

SERVICE COMPLAINT CASE SUMMARY 3

RAF SERVICE COMPLAINT (SC) – TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE (TACOS) - PROMOTIONS

FINAL DECISION LETTER ISSUED - OCTOBER 2018

DECISION BY DECISION BODY

Complaint

A Regular RAF Officer (Wg Cdr) submitted a SC alleging that despite placing in 2017 and received recommendations in his current Officers' Joint Appraisal Report (OJAR), he was not presented to the Combined Selection Board (CSB) and thus were not considered for selection for Advanced Staff Training (AST).

The SC is deemed **Admissible** by the Commanding Officer and investigated accordingly.

Investigation

The complaint was divided into 3 parts and each was investigated:

1. That substantive Wg Cdrs are at a disadvantage.

The Decision Body found that substantive Wg Cdrs are not at a disadvantage and that more did not have to be presented to the CSB for consideration for AST. The responses show that the number of Wg Cdrs presented was considered both against the reports and the number of AST places across the wider branches.

2. Pre-Boarding process.

The Decision Body found that although time was indeed tight in preparation for the Pre-Selection Board, there is an e-mail trail showing that, despite The Wg Cdr's OJAR arriving late, efforts were made to ensure that he was considered at Pre-Boarding.

3. Training.

The Decision Body finds that both Desk Officers were appropriately

trained for their roles evidence was provided of significant efforts to ensure that they were trained and competent for their Desk Officer roles. Their responses and evidence show a level of thoroughness and understanding of the Pre-Boarding and Boarding process.

Decision

The Decision Body did **Not Uphold** this complaint and therefore no redress was awarded.

Service Complaints Ombudsman for the Armed Forces (SCOAF) Involvement: No

DETERMINATION BY APPEAL BODY

Reason for Appeal

The Complainant disagreed with the Decision Body's decision.

Investigation

In this Service Complaint is was deemed necessary to hold an Oral Hearing to clarify specific elements of evidence. It gave all parties the option to comment on the investigation.

Determination

The Appeal Body Panel at Oral Hearing did not come to a different conclusion to that at Decision Body level and the Service Complaint was **Not Upheld** and no redress was awarded, however, it was recommended that the Air Secretary Staff Orders are retitled.

Service Complaints Ombudsman for the Armed Forces (SCOAF) Involvement: No

