to consider officers for promotion to the grades of captain through major general. Board membership consists of at least five or more officers who are senior in grade to the eligible officers.

Appeals Process. Officers may appeal to correct or remove performance reports through either the Air Force Personnel Center or the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR). Applicants should clearly and concisely state how they want their performance reports changed and provide evidence to support the requested changes. Applicants must offer clear evidence that the original performance reports were unjust or wrong. The corrected records of the officers who had met a board and who were subsequently nonselected are usually sent to the Special Selection Board for supplemental consideration. However, in rare cases, the AFBCMR may recommend that an officer be promoted directly instead of sending his corrected record to the Special Selection Board. This situation usually occurs when several performance reports have been removed, and as a result, the officer cannot receive fair consideration from the Special Selection Board. Since March 1985, the AFBCMR had also made five direct promotion recommendations where the applicants claimed that, due to the classified nature of their jobs, the Central Selection Boards did not receive complete and accurate information on their duties and accomplishments. See Appendix B for a discussion of these five AFBCMR cases.

Special Selection Boards. The Air Force Personnel Center conducts Special Selection Boards to consider officers who did not meet, or were improperly considered by, one or more Central Selection Boards. The Special Selection Boards consider records that were corrected by the Air Force Personnel Center or the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records. To the maximum extent possible, the Special Selection Boards use the same procedures and criteria as the Central Selection Boards to determine whether to promote the applicant. After being considered by the Special Selection Board, applicants cannot resubmit an appeal unless they have substantial new evidence.

Objectives

The audit objective was to determine whether Air Force officers working in special access programs were at a disadvantage during the promotion process and to evaluate seven specific allegations. We did not review the management control program because the scope of the audit was limited to the Hotline allegations. See Appendix A for a discussion of the audit process. See Appendix B for a discussion of other matters of interest pertinent to our review but not directly related to the overall objective. See Appendix C for a discussion of each allegation submitted to the DoD Hotline.

Results of the Overall Allegation

The overall allegation that Air Force officers working on special access and other highly classified programs were at a disadvantage during the promotion process because their performance reports could not include classified information was not substantiated. Based on the procedures and criteria that the promotion boards use to evaluate records and select officers, omitting classified information from officers' performance reports did not significantly affect their chance of being promoted. In addition, officers working on special access programs have been promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate from 1997 through 1999.

Documents Considered By Promotion Boards

The Central Selection Boards and the Special Selection Boards receive an Officer Selection Record for each officer meeting the board. The Officer Selection Record includes an Officer Selection Brief, the Promotion Recommendation Form, Officer Performance Reports, and Training Reports. The Officer Selection Record may also include Letters of Evaluation, disciplinary actions, Professional Military Education deferment letters, board certifications, and awards, and any written communication from the individual officer to the board that the officer considers important to his or her case. However, the two most important documents in the Officer Selection Record are the Promotion Recommendation Form and the Officer Performance Reports.

Promotion Recommendation Form. The senior rater completes the Promotion Recommendation Form. It describes the officer's performance-based potential and provides a message to the Central Selection Board about the officer's fitness for promotion, which are based on the senior rater's perspective. The senior rater must also choose one of the following three overall promotion recommendations for the officer.

- A "Definitely Promote" recommendation says that the strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential alone warrants promotion. The number of "Definitely Promote" recommendations that a senior rater may give is limited to a percentage of their eligible officers in the same grade and promotion zone. Management Level Reviews award "definitely promote" recommendations among officers aggregated from units with less than the minimum group size needed for senior raters to award a "definitely promote" recommendation.

- A "Promote" recommendation says that the ratee is qualified for promotion.

- A "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation says that the ratee does not warrant promotion on the Central Selection Board for which the Promotion Recommendation Form is being prepared.

Officer Performance Reports. An Officer Performance Report describes the quality of the officer's performance and the merit of work performed. The performance report assesses and documents what the officer did, how well he or she did it, and the officer's potential based on that performance. The Officer Performance Report for officers who work on highly classified programs should provide an unclassified assessment of the classified duties performed by the officer.

Promotion Board Procedures and Criteria

Air Force Pamphlet 36-2506, "You and Your Promotions - The Air Force Officer Promotion Program," September 1, 1997, states that the promotion boards select officers based on their potential to successfully serve in the next higher grade and in positions of greater responsibility. Promotion boards consider factors such as the officer's job performance, leadership, professional qualities, depth and breadth of experience, job responsibility, education, and specific achievements. The Promotion Recommendation Form and the Officer Performance Reports have the biggest impact on whether the officer is promoted. Officers who receive a "definitely promote" recommendation have a high probability of being promoted. Strong performance reports are essential for officers receiving a "promote" recommendation. In reviewing performance reports, the promotion boards look for the quality of the officer's performance and the merit of work performed, rather than for specifics about the program on which the officer worked. The two most important sections of the Officer Performance Report are the rater overall assessment and the additional rater overall assessment because they discuss the quality of the officer's performance and performance-based potential compared to other officers in the same grade. These sections also contain job and professional military education recommendations if warranted.

Each Officer Selection Record is scored from six to ten in half point increments. The Boards conduct trial runs using records from prior promotion boards to practice scoring and to familiarize board members with the selection records and situations they may encounter. Although there is no requirement for absolute uniformity of scores, these trial runs ensure that all board members have a similar scoring baseline. The Central Selection Boards score each record and fill the available promotion slots based on the scored records. The Special Selection Boards score the appealing officer's corrected record and the ten benchmark records[1] from the original Central Selection Board. The benchmark records and the appealing officer's records are not identified to the board members. To be promoted, the appealing officer's score must be higher than all five nonselected officers and must be equal to or greater than at least one of the five selected officers.

[1]Benchmark records are the records of the five selected officers and five nonselected officers surrounding the point at which the best qualified quota was exhausted by a particular Central Selection Board.

Promotion Rates of Officers Working on Special Access Programs

An analysis of the promotion rates for officers working in special access programs indicates that those officers are not at a disadvantage during the promotion process. Officers working on special access programs were promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate from 1997 through 1999. The following table shows the 3-year promotion average for each rank. See Appendix D for a discussion of the methodology, analysis limitations, and promotion rates for each year.

Air Force Promotion Rates from 1997 through 1999

	Major			Lieutenant Colonel			Colonel		
Special Access	Eligible	Selected	%	Eligible	Selected	%	Eligible	Selected	%
No	7016	5798	82.6	5195	3292	63.4	2557	1058	41.4
Yes	296	276	93.2	241	160	66.4	89	40	44.9
Average	7312	6074	83.1	5436	3452	63.5	2646	1098	41.5

Conclusion

After reviewing the promotion boards' procedures and criteria, we do not believe, in general, that Air Force officers who work on special access or other highly classified programs were at a disadvantage in the promotion process. Air Force officers are promoted based on their potential to successfully serve in the next higher grade and in positions of greater responsibility. Promotion boards consider factors such as the officer's job performance, leadership, professional qualities, depth and breadth of experience, job responsibility, education, and specific achievements. The promotion boards look for the quality of the officer's performance and the merit of work performed rather than specifics about the program on which the officer worked. In addition, officers working on special access programs were promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate from 1997 through 1999.

Appendix A. Audit Process

Scope

Work Performed. We interviewed officials from the Air Force Personnel Center, the AFBCMR, and the Security and Special Programs Directorate within the Air Force Office of the Administrative Assistant. We reviewed Air Force instructions, pamphlets, and training guides pertaining to the Air Force promotion process, including procedures for conducting promotion boards, submitting appeals, and correcting records. We obtained and reviewed promotion rates provided by the Air Force Personnel Center for promotion to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel from 1997 through 1999. We also reviewed case files for seven AFBCMR cases held between March 1985 and August 1998 and met with two AFBCMR members who served on several of those cases.

Limitations to Audit Scope. The scope of the audit was limited in that we did not review the management control program.

DoD-Wide Corporate-Level Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) Goals. In response to the GPRA, the Department of Defense has established 2 DoD-wide goals and 7 subordinate goals. This report pertains to achievement of the following goals and subordinate performance goals:

DoD Corporate-Level Goal 2: Prepare now for an uncertain future by pursuing a focused modernization effort that maintains U.S. qualitative superiority in key warfighting capabilities. Transform the force by exploiting the Revoltion in Military Affairs, and reengineer the Department to achieve a 21st century infrastructure. **Subordinate Performance Goal 2.1:** Recruit, retain, and develop personnel to maintain a highly skilled and motivated force capable of meeting tomorrow's challenges. **(00-DoD-2.1)**

General Accounting Office High-Risk Area. The General Accounting Office has identified several high-risk areas in the DoD. This report provides coverage of the Military Personnel Management high risk area.

Methodology

Use of Computer-Processed Data. We relied on computer-processed data in our analysis of promotion rates without performing tests of system general and application controls to confirm the reliability of the data. We did not establish reliability of the data because the analysis involved minimal computer processing and we did not use the data as the primary support for conclusions in the report. We relied primarily on our review of the procedures used by the promotion boards to select officers for promotion. We used the computer-processed data as an additional support and to determine whether a more

detailed analysis of the promotion rates was warranted. Not establishing the reliability of the database did not materially affect the results of the audit.

Audit Type, Dates, and Standards. We performed this economy and efficiency audit from July 1999 through November 1999, in accordance with auditing standards that the Comptroller General of the United States issued, as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. However, we made an exception to the auditing standards by not assessing the reliability of computer-processed data used in our analysis of promotion rates.

Contacts During the Audit. We visited or contacted individuals and organizations within DoD. Further details are available on request.

Management Control Program

We did not review the management control program because the scope of the audit was limited to the hotline allegations.

Prior Coverage

No prior coverage had been conducted on the subject during the last 5 years.

Appendix B. Other Matters of Interest

Since March 1985, the AFBCMR had recommended directly promoting five officers after concluding that those officers were unable to fairly compete for promotion because their performance reports could not include their classified duties and accomplishments. These direct promotion recommendations were based on the professional judgment of AFBCMR members as opposed to the procedures and criteria that the promotion boards used to promote all other Air Force officers.

Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records. Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552, governs the correction of military records. This statute authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to correct any military record when it is "necessary to correct an error or injustice." The purpose of the statute was to relieve the Congress from consideration of private bills to correct errors or injustices in military records. The statute provides for the Secretary of the Air Force to act through a board of Air Force civilians in considering applications for correction of military records. The Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records is the highest level of administrative review within the Department of the Air Force.

Appeals from Officers Working on Special Access Programs. The Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records identified seven promotion cases involving Air Force officers working on special access and other highly classified programs since March 1985. The applicants in those seven cases claimed, in general, that because of the classified nature of their jobs, the Central Selection Boards did not receive complete and accurate information on applicants' duties and accomplishments.

AFBCMR Recommendations and Conclusions. Five of the seven applicants were subsequently promoted, all to the rank of colonel. After weighing the contents of the applicants' performance reports against the true nature of their assignments and accomplishments, the AFBCMR concluded in those five cases that the applicants had been denied an opportunity to fairly compete for promotion.

Comparison of Procedures and Criteria Used By the Promotion Boards and the AFBCMR. The promotion boards use scoring criteria and trial runs to score records consistently and select officers in a competitive environment. For the seven cases reviewed, the AFBCMR relied solely on the professional judgment of the board members to determine whether the evidence provided by the applicants warranted a direct promotion recommendation. The AFBCMR board members did not score the applicants' records or compare the applicants' records with the records of other officers.

Points to Consider While Reviewing Future Appeals. The AFBCMR has the authority to broadly interpret an injustice requiring remedial action, and our intent is not to second-guess the AFBCMR on its recommendations in those five cases. However, our review of the promotion boards' procedures and criteria did not reveal that omitting classified information from officers' performance reports significantly affected their chance of being promoted. In addition, the quality of the records competing for promotion was extremely high and the quota was limited. Those decisions would best be made in the competitive environment of the promotion boards rather than by the AFBCMR. Furthermore, other officers performing equally sensitive, classified duties competed for promotion without special consideration from the AFBCMR. Those officers, in general, were promoted above the Air Force average promotion rate during the last 3 years. We are providing this information for the AFBCMR to consider while it reviews future appeals of this type; however, because there have been no direct promotion recommendations since January 1993, we do not believe that the audit warranted recommendations.

Appendix C. Summary of Allegations and Audit Results

A full discussion of the overall allegation is provided in the Finding section of this report. Audit results to the seven specific allegations follow.

Allegation 1. The Air Force did away with classified performance reports, unlike the Army which still uses classified performance reports.

Audit Results. The allegation was unsubstantiated. Although the Army used a separate personnel system and classified performance reports for officers in the classified arena, the Air Force had never used classified performance reports. The Army used a separate personnel system because many officers spend their entire careers in the classified arena. Air Force officers do not usually spend their entire careers in the classified arena. The Air Force did not need a separate personnel system because omitting classified information from officers' performance reports did not significantly affect their chance of being promoted. A full discussion of promotion board procedures and criteria is provided in the Finding section of this report. In addition, officers working on special access programs were promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate from 1997 through 1999. See Appendix D for a full discussion of the promotion rates.

Allegation 2. Air Force officers whose careers have been spent immersed in special access and other sensitive programs cannot receive fair consideration because their performance reports end up intentionally "vanilla."

Audit Results. The allegation was unsubstantiated. The promotion boards review performance reports to determine the quality of the officer's performance and the merit of work performed rather than specifics about the program on which the officer worked. A full discussion of promotion board procedures and criteria is provided in the Finding section of this report. In addition, officers working on special access programs were promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate from 1997 through 1999. See Appendix D for a full discussion of the promotion rates.

Allegation 3. No Air Force officer ever assigned as commander of Detachment 701 (the old HQ AFOSI Detachment 1) or Region 7 of the Office of Special Investigations has ever been promoted above the rank of major.

Audit Results. The allegation was unsubstantiated. The Commander of Region 7 was a colonel. We were unable to determine the validity of the claim that no Air Force officer assigned as commander of Detachment 701 had been promoted above the rank of major because the Office of Special Investigations was restructured several years ago. As of December 1999, only a Technical Sergeant and a GS-7 civilian were assigned to Detachment 701.

Allegation 4. The Air Force holds special classified promotion review boards to review the classified accomplishments of an Air Force officer's career which have not been made available to all Air Force officers who have spent many years working on special access programs.

Audit Results. The allegation was partially substantiated. There are no special classified promotion review boards that are specifically for Air Force officers working on special access and other highly classified programs. However, several Air Force officers who worked on special access and other highly classified programs appealed to the AFBCMR, which reviews all types of cases and is available to all Air Force officers. See Appendix B for a discussion of those cases.

Allegation 5. The AFBCMR inappropriately concluded that altered duty titles and duty locations on an Air Force officer's performance reports would not affect the fairness with which the records were reviewed.

Audit Results. The allegation was unsubstantiated. Based on the procedures and criteria that the Air Force promotion boards use to evaluate records and select officers, omitting classified information, such as actual duty titles and duty locations, from an officer's performance reports did not significantly affect the officer's chance of being promoted. The promotion boards review performance reports to determine the quality of the officer's performance and the merit of work performed, rather than specifics about the program on which the officer worked. A full discussion of promotion board procedures and criteria is provided in the Finding section of this report.

In the case submitted by the hotline complainant, the AFBCMR approved the requested changes to the applicant's record, including the duty title change, and recommended that the applicant be considered for promotion by the Special Selection Board.

Allegation 6. Air Force officers in joint duty assignments may be at a disadvantage because members of their Management Level Evaluation Board, who are not Air Force officers or civilians, may not realize that the Air Force no longer allows classified performance reports.

Audit Results. The allegation was unsubstantiated. The president of Management Level Evaluation Boards for Air Force officers performing joint duty assignments was required to be an Air Force general officer who would have been able to inform other panel members that the Air Force did not allow classified performance reports.

Allegation 7. The Air Force encourages officers to focus their expertise on special access and other sensitive programs, even though these officers will be at a disadvantage during the promotion process because they receive "vanilla" performance reports.

Audit Results. The allegation was unsubstantiated. To our knowledge, the Air Force did not encourage officers to focus their expertise on special access and other highly classified programs. In fact, Air Force guidance, such as Air Force Pamphlet 36-2506, "You and Your Promotions - The Air Force Officer Promotion Program," September 1, 1997, encourages officers to

diversify and obtain a variety of jobs and tasks. Even if they were encouraged to focus their expertise on these programs, promotion rates indicated that Air Force officers working on special access programs were not at a disadvantage during the promotion process. They were promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate from 1997 through 1999. See Appendix D for a full discussion of the promotion rates.

Appendix D. Promotion Rates of Officers Working in Special Access Programs

During the audit, the Air Force Personnel Center prepared an analysis of promotion rates for officers working on special access programs. Although the results cannot be generalized statistically beyond the subpopulation identified, the analysis indicated that officers working in special access programs were not at a disadvantage during the promotion process.

Analysis Methodology. The Air Force Personnel Center used records from the last three promotion boards and a list of officers currently working on special access programs, including the dates they began working on special access programs. The Air Force Personnel Center merged these records to identify officers who met promotion boards for major, lieutenant colonel, or colonel while they were working on special access programs.

Limitations of Analysis. The Air Force Personnel Center used a list of officers currently working in special access programs; therefore, the analysis did not include officers who no longer work in special access programs even if they met a prior promotion board while working in special access programs. Additionally, the analysis was limited to promotion rates of officers who met promotion boards while they were in the promotion zone. The analysis did not evaluate the promotion rates of officers working on special access programs who met a promotion board above or below the promotion zone.

Analysis Results. Officers currently working on special access programs were promoted to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel above the Air Force average promotion rate during the last 3 years. Tables D-1, D-2, and D-3 show the promotion rates to major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel for Air Force officers working on special access programs and all other Air Force officers for each year. Page 5 of this report shows the 3-year promotion average for each rank.

Table D-1. Air Force Promotion Rates to Major

Special Access	1997			1998			1999		
	Eligible	Selected	%	Eligible	Selected	%	Eligible	Selected	%
No	2758	2223	80.6	2402	1976	82.3	1856	1599	86.2
Yes	104	100	96.2	95	86	90.5	97	90	92.8
Average	2862	2323	81.2	2497	2062	82.6	1953	1689	86.5

Table D-2. Air Force Promotion Rates to Lieutenant Colonel

Special Access	1997 Eligible	1997 Selected	1997 %	1998 Eligible	1998 Selected	1998 %	1999 Eligible	1999 Selected	1999 %
No	1767	1108	62.7	1697	1064	62.7	1731	1120	64.7
Yes	78	55	70.5	77	46	59.7	86	59	68.6
Average	1845	1163	63.0	1774	1110	62.6	1817	1179	64.9

Table D-3. Air Force Promotion Rates to Colonel

Special Access	1997 Eligible	1997 Selected	1997 %	1998 Eligible	1998 Selected	1998 %	1999 Eligible	1999 Selected	1999 %
No	894	376	42.1	773	321	41.5	890	361	40.6
Yes	27	8	29.6	25	9	36.0	37	23	62.2
Average	921	384	41.7	798	330	41.4	927	384	41.4

Appendix E. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics
  Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange
  Director, Special Programs
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
  Deputy Chief Financial Officer
  Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness)

Department of the Army

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Army
Chief, Technology Management Office, Army Staff

Department of the Navy

Naval Inspector General
Auditor General, Department of the Navy
Director, Special Programs Division, Chief of Naval Operations

Department of the Air Force

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition)
  Director, Special Programs
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force
Commander, Air Force Personnel Center
Director, Air Force Review Boards Agency
  Executive Director, Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records
Commander, Office of Special Investigations
Director, Security and Special Programs Oversight

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, National Security Agency
  Inspector General, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency

Non-Defense Federal Organizations

Office of Management and Budget
General Accounting Office
National Security and International Affairs Division
Technical Information Center

Congressional Committees and Subcommittees, Chairman and Ranking Minority Member

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Armed Services
House Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, Committee on Government Reform
House Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International Relations, Committee on Government Reform

Air Force Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Comments

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, DC

27 JAN 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

FROM: AF/DP

SUBJECT: Allegations on the Air Force Promotion Process for Officers Working on Special Access Programs, 22 Dec 99 (Project No. 9AD-8010)

This is in reply to your memorandum requesting the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller) to provide Air Force comments on subject report.

We concur with each of the findings of the subject report; however, we have four technical corrections we recommend be made before the report is finalized (attached).

We appreciate your consideration of our suggestions and welcome any comments. My POC is Lt Col Nellie Riley, AF/DPFPP, 695-4679.

Attachment:
Proposed Technical Corrections

ROGER M. BLANCHARD
Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff,
Personnel

Final Report Reference

Technical Corrections to DoD Inspector General Report

"Allegations on the Air Force Promotion Process for Officers Working on Special Access Programs, 22 Dec 99"

(Project No. 9AD-8010)

Technical Correction 1) Page 1, paragraph 3: The current verbiage suggests that only those officers who were nonselected for promotion may appeal to correct or remove their performance reports through the Air Force Personnel Center or the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records. All officers have this right; although normally, only those who were nonselected will be offered supplemental consideration. The suggested edits more clearly state the fact that all officers have the right to appeal. Change as follows: — Revised Page 1

> Page 1, paragraph 3, line 1: Delete "who are not selected for promotion by the Central Selection Board"
>
> Page 1, paragraph 3, line 7: Delete "Corrected records" and insert "The corrected records of officers who had met a board and who were subsequently nonselected"

Technical Correction 2) Page 3, paragraph 2: The Officer Selection Record (OSR) may also contain a letter from the officer. Change as follows: — Revised Page 3

> Page 3, paragraph 2, line 7: After "certifications," delete "and" and after "awards" insert ", and any written communication from the individual officer to the board that the officer considers important to his/her case."

Technical Correction 3) Page 3, paragraph 3: It is an important distinction that the PRF provides information on the officer's fitness for promotion from the senior rater's perspective. Change as follows: — Revised Page 3

> Page 3, paragraph 3, line 4: After "... for promotion" insert ", from the senior rater's perspective"

Technical Correction 4) Page 4, paragraph 3: The verbiage is somewhat vague in that it doesn't explicitly state that the benchmark records are also scored along with the consideree's record and that neither the benchmark records nor the consideree's record are identified to the board members. Change as follows: — Revised Page 4

> Page 4, paragraph 3, line 8: Delete "compare it to"
>
> Page 4, paragraph 3, line 9: After "...Central Selection Board," insert "Neither the benchmark records, nor the appealing officer's record are identified to the board members.
>
> Page 4, paragraph 3, line 10: Insert "appealing" before "officer's score must..."

Audit Team Members

The Acquisition Management Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD, prepared this report.

Thomas F. Gimble
Patricia A. Brannin
Robert K. West
James B. Mitchell
Carolyn M. Blalock
Jill M. Nerreter