DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

AETCI36-2640_AETCGM2016-02

23 August 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR 2 AF/CC
AU/CC

FROM: HQ AETC/A2/3/10
1 F Street Suite 2
Randolph AFB TX 78150-4325

SUBJECT: AETC Guidance Memorandum to AETCI 36-2640, *Technical and Basic Military Training Evaluation*

1. By Order of the Commander Air Education and Training Command, this is an AETC Guidance Memorandum (GM) implementing an immediate change to AETCI 36-2640, 15 July 2014. **Compliance with this Memorandum is mandatory.** To the extent its directions are inconsistent with other Air Force publications, the information herein prevails, in accordance with AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*.

2. Effective immediately, AETCI 36-2640 is changed as reflected in the attachment to this memo. It directs HQ AETC/A3-OAD to provide coded data working files for RAND developed BMT Trainee and MTI Survey data of the previous quarter back to the 737 TRG then adds a 737 TRG responsibility describing its corresponding role with the returned raw data. It revises two notes: Note[1] replaces the 937 TRG to the 59 TRG; Note[4] removes an FEQ waiver for three AFSCs. It maintains the FEQ as a biennial survey and the approval authority for exceptions to the biennial requirement for a field evaluation at the TRG/CC level (AETCI36-2640_AETCGM2016-01) while retaining the guidance that extends the suspense dates of TRG and 2 AF/TTOC semiannual trend analysis reports (AETCI36-2640_AETCGM2015-01).

3. The guidance and procedures in this Memorandum become void after one year has elapsed from the date of this Memorandum, or upon incorporation by an interim change or rewrite to AETCI 36-2640. Our POC is Mr. Bill DeCleene, AETC/A3PV, DSN 487-6181.

TIMOTHY E. OWENS
Colonel, USAF
Deputy Director of Intelligence, Operations, and Nuclear Integration

Attachment 1
Changes to AETCI 36-2640, 15 July 2014

Attachment 1

Changes to AETCI 36-2640, 15 July 2014

2.4.5. (HQ AETC/A3-OAD) (Added) Provide coded data working files (e.g. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, also known as SPSS, type files) for RAND developed BMT Trainee and MTI Survey data of the previous quarter (after survey administration), within 10 duty days after the end of the quarter, in order for the 737 TRG to perform specific data inquiries, analysis and triangulation with locally maintained tactical level data.

2.5.2. Deleted.

2.6.5. Approve exceptions to the requirement for a biennial field evaluation questionnaire.

2.8.4. (737 TRG) (Added) Use the RAND Trainee Survey and the RAND MTI (Climate) Survey raw data on a quarterly basis to perform specific data inquires, analysis and triangulation with locally maintained tactical level data.

5.1. Program Requirements. Each training group will establish an external evaluation program. Occupational analysis reports (OAR), subject-matter expert (SME) feedback, FI, CSIP, FEQ, and FEQS should be reviewed and/or used as appropriate.

Note[1]: As a minimum, the 59 TRG will conduct external evaluations for all assigned initial skills officer courses. For all enlisted initial skills courses with AF graduates taught by the METC, the 59 TRG will conduct external evaluation until METC gains the capability.

Note[2]: Due to unique mission requirements, IAAFA is waived from the external evaluation program.

Note[3]: BMT will establish procedures for an external evaluation program in a supplement to this instruction.

Note[4]: Due to unique training pipeline flow, the following AFSs are waived from using FEQs and FEQSs: Career Enlisted Aviators (1AXXX (except 1A8XX) & 1UXXX). Special Operations Weather and Combat Control pipelines will accomplish their FEQ during their first assignment at the Special Tactics Training Squadron after Combat Control School. TRG/CCs may waive other AFSCs if 3-level graduates continue in a training status for 5-level upgrade before going to first duty station with documented justification and an alternate plan to obtain external evaluation (e.g. conducting OARs, from supervisors and SMEs who attend specialty training requirements team (STRT)/utilization and training workshops (U&TW), other mandated survey protocols like Aircrew Graduate Evaluation Program covered in AETCI 36-2206).

5.5.1.1. As a minimum, training groups will complete a biennial field evaluation (two years from the date the last FEQS was signed) on each active initial skill AFSC awarding and mandatory 7-skill level craftsman courses (to include Type 6) that produced graduates.

5.5.1.3. The approval authority for exceptions to the biennial requirement for a field evaluation is the TRG/CC for 2 AF units and Eaker Center/MSO for Eaker Center. Some reasons for extending the evaluation cycle may include a lack of sample size for the questionnaire, transferring a course from one location to another, or changing the course from one type of training to another (e.g., type 3 to type 6.)

5.5.1.4. The TRG Evaluation Office will maintain documentation of the internal coordination and approval memo for an extension to the biennial requirement at least until the next FEQ and associated FEQS are completed. The memo will include reasons for the extension, the date the last field evaluation was completed, and a revised evaluation date. Distribute a copy of the approval extension memo to the applicable AFCFM and AETC/A2/3/10 TPM.

9.1.5. Distribute by 30 May and 30 November to HQ AETC/A3T, training wing and training group commanders with a courtesy copy to HQ AETC/A3P. Evaluation Summary reports will not contain Privacy Act information.

9.2.3. Submit analysis as shown in Attachment 4 to 2 AF/TTOC Workflow by 30 April (covering 1 October XX – 31 March XX) and 30 October (covering 1 April XX – 30 September XX). Reports will not contain Privacy Act information.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER AIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

AETC INSTRUCTION 36-2640

15 JULY 2014

Certified Current on, 11 August 2015

Personnel

TECHNICAL AND BASIC MILITARY TRAINING EVALUATION

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available for downloading or ordering on the e-Publishing website at **www.e-Publishing.af.mil.**

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: HQ AETC/A3PV

Certified by: HQ AETC/A3P (Ms. Bonnie E. Molina)

Supersedes: AETCI 36-2201, 13 September 2010

Pages: 46

This instruction implements AFPD 36-26, *Total Force Development*. It establishes responsibilities and procedures for evaluating the quality of technical and basic military training (BMT). It applies to the Inter-American Air Force Academy (IAAFA), Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC), Air National Guard (ANG), technical training administered by Air University (AU) Eaker Center, and training groups (TRG) aligned under the Second Air Force (2 AF) involved in managing, developing, and conducting BMT and technical training within AETC. Due to unique mission requirements, it does not apply to the 517 TRG or Defense Language Institute English Language Center (DLIELC). It applies to the 937 TRG, IAAFA, and 737 TRG (Basic Military Training (BMT)) as noted in applicable paragraphs.

This instruction requires collecting and maintaining information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by Title 10, United States Code, Section 8013. System of Records notice F036 AF PC Q, *Personnel Data System*, applies. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with (IAW) Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located in the Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS). The use of the name or mark of any specific manufacturer, commercial product, commodity, or service in this publication does not imply endorsement by the Air Force.

This AETCI may be supplemented by commanders responsible for implementing this instruction. Supplements will be used to establish organization-specific guidance. (T-2) Do not use local operating instructions to implement this guidance. (T-2) Commanders will send

proposed supplements through their training group or wing and 2 AF (2 AF units only) to HQ AETC/A3P for review and coordination prior to publishing. (T-2)

Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication.* Route AF Forms 847 from the field unit through the training group, training wing and 2 AF (2 AF units only) to HQ AETC/A3P.

The authorities to waive wing/unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier ("T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3") number following the compliance statement. See AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Unless otherwise specified, requests for waiver must be submitted by the group or wing commander through 2 AF (2 AF units only) to HQ AETC/A3P. (See paragraph 1.2 for specific procedures.) T-2

See Attachment 1 for a glossary of references and supporting information used in this publication.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This document has been substantially revised and must be completely reviewed. This revision updates the publication number to align it under the antecedent AFPD 36-26, *Total Force Development*. Major changes include incorporating required tiering and reformatting IAW AFI 33-360; specifying application to the 937 TRG; changing the requirements for technical training groups' to prepare and submit a semiannual Type 6, Distance Learning (DL) Student Feedback Report and a separate Semiannual Trend Analysis Report to the requirement to submit one report, the fiscal year (FY) Semiannual Evaluation Summary Report; adding requirements for BMT to administer the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey and conduct the RAND Military Training Instructor (MTI) Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s); discontinuing the graduate assessment survey (GAS) and adding standardized questions from the GAS to field evaluation questionnaires (FEQ) administered to supervisors of non-prior service (NPS) AF enlisted and officer initial skills course graduates; increasing administration of field evaluations of enlisted and officer initial skills courses from biennially to annually; changing approval authority to grant exceptions to the annual field evaluation requirement to 2 AF; updating the format for the field evaluation questionnaire summary (FEQS); and updating Training Assessment Program requirements to support implementation of the new Air Force Inspection System.

1. Overview. 3
2. Roles and Responsibilities: 4
3. Training Evaluation Program (TEP). 6
4. Internal Evaluation. 6
5. External Evaluation. 9

6. Technical Training Group TA Program/BMT Standardization/Evaluation (Stan/Eval). 14

7. Interservice Training. 16

8. Use of Training Evaluation Data. 16

9. Trend Analysis. 16

Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION 18

Attachment 2—SAMPLE IN-RESIDENCE TRAINING END-OF-COURSE STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEY 21

Attachment 3—SAMPLE TYPE 6, DL END-OF-COURSE FEEDBACK 24

Attachment 4—SAMPLE FY SEMIANNUAL EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT XX TRAINING GROUP FY SEMIANNUAL EVALUATIONSUMMARY REPORT 20XX 26

Attachment 5—TYPE 6 STUDENT FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE DATA 29

Attachment 6—SAMPLE FIELD INTERVIEW (FI) GUIDES (FOR GRADUATES AND SUPERVISORS) 31

Attachment 7—SAMPLE CUSTOMER SERVICE INFORMATION PROCESS (CSIP) TEMPLATE 35

Attachment 8—FIELD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT 36

Attachment 9—FORMAT FOR FIELD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY (FEQS) 44

1. Overview.

1.1. **Purpose.** This publication establishes guidance and procedures for administering training evaluation for technical and basic military training (BMT). Training evaluation provides the basis for determining the quality of training. Evaluations are conducted as a part of the Instructional System Development process to examine the effectiveness and efficiency of the training program. Refer to AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program*, AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development*, and AFH 36-2235, Volume 9, *Information for Designers of Instructional Systems: Application to Technical Training*, and Volume 13, *Information for Designers of Instructional Systems for Basic Military Training (BMT)* for additional guidance.

1.2. Waiver Authority. Policy and procedures are enacted to provide quality and consistency in training and evaluation. Occasionally, unique circumstances may warrant special consideration and possible waiver of policy provisions. At the same time, because it is important to preserve fidelity of training, evaluation, and policy implementation throughout the command, a process must be established for review of proposed waivers.

1.2.1. Unless otherwise stated in this instruction, AETC/A3P is the waiver authority for waivers that change the intent of the policy outlined in this instruction. (T-2) For waivers to unit supplements, the unit generating the supplement will identify the waiver authority to that supplemental guidance.

1.2.2. Requests for waiver will be submitted through the group or wing commander and 2 AF (2 AF units only) to HQ AETC/A3P. (T-2) Waiver requests must:

1.2.2.1. Identify the specific policy reference and text to be waived.

1.2.2.2. Rationale for the waiver: Explain which of the 3 reasons listed under AFI 33-360, paragraph 1.9.1 apply and describe why.

1.2.2.3. Time period or circumstance for which the waiver will be required.

1.2.2.4. Risk mitigation measures the requesting commander will implement during the waiver period.

1.2.2.5. Impact if waiver is disapproved.

1.2.3. Units will upload approved waivers into Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT) for inspection activity review. Because waivers are the expression of a specific commander accepting risk, Tier 1, 2, and 3 waivers expire 30 days after a change of command unless the new commander renews the waiver. For non-tiered waivers, a waiver remains in effect until canceled in writing by the approving official, the publication is revised, or the waiver expires.

2. Roles and Responsibilities:

2.1. HQ AETC/A2/3/10 will set policy, review and coordinate on implementing supplements, evaluate waivers for approval or disapproval, and help resolve training evaluation questions.

2.2. HQ AETC/A2/3/10 Training Pipeline Manager (TPM), as applicable, will:

2.2.1. Review FEQs prior to administration, request inputs on FEQs from the Air Force Career Field Manager (AFCFM), and provide feedback to the training wing/group.

2.2.2. Review Field Evaluation Questionnaire Summaries (FEQS), BMT Survey Reports, and 2 AF fiscal year (FY) Semiannual Evaluation Summary Reports, as applicable. If exception is taken to findings, conclusions, or actions, notify 2 AF/TTOC and the applicable training wing/group and cite rationale for exception.

2.3. HQ AETC/SAS-TSS will:

2.3.1. House the data and the interface for the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey and RAND MTI Survey (MTI Climate Survey), or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s)

2.3.2. Maintain trainee and MTI anonymity; by ensuring the software/system configuration does not collect trainees' personally identifiable information from the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey and the RAND MTI (Climate) Survey, or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s).

2.4. HQ AETC/A3-OAD will:

2.4.1. Compile and analyze data from the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey and RAND MTI (Climate) Survey, or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s).

2.4.2. Provide results quarterly on the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s) to the Recruiting, Education and Training Oversight Council (RETOC).

2.4.3. Provide a semi-annual update on the RAND MTI (Climate) Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s) to the RETOC.

2.4.4. Submit the results from both surveys or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s) to HQ AETC/A2/3/10, 2 AF, and the 37 TRW.

2.5. Headquarters Second Air Force Technical Training Operations Center (2 AF/TTOC) will:

2.5.1. Monitor subordinate training wing/group training evaluation programs for effectiveness and provide crossfeed of information between wings.

2.5.2. Approve exceptions to the requirement for an annual field evaluation.

2.5.3. Conduct a FY semiannual trend analysis. Prepare and distribute a FY Semiannual Evaluation Summary Report to HQ AETC/A3T, training wing and training group commanders with a courtesy copy to HQ AETC/A3P.

2.5.4. Extract graduate data from Oracle Training Administrator (OTA) and forward to training groups monthly.

2.5.5. Maintain a list of all FEQ eligible courses and last completed FEQS date.

2.5.6. Route requests for software production support pertaining to training evaluations software other than Technical Training Management System (TTMS) to HQ AETC/A3P.

2.5.7. Maintain the AETC TT and BMT Evaluations site.

2.6. Training groups will:

2.6.1. Establish a Training Evaluation Program (TEP) as required in this instruction to ensure all assigned courses provide quality training in an effective and efficient manner.

2.6.2. Encourage group personnel on TDY to solicit feedback on courses, when possible, and provide feedback to course personnel and evaluation offices.

2.6.3. Conduct other research or evaluation programs for the improvement of graduate or training quality as deemed necessary.

2.6.4. Route requests for software support pertaining to training evaluations software other than TTMS through 2 AF/TTOC to HQ AETC/A3P. Training groups will not purchase evaluation software or services without prior coordination with 2 AF/TTOC and HQ AETC/A3P.

2.7. Technical training groups will conduct a fiscal year (FY) semiannual trend analysis and prepare a FY Semiannual Evaluation Summary Report.

2.8. BMT (737 TRG) will:

2.8.1. Prepare the 737 TRG Quarterly Survey Report.

2.8.2. Proctor the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey and the RAND MTI (Climate) Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument.

2.8.3. Provide a testing facility with terminals.

2.9. HQ AETC CSS/SCOK will provide data automation support for the Training Quality Assessment (TQA) training evaluation software.

2.10. HQ AETC/A5T is the Program Management Office for TTMS.

3. Training Evaluation Program (TEP).

3.1. Each training group will establish a TEP to provide a medium for collecting relevant course data that can be used to identify training improvement opportunities. The TEP will include, as a minimum, internal evaluation (paragraph 4), external evaluation (paragraph 5), a TA program for technical training groups and a Stan/Eval program for BMT (paragraph 6). **Note:** The 937 TRG TEP will include a TA program; and internal and external evaluation programs with specific requirements as described in "Notes" in applicable paragraphs.

3.2. Where installed and operational, use the TTMS for all unclassified formal technical and basic military training related functions to include course development and delivery, instructor and student management, resource management, and course evaluation. For courses containing classified information, enter all unclassified course information necessary to complete adequate student accounting when developing courses in the TTMS course development software. Use automated products produced by TTMS, if available. Forms generated electronically by these systems may be used in lieu of prescribed forms. For METC Courses, the 937 TRG will use data collected by METC, as applicable.

4. Internal Evaluation. Internal evaluation is the acquisition and analysis of feedback and management data from within the training environment to determine if training accomplishes the instructional objectives effectively and efficiently. It helps commanders, supervisors, and instructors improve course and unit support; identifies outstanding instructors, facilities, and equipment; and allows students to attain a sense of participation and responsibility for improving training programs.

4.1. **Program Requirements.** Each training group will establish an internal evaluation program. The program will include, as a minimum, such areas as student feedback, measurement review, elimination and washback trend analysis, and instructional review. AETCI 36-2641, *Technical and Basic Military Training Development*, contains minimum requirements for measurement and instructional review. AETCI 36-2642, *Technical and Basic Military Training Administration*, contains minimum requirements for elimination and washback trend analysis. **Note:** The 937 TRG will conduct internal evaluation for Medical Readiness Courses and assigned officer courses. The 937 TRG internal evaluation program for all enlisted initial skills courses Types 3, 5, 8, 9, A, B and C taught by the METC will include only General Support, Base Support, and Military Training.

4.2. **Student Feedback**. Each training group will establish a student feedback program. At a minimum, each training squadron and faculty development flight (or equivalent unit) will participate in the program. The program is intended to obtain constructive comments on training, training environment, and base support.

4.2.1. Commanders will appoint student feedback monitors, in writing, to manage the program. Training groups will establish procedures for maintaining, tracking, and follow-up of student feedback to ensure responses are timely and appropriate. **Note:** Each training group serviced by a HQ AFRC/A1K and/or ANG liaison office must also include procedures for forwarding student feedback received pertaining to their liaison offices. When AETC Forms 736 are submitted by students attending AETC technical training courses regarding quality of service received by HQ AFRC/A1 liaison offices, the training group will forward the forms to HQ AFRC/A1K, 155 2d Street, Robins AFB GA 31098 for review and necessary action. For ANG student feedback regarding liaison services, the information should be sent to the ANG Liaison Superintendent, 37 TRW/LN, 1550 Wurtsmith St, JBSA Lackland, TX 78236.

4.2.2. Each course will include a briefing on the student feedback program as part of the orientation unit, and allow time in each class prior to graduation, for students to participate in a course critique. Encourage all students to submit feedback on any aspect of training at any time to identify opportunities for training or support improvement. Feedback monitors will ensure replies to students/classes are provided when requested. When possible, use EOC feedback to summarize recommendations from graduating students.

4.2.3. To standardize the collection of end-of-course (EOC) feedback for resident courses to include training detachments, technical training groups will use the TTMS EOC, if available, or the sample survey at Attachment 2. (See TTMS EOC Handbook for additional system procedures.) Training groups may modify the survey at Attachment 2 to meet their individual needs (for example, add questions). However, to standardize data collection, the survey must contain (as a minimum) the same questions with the supporting rating scale in Attachment 2. AETC Form 736, *Student Feedback*, may also be used to obtain student feedback.

4.2.3.1. Technical training courses using MT will add the following question to resident technical training EOC student feedback surveys for these courses: **Did motivational training used in the course improve your motivation?**

4.2.3.2. The 737 TRG develops the BMT EOC survey and will include a copy in the 737 TRG supplement to this instruction. BMT uses the following two statements requiring a “Yes” or “No” response regarding MT on the BMT EOC: **My MTI(s) used push-ups, flutter kicks, or four count squat thrusts as motivation.** and **I believe the motivation exercises helped me to become more motivated or helped to correct my deficiencies.**

4.3. 737 TRG (BMT) Specific Surveys.

4.3.1. The 737 TRG will proctor the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey, the RAND MTI Survey (MTI Climate Survey), or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s).

4.3.2. The RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s) will be administered to every trainee prior to graduation to assist the Air Force in fostering a BMT environment free of abuse and misconduct.

4.3.3. The RAND MTI (Climate) Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s) will be administered twice per year to gather feedback on work experiences as well as abuse and misconduct to ensure a positive and safe training environment for both trainees and MTIs.

4.3.4. HQ AETC/A3-OAD will:

4.3.4.1. Compile and analyze data from the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey and RAND MTI (Climate) Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s).

4.3.4.2. Produce a quarterly report on the RAND BMT Abuse and Misconduct Survey and a semi-annual update on the RAND MTI (Climate) Survey or other HQ AETC approved survey instrument(s) to the RETOC. The report will provide negative and positive trends regarding the environment.

4.3.4.3. Submit report results to HQ AETC/A2/3/1/0, 2 AF, and the 37 TRW.

4.3.5. The RETOC Secretariat will establish an annual review of the surveys. Requests for changes to the survey instruments will be forwarded to the RETOC Secretariat IAW the RETOC charter.

4.4. Type 6 Student Feedback. To standardize the collection of EOC student feedback for Type 6 DL courses, training groups will use the sample survey at Attachment 3. Training groups may modify the survey at Attachment 3 to meet their individual needs (for example, add questions, use paper or electronic format). However, to standardize data collection, the survey must contain (as a minimum) the same questions with the supporting rating scale in Attachment 3. Type 6 courses may use any available method (on-line, electronic, and paper) to collect EOC student feedback data. For web-based Type 6 surveys, training groups will include the web site in Type 6 course materials and courseware.

4.4.1. Training groups will establish procedures for maintaining, tracking, and follow-up of Type 6 student feedback to ensure responses are timely and appropriate. As a minimum, forward any specific questions rated disagree or strongly disagree to the appropriate training manager. For Faculty Development Type 6 courses without a training manager assigned, forward specific questions rated “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree” to the 2 AF Faculty Development Functional Manager. Process any request for a response the same as a CSIP inquiry (See paragraph 5.4.)

4.4.2. Training groups will include Type 6 student feedback in the FY Semiannual Evaluation Summary Report using the format at Attachment 4 with individual course reports as attachments to the summary report. Use format at Attachment 5 for individual course reports.

4.4.3. Individual course reports must include data collected on the 25 mandatory questions and on any additional questions the group may have added to the feedback survey.

4.4.3.1. Report data by course and include, as a minimum, the number of graduates in the reporting period, the number of graduates responding, the number of questions with an overall rating of less than 90 percent, a summary of findings with corrective

actions taken or planned, and an attachment with the percentage of graduates who responded to each possible response to the questions.

4.4.3.2. Type 6 student feedback reports will not contain Privacy Act information. In the summary, include root causes, lessons learned, and trends (positive and negative), as appropriate. *EXCEPTION:* Questions 11 through 15 are exempt from the 90 percent rule because AETC schoolhouses have no direct control over these items for units outside of AETC. However, data, comments, and any applicable corrective actions must be annotated.

4.4.4. HQ 2 AF/TTOC will monitor Type 6 DL student feedback reports for trends and assist training groups in resolving issues, as necessary. 2 AF/TTOC will ensure trends outside 2 AF's span of control are forwarded to the HQ AETC/A2/3/10 TPM for assistance in resolving, with a courtesy copy to HQ AETC/A3P.

5. External Evaluation. External evaluation provides an indication of customer satisfaction of the graduate's ability to perform tasks required in the career field; how well gained knowledge and skills transfer to the workplace. In addition, external evaluation may indicate the need to revise training standards or courses to improve training quality, add technology, and/or identify skills and knowledge where training might be reduced or increased. All training standard changes are made according to AFI 36-2201 and AETCI 36-2641.

5.1. **Program Requirements.** Each training group will establish an external evaluation program. Occupational analysis reports (OAR), subject-matter expert (SME) feedback, FI, CSIP, FEQ, and FEQS should be reviewed and/or used as appropriate.

Note: As a minimum, the 937 TRG will conduct external evaluations for all assigned initial skills officer courses. For all enlisted initial skills courses with AF graduates taught by the METC, the 937 TRG will conduct external evaluation until METC gains the capability. External evaluations for the Medical Readiness courses are conducted IAW AFI 41-106, *Medical Readiness Program Managemen*t.

Note: Due to unique mission requirements, IAAFA is waived from the external evaluation program.

Note: BMT will establish procedures for an external evaluation program in a supplement to this instruction.

Note: Due to unique training pipeline flow, courses where 3-level graduates continue in a training status for 5-level upgrade without going to first duty station are waived from using FEQs, and FEQSs. (Examples are the Special Operations Weather, Enlisted Aircrew, Apprentice Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Operators [AFSC 1A8XXX] and Combat Control pipelines). Feedback for these unique pipelines can still be obtained when conducting OARs, from supervisors and SMEs who attend specialty training requirements team (STRT)/utilization and training workshops (U&TW).

5.2. **Occupational Analysis Reports (OAR).** AFI 36-2623, *Occupational Analysis*, contains policy on OARs. Review OARs to compare the current career field education and training plan (CFETP) or course training standard (CTS) with feedback from the field. Feedback from SMEs who attend STRT/U&TWs and results of the specialty knowledge test/career development course (SKT/CDC) compatibility critique helps ensure course content is current. Compare the OAR training report to feeback received through internal and external evaluations.

5.3. **Field Interview (FI).** FIs are another source for obtaining data on both currency and effectiveness of courses, if funding permits. Training groups must check with the Air Force Survey Program Office (OPR for AFI 38-501, *Air Force Survey Program*) for applicable administration requirements prior to conducting FIs.

5.3.1. When planning onsite visits, evaluators/interviewers should contact the Base Training Office (BTO) at each selected installation to coordinate plans for the FIs. (Note: Contact the Base 3S2XX Functional Manager, if no BTO exists.) Interviews should not conflict with planned inspections and exercises at onsite locations.

5.3.2. Evaluators/interviewers should interview course training personnel in the career fields being evaluated prior to conducting FIs to gain an understanding of any existing or unique career field peculiarities. Samples of FI guides (for supervisors and graduates) are at Attachment 6.

5.3.3. Any specific request for information or clarification contained on a FI response that cannot be immediately answered by the interviewer will be processed the same as a CSIP inquiry or if necessary, within 5 workdays after return from temporary duty (TDY).

5.3.4. Third party interviews, such as those by education and training managers, course personnel, or interviews conducted by any other technologically advanced means of direct communication may also be used. A copy of the FI guides should be available for use in third party interviews and feedback obtained should be sent to the training group evaluation office. The same procedures for answering requests for information or clarification as listed in paragraph 5.3.3. will be used.

5.3.5. Training groups will establish procedures to route FI feedback to appropriate offices and implement follow-up procedures to ensure concerns or problems identified are tracked and corrected.

5.4. **Customer Service Information Process (CSIP).** The CSIP consists of the customer service information line (CSIL) and any other written method by which the field communicates to a training group to ask questions or express concerns or problems with training received. CSIL information is required to be listed in all CFETPs and CTSs IAW AETCI 36-2641.

5.4.1. Groups will establish a tracking mechanism to monitor use and follow-up action of CSIP inquiries and implement procedures to ensure problems identified are tracked and corrected. As a minimum, the tracking mechanism should include date of inquiry, how the inquiry was received, and satisfaction results. Track the field's concern using a locally developed template similar to Attachment 7.

5.4.2. The CSIL is a method by which any field user (supervisor, graduate, etc.) can communicate directly with the appropriate training group concerning training issues. Each training group will establish a phone number (with voicemail for non-duty hours) and distribution/organizational email address for such purposes. Groups will contact the inquirer to obtain all relevant information necessary to effectively answer the inquiry.

5.4.3. Each training group will provide answers to inquiries as soon as possible, but not later than 5 workdays after contact with the caller or receipt of written inquiry.

5.4.4. Each group will establish routing procedures to ensure the person most qualified to answer the inquiry prepares the reply. If a phone answer is appropriate, the person preparing the answer will call the requestor with the reply.

5.4.5. Answers to significant training issues (such as changing course content, proficiency level, or length of a training program) or problems will be in writing. The group evaluation office will review the written replies and keep copies of these replies. Copies will also be sent to the appropriate AFCFM, major command (MAJCOM) Air Force specialty (AFS) functional manager, AETC/A2/3/10 TPM, and 2 AF/TTOC Workflow.

5.4.6. To enhance customer satisfaction, training groups may send a customer satisfaction survey to the originators of inquiries to significant training issues.

5.5. **Field Evaluation Questionnaire (FEQ) and Field Evaluation Questionnaire Summary (FEQS).** FEQs are designed to solicit feedback from supervisors and/or graduates to determine if graduates were trained as specified in the training standard. For officer and enlisted initial skills courses, standard questions will be added for supervisors of non-prior service (NPS) Air Force graduates. These standard questions will be used to determine the adequacy of further military training provided NPS students while attending initial skill technical training courses. FEQSs summarize questionnaire results.

5.5.1. When scheduling field evaluations, give priority to courses where there is a concern about training.

5.5.1.1. As a minimum, training groups will complete an annual field evaluation (from the date the last FEQS was signed) on each active initial skill AFSC awarding and mandatory 7-skill level craftsman courses (to include Type 6) that produced graduates.

5.5.1.2. When an initial skill or mandatory 7-skill level course is brought on line for the first time start a field evaluation using graduates two to three classes following completion of validation.

5.5.1.3. The approval authority for exceptions to the annual requirement for a field evaluation is is 2 AF/TTOC for 2 AF units and Eaker Center/MSO for Eaker Center. Some reasons for extending the evaluation cycle may include a lack of sample size for the questionnaire, transferring a course from one location to another, or changing the course from one type of training to another (e.g., type 3 to type 6 to another.)

5.5.1.4. The TRG Evaluation Office will document the request for extension to the annual requirement, coordinate with the training manager, and submit to 2 AF/TTOC. Include reasons for the extension, the date the last field evaluation was completed, and a revised evaluation date in the documentation. Copies of the documentation of an approved extension will be distributed to the applicable AFCFM and AETC/A2/3/10 TPM.

5.5.2. Develop FEQs as prescribed in Attachment 8 to simplify completion by the customer. When questionnaires are being developed, request inputs from the AFCFM through the AETC/A2/3/10 TPM and course personnel. (Coordination at the STRT/U&TW may fulfill this requirement.) As a minimum, include questions

concerning the ability of graduates to perform those tasks deemed critical and/or core to the career field.

5.5.3. Supervisors are the preferred source for evaluating recent graduates of initial skill courses. Survey graduates when a supervisory survey would not provide adequate feedback. When both graduate and supervisor data are gathered, present the data for each separately. In supervisor questionnaires, ask for an overall rating of graduates' job performance. In graduate questionnaires, ask for a rating of overall training provided.

5.5.4. Use TQA to determine the minimum number of questionnaires required. When applicable, use a representative sample of students from each MAJCOM, to include ANG, AFRC, and sister services. (Note: Table 1 provides an example for sample size and confidence levels to illustrate the logic used by TQA. It does not include all possible confidence levels.)

5.5.5. Use the most direct route to the graduate's supervisor when requesting he or she complete an FEQ. This may mean routing through the BTO. (Note: Contact the Base 3S2XX Functional Manager, if no BTO exists.) In order to achieve an adequate sample size, use one of the following methods:

5.5.5.1. **Shotgun.** Send FEQ completion requests at the same time to supervisors of graduates and/or graduates who have been in the field from 4 to 6 months. When using this method, data should be extractable by length of time. (For example, if mailing in June, send requests to those who graduated between January and March.)

5.5.5.2. **Sequential.** Send a FEQ completion request each month to graduates and/or supervisors of graduates who have been in the field for 4 months. Continue to send out mailings until a large enough sample is achieved to represent the career field. (For example, send notification to complete surveys in June for March graduates, in July for April graduates, in August for May graduates, etc.)

5.5.6. Use the most direct route to conduct follow-up actions with the BTO, force support squadron commander or equivalent if you need help reaching the minimum confidence level. (Note: Contact the Base 3S2XX Functional Manager, if no BTO exists.) Achieving the desired confidence level is critical for evaluation, validity, and support of conclusions and actions in the FEQS. **Note:** If a problem area is identified that needs immediate attention, forward to the responsible training squadron for action. Do not use the criteria in paragraph 5.5.7 for this purpose.

5.5.7. When the minimum required confidence level is achieved, training is considered adequate on a training standard item when 90 percent of usable surveys rate the training at or above the required level. Items falling below 30 percent utilization should be reviewed for retention, deletion, or alternate mode of training.

5.5.8. Use the format in Attachment 9 to document the results of the FEQs, analysis, and summary of corrective actions taken or planned for all items not meeting the training adequacy or utilization criteria described in paragraph 5.5.7. Specifically state if the required confidence level was obtained as specified in Table 1, Note 2. The FEQS must be signed by the training group commander and identify the items failing to meet either adequacy or utilization criteria. Consider all applicable evaluation data, both internal and external, when preparing the FEQS. FEQSs will not contain Privacy Act information.

5.5.8.1. When the desired confidence level is achieved, analyze data paying particular attention to those items deemed critical to the career field (core tasks, etc.). If a critical item falls below the minimum adequacy criteria described in paragraph 5.5.7, make every effort to work with course personnel, training managers, AETC/A2/3/10 TPM, AFCFMs, and other SMEs to determine the cause and recommend the best course of action. Consider conducting a thorough analysis of the method of delivery, sequence of training, test results, washback rates, etc.

5.5.8.2. When the desired confidence level is not achieved, analyze the data received to identify possible problem areas, summarize results, and publish report using the format at Attachment 9, specifically stating that the confidence level was not obtainable. No recommended course of action is required.

5.5.8.3. Any specific request for information or clarification related to training provided contained on a questionnaire comment sheet will be processed the same as a CSIP inquiry.

5.5.8.4. Post FEQSs to the AETC TT and BMT Evaluations site and notify the AFCFM, HQ AETC/A2/3/10 TPM, and 2 AF/TTOC it has been posted. Notify applicable training groups when posting a FEQS prepared on standardized faculty development courses. (**Note:** Additional distribution will be determined by the group commander.)

5.5.9. Upon request from AETC/A3PV, training groups will provide information on post graduate surveys. This information will be used to request a survey control number (SCN) IAW AFI 38-501. Information requested normally consists of a list of projected courses with applicable target survey population for a specific time period.

Table 1. Graduate Sampling. (Notes 1 and 2)

ITEM	A	B			C	D		
	Course Graduates During Sample Period	Sample Size Confidence Level			Course Graduates During Sample Period	Sample Size Confidence Level		
		95%	90%	80%		95%	90%	80%
1	10	10	10	9	700	255	195	133
2	20	19	19	18	750	261	199	134
3	30	28	27	25	800	267	202	136
4	40	36	35	32	850	272	205	137
5	50	44	42	38	900	277	208	139
6	60	52	49	44	1,000	286	213	141
7	70	60	56	49	1,100	293	217	143
8	80	67	62	54	1,200	300	221	144
9	90	73	68	58	1,300	306	224	146
10	100	80	73	62	1,400	311	227	147
11	101	81	74	63	1,500	316	229	148
12	110	86	78	66	1,600	320	231	149

13	120	92	83	69	1,700	324	233	149
14	130	98	88	72	1,800	327	235	150
15	140	104	92	75	1,900	330	237	151
16	150	109	97	78	2,000	333	238	151
17	160	114	101	81	2,200	338	241	152
18	170	119	104	83	2,400	343	243	153
19	180	124	108	86	2,600	347	245	154
20	181	125	109	87	2,800	350	247	155
21	190	129	112	88	3,000	353	248	155
22	200	133	115	90	3,500	358	251	157
23	250	154	130	99	4,000	364	253	157
24	300	171	142	106	5,000	370	257	159
25	350	187	153	112	7,000	378	261	160
26	400	200	161	116	10,000	383	263	161
27	450	212	169	120	15,000	390	265	162
28	500	222	176	123	25,000	394	268	163
29	550	232	181	126	50,000	397	269	163
30	600	240	186	129	100,000	398	270	164
31	650	248	191	131	---	---	---	---

NOTES:

1. Here is an example of how to use this table. If sample course production is 500 and 95 percent is the desired confidence level, then 222 usable questionnaires are required. This figure is 85 percent of the questionnaires to be mailed out. The number of questionnaires to be mailed is computed as follows: (Refer to AFHB 36-2235, Volume 9, for more information.)

$$\frac{85\%}{100\%} = X = \frac{222 \times 100}{85} = 261 \text{ (number of questionnaires to mail)}$$

2. Sample size numbers represent required usable returned questionnaires. For evaluation of courses with 100 or fewer graduates during the sampling period, an 80 percent confidence level is required. For courses with 101 through 180 graduates, a 90 percent confidence level is required. For courses with 181 or more graduates, a 95 percent confidence level is required.

6. Technical Training Group TA Program/BMT Standardization/Evaluation (Stan/Eval). The TA Program/BMT Stan/Eval focus on the group's success in providing graduates who meet customers' needs. It also focuses on effective use of Air Force resources. The TA Program/BMT Stan/Eval provide an internal resource for respective commanders to assess the quality of their organizations and take early corrective actions when required.

6.1. Each technical training group will establish a TA Program, and BMT will establish a Stan/Eval Program, to give their respective Group Commander, subordinate commanders and group Airmen the right information at the right time to assess risk, identify areas of improvement, determine root cause and precisely focus limited resources – all aligned with the commander's priorities and on the commander's timeline. The TA Program and BMT Stan/Eval should also facilitate requests for targeted assistance from the Wing, NAF, MAJCOM commanders and staff when/where needed.

Note: Due to unique mission requirements, the 517 TRG and the AU Eaker Center are excluded from TA Program requirements.

6.2. Technical Training Group TA Programs and BMT Stan/Eval will:

6.2.1. Inspect group-wide and subordinate unit effectiveness as well as assessing cross-unit functions/programs as directed by the Group Commander. Commanders will determine the appropriate scope, scale; timing and methodology to most effectively accomplish the objectives of the TA and BMT Stan/Eval Programs, respectively, and support the Wing Commander's Inspection Program (CCIP).

6.2.2. Serve as TRG focal point for higher headquarters (HHQ) inspections. Review corrective actions for deficiencies discovered during inspections, and track AFSO 21 initiatives to resolve significant and critical deficiencies.

6.2.3. Conduct special assessments/evaluations as directed or requested by commanders.

6.3. Training Assessments and BMT Stan/Evals will:

6.3.1. As a minimum, all TA Programs and the BMT Stan/Eval will evaluate compliance with applicable technical and basic military training policies for the following: feedback programs; resources management; risk management; training development and training management; trainee administration and scheduling; military training; motivational training practices (if applicable); and instructor utilization, proficiency, and training.

6.3.2. Conduct evaluations to collect the facts (positive and negative), and validate findings.

6.3.3. Publish a report as required by the group commander.

6.3.4. Provide corrective action reports for deficiencies found during assessments and Stan/Evals. Continue follow-ups until such findings are resolved.

6.4. **Training Assessment and BMT Stan/Eval Augmentation.** The TA Program and BMT Stan/Eval offices will select qualified personnel, such as instructor supervisors, training specialists, MTLs and MTIs, as applicable, whom are recommended by their training squadron commander to be augmenters. The TA Program and BMT Stan/Eval offices will maintain a listing of current augmenters with specific areas of expertise.

6.5. **TA Program and BMT Stan/Eval Evaluator Training**.

6.6.1. Each TA Program office and BMT Stan/Eval will develop a training plan to train all TA Program and BMT Stan/Eval personnel, respectively, including augmenters. The purpose of the training is to ensure uniformity in application of evaluation techniques and philosophy for each program, respectively. Training must cover evaluation techniques,

documentation and standardization of instructor evaluations, safety, risk management and security requirements associated with courses.

6.6.2. Each permanent or augmenter evaluator for the TA Program and BMT Stan/Eval must receive training prior to performing evaluation duties from the TA Program or BMT Stan/Eval, respectively.

7. Interservice Training. Evaluate interservice courses in accordance with AFI 36-2230-IP, *Interservice Training*, and applicable interservice agreements. Use caution to ensure AETC does not duplicate existing host-service evaluations that are adequate. The chief of the training evaluation unit may include or exclude other service graduates from surveys except when specifically requested to do so by officials of other services.

8. Use of Training Evaluation Data.

8.1. Each training group will develop metrics to measure and track efficiency and effectiveness of training courses. Internal evaluations are the primary source for efficiency metrics and external evaluations are the primary source for effectiveness metrics. Qualitative and quantitative assessments may be merged to enhance the validity of findings. When metrics show a deficiency, develop and implement corrective actions.

8.2. Technical training groups will present evaluation data to AFCFMs, at STRT/U&TWs, or other similar forums and use this data to help develop training requirements. BMT will present evaluation data at the BMT Triennial Review.

9. Trend Analysis.

9.1. AF/TTOC will conduct a FY semiannual trend analysis and prepare a FY Semiannual Evaluation Summary Report:

9.1.1. Consolidate and summarize TRG evaluation reports. Review feedback to determine potential problem areas in training evaluation.

9.1.2. Analyze all internal and external inspections and evaluations conducted at 2 AF units.

9.1.3. Identify operational or training factors/trends that positively or adversely affect training.

9.1.4. Make specific recommendations for corrective actions as needed and include Deficiency Cause Codes, FEQS, FI, and DL feedback, as applicable.

9.1.5. Distribute by 20 May and 20 November to HQ AETC/A3T, training wing and training group commanders with a courtesy copy to HQ AETC/A3P. Evaluation Summary reports will not contain Privacy Act information.

9.2. Technical training groups will conduct a FY semiannual trend analysis and prepare a FY Semiannual Evaluation Summary Report as follows:

9.2.1. As a minimum, review higher headquarters inspections, internal, and external evaluation results.

9.2.2. Identify trends in evaluation programs to include FEQ data, FIs, CSIP, and student feedback data (if available).

9.2.3. Submit analysis as shown in Attachment 4 to 2 AF/TTOC Workflow by 20 April (covering 1 October XX – 31 March XX) and 20 October (covering 1 April XX – 30 September XX). Reports will not contain Privacy Act information.

Note: Eaker Center and IAAFA are exempt from requirement to conduct a semiannual trend analysis and submit a FY Semiannual Evaluation Summary Report.)

9.3. BMT will prepare a FY quarterly summary (to include corrective actions as required on areas identified for improvement) on internal and external evaluation results IAW format prescribed in a 737 TRG supplement to AETCI 36-2640. BMT summaries will not contain Privacy Act information. The BMT Summary will be posted to the AETC TT and BMT Evaluations site no later than 45 days following the quarter (for example, 15 February for the October – December quarter) and notify HQ AETC/A3T, A3PV, and 2 AF/TTOC it is available for review.

MICHAEL A. KELTZ, Major General, USAF
Director of Intelligence, Operations, and Nuclear Integration

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management,* 7 February 2013

AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program,* 15 September 2010

AFI 36-2230 (I), *Interservice Training,* 29 August 2012

AFI 36-2623, *Occupational Analysis,* 10 September 2012

AFI 38-501, *Air Force Survey Program,* 12 May 2010

AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development,* 1 November 1993

AFH 36-2235, Volumes 1, *Information for Designers of Instructional Systems,* 01 Sep 2002

AFH 36-2235, Volumes 2-12, *Information for Designers of Instructional Systems,* 01 Nov 2002

AFH 36-2235, Volumes 13, *Information for Designers of Instructional Systems,* 03 Aug 2003

AFI 90-201, *Air Force Inspection System,* 23 March 2012

AETCI 36-2641, *Technical and Basic Military Training Development,* 26 June 2014

AETCI 36-2642, *Technical and Basic Military Training Administration,* 9 September 2010

Prescribed Forms

AETC Form 736, *Student Feedback,* 18 September 2007

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication,* 22 September 2009

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AETC—Air Education and Training Command

AFCFM—Air Force Career Field Manager

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFRIMS—Air Force Records Information Management System

AFS—Air Force specialty

AFSC—Air Force specialty code

ANG—Air National Guard

AU—Air University

BTO—Base Training Office

BMT—basic military training

CC—commander

CDC—career development course

CFETP—Career Field Education and Training Plan

CSIL—customer service information line

CSIP—customer service information process

CTS—course training standard

DL—distance learning

DLIELC—Defense Language Institute English Language Center

DSN—Defense Switching Network

EOC—end of course

FEQ—field evaluation questionnaire

FEQS—field evaluation questionnaire summary

FI—field interview

GSU—geographically separated unit

IAAFA—InterAmerican Air Force Academy

IG—inspector general

MAJCOM—major command

METC—Medical Education and Training Campus

MT—motivational training

MTL—military training leader

MTF—military training flight

NPS—non-prior service

OAR—occupational analysis report

OPR—office of primary responsibility

PCS—permanent change of station

PC—personal computer

RCS—reports control symbol

RDS—records disposition schedule

RETOC—Recruiting, Education and Training Oversight Council

SCN—survey control number

SKT—specialty knowledge test

SME—subject-matter expert

STRT—Specialty Training Requirements Team

STS—specialty training standard

TDY—temporary duty

TEP—training evaluation program

TPM—training pipeline manager

TQA—Training Quality Assessment

TRG—training group

TT—technical training

TTMS—technical training management system

U&TW—utilization and training workshop

Attachment 2

SAMPLE IN-RESIDENCE TRAINING END-OF-COURSE STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEY

Table A.2.1. Sample Feedback

SAMPLE IN-RESIDENCE TRAINING END-OF-COURSE STUDENT FEEDBACK SURVEY

Course Number & Title _____

Class ID _____

Shift and Section (if applicable) _____

Graduation Date _____

MTF Squadron (if applicable) _____

Student Name (optional unless reply requested) _____

Student Address (optional unless reply requested) _____

This questionnaire asks for your impressions of the overall training, training environment, training facilities, and the quality of instruction. Use the scale provided to indicate your rating of these areas and mark it on the answer sheet provided.

A. Strongly Agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly Disagree E. Not Applicable

If you rate any item disagree or strongly disagree, please explain what areas you feel the training was inadequate. **PLEASE BE SPECIFIC.**

INSTRUCTOR

1. Instructor presentations were clear.

2. Instructors were knowledgeable in the subjects they taught.

3. Instructors maintained a safe learning environment.

4. Instructors established a positive learning environment.

5. Individual assistance was provided as needed.

CURRICULA

6. Instructional objectives were understandable.

7. Course training materials (for example study guides, workbooks, tech data, etc.) were clearly written.

8. Course training materials supported classroom instruction.

9. Instructional technology (for example, simulators, computer based training, etc.) enhanced learning.

CURRICULA (Non B, L, Q courses)

10. Course enhanced my knowledge, skills, and/or abilities.

MEASUREMENT

11. Measurement devices (for example, performance tests, progress checks, and/or written tests) covered course objectives.

CLASSROOM RESOURCES

12. Equipment (for example, simulators, trainers, computers, etc.) was available in sufficient quantities.

13. Equipment (for example, simulators, trainers, computers, etc.) was in good operating condition.

14. Classroom environment (for example, lighting, furniture, heat/air, etc.) was satisfactory for learning.

MILITARY TRAINING (Non-Prior Service [NPS] Only)

15. Military training leaders (MTL) clearly explained policies, procedures, and standards.

16. MTLs were approachable.

17. MTLs were available when I needed help or guidance.

18. MTLs were consistent in enforcing standards.

19. MTLs led by example.

20. Airman leaders (Ropes) were consistent in enforcing standards.

21. Airman leaders (Ropes) treated all students fairly.

22. Airman leaders (Ropes) were helpful.

GENERAL SUPPORT (NPS Only)

23. Assignment personnel were helpful.

24. My dormitory was sufficiently quiet to allow study.

25. My dormitory was sufficiently quiet to allow sleep.

26. I had sufficient time to study outside of the classroom.

27. I had sufficient time to eat lunch.

GENERAL SUPPORT (TDY Only)

28. Lodging personnel were responsive to my needs.

29. Lodging facilities were adequate.

BASE SUPPORT (ALL)

30. Base chapel programs met my needs.

31. Medical facilities met my needs.

32. The finance office met my needs.

33. The military personnel flight met my needs.

34. Base facilities (gym, theater, library, dry cleaners, etc.) met my needs.

35. Dining facilities were adequate.

OVERALL (NPS Only)

36. I experienced a positive learning environment during technical training.

37. This experience has motivated me towards a successful military career.

Attachment 3

SAMPLE TYPE 6, DL END-OF-COURSE FEEDBACK

Table A3.1. Sample Format

Course Title _____

Course Number _____

Course Start Date _____

Name of Instructor (if applicable) _____

Unit, Office Symbol, and Base _____

This questionnaire asks for your impressions of the overall training, training environment, training facilities, and the quality of instruction. Use the scale provided to indicate your rating of these areas and mark it on the answer sheet provided.

A. Strongly Agree B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly Disagree E. Not Applicable

COURSE EFFECTIVENESS

1. Course objectives were clearly stated.

2. Course objectives were relative to my job requirements.

3. Course content supported the objectives.

4. Course objectives were tested at appropriate times throughout the course.

5. Test questions adequately measured my knowledge of course objectives.

6. Test questions were understandable.

7. Beneficial and timely feedback/help was built into the courseware or was provided by the instructor.

8. Safety procedures were stressed.

9. The course was organized logically.

10. The course enhanced my knowledge, skills, and/or abilities.

ENVIRONMENT/EQUIPMENT

11. Learning environment (lighting, furniture, equipment, temperature) was satisfactory for learning.

12. Equipment required for course completion was easily accessible.

13. Equipment required for course completion functioned properly.

14. I knew how to receive technical assistance if required.

15. Technical assistance was provided in a timely manner.

COURSEWARE

16. Course materials were received in a timely fashion and in good condition.

17. The pace of course material was relative to the degree of difficulty.

18. The level of interaction enhanced my learning.

19. Course materials were easy to understand and user friendly.

20. Course pictures and videos were clear and supported training.

21. Audio added to the lesson presentations.

22. Course materials contained current and accurate information.

23. Indicate the approximate number of hours required to complete the course (using the following scale).

A. 5-10 hours B. 11-20 hours C. 21-30 hours D. 31-40 hours E. 40+ hours

24. Identify your primary learning environment during course completion (using the following scale).

A. PC at work site B. PC at home C. Computer lab at Education Office

D. Distance Learning classroom E. Other (Please indicate)_____

OVERALL COURSE RATING

25. My overall rating of this course is:

A. Outstanding B. Excellent C. Satisfactory D. Marginal E. Unsatisfactory

If your overall rating of this course is marginal or unsatisfactory, please explain in what areas you feel the training was inadequate. **PLEASE BE SPECIFIC.**

IF YOU ENCOUNTERED PROBLEMS WITH COURSE COMPLETION, PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS FOR OUR CORRECTIVE ACTION.

Attachment 4

SAMPLE FY SEMIANNUAL EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT XX TRAINING GROUP FY SEMIANNUAL EVALUATIONSUMMARY REPORT 20XX

A4.1. Internal Evaluation Program Data:

A4.1.1. Units/functions evaluated this period (List GSU inspections by date).

A4.1.2. Analysis of trends observed in organization evaluations ≥ 10% of total problems.

Table A4.1. Summary of Internal Evaluation Data *(Example)*

1. Problem	2. Deficiency Cause Code	3. Cause Title	4. # of cases cited	5. % Total Problems	6. Mission Impact
1.			7	33.3%	
Solutions, Countermeasures to prevent recurrence and LIMFACS, if any.					
2.			7	33.3%	
Solutions, Countermeasures to prevent recurrence and LIMFACS, if any.					
3.			7	33.3%	
Solutions, Countermeasures to prevent recurrence and LIMFACS, if any.					
Notes: 1. Describe the problem. 2. List the Deficiency Cause Code as outlined in AFI 90-201. 3. List the Title of the Deficiency Cause Code as outlined in AFI 90-201. 4. List the number of problems discovered. 5. List the percentage of total problems discovered for the report period (In the example above, there was a total of 21 problems cited. For each problem 33.3% is the portion of the total). 6. Types of Mission Impact: Minor, Significant, Critical.					

A4.1.3. Status of previously reported "OPEN" problems. *(Example)*

A4.1.3.1. Attrition rates in course XXXXX identified in previous analysis report remain high at 33% despite efforts to revise curriculum and emphasis on remedial training. Currently working with AFPC and AFCFM to increase entrance requirements for this career field

A4.1.4. Process improvements *(Example)*

A4.1.4.1. Conducted AFSO-21 process improvement event to analyze course development times under ISD construct. Implemented rapid prototyping model to react more quickly to changes occurring on the battlefield. Resulted in reduction of training development time from 11 months to 45 days. Details of the process are available by contacting XX TRG evaluations at DSN XXX-XXXX

A4.1.5. Special evaluations (if applicable) *(Example)*

A4.1.5.1. The XX TRG Commander directed a hands-on inventory of all NWRM items to ensure accountability. No problems noted.

A4.1.6. **Student feedback data (to include Type 6): Table A4.2 In-Residence** *(Example)*

Training Group	Tech Training Satisfaction Rate	Military Training Satisfaction Rate	General Support Satisfaction Rate	Base Support Satisfaction Rate
XX TRG	96%	90%	94%	92%
Problems, Solutions, Countermeasures, and LIMFACS identified through in-residence student feedback: None				

Table A4.3. Type 6, if applicable *(Example)*

Training Group	# Courses	# Graduates	# GraduatesResponding	% Questions >90% SAT
XX TRG	18	521	521	85%
Problems, Solutions, Countermeasures, and LIMFACS identified through type-6 student feedback: XX TRG noted that many students attempted the survey more than once. The Type 6 data indicates that the results of the surveys were not reliable for fourteen of the eighteen courses. LIMFAC: connectivity issues and slow server response times.				

A4.2. External Evaluation Program Data. Analysis (cumulative to cover 6-month period).

A4.2.1. **Field Evaluation Questionnaire (FEQ) Data**.

Table A4.4. FEQ Table *(Example)*

Training Group	FY 13 Q1-Q2 Courses Requiring Field Eval	FY 13 Q1-Q2 FEQ Projects Mailed	FY 13 Q1-Q2 Waivers Approved	FY 13 Q1-Q2 Courses Not Due Field Eval	FY 13 Q3-Q4 Courses Requiring Field Eval	FY 13 Q3-Q4 FEQ Projects Mailed	FY 13 Q3-Q4 Waivers Approved	FY 13 Q3-Q4 Courses Not Due Field Eval
XX TRG	5	4	1	19	2	2	0	23

Problems, Solutions, Countermeasures, and LIMFACS identified through FEQs: None

Notes:
1. Courses Requiring Field Evaluation: Equals the number of courses required during the period. 2. FEQ Projects Mailed: Number of FEQ projects which have been mailed (not number of mailings, just number of projects).
3. Waivers Approved: Number of FEQs waived during reporting period.
4. Courses Not Required FEQ: Number of courses required but could not be conducted.
5. Courses Requiring Field Eval = Projects Mailed + Waivers Approved.
6. Courses Not Due + Courses Requiring Field Eval = Total number of AFSC awarding courses and mandatory 7-level courses.

A4.2.2. Provide total FEQ projects closed during period, non-relational to projects mailed.

Table A4.5. Example. Field Interview (FI):

Training Group	# Locations Visited	# Supervisor Surveys Conducted	% Supervisor Surveys SAT	# Graduate Surveys Conducted	% Graduate Surveys SAT
XX TRG	2	38	76%	69	87%
Problems, Solutions, Countermeasures, and LIMFACS identified through FI: Supervisors reported graduates of course XXXXX trained on outdated data collection systems were taking longer than planned to complete upgrade training. Confirmed training need with career field manager. LIMFAC: new data collection system requires data system upgrade estimated at $120K.					

GROUP COMMANDER SIGNATURE

Attachment:
Type 6 Student Feedback Questionnaire Data

cc:
TRW/CC

Attachment 5

TYPE 6 STUDENT FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Table A5.1. Sample Format Student Feedback

TYPE 6 STUDENT FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

(Course Number/Title)

From (Start Date to End Date)

	Total Resp QTR/YR	Percent Sat > QTR/YR	Percent UnSat QTR/YR	Strongly Agree QTR/YR	Agree QTR/YR	N/A QTR/YR	Disagree QTR/YR	Strongly Disagree QTR/YR
Course Effectiveness								
1. Course objectives were clearly stated.	11/11	100/100	0/0	1/1	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
2. Course objectives were relative to my job requirements.	11/11	100/100	0/0	3/3	8/8	0/0	0/0	0/0
3. Course content supported the objectives.	9/9	89/89	11/11	4/4	4/4	2/2	1/1	0/0
4. Course objectives were tested at appropriate times throughout the course.	11/11	91/91	9/9	4/4	6/6	0/0	1/1	0/0
5. Test questions adequately measured my knowledge of course objectives.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
6. Test questions were understandable.	11/11	100/100	0/0	5/5	6/6	0/0	0/0	0/0
7. Beneficial and timely feedback/help was built into the courseware or was provided by the instructor.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
8. Safety procedures were stressed.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
9. Course was organized logically.	11/11	91/91	9/9	3/3	7/7	0/0	1/1	0/0
10. Course enhanced my knowledge, skills, and/or abilities.	11/11	100/100	0/0	5/5	6/6	0/0	0/0	0/0
Environment/Equipment								
*11. Learning environment (lighting, furniture, equipment, and temperature) was satisfactory for learning.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
*12. Equipment required for course completion was easily accessible.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
*13. Equipment required for course completion functioned properly.	11/11	91/91	9/9	4/4	6/6	0/0	1/1	0/0
*14. I knew how to receive technical assistance if required.	11/11	100/100	0/0	5/5	6/6	0/0	0/0	0/0
*15. Technical assistance was provided in a timely manner.	11/11	100/100	0/0	6/6	5/5	0/0	0/0	0/0
Courseware								
16. Course materials were received in a timely fashion and in good condition.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
17. The pace of course	11/11	100/100	0/0	3/3	8/8	0/0	0/0	0/0

material was relative to the degree of difficulty.								
18. The level of interaction enhanced my learning.	9/9	89/89	11/11	4/4	4/4	2/2	1/1	0/0
19. Course materials were easy to understand and user friendly.	11/11	91/91	9/9	4/4	6/6	0/0	1/1	0/0
20. Course pictures and videos were clear and supported training.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
21. Audio added to the lesson presentations.	11/11	100/100	0/0	5/5	6/6	0/0	0/0	0/0
22. Course materials contained current and accurate information.	11/11	100/100	0/0	4/4	7/7	0/0	0/0	0/0
				5-10 hours	11-20 hours	21-30 hours	31-40 hours	40+ hours
23. Enter the approximate number of hours required to complete the course.				5/5	6/6	0/0	0/0	0/0
				PC at work	PC at home	Comp Lab	DL class	Other
24. Identify your primary learning environment during course completion.	11/11			1/1	0/0	2/2	1/1	1/1
				Outstanding	Excellent	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
25. Overall rating of this course.	11/11	100/100		2/2	7/7	2/2	0/0	0/0
Comments								

NOTE: *Questions exempt from 90 percent rule. AETC schoolhouse has no direct control over these items for units outside AETC. However, data, comments, and any applicable corrective actions must be annotated.

Attachment 6

SAMPLE FIELD INTERVIEW (FI) GUIDES (FOR GRADUATES AND SUPERVISORS)

(DO NOT REPRODUCE)

Table A6.1. Sample Interview Format

SAMPLE FIELD INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SUPERVISORS:

PART A - BACKGROUND DATA

1. COURSE GRADUATE ATTENDED

2. GRADUATE'S GRADE AND NAME (Last, First, MI)

3. DATE

4. NAME OF SUPERVISOR/GRADE/DSN/E-MAIL

5. DUTY AFSC AND TITLE OF SUPERVISOR

6. LENGTH OF TIME SUPERVISING GRADUATE

7. ORGANIZATION

8. BASE

9. MAJCOM

PART B - FINDINGS (FOR SUPERVISOR OF ENLISTED COURSE GRADUATES ONLY)

1. Are you knowledgeable of the training requirements outlined in the training standard?

YES NO

2. Has the graduate performed assigned tasks to the proficiency levels specified for the skill level in the training standard? (If NO, identify applicable tasks below.)

YES NO

3. Has the graduate performed tasks other than those listed in the training standard? (If YES, list tasks below.)

YES NO

4. Does the job performance of the graduate indicate he or she might have received more training than necessary for particular tasks? (If YES, describe below.)

YES NO

5. Has it been necessary to conduct additional training because of apparent deficiencies in the course? (If YES, describe deficiencies below.)

YES NO

6. Is the graduate making satisfactory progress? (If NO, list problems below.)

YES NO

7. Do you have any suggestions that would improve this course? (If YES, explain below.)

YES NO

8. Please rate the graduate's overall job performance, using the following rating scale. (***NOTE:*** Please explain a marginal or unsatisfactory rating.)

OUTSTANDING EXCELLENT SATISFACTORY MARGINAL UNSATISFACTORY

9. Everything considered, are you satisfied with the attitude and motivation of this recent graduate? (If NO, explain below.)

YES NO

PART C - FINDINGS (FOR SUPERVISORS OF SUPPLEMENTAL OR OFFICER COURSE GRADUATES ONLY)

1. Did the graduate experience any significant difficulty in performing his or her duties that you consider the result of inadequate training in the course? (If YES, please explain.)

YES NO

2. Please rate the graduate's overall job performance using the following rating scale. (Please explain a marginal or unsatisfactory rating.)

OUTSTANDING EXCELLENT SATISFACTORY MARGINAL UNSATISFACTORY

3. Do you have any suggestions that would improve this course? (If YES, explain below.)

YES NO

4. Would you recommend this course to others? (Please explain why or why not.)

YES NO

PART D - MISCELLANEOUS DATA (FOR ALL SUPERVISORS)

1. Other comments and recommendations regarding the training.
2. Would you like a return phone call from our evaluation office?

YES NO Your DSN:

NAME OF INTERVIEWER

(DO NOT REPRODUCE)

SAMPLE FIELD INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR GRADUATES:

PART A - BACKGROUND DATA

1. COURSE ATTENDED
2. GRADUATE'S GRADE AND NAME (Last, First, MI) /DSN/E-MAIL
3. DATE
4. DATE GRADUATED FROM COURSE
5. DUTY AFSC
6. DUTY TITLE
7. ORGANIZATION
8. BASE
9. MAJCOM

PART B - FINDINGS

1. Did the course adequately prepare you to perform all of your present duties? (If NO, please explain.)

YES NO

2. Should more training be given in any particular area(s) of the course? (If YES, please explain.)

YES NO

3. Is any part of the training unnecessary? (If YES, please explain.)

YES NO

4. Do you have any specific recommendations for improving the course? (If YES, please explain.)

YES NO

5. Please rate how well you were trained overall to perform your job. (NOTE: Please explain a marginal or unsatisfactory rating.)

OUTSTANDING EXCELLENT SATISFACTORY MARGINAL UNSATISFACTORY

PART C - MISCELLANEOUS DATA

1. Other comments/recommendations regarding training.
2. Would you like a return phone call from our evaluation office?

YES NO Your DSN:

NAME OF INTERVIEWER

Attachment 7

SAMPLE CUSTOMER SERVICE INFORMATION PROCESS (CSIP) TEMPLATE

(DO NOT REPRODUCE)

Table A.7.1. Sample Customer Service

Control No:

Received By: Date: Time:

Data Received Via: Phone Letter E-mail Other

Requester's Name, Grade, and DSN:

Mailing Address

Graduate's Name and Grade:

Graduation Date Course Attended

Course Title: Training Standard Date:

Problem/Concern:

RESPONSE

Answered in Eval by: Date: Time:

Suspense Date: Received By: Date:

Who Responded? Section: Date: Time:

Responded By (Circle One): Phone Letter E-mail Other

Nature of Response:

Copies Sent To: MAJCOM AFCFM 2 AF/TTOC Other

Remarks:

Customer Expressed Satisfaction ☐ Customer Satisfaction Sent ☐

Attachment 8

FIELD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

A8.1. Factors to Consider When Designing Questionnaires for the USAF Graduate Evaluation Program. When evaluators construct the field evaluation questionnaire, the following three major areas should be considered:

A8.1.1. **Obtaining Data to Meet the Objectives of Field Evaluation.** The objective of every evaluation project is to determine if graduates are adequately trained to perform the tasks taught in the course and required in the field. For officer and enlisted initial skills courses, standard questions will be added for supervisors of non-prior service (NPS) graduates (see Paragraph A8.3). These standard questions will be used to determine the adequacy of further military training provided NPS students while attending the initial skill technical training course(s). Word the questionnaire so it can be understood and answered with relative ease. Extensive background questions may also be used to permit meaningful analysis of data received. Questions of observable performance should be used where possible. Emphasis should be on tasks taught in the course. Limit questions on knowledge-level objectives to a minimum. When developing the initial FEQ, emphasis should be on surveying major training standard items rather than on surveying individual training standard items. Individual items may be surveyed in a subsequent survey if there are indicators of a problem in a particular area.

A8.1.2. **Providing Sufficient Instructions to Ensure Completion of Questionnaires.** State the purpose of the survey, authority under which it is conducted, suspense date for completion, and to whom questions can be referred. Provide information on the importance of the survey and the mechanics of how to complete the questionnaire.

A8.1.3. **Designing Questionnaires for the AETC Graduate Evaluation Data System.** Design questionnaires for use with a standardized computer analysis program. Written comments can also be obtained from the respondent by providing a remarks section on the questionnaire.

A8.2. First Question on Both Questionnaires. If the questionnaire cannot be completed, this question will ask the respondent to indicate why. This question is mandatory. He or she will pick an answer from the following choices:

Table A8.1. Questionnaire

Supervisor Questionnaire	Graduate Questionnaire
0 - Working in another AFSC (explain on remarks sheet)	0 - Working in another AFSC
1 - Discharge	1 - Awaiting security clearance
2 - Member does not meet standards of conduct	2 - Working in another duty position
3 - No security clearance	3 - Attending additional formal training
4 - Transferred/reassigned	4 - Medically disqualified
5 - Not assigned/assignment canceled	5 - Working in Quality Control

6 - Disqualified under Personnel Reliability Program	6 - Working in Job/Production Control
7 - Medically disqualified	7 - Other (explain on remarks sheet)
8 - Other (explain on remarks sheet)	

A8.3. Second Question on the Supervisor Questionnaire for enlisted and officer initial skills course graduates: "Are you the supervisor of a non-prior service (NPS) officer or enlisted initial skill graduate?" If the response is "No", then direct supervisors to skip Q# 3- Q# 9. If the response is "Yes", direct supervisors to respond to Q# 3 – Q# 9. Standard questions and rating scale in Tables A8.2 and A8.3 will be included on all supervisor FEQs for enlisted and officer, respectively (to include AFRC and ANG) initial skill Types 3, 5, 8, 9, A, B, and C courses (AB/OB in 3rd and 4th position of course number) as identified below.

A8.4. ENLISTED FEQ. Request comments for **Does Not Meet Standards**, **Below Standards**, and **Well Below Standards** responses.

Table A8.2. NPS Enlisted Initial Skills FEQ Questions/Rating Scale/Responses

Question #3
What is your assessment of the graduate's observance of military bearing and customs and courtesies to include proper reporting procedures, proper rendering of the salute, respect for the flag, and display of Air Force Core Values?

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, please identify the specific deficiency so it can be adequately addressed. Check one or more that apply:

- Financial Irresponsibility
- Personal Accountability
- Non-Team Player
- Customs/Courtesies
- Immaturity
- Substance Abuse
- Lack of Discipline
- Lack of Respect
- Disrespect for Authority
- Lack of Integrity
- Late for Duty
- Misses Appointments
- Lack of Interest
- Other (This selection requires a comment.)

Question #4
What is your assessment of the graduate's observance of Air Force standards for dress and personal appearance to include proper wear of uniform combinations?

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #5
Based on your initial evaluation as required by AFI 36-2201 how would you rate the graduate's ability to perform hands-on tasks at the proficiency levels specified in the 3-level course column in the CFETP/STS?

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, please identify the task(s) and graduate's actual proficiency level using the proficiency code key in the CFETP/STS and check one or more of the following that apply:

- Lack of Subject Knowledge
- Failure to Follow Instructions
- Lack of Technical Skills
- Lack of Responsibility
- Poor Reading Skills
- Inability to Use Publications/TOs
- Failure to Follow Safety Procedures
- Poor Communication Skills
- Physical Limitations
- Other (This selection requires a comment.)

Question #6
Based on your initial evaluation as required by AFI 36-2201 how would you rate the graduate's understanding of the subject knowledge items specified in the 3-level course column in the CFETP/STS?

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal

4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #7
What is your assessment of the graduate's ability to effectively use references (i.e., instructions, technical orders, commercial publications, etc.) listed for items in the 3-level course column of the CFETP/STS? For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, please identify in your comments the specific references you felt the graduate could not effectively use.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #8
What is your assessment of the graduate's ability to effectively use required support equipment (i.e., diagnostic equipment, test equipment, computer systems, tools, instruments, etc.) to perform his/her 3-level duties? For ratings 1, 2 and 3, please identify in your comments the specific support equipment you felt the graduate could not effectively use.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #9
How well do the items and/or associated proficiency levels listed in the CFETP/STS meet the 3-level job requirements in your work center? For ratings 1, 2 and 3, please identify in your comments task(s) not currently in the CFETP/STS you feel 3-levels in your workplace need to perform or task(s) where a different level of proficiency is required.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, describe the specific deficiency so it can be adequately addressed. Check one or more that apply:

- Working Outside Primary Duty - Working on Unique Equipment - 3-Level CFETP Tasks Not Applicable to this Location - Other (This selection requires a comment.)

A8.5. OFFICER FEQ. Request comments for **Does Not Meet Standards**, **Below Standards**, and **Well Below Standards** responses.

Table A8.3. NPS Officer Initials Skills FEQ Questions/Rating Scale/Responses.

Question #3 What is your assessment of the graduate's observance of military bearing, customs and courtesies, and display of Air Force Core Values? 1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable 2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory 3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal 4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory 5 - Above Standards / Excellent 6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, please identify the specific deficiency so it can be adequately addressed. Check one or more that apply: - Financial Irresponsibility - Personal Accountability - Non-Team Player - Customs/Courtesies - Immaturity - Substance Abuse - Lack of Discipline - Lack of Respect - Disrespect for Authority - Lack of Integrity - Late for Duty - Misses Appointments - Lack of Interest - Other (This selection requires a comment.)
Question #4 What is your assessment of the graduate's observance of Air Force standards for dress and personal appearance to include proper wear of uniform combinations? 1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable

2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #5
Based on your initial evaluation as required by AFI 36-2201 how would you rate the graduate's ability to perform hands-on tasks effectively?

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, please identify the task(s) and check one or more of the following that apply:

- Lack of Subject Knowledge
- Failure to Follow Instructions
- Lack of Technical Skills
- Lack of Responsibility
- Poor Reading Skills
- Inability to Use Publications/TOs
- Failure to Follow Safety Procedures
- Poor Communication Skills
- Physical Limitations
- Other (This selection requires a comment.)

Question #6
Based on your initial evaluation as required by AFI 36-2201 how would you rate the graduate's understanding of subject knowledge items in performing his/her duties effectively?

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #7
What is your assessment of the graduate's ability to effectively use references (i.e., instructions, technical orders, commercial publications, etc.) to perform his/her duties? For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, please identify in your comments the specific references you felt the graduate could not

effectively use.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #8
What is your assessment of the graduate's ability to effectively use required support equipment (i.e., diagnostic equipment, test equipment, computer systems, tools, instruments, etc.) to perform his/her duties? For ratings 1, 2 and 3, please identify in your comments the specific support equipment you felt the graduate could not effectively use.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Question #9
How well did the training received by the graduate meet job requirements in your work center? For ratings 1, 2 and 3, please identify in your comments task(s) not currently trained you feel initial skill officers in your workplace need to perform or task(s) where a different level of proficiency is required.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

For ratings of 1, 2, and 3, describe the specific deficiency so it can be adequately addressed. Check one or more that apply:

- Workcenter has specialized requirements
- Workcenter has specialized equipment and hardware
- Training is not appropriate for workcenter mission
- Training is not in-depth enough
- Other (This selection requires a comment.)

Notes:

1. Rating Scale. The FEQ is used to determine if graduates were trained as specified in the training standard. In order to meet this objective, the rating scale should mirror the training standard proficiency requirements as closely as possible. When surveying supervisors, use the task performance proficiency code descriptions (for example, Extremely Limited, Partially Proficient, etc.) whenever possible. Limit the use of satisfaction levels to only those FEQs that the proficiency code does not apply to or when surveying graduates about the training they received.

2. Last Question on the Supervisor's Questionnaire. Include a question that asks the supervisor to rate the graduate's overall preparation for the job. For example, "Based on your responses to (*items one through the last question relating to the Specialty Training Standard (STS)/Course Training Standard (CTS)*), please provide an overall rating of how well the course (*list course name*) prepared the graduate to perform assigned duties as an apprentice (*enter job title*)." Use the following rating scale.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

3. Last Question on the Graduate's Questionnaire. Include a question that asks the graduate to rate the overall training provided. For example, "How would you rate the overall training provided?" Use the following rating scale.

1 - Well Below Standards / Unacceptable
2 - Below Standards / Unsatisfactory
3 - Does Not Meet Standards / Marginal
4 - Meets Standards / Satisfactory
5 - Above Standards / Excellent
6 - Well Above Standards / Outstanding

Attachment 9

FORMAT FOR FIELD EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY (FEQS)

Table A9.1. Sample FEQS

Course Title:
Course Number:
CFETP Date:
Course Length: ___ days
Instructional Design: (Group-Paced, Self-Paced, etc.)
Elimination Rate (as applicable, rounded to the nearest whole percent): ____%
Annual STR/TPR: Current FY Programmed ___/__ Previous FY Graduates ___/__
Sampling Period: _____to _____ Number of Graduates: _____
Number of Questionnaires: **Sent: _____ Returned:_____ Usable: _____**
Questionnaire Return Rate:____% (rounded to whole percent)
Confidence Level Required:____% Achieved:____% (rounded to whole percent)

Overall Rating of Training Provided:____% (rounded to whole percent)
Number of Tasks Failing to Meet 90% Adequacy Criterion: ___ of ____
Number of Tasks Failing to Meet 30% Utilization Criterion: ___ of ____

Summary of Findings and Corrective Actions Taken or Planned: During the sampling period of Jan-Mar 2014, 500 students graduated from the (blank) course and IAW AETCI 36-2640 Table 1, Graduate Sampling, 222 returned-usable surveys are required to meet the 95% confidence level. Of the 100 task items surveyed, 25 fell below the 90% adequacy and 6 did not meet the 30% Utilization rate (See Attachments 1-4 for supporting data).

FEQ Supervisor/Graduate Comments: (Summary or list of comments with NO NAMES OR PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION; STS reference, Proficiency Code, Current Adequacy Criterion. Distinguish between supervisor or graduate comments (see Attachment 5 for complete list [if applicable])

ADDITIONAL TRAINING EVALUATION DATA

Field Interviews: Number of personnel interviewed (graduates, supervisors or both) and locations, with comment summary. If none conducted enter NONE. (May include FI report)

End-of-Course Critique Student Feedback Survey: (Summary of comments and ratings)

Customer Service Information line (CSIL): Number of calls related to the course in question…if none enter NONE.

Occupational Analysis Report (OAR), if applicable: Compare the OAR training report to feeback received through internal and external evaluations as applicable**.**

Previous FEQ Summary: Short synopsis (Example):
The last FEQS was completed on 12 March, 2012 and is/is not based on the same CFETP date of 1 Nov 2010. The survey of 158 graduates produced a confidence level of 98%. Correlation between the previous FEQS and this one shows the overall satisfaction improved from 95% to 100%. The number tasks failing to meet the 30% utilization criterion remained at zero. The number of tasks failing to meet 90% adequacy criterion fell from 5 to zero.

_____ _____
(Training Group Commander's Signature) Date

Attachment(s):
1. STS/CTS Data Summary from AETC TQA (web) query
2. FEQ Survey Returns Report (TQA)
3. TTMS Upfront Production Numbers for Sampling Period (screen capture)
4. Tasks Failing to Meet the 90% Adequacy and/or 30% Utilization Criterion
5. FEQ Comments (Summary or list of comments with NO NAMES OR PERSONALLY IDENTIFYING INFORMATION; STS reference, Proficiency code and Current Adequacy Criterion)

Note: Add additional attachments as required to support conclusions, i.e. comment matrix from End-of-Course Student Feedback Survey

STS REF	Prof Code	Title	Adequacy	Utilization	Corrective Action	ECD
40.4.	b	Identify law of supply and demand procedures.	71%	82%	This STS line item is covered by Block IV text material and lecture. Definitions of supply and demand as well as the three steps (procedures) for determining supply and demand are stressed in both lecture and text. Student comprehension is measured by progress check and on the block test with questions relevant to the steps (procedures). The course material covers this topic to the b level in this course. After reviewing the AETC Form 668, student comprehension appears to be 88% on average. This line item will be discussed at the upcoming U&TW for possible deletion from the STS. .No action is required.	N/A