



Evaluation Appeal and Corrections Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) January 2024

(Answers contained herein should be treated as policy as all answers are derived from Army Regulation (AR) 623-3, Evaluation Reporting System, DA Pamphlet (DA Pam) 623-3, Evaluation Reporting System, or other policy references. This FAQ is designed to clarify answers to assist the field.)

usarmy.knox.hrc.mbx.tagd-eval-appeals@army.mil

U.S. Army Human Resources Command
Appeals and Corrections (AHRC-PDV-EA)

Fort Knox, KY 40122-5407
502-613-9022 (DSN: 983)

References:

- AR 623-3, Evaluation Reporting System, dated 14 June 2019
- DA Pam 623-3, Evaluation Reporting System, dated 27 September 2019
- AR 15-6, Procedures for Administrative Investigations and Boards of Officers, dated 1 April 2016
- AR 600-8-24, Officer Transfers and Discharges, 8 February 2020

Section I: General Information

a. Question: I am not happy with an evaluation that I received. Do I have any recourse?

Answer: If you receive an Officer Evaluation Report (OER), Noncommissioned Officer Evaluation Report (NCOER), or Academic Evaluation Report (AER) which you firmly believe is an inaccurate or unjust evaluation of your performance and/or potential, or that contains administrative errors, that report may be a candidate for an appeal. Likewise, a report that was not rendered in accordance with (IAW) the AR in effect at the time of preparation may be considered for appeal.

If you are simply dissatisfied with receiving a good report (for example, with nothing but favorable comments) because you believe it should be better, you should be aware that it is difficult to successfully challenge the judgement of your rating officials with clear and convincing evidence that you deserve better. Even if successful, the remedy applied would probably be to remove the portions proven inaccurate or unjust, rather than raising the scores or block placements.

In deciding what to appeal, you must consider early on whether you can gather useful evidence in support of an appeal. Refer to AR 623-3, paragraph 4-11 and DA Pam 623-3, paragraph 6-2 for examples of useful evidence. Your self-authored statement alone does not suffice as evidence of an inaccurate, unjust or administratively flawed evaluation report (ER). Remember, the report, as accepted by Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA), is presumed to be correct (as referenced in AR 623-3 paragraph 3-37) until you prove that it is not.

b. Question: How long do I have to submit an evaluation appeal to HQDA?

Answer: Appeals for an OER, NCOER, or AER must be submitted within **three years** of the “thru” date for the report. This restriction will only be waived under exceptional circumstances. This applies to both administrative corrections and substantive appeals. As a rule, the likelihood of successfully appealing a report diminishes with the passage of time. Prompt submission is recommended.

c. Question: What if the “thru” date of the ER I want to appeal is more than three years ago?

Answer: IAW AR 623-3, paragraphs 4-8 b. and c., failure to submit an appeal within three years of an evaluation “thru” date will require the appellant to submit their appeal directly to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR). Soldiers may apply online to the ABCMR at <https://arba.army.pentagon.mil>.

d. What are my chances of successfully appealing an evaluation report?

Answer: Your success in appealing a report will depend largely on your effort to present clear and convincing evidence that the evaluation is inaccurate or unjust. The best evidence is obtained from third parties who were in a position to observe your performance from the same perspective as your rating officials. The most impactful statements come from other Soldiers who are senior in rank to the Appellant, rather than their subordinates.

Statistics are not published on the approval/disapproval rate of evaluation report appeals as they do not reflect a true picture of the effectiveness of the program. Some appeals are received at HQDA that only meet the minimum requirements of the regulation for acceptance and processing, while others are well-documented and reflect the efforts of the individual appealing a report.

Because each ER is unique, each appeal is unique. It is important to remember that the Evaluation Redress System is designed to correct errors, or injustice, not weakness, poor judgement, or poor performance by the rated soldier. Evaluations that reflect duty performance not on a level with previous or subsequent reports are not to be presumed to be an error. The bottom line is that the success of your appeal depends mainly on you!

Section II: The Evaluation Report Redress Program

a. Question: What is the Evaluation Report Redress Program (ERRP)?

Answer: The ERRP is both preventative and corrective in that it is based upon principles structured to prevent, and provide a remedy for, alleged injustices or regulatory violations.

b. Question: What are the steps in the ERRP?

Answer: The first step in the ERRP is the Commander's or Commandant's Inquiry, which is followed by a formal ER appeal to HQDA, IAW AR 623-3, paragraphs 4-1 through 4-6.

c. Question: What is a Commander's or Commandant's Inquiry (CI)?

Answer: The primary purpose of the CI is to provide a greater degree of command involvement in preventing obvious injustices to the rated Soldier and correcting errors before they become a matter of permanent record in the rated Soldier's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR). A secondary purpose is to obtain command involvement in clarifying errors or injustices after the ER is accepted at HQDA. See AR 623-3, Chapter 4, Section II.

Requests for a CI will occur no later than **60 days** after the signature date of the rated Soldier (or senior rater, if the Soldier's signature is omitted) for OERs and NCOERs or reviewing official for a DA Form 1059 and DA Form 1059-1. The inquiry must be completed not later than **120 days** after the signature date of the senior rater (OER), supplementary reviewer (NCOER), or authenticating officer (AER).

After an evaluation is filed permanently in a Soldier's AMHRR, a CI may still be completed beyond the 60-day requirement at the discretion of the Commander completing the inquiry. However, there is not a regulatory requirement that the request must be honored if it is received late. In these after-the-fact cases, the CI is not intended to be a substitute for the appeal process, which is the primary means of addressing errors and injustices after the report has become a matter of permanent record.

d. Question: The Commander conducting the inquiry determined there was bias, injustice, or inaccurate/untrue statements. What happens to the CI memorandum?

Answer: IAW AR 623-3, paragraph 4-5 g., if the official conducting the inquiry determines the report has serious irregularities or errors or any violation of policy, the official will ensure that all members of the original rating chain are allowed to correct or edit the evaluation. However, note that the commander completing the inquiry cannot compel the rating chain to make any corrections/changes to the report. A complete breakdown of the CI steps can be found in AR 623-3, paragraph 4-6, table 4-1.

The CI memorandum, with supporting documentation, i.e. AR 15-6 investigation or other formal investigation that support the findings will be forwarded to the Evaluation Appeals and Corrections Team:

usarmy.knox.hrc.mbx.tagd-eval-appeals@army.mil

Section II: Preparing a Substantive ER Appeal

a. Question: Where can I find guidance for submitting an OER, NCOER, or AER appeal?

Answer: AR 623-3, Chapter 4, beginning at paragraph 4-7, and DA Pam 623-3, paragraph 6-1 provides detailed guidance on the appeal process.

b. Question: Where can I find help in constructing an appeal packet?

Answer: DA Pam 623-3, paragraph 6-2 provides guidance on preparing an appeal. The steps include developing rationale, obtaining evidence, preparing the appeal memorandum, and submission of the packet to HQDA.

c. Question: Are there examples of the appeal memorandums available?

Answer: Appeal correspondence formats can be found in AR 623-3, Figure 4-2, and DA Pam 623-3, Figures 6-1 through 6-5. There are also examples available on the HRC Evaluation Appeals and Corrections webpage for your convenience: [Evaluation Appeals and Corrections](#)

d. What should my appeal memorandum convey to the reader?

Answer: An appeal memorandum should be formatted in such a way that specifically states 1) exactly what is being appealed (comments and box checks); 2) the basis of appeal (what is the violation of policy); and 3) the specific evidence that refutes the specific comments in the evaluation. You may want to visit your local S1, or staff judge advocate to assist you in noting any instances in the ER where provisions of the governing regulation were not followed.

In paragraph 2 and subsequent paragraphs of the memorandum, identify the location of (i.e. Part IV, block a., Part IV, block f.) and the specific portions of the report that are being appealed (copied directly from the evaluation) and the basis of the disagreement. Be clear, brief, and specific. As you explain why you are appealing the specific comments, point the Board to the specific evidence that supports the allegations (i.e. “see enclosure 3”) and explain exactly what the evidence is intended to show. Every allegation/claim must be supported by evidence. The discussion as a minimum should: Highlight the specific untrue/unjust comments; provide an explanation as to why they are unjust, inaccurate, etc.; and direct the reader/board to the specific evidence that supports the claims, and which show the comments in the evaluation are not true.

e. Question: What type of evidence do I need?

Answer: There are no constraints on the type or amount of evidence that can be presented. AR 623-3, paragraph 4-7 and DA Pam 623-3, paragraph 6-2 provides fairly extensive guidance as to what will or won't be helpful in your appeal case. Evidence must be material and relevant to the claim (i.e., statements from third parties, rating officials, or other documents from official sources.)

Official documents must be certified true copies signed by the commander, BN/BDE S1, JAG, or other personnel in positions of authority who can confirm the authenticity of these documents. Do not include documents that are not relevant or have no bearing on the appeal (i.e., previous or subsequent evaluations and awards, character letters that do not address the specific allegations/contentions or the comments in the evaluation, orders, etc.).

Enclosures should be numbered in the same order as discussed in the narrative with the evaluation in question being Enclosure 1. If there are multiple pages in one enclosure, label each separately, i.e. Enclosure 2,

page 1 of 3, Enclosure 2, page 2 of 3, and so on. Upon completion of the narrative, if a specific document is not referenced as evidence, then consider removing it from the appeal packet as it may not be relevant.

For an administrative error, appropriate evidence may include:

- The published, approved rating scheme used by the organization during the period of the report being appealed.
- Assignment, travel, or TDY orders.
- DA Form 705 (Army Combat Fitness Test Scorecard), DA Form 5500/5501 (Body Fat Content Worksheet).
- Leave Records.
- Organization manning documents.
- Hospital admission, diagnosis, and discharge sheets.
- Statements of military personnel officers or other persons with knowledge of the situation pertaining to the evaluation (third-party support statement).
- The results of a Commander's Inquiry (CI), Inspector General (IG), Equal Opportunity (EO), and/or AR 15-6 Investigations.

NOTE: The investigating Officers' findings and recommendations to the Approving Authority does NOT fulfill this requirement. The Approval Authority IS the final results of the investigation. This memorandum must accompany the investigation.

NOTE: Any of the documents listed above that can be edited but must marked as certified true copies. This applies to evidence in either an administrative or substantive appeal.

For a substantive appeal, appropriate evidence may also include:

- All evidence listed above.
- Statements from third parties, rating officials, or other documents from official sources that support claims of inaccuracy or injustice.

Evidence that is not appropriate or provides little value:

- Board of Inquiry/Show Cause/Separation Board results. The board's ONLY mission is to determine whether or not a Soldier should be retained on active duty. It does not negate an AR 15-6, IG, EO, or other substantiated investigation.

- Previous and/or subsequent evaluations. Army evaluation reports are independent assessments of how well the rated Soldier met duty requirements and adhered to the professional standards of the Corps *within the period covered by the report*.
- Award citations or letters of commendation.

Remember, the burden of proving your case rests fully on **your** shoulders!

f. After my evaluation appeal packet is complete, how do I submit it to HQDA?

Answer: IAW DA PAM 623-3, Table 6–1, the finalized, original appeal, plus one complete copy (does not need to be certified) will be mailed hard copy to Commander, U.S. Army Human Resources Command, ATTN: AHRC–PDV–EA), 1600 Spearhead Division Avenue, Department 470, Fort Knox, KY 40122–5407.

Do not use tabs, put documents in document protectors, or use staples. Submit the appeal packet one-sided.

Due to ongoing telework operations, we will accept appeal packets submitted via email to the Team Mailbox: usarmy.knox.hrc.mbx.tagd-eval-appeals@army.mil. We request that the packet be submitted as a single PDF document, condensed in size as much as possible.

g. Question: I am stationed OCONUS. Do I have to mail my packet hard copy?

Answer: No. As an exception, HRC will accept evaluation appeals from Soldiers who are stationed in, or deployed to, an OCONUS location via email: usarmy.knox.hrc.mbx.tagd-eval-appeals@army.mil

Section III: Processing and Disposition of Substantive Appeals

a. Question: I've submitted my appeal, what happens next?

Answer: Upon receipt of an ER appeal, the appellant will be notified of its receipt by HRC IAW AR 623-3, paragraph 4-9 a. For claims of substantive inaccuracy or injustice, an analyst within the Appeals and Corrections Section will review the complete packet for sufficient supporting documentation and evidence.

If the appeal case lacks sufficient supporting evidence, the analyst assigned to the case email the appellant, returning the request without action, with a detailed memorandum explaining the reasons for the return.

The Evaluation Appeals Section will no longer return evaluation appeal requests by mail. Any hard copy documents received by mail will be scanned and maintained in the Evaluation Appeals Program System. The original hard copy documents and correspondence, if applicable, will be disposed of in accordance with the Army Records Information Management System (ARIMS).

b. Question: What happens if my appeal packet is accepted for adjudication?

Answer: Substantive appeals that have sufficient evidence will be further forwarded for adjudication by the Army Special Review Board (ASRB). The ASRB may approve the appeal, in whole or in part, or may deny, depending upon the merits of the case.

c. Question: If my appeal is submitted to the ASRB, how long will it take to come back?

Answer: Cases submitted to the ASRB due to substantive errors are worked according to priority. Current processing timeline for each priority is approximately as follows:

Priority 3: 12-15 months

Priority 2: 8-12 months

Priority 1: 4-8 months

** AR 623-3, paragraph 4-10 explains the different priority levels.

d. Question: I appeared before a Board of Inquiry (BOI) as a result of the evaluation and was retained. Is this sufficient enough evidence to successfully appeal the evaluation?

Answer: No! AR 600-8-24 states that a BOI is limited to making a determination on whether to retain (with or without reassignment) an officer on active duty or to eliminate. Although the BOI may have found some allegations unsubstantiated by a preponderance of the evidence, the rating official or chain of command is not bound by the board's findings. This information can also be found in DA Pam 623-3, paragraph 6-2 a. (2).

e. Question: Can I appeal an evaluation if it is not the same as a draft evaluation that I was presented?

Answer: No. All evaluations are considered drafts and working copies until all signatures are obtained, the evaluations is submitted to HQDA for processing, and becomes final and processed through to the Soldier's Army Military Human Resources Record (AMHRR). The fact that a draft report differed from the final report is not sufficient justification to appeal the evaluation.

f. Question: Can I appeal an evaluation because the ratings are different (lower) than evaluations received prior to this one?

Answer: No. IAW AR 623-3, paragraph 1-9, Army evaluation reports are independent assessments of how well the rated Soldier met duty requirements and adhered to the professional standards within the period covered by the report. Comparison to performance in previous reports is not sufficient enough evidence to overturn an evaluation.

g. Question: My rating chain failed to counsel me during the rating period. Can I submit an appeal for this failure?

Answer: No. AR 623-3, paragraph 4-11 e. states "...no appeal may be filed solely based on the contention that the appellant was never counseled." Appeals based on alleged administrative error such as counseling dates will be accepted only under the most unusual and compelling circumstances. Additionally, paragraph 2-10 states that the rated Soldier is

the subject of the evaluation and has *considerable responsibility in the evaluation process*.

h. Question: I received a bad evaluation based on a faulty AR 15-6 investigation. Can I appeal based on the faulty investigation?

Answer: No. DA Pam 623-3, paragraph 6-2 a (1) specifically states that Soldiers may not submit an appeal based on an improperly conducted or false findings of an AR 15-6 investigation. The Commanding General, U.S. Army Human Resources Command, does not have the responsibility nor the authority to refute a field commander's investigative findings.

As a recommendation, you can:

(1) Return to the Appointing Authority for the investigation and request reconsideration or appeal the investigation based on the points and errors cited in your appeal memorandum from legal representation.

(2) Along with any retained counsel, consult your military legal office to get their documented opinion of any of your perceived irregularities or illegalities that may have occurred during the course of this investigation. Include this documentation in your next evaluation appeal packet, should you decide to refile.

Section IV: Administrative Corrections

a. Question: What is an administrative correction?

Answer: An administrative correction is a minor adjustment to administrative data on an evaluation that could have an impact on a Soldier's selection board proceedings, career decisions, or personnel management decisions.

IAW AR 623-3, paragraph 4-7 g. (1) claims of administrative error pertain to the following:

- DA Form 67–10 series (OER), part I; part II; part III, blocks a. and b.; and part IV, block a.
- DA Form 2166–9 series (NCOER), part I; part II; part III, blocks a. and b.; and part IV, blocks a. and b.

- DA Form 1059, part I; part II, blocks b., c., e.1, and e.2; and part IV.
- DA Form 1059–2, part I; part II, blocks b., c., e.1, and e.2; and part IV.
- DA Form 1059–1, part I; part II, blocks b. and c.; and part IV.

b. Question: What are some examples of administrative corrections?

Answer: The Primary Military Occupational Specialty (PMOS) reflects 42A3O, but the Soldier is an 11B4O. The Duty MOS (DMOS) reflects Soldier is an 11B2O but is actually serving in an 11B4O position. In both of these examples, a memorandum can be completed by the rated Soldier and returned with a copy of the Enlisted Record Brief, Soldier Talent Profile, or Unit Manning Document showing the correct PMOS or DMOS, and the Appeals and Corrections Team will adjust the report.

c. Question: Do I have to submit an administrative correction, or can it be submitted by my rating chain or S1?

Answer: As the rated Soldier, you do not have to submit the correction. However, AR 623-3, paragraph 4-7 d. states that “an appeal begun by any party on behalf of an appellant will be referred to the appellant for concurrence and comment before it is submitted.” If the correction is submitted by anyone other than the rated Soldier, the Soldier must concur with the requested corrections.

d. Question: Do I have to submit a request for administrative corrections hard copy via mail?

Answer: No. HQDA will accept minor administrative correction requests, with appropriate supporting documentation, via email:
usarmy.knox.hrc.mbx.tagd-eval-appeals@army.mil

e. Question: I just noticed that there are multiple words misspelled and grammatical errors on the evaluation that just posted to my AMHRR. Can I request an administrative correction to fix it?

Answer: No. AR 623-3, paragraph 4-7 g. (7) states HQDA will not conduct minor spelling, grammatical, and/or punctuation corrections that would

have been easily revealed through review of the evaluation. Rating officials must make a concerted effort to ensure every evaluation is reviewed for these types of minor administrative errors prior to submission to HQDA for examination and inclusion into the rated Soldier's AMHRR.

It is also imperative that the rated Soldier review the report, in its entirety, to identify these types of errors prior to signing the report.

f. Question: My senior rater stated “send to ALC” in his comments, but I’ve already completed ALC. Can I request that this be corrected?

Answer: No, you as the rated Soldier cannot request that corrections be made to a senior rater's comments – see Question A. However, the senior rater on the report can send in a request that we adjust his comments. The memo will need to state exactly how the comments currently read, and how to correct them to read.

g. Question: Is there a specific format to request an administrative correction to an evaluation?

Answer: Yes. Example memorandums are available on the HRC Evaluation Corrections and Appeals website: [Evaluation Appeals and Corrections](#)

h. Question: My evaluation was submitted without my signature. I would like to have the opportunity to sign. Is there anything I can do?

Answer: The senior rater can request that we return the report for signature. If the evaluation has already been accepted into iPERMS, after the report is signed by the rated Soldier, the senior rater must inform the Appeals and Corrections Team so that the report can be pulled in, completed, and reversioned in iPERMS.

Section V: Addendum

a. Question: I wrote an evaluation, which is already iPERMed, and the Soldier was later found to have committed an offense that would have required a lower evaluation. Do I have any options?

Answer: Yes. IAW DA Pam 623-3, paragraph 5-3 a., if rating officials become aware of verified derogatory information that would have resulted in a lower evaluation of the rated Soldier, they will submit an addendum to the previous evaluation report.

b. Question: What happens if, as the rater, I do not want to amend the report, but the senior rater wants to add comments?

Answer: The first commander in the chain of command receiving the new information will ensure that all members of the original rating chain are aware of it and are allowed to comment. The commander will comment, in the cover memorandum, which rating chain members provided comments for the addendum.

c. Question: My rating chain presented me with addendum memorandums that lower my previous evaluation. Do I have to provide comments?

Answer: No. As the rated Soldier, if you choose not to provide any comments, the commander coordinating the submission will annotate on their memorandum that the rated Soldier chose not to provide comments.

Section V: Miscellaneous

a. Question: What are some common errors that an appellant makes when submitting an evaluation appeal?

Answer:

(1) The appellant references items but fail to submit the evidence that supports their contentions. For example, the appellant contends they submitted an Inspector General or Equal Opportunity complaint but fail to provide the finalized version of the complaint with approved findings.

(2) The appellant submits letters of support from individuals who have no first-hand knowledge of the issues surrounding the appeal.

(3) The appellant contests the rating officials but fails to provide a certified true copy of the rating scheme, signed by the approving authority that is dated during the rating period in question.

b. Question: My evaluation was returned from HQDA for corrections. Should the rater and senior rater just remove their signatures, make corrections, and then resubmit to HQDA?

Answer: No. All signatures must be removed in reverse order (Supplementary Reviewer (if required), Rated Soldier, Senior Rater, and then the Rater) when making changes to a completed evaluation. If the rating chain removes their signatures first, the rated Soldier will no longer have accessibility to the report.

c. Question: We didn't follow the instructions for removing signatures when my report was returned. Now I cannot sign it. What can we do?

Answer: If the rating chain removed their signatures prior to the rated Soldier removing theirs, the rated Soldier can remove their signature by clicking the *Signature Removal* button under the TOOLS column on the EES homepage.



d. Question: My evaluation was returned for corrections, but the rater is no longer in the service and cannot access the evaluation to correct and resubmit. How do we fix this?

Answer: The evaluation should be recreated in a .pdf format (downloaded from the Army Publishing Directorate) and sent to the original rating official(s) to obtain an “ink” signature. After all signatures are obtained, the corrected report should be mailed to HQDA for processing:

U.S. Army Human Resources Command
Evaluations Processing Branch (AHRC-PDV-ER)
1600 Spearhead Division Ave, RM 2-1-027
Fort Knox, KY 40122-5407