



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
WASHINGTON, DC

AFI10-1703V2\_AFGM2016-01

17 MAY 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION C  
MAJCOMs/FOAs/DRUs

FROM: SAF/CIO A6  
1480 Air Force Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20330-1480

SUBJECT: Air Force Guidance Memorandum to AFI 10-1703, Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*

By Order of the Secretary of the Air Force, this Air Force Guidance Memorandum immediately changes Air Force Instruction 10-1703, Volume 2, *Cybercrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*, 15 October 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*. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained IAW Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS) Records Disposition Schedule (RDS).

As a result of the publication of AF Policy Directive 17-2, *Cyberspace Operations*, which supersedes AFPD 10-17, *Cyberspace Operations*, dated 31 July 2012; AFI 10-1703, Volume 2 is hereby renumbered as AFI 17-203, Volume 2. This Memorandum is a renumbering of AFI 10-1703 only; the title and content remain unchanged. I hereby direct the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for AFI10-1703 to conduct a special review in accordance with AFI33-360 to align its content with AFPD17-2. This will result in a rewrite or rescind action of AFI10-1703.

This Memorandum becomes void after one year has elapsed from the date of this Memorandum, or upon incorporation by interim change to, or rewrite of AFI 10-1703, Volume 2, whichever is earlier.

WILLIAM J. BENDER, Lt Gen, USAF  
Chief of Information Dominance and Chief  
Information Officer

**BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY  
OF THE AIR FORCE**

**AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 10-1703,  
VOLUME 2**



**15 OCTOBER 2014**

*Incorporating Change 1, 2 JULY 2015*

**Operations**

**CYBERCREW STANDARDIZATION  
AND EVALUATION PROGRAM**

**COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY**

---

**ACCESSIBILITY:** Publications and forms are available on the e-Publishing website at [www.e-Publishing.af.mil](http://www.e-Publishing.af.mil) for downloading or ordering

**RELEASABILITY:** There are no releasability restrictions on this publication

---

OPR: HQ USAF/A6SS

Certified by: HQ USAF/A6S  
(Brig Gen Zabel)

Pages: 42

---

This instruction implements Air Force (AF) Policy Directive (AFPD) 10-17, *Cyberspace Operations*. It establishes the Cybercrew Standardization and Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Program that supports AF objectives and provides guidance on how to structure and monitor a stan/eval program. This publication applies to all military and civilian AF personnel, members of AF Reserve Command (AFRC) units and the Air National Guard (ANG). This publication may be supplemented at the unit level; route all direct supplements through channels to HQ USAF/A6S for coordination prior to certification and approval. Refer to lead MAJCOM-provided instructions for specific stan/eval requirements unique to individual and cybercrew positions. The authorities to waive wing/unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier (“T-0, T-1, T-3, T-3”) number following the compliance statement. See AFI 33-360, Publications and Forms Management, Table 1.1 for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Send recommended changes or comments to the Office of Primary Responsibility (HQ USAF/A6SS, 1480 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1480), using AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*; route AF Forms 847 from the field through the appropriate functional’s chain of command. This instruction requires collecting and maintaining information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 552a). System of records notices F036 AF PC C, Military Personnel Records System, and OPM/GOVT-1, *General Personnel Records*, apply. When collecting and maintaining information protect it by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by 10 U.S.C. 8013. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes

prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the AF Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located in the AF Records Management Information System (AFRIMS). See Attachment 1 for a glossary of references and supporting information.

### ***SUMMARY OF CHANGES***

This interim change revises AFI 10-1703, Volume 2, by incorporating changes identified during the compliance statement review, and updating office symbols and references. Several tiering codes have been updated and related language changed to improve readability and clarify responsibilities.

<b>Chapter 1—PURPOSE</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. General. ....	5
1.2. Objectives. ....	5
1.3. Waiver Authority. ....	5
<b>Chapter 2—HIGHER HEADQUARTERS (HHQ) STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1. Scope. ....	7
2.2. Air Staff. ....	7
2.3. MAJCOMs. ....	7
2.4. NAFs. ....	8
<b>Chapter 3—UNIT STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1. Scope. ....	10
3.2. Operations Group Commander (OG/CC). ....	10
3.3. Stan/Eval Organization. ....	10
3.4. Squadron Commander. ....	11
<b>Chapter 4—CYBERCREW EXAMINERS</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1. General. ....	12
4.2. SEEs will: ....	12
<b>Chapter 5—CYBERCREW QUALIFICATION EVALUATIONS</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1. General. ....	13
5.2. Categories. ....	13
5.3. Phases. ....	14
5.4. Qualification Levels. ....	14

5.5.	Evaluation Criteria. ....	15
5.6.	Requisites. ....	15
5.7.	Timing of Qualification Evaluations. ....	16
5.8.	Failure to Pass a Positional Evaluation. ....	16
5.9.	Failure to Complete an Evaluation within the Required Period. ....	17
5.10.	Commander-Directed Downgrade. ....	17
5.11.	Multiple Qualifications. ....	17
<b>CHAPTER 6—CYBERCREW PERFORMANCE EXAMINATION PROGRAM</b>		<b>18</b>
6.1.	Purpose. ....	18
6.2.	General. ....	18
6.3.	Grading System. ....	18
6.4.	Conduct of a Performance Evaluation. ....	18
6.5.	Remedial Action. ....	19
6.6.	Supervised Status Requirement. ....	19
6.7.	Re-Evaluation. ....	19
<b>Chapter 7—CYBERCREW WRITTEN EXAMINATION PROGRAM</b>		<b>20</b>
7.1.	Purpose. ....	20
7.2.	General. ....	20
7.3.	Grading System. ....	21
7.4.	Conduct of Written Examinations. ....	21
7.5.	Remedial Action. ....	21
7.6.	Supervised Status Requirement. ....	22
7.7.	Retest. ....	22
<b>Chapter 8—DOCUMENTATION</b>		<b>23</b>
8.1.	Scope. ....	23
8.2.	Electronic Database. ....	23
8.3.	AF Form 4418, Certificate of Cybercrew/Spacecrew Qualification. ....	23
8.4.	AF Form 4420, Individual’s Record of Duties and Qualification. ....	23
8.5.	Individual Qualification Folder (IQF). ....	23
<b>Chapter 9—ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS (CIF, CII, GO/NO-GO, TREND ANALYSIS, SEB)</b>		<b>27</b>
9.1.	Scope. ....	27
9.2.	Crew Information File (CIF). ....	27

Table 9.1.	CIF Volumes .....	27
9.3.	Stan/Eval Command Interest Items (CII). .....	28
9.4.	Go/No-Go Program. ....	29
9.5.	Trend Analysis Program. ....	29
9.6.	Stan/Eval Board. ....	30
9.7.	Disposition of Documentation. ....	30
<b>Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION</b>		<b>31</b>
<b>Attachment 2—MASTER QUESTION FILE</b>		<b>37</b>
<b>Attachment 3—EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>		<b>38</b>
<b>Attachment 4—STAN/EVAL BOARD MINUTES</b>		<b>40</b>
<b>Attachment 5—PERFORMANCE EXAMINATION SCENARIO</b>		<b>42</b>

## Chapter 1

### PURPOSE

**1.1. General.** The Cybercrew Stan/Eval Program provides commanders a tool to validate mission readiness and the effectiveness of unit cyberspace operations, including documentation of individual cybercrew member qualifications and capabilities.

1.1.1. Cybercrews consist of individuals who conduct cyberspace operations and are assigned to a specific cyberspace weapon system (CWS).

1.1.2. This Instruction applies to cybercrew positions that are designated mission ready (MR)/combat mission ready (CMR) in the applicable lead MAJCOM-provided guidance. Personnel filling MR/CMR positions at the 624 OC will adhere to guidance in Paragraphs 1.1 through 1.3.5, and applicable lead MAJCOM-provided guidance only. (T-2)

1.1.3. Individuals who perform cyberspace support functions and are not assigned a MR/CMR cybercrew position within a CWS follow the guidance for AF cyberspace support activities contained in AFI 33-150, *Management of Communications Activities*, and/or AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program*, as applicable. Examples include, but are not limited to, Information Assurance professionals, network administrators, help desk personnel, and Communications Focal Point (CFP) technicians.

### 1.2. Objectives.

1.2.1. Provide a system to assess and document individual proficiency and capability to accomplish assigned cyberspace operations duties.

1.2.2. Develop and ensure standardization of operational procedures for CWS employment.

1.2.3. Ensure compliance with appropriate operational, training, and administrative directives.

1.2.4. Evaluate and revise operational directives, procedures, and techniques as necessary.

1.2.5. Recognize trends in order to recommend/initiate changes to training programs and directives.

**1.3. Waiver Authority.** Submit requests for waivers according to the instructions in this paragraph.

1.3.1. HQ AFSPC/A3T is the waiver authority for this instruction. Unless otherwise noted, waiver authority may be delegated to the appropriate Wing Commander, but may not be further delegated.

1.3.2. General Guidance. Provisions of this AFI may be waived by Wing, Group, or NAF Commanders with appropriate justification. Forward copies of all waivers granted to the next higher headquarters, and to HQ AFSPC/A3T and HQ AF/A6SS. AF Reserve and National Guard units will forward copies of waivers to HQ AFRC/A3T or NGB/A3, as appropriate, and to HQ AFSPC/A3T and HQ AF/A6SS. (T-1)

1.3.3. AF Reserve Units. Waiver authority granted in this instruction applies only to MR/CMR designation and does not extend to the waiver of AFSC-awarding requirements.

1.3.4. Air National Guard (ANG) units. NGB/A3C is the waiver authority for this instruction for ANG units. AFSPC gained units will process waivers IAW paragraph 1.3 through their appropriate ANG group commander where applicable. (T-2) The group/unit commander will submit waiver requests to NGB/A3C. (T-2) NGB/A3C will provide a copy of the waiver request and waiver decision to HQ AFSPC/A3T.

1.3.5. Waivers remain in effect for the life of the published guidance, unless a shorter period of time has been specified, the waiver is cancelled in writing, or a change to this AFI alters the basis for the waiver.

## Chapter 2

### HIGHER HEADQUARTERS (HHQ) STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION

**2.1. Scope.** For the purposes of this instruction, HHQ includes Headquarters U.S. Air Force (HAF), MAJCOM, and NAF stan/eval functions.

#### **2.2. Air Staff.**

##### 2.2.1. AF/A6S.

2.2.1.1. Sets policy and guides the conduct and execution of the Stan/Eval Program.

2.2.1.2. Assigns AF/A6SS as the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for this Instruction.

2.2.1.3. Oversees development and management of all CWS policy documents.

##### 2.2.2. AF/A6SS.

2.2.2.1. Reviews and maintains this instruction.

2.2.2.2. Reviews MAJCOM supplements to this AFI to ensure compliance with basic policy guidance in this instruction, as applicable.

2.2.2.3. Maintains liaison with HAF organizations, MAJCOMs, and cyber career field functional managers to ensure compliance by all cybercrew personnel.

2.2.2.4. Coordinates with HAF organizations and MAJCOM stan/eval functions to ensure lead MAJCOM-developed guidance conforms to and complies with basic AF policy guidance contained in this Instruction.

2.2.2.5. Oversees development and management of all lead MAJCOM-developed guidance documents.

**2.3. MAJCOMs.** The following guidance applies only to MAJCOMs designated as the lead command or as a using command for a CWS.

##### 2.3.1. General.

2.3.1.1. MAJCOM stan/eval staffs are primarily responsible for establishing administrative processes. Lower echelons of command are primarily responsible for the cyberspace operations and evaluation functions.

2.3.1.2. MAJCOM stan/eval staffs may obtain MR/CMR certification in a cybercrew position to maintain functional expertise.

2.3.1.3. HAF, direct reporting units, and the ANG are considered MAJCOMs for the purpose of this instruction.

##### 2.3.2. Functions.

2.3.2.1. The lead MAJCOM for each CWS will develop and manage applicable guidance.

2.3.2.1.1. MAJCOM functionals will determine CWS-specific operational guidance. Guidance provided by the lead MAJCOM will be no less restrictive than that contained in this AFI.

2.3.2.2. Convene conferences and working groups, as necessary, to review and improve command stan/eval policies and procedures.

2.3.2.3. Provide staff coordination and control of all Cybercrew Information File (CIF) items issued from the MAJCOM level to units (see Chapter 9).

2.3.2.4. Establish guidance for MAJCOM-mandated stan/eval software, when applicable.

2.3.2.5. Assist with the review, updating and distribution of CWS-specific Master Question Files (MQFs) as needed (see Chapter 7).

2.3.2.6. Coordinate on evaluation criteria and guidance in conjunction with the lead MAJCOM and other user MAJCOMs operating like CWSs.

2.3.2.7. Coordinate on and process applicable AF Forms 847 through stan/eval channels (Ops Group Stan/Eval (OGV), NAF (if applicable), and MAJCOM. ANG units will utilize the NAF/MAJCOM command structure with oversight responsibility. (T-2)

2.3.2.8. Review subordinate unit Stan/Eval Board (SEB) minutes and address any action items requiring HHQ assistance.

2.3.2.9. In the absence of a NAF stan/eval function, assume responsibilities listed in paragraph 2.4.

### 2.3.3. Organization.

2.3.3.1. MAJCOM Commanders will assign the MAJCOM/A3 (or equivalent) responsibility for the MAJCOM stan/eval program.

2.3.4. Augmentation. Each MAJCOM may use augmentees from other MAJCOMs to support or conduct cross-command stan/eval program reviews and evaluations with concurrence of all the MAJCOM stan/eval organizations involved. Augmentees will use the criteria of the MAJCOM they are augmenting. (T-2)

## 2.4. NAFs.

2.4.1. General. NAF stan/eval will maintain a tactical focus and perform the operational role in evaluating unit stan/eval functions within its chain of command. (T-2) MAJCOM stan/eval assumes these responsibilities when no NAF stan/eval exists.

### 2.4.2. Functions.

2.4.2.1. Provide oversight and guidance for stan/eval functions in lower echelon units, in gained units, and in aligned AFRC/ANG units.

2.4.2.2. Coordinate on and process applicable AF Forms 847 through stan/eval. ANG units will utilize the NAF/MAJCOM command structure with oversight responsibility. (T-2)

2.4.2.3. Provide staff coordination and control of all CIF items issued from the NAF level to units (see Chapter 8).

2.4.2.4. Provide qualified cyber examiners to augment other MAJCOM and NAF agencies when requested (see paragraph 2.3.4).

2.4.2.5. Administer objectivity evaluations, when practical, to chiefs of stan/eval or senior stan/eval crews in lower echelon units, in gained units, and in AFRC/ANG units for which oversight responsibility is assigned. NAF stan/eval personnel do not require cybercrew examiner certification to conduct objectivity evaluations.

2.4.2.6. Observe execution of unit missions and provide feedback when feasible.

2.4.2.7. Review subordinate unit SEB minutes and, at a minimum, address any action items requiring HHQ assistance.

2.4.2.8. Review and approve MQFs.

2.4.2.9. Review and approve evaluation criteria.

2.4.2.10. Review and coordinate on applicable lead MAJCOM-provided guidance.

### 2.4.3. Organization.

2.4.3.1. NAF commanders will designate the NAF/A3 (or equivalent) responsible for the NAF stan/eval program.

2.4.3.2. NAF stan/eval staff should be selected from personnel with cybercrew stan/eval experience when practical.

2.4.4. Augmentation. Each NAF may use qualified augmentees to support or conduct reviews, evaluations, and inspections with concurrence of all the NAF stan/eval organizations involved.

## Chapter 3

### UNIT STAN/EVAL FUNCTIONS AND ORGANIZATION

**3.1. Scope.** For purpose of this instruction, "unit" includes levels of organization under HHQ required to establish a stan/eval function. Most units are composed of an Operations Group (OG) and cyber squadrons/detachments (henceforth in this AFI, "Operations Group" will be considered any Group-level command, and "squadron" should be used synonymously with "detachment"). Where there is no parent OG, squadrons will assume duties listed for OGs. (T-2)

**3.2. Operations Group Commander (OG/CC).** When circumstances prohibit the OG/CC from executing these responsibilities, the MAJCOM/A3 may grant a written waiver allowing a squadron/detachment commander (Sq/Det/CC) to assume them. The OG/CC will:

- 3.2.1. Direct the conduct of the unit level stan/eval program (T-3).
- 3.2.2. Provide manpower to the unit stan/eval function to execute the duties directed by this AFI (T-3).
- 3.2.3. Designate OGV stan/eval examiners (SEE) (see section 4.2) (T-3).
- 3.2.4. Designate additional cybercrew examiners who are not assigned to OGV, when necessary, to meet unique unit requirements. Document in the SEB minutes (see Attachment 4) (T-3).
- 3.2.5. Designate, when necessary, stan/eval liaison officers (SELOs) to assist OGV in administrative duties (T-3).
- 3.2.6. Chair the SEB (T-3).
- 3.2.7. Establish procedures to implement MAJCOM-mandated stan/eval software, as necessary (T-3).
- 3.2.8. Provide waiver authority for weapon system cybercrew examiners to evaluate mission/skill sets in which they are not certified (T-3).

**3.3. Stan/Eval Organization.** The stan/eval function is normally administered from the group level (OGV) with the Chief of Stan/Eval reporting directly to the OG/CC. However, when circumstances prohibit, or if directed by the OG/CC, the Squadron/Detachment may assume responsibility for this function. Reserve this transfer of responsibility for units not collocated with the Group. The stan/eval function will:

- 3.3.1. Consist of a Chief of Stan/Eval and at least one examiner per cybercrew position per CWS. (T-3)
  - 3.3.1.1. The OG/CC may determine if a specific examiner is not required based on unit requirements or personnel constraints. This should be indicated in the SEB minutes.
  - 3.3.1.2. The Chief of Stan/Eval will be a certified examiner in a unit CWS (T-3) and report directly to, and be rated by, the OG/CC (or Sq/Det/CC when the function resides below group) (T-3).
  - 3.3.1.3. Commanders will ensure that examiners are selected from the most suitable, highest qualified and most experienced personnel (T-3).

3.3.2. Process AF Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew/Spacecrew Qualification* and AF Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualifications* (T-3).

3.3.3. Establish, monitor, and maintain the unit Individual Qualification Folders (IQF) program IAW Chapter 8 (T-3).

3.3.4. Establish procedures for review and quality control of evaluation documentation (T-3).

3.3.5. Establish and maintain a trend analysis program IAW Chapter 9 (T-3).

3.3.6. Conduct SEBs IAW Chapter 9 and ensure SEB minutes are distributed within 15 calendar days (T-3). OG/CC determines the distribution, which at a minimum includes the NAF stan/eval function. (T-3)

3.3.7. Establish unit no-notice program and goals. (T-3) The stan/eval function will monitor this program to ensure goals set by the OG/CC or SQ/CC are met and unit no-notice evaluations are distributed proportionately among positions and types of evaluations (T-3).

3.3.8. Design evaluation criteria and submit to NAF for review and approval IAW Attachment 3 (T-3). Evaluation criteria require NAF approval prior to implementation.

3.3.9. Design Master Question Files (MQFs) for all CWSs assigned to the group and submit to NAF for review and approval IAW Attachment 2 (T-3). MQFs require NAF approval prior to implementation.

3.3.10. Develop and document the SEE training program (T-3), designed to instruct and certify SEEs on the proper manner in which to correctly assess cybercrew proficiency as part of their role in the Instructional Systems Development (ISD) process. Prior to implementation of the SEE training program, the appropriate NAF stan/eval will review and approve the program and ensure it meets the requirements of Chapter 4 (T-3).

3.3.11. Monitor the upgrade and objectivity of all SEEs (T-3).

3.3.12. At least quarterly, advise unit leadership on unit cybercrew qualification status, requisite completion, and upcoming expiration dates (T-3). In addition, at least semi-annually the stan/eval function will advise unit leadership on unit trends as well as combined trends across all units under the stan/eval office's responsibility. (T-3)

**3.4. Squadron Commander.** Supports the group stan/eval program and encourages a positive climate conducive to successful implementation of the Cybercrew Standardization and Evaluation Program.

## Chapter 4

### CYBERCREW EXAMINERS

**4.1. General.** The evaluation portion of the Cybercrew Stan/Eval Program is administered by SEEs at both the group and squadron levels. An examiner who is qualified on more than one CWS may evaluate more than one position.

**4.2. SEEs will:**

4.2.1. Complete appropriate training program documented on AF Form 4420 before certification **(T-3)**. A certified SEE conducting the SEE training on another individual does not need to be appointed as an instructor. A certified SEE will observe and supervise evaluator trainees **(T-3)**. At a minimum the training consists of:

4.2.1.1. Applicable equipment configuration and scheduling procedures (e.g., simulator and on-line equipment configuration, test and evaluation scenario control procedures).

4.2.1.2. ISD process and procedures.

4.2.1.3. Construction, conduct, and administration of the written phase of an evaluation.

4.2.1.4. Construction, conduct, and administration of the performance phase of an evaluation.

4.2.1.5. Observance, at a minimum, of one certified SEE conducting an evaluation.

4.2.2. Conduct cybercrew evaluations IAW with this instruction. **(T-3)**

4.2.3. Maintain MR/CMR status in each position that they will evaluate **(T-3)**. NAF-level examiners are only required to maintain basic mission capable (BMC) status per the requirements in AFI 10-1703, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*.

4.2.4. Administer evaluations only in those positions in which they maintain qualification and certification. **(T-3)** Exception: spot qualification (SPOT) evaluations and where specifically authorized in applicable MAJCOM guidance.

4.2.5. Not administer evaluations outside of their MAJCOM unless specifically requested by the MAJCOM stan/eval organization of the examinee and approved by the MAJCOM stan/eval organization of the examiner **(T-2)**. MAJCOMs may establish procedures in their supplement for CWS cybercrew examiners to administer evaluations outside of NAFs/units within their own MAJCOM (see also paragraph 2.3.4).

4.2.6. Pass an objectivity evaluation administered by the Chief of Stan/Eval or designee based on the NAF approved SEE training and certification program. Objectivity evaluations can be administered by HHQ personnel IAW paragraph 2.4.2.5. **(T-3)**

4.2.7. Conduct a thorough pre-evaluation briefing and post-evaluation debriefing for the examinee and applicable cybercrew members on all aspects of the evaluation. **(T-3)**

4.2.8. Debrief the examinee's flight commander or operations officer on the results of the evaluation. As soon as possible, notify the examinee's squadron commander (or available supervision if the squadron commander cannot be reached) whenever Qualification Level 2 or 3 (Q2 or Q3) performance is observed (see paragraph 5.4). **(T-3)**

## Chapter 5

### CYBERCREW QUALIFICATION EVALUATIONS

**5.1. General.** The Cybercrew Stan/Eval Program utilizes cybercrew evaluations to ensure qualification of cybercrew members and standardization of operations.

**5.2. Categories.** Cybercrew qualification evaluations are divided into three categories, (Qualification (QUAL), Mission (MSN), and SPOT), each consisting of two structured phases, written and performance. (Exception: A SPOT evaluation may only consist of one phase, depending on its purpose.)

#### 5.2.1. QUAL Evaluations.

5.2.1.1. Purpose. Ensure basic qualification in a CWS and/or cybercrew position.

5.2.1.2. Execution. All cybercrews will complete periodic QUAL evaluation in their primary assigned CWS cybercrew positions in accordance with lead command developed criteria described in paragraph 2.3.2.1 of this instruction (**T-3**). QUAL evaluations may be combined with MSN evaluations IAW lead MAJCOM guidance.

#### 5.2.2. MSN Evaluations.

5.2.2.1. Purpose. To ensure qualification to employ the CWS at the assigned cybercrew position in the accomplishment of the unit's operational and/or designated operational capability (DOC) statement missions.

5.2.2.2. Execution. All cybercrew members maintaining MR/CMR status (IAW AFI 10-1703, Vol 1) will complete a periodic MSN evaluation as specified in the applicable lead MAJCOM guidance. (**T-1**)

5.2.2.2.1. The MSN evaluation should reflect the type and difficulty of tasks required in fulfillment of the CWS operational and/or DOC statement missions.

#### 5.2.3. SPOT Evaluations.

5.2.3.1. Purpose. Evaluate a specific event or requirement without intending to satisfy the requirements of a periodic evaluation and/or an initial evaluation.

5.2.3.2. Execution. A SPOT has no specific requisites, unless specified in lead MAJCOM guidance, but may be no notice (N/N).

5.2.3.2.1. An examinee may utilize a SPOT evaluation to update a QUAL/MSN evaluation expiration date provided all requirements for the QUAL/MSN are met.

5.2.3.2.2. Any qualifying event and/or evaluation not listed in paragraphs 5.2.1 through 5.2.3 should be documented as a SPOT evaluation.

5.2.3.2.3. Objectivity evaluations should be documented as a SPOT on the AF Form 4418.

5.2.4. Prefixes. The following prefixes should be used, when applicable, to further describe the evaluations listed in paragraphs 5.2.1 through 5.2.3:

5.2.4.1. Initial (INIT). The first evaluation of any type in a specific CWS cybercrew position.

5.2.4.2. Requalification (RQ). An evaluation administered to remedy a loss of qualification due to:

5.2.4.2.1. Expiration of a required periodic evaluation. Commanders will ensure that the recheck is IAW the guidance for that periodic evaluation. **(T-3)**

5.2.4.2.2. Loss of currency that requires a requalification evaluation (IAW lead MAJCOM guidance). In this case, use RQ SPOT for documentation. The certifying official directs the requalification criteria, which will as a minimum include those items for which the individual is not current.

5.2.4.2.3. A failed periodic evaluation. The certifying official directs the requalification criteria, which will as a minimum include those items for which the individual failed the evaluation.

5.2.4.2.4. Loss of qualification due to a commander-directed downgrade (see paragraph 5.10). The commander will direct the recheck criteria on the AF Form 4418.

5.2.4.2.5. Do not use the RQ prefix with a requalification following a failed INIT evaluation. No qualification was achieved, thus requalification is not possible.

5.2.4.3. No-Notice.

5.2.4.3.1. The N/N evaluation program provides commanders a sampling of daily cybercrew performance and an assessment of unit training effectiveness.

5.2.4.3.2. A N/N evaluation is one where the examinee is notified of the evaluation at or after the beginning of the cybercrew changeover.

5.2.4.3.3. A N/N cannot be combined with an INIT evaluation.

5.2.4.4. Simulator (SIM). An evaluation where the performance phase requisite is conducted in a simulator as defined in lead MAJCOM guidance.

5.2.4.5. Multiple Prefixes. More than one prefix may be used to describe an evaluation. If it is not obvious in the context of the evaluation, explain the applicability or purpose of any prefixes on the AF Form 4418 IAW Chapter 8.

**5.3. Phases.** QUAL and MSN evaluations consist of two structured phases, written and performance. Passing of the written phase is a pre-requisite for the beginning of the performance phase. SPOT evaluations may consist of one or both phases depending on their purpose.

**5.4. Qualification Levels.** Qualification levels are grades assigned to the overall evaluation. Individual phases are graded IAW Chapters 6 and 7 and are considered when determining the overall qualification level. Qualification levels are:

5.4.1. Qualification Level 1 (Q1). The member demonstrated desired performance and knowledge of safety, procedures, equipment and directives within tolerances specified in the grading criteria. This is awarded when no discrepancies were noted, and may be awarded when discrepancies are noted if:

5.4.1.1. The discrepancies resulted in no unsatisfactory (U) grades being given in any area(s)/subarea(s).

5.4.1.2. All discrepancies noted during the evaluation were resolved during the debrief of that evaluation.

5.4.1.3. Passed written exam with score of 90-100 on first attempt.

5.4.2. Qualification Level 2 (Q2). The member generally demonstrated desired performance and knowledge of safety, procedures, equipment and directives within tolerances specified in the grading criteria, but:

5.4.2.1. There were one or more area(s)/subarea(s) where additional training was assigned.

5.4.2.2. A non-critical area/subarea grade of U was awarded.

5.4.2.3. Passed written exam with score of 80 to <90 on first attempt.

5.4.3. Qualification Level 3 (Q3). The member demonstrated an unacceptable level of safety, performance or knowledge. The member is not qualified to perform cybercrew duties.

5.4.3.1. An area grade of U awarded in a critical area requires an overall Q3 for the evaluation.

5.4.3.2. Failed written exam with a score of <80.

5.4.3.3. Reference paragraph 7.7 for retest scoring information.

5.4.4. Exceptionally Qualified (EQ) Designation (Optional). An EQ designation may be awarded by the examiner when:

5.4.4.1. The examinee has demonstrated exceptional skill and knowledge in all portions of the evaluation.

5.4.4.2. The examinee has not failed any part and;

5.4.4.3. The examinee received a Q1 grade with no discrepancies on all areas/subareas.

5.4.4.4. The operator passed written exam with a score of 95-100.

**5.5. Evaluation Criteria.** Evaluation criteria define the performance standards expected of cybercrews in their accomplishment of the mission. These standards are the measurement against which crewmembers are evaluated to achieve and maintain their qualifications. Lead MAJCOM-provided guidance identifies areas/subareas required for evaluation completion and provides required evaluation criteria. Attachment 3 gives examples for evaluation criteria.

**5.6. Requisites.** Requisites are defined as that combination of written examinations, performance examinations, and other requirements identified in lead MAJCOM-provided guidance as required for an evaluation to be considered complete.

5.6.1. Lead MAJCOM-provided guidance specifies requisites for each cybercrew position and associated qualifications.

5.6.2. Units that direct additional requisites beyond those specified in the appropriate lead MAJCOM-provided guidance must document these within their unit instructions (**T-3**).

5.6.3. For multiple qualifications, the evaluation of one requisite may count for separate evaluations provided the evaluations occur IAW the provisions of section 5.7.

5.6.4. Requisites that were valid for a failed examination remain valid.

### **5.7. Timing of Qualification Evaluations.**

5.7.1. Expiration Date. Required periodic evaluations are defined in the respective lead MAJCOM-provided guidance; however, Commanders will ensure that they do not exceed the last day of the 17<sup>th</sup> month after the evaluation was successfully completed (**T-3**).

5.7.2. Requirements before Permanent Change of Station (PCS)/Temporary Duty (TDY). If a periodic evaluation expires within three months after the proposed departure for a PCS to an assignment in the same mission type, or during an upcoming TDY, complete the required evaluation(s) before departing for either the PCS assignment or the TDY.

### **5.8. Failure to Pass a Positional Evaluation.**

5.8.1. Requalification. If a member fails a positional evaluation, Commanders will ensure that a successful RQ is completed within 30 calendar days after the date of the first failure (e.g., for an evaluation on 20 June, complete the recheck by 19 July) (**T-3**). For Air Reserve Component (ARC) units, Commanders will ensure that a successful RQ is completed within 90 calendar days after the date of the first failure (**T-3**).

5.8.2. Restrictions. When called for by this instruction or deemed necessary in the judgment of the SEE, the SEE may recommend restrictions be imposed on the examinee until successful completion of assigned additional training and/or a recheck. The certifying official, or designated representative, makes the final determination.

5.8.2.1. Restrictions should address the specific phase of operation that requires supervision and the criteria for removal of the restrictions.

5.8.2.2. QUAL Evaluation: Place the examinee on supervised status (see paragraph 5.8.4) on the system in which the evaluation was administered. For specialized and/or multiple qualified cybercrew maintaining qualification for similar duty in multiple CWSs, lead MAJCOM-provided guidance may direct supervised status on all systems in which the individual maintains qualification.

5.8.2.3. MSN Evaluation: Place the examinee on supervised status (see paragraph 5.8.4) on the system in which the evaluation was administered.

5.8.3. Status Downgrade. Cybercrew members receiving a Q3 QUAL and/or MSN evaluation are non-mission ready (N-MR)/non-combat mission ready (N-CMR) IAW lead MAJCOM-provided guidance. Place cybercrew members receiving a failing score on a QUAL on supervised status.

#### **5.8.4. Supervised Status.**

5.8.4.1. If an examinee is placed on supervised status as a result of unsatisfactory performance or restrictions, the squadron commander will determine the type of supervisor (i.e., instructor or designated supervisor) based on lead MAJCOM-provided guidance (**T-3**).

5.8.4.2. The certifying official determines the restrictions to be imposed on the member.

### **5.9. Failure to Complete an Evaluation within the Required Period.**

5.9.1. If a member fails to complete an evaluation within the period listed in paragraph 5.7, the member loses the qualification covered by the evaluation and the restrictions of paragraph 5.8 apply.

5.9.2. Qualification may be re-established by administering a requalification evaluation or by completion of the delinquent evaluation. OG/CC or designee may approve waivers to preclude the re-accomplishment of completed requisites to complete the evaluation on a case-by-case basis.

**5.10. Commander-Directed Downgrade.** The certifying official may direct a downgrade (Q/U) in a specific area/sub-area without disqualifying an individual. Additionally, a certifying official may direct a downgrade that either removes a qualification or completely disqualifies an individual. Downgrades may be directed without administering an evaluation using the following guidance:

5.10.1. For performance-related cases use for cause only (e.g., breach of weapon system discipline, safety, etc.). Incidents do not have to be directly observed by an examiner, but may be recommended by an examiner from any CWS/cybercrew specialty.

5.10.2. For non-performance-related cases involving lapses of judgment significant enough to cause a commander to lose confidence in the cybercrew member's ability to safely operate the equipment, do not use a downgrade or disqualification as a substitute for or in lieu of appropriate progressive disciplinary measures (e.g., Verbal Counseling, Letter of Counseling, Letter of Reprimand, Article 15, etc.). Consult with the supporting Staff Judge Advocate office for legal advice in these cases. Use in cases where such incidences directly affect the commander's confidence in the cybercrew member's ability to safely operate the equipment (e.g., lapse in judgment significant enough to cast doubt on the cybercrews decision-making abilities on the system).

5.10.3. For downgrades that either remove qualifications or completely disqualify an individual, the affected cybercrew will cease acting in the qualification(s) from which they have been downgraded effective with the date the commander initiated the downgrade. **(T-3)**

5.10.4. Commanders will ensure that downgrades are documented IAW paragraph 8.3.2. **(T-3)**

**5.11. Multiple Qualifications.** Lead MAJCOM-provided guidance addresses evaluations in multiple cybercrew positions.

5.11.1. Documentation. MAJCOMs may authorize certification in more than one CWS for crewmembers only when such action is authorized by command mission requirements and is economically justifiable. This authority cannot be delegated below the MAJCOM level, except for the lead MAJCOM, which may further delegate within its command, but not lower than wing commander. Document MAJCOM authority for multiple qualifications in the IQF.

5.11.2. QUAL Evaluations. All members must have a QUAL evaluation in each position **(T-2)**.

5.11.3. Failure to pass an evaluation. A downgrade resulting from a failure of a QUAL applies only to the specific position for which the evaluation was administered.

## Chapter 6

### CYBERCREW PERFORMANCE EXAMINATION PROGRAM

**6.1. Purpose.** The performance program measures the skills and abilities of a crewmember through observation of their performance in a specific cybercrew position.

**6.2. General.**

6.2.1. Performance examination management. Unit stan/eval will develop and maintain standard performance examination scenarios for each position IAW Attachment 5. **(T-3)**

6.2.2. Performance examination scenario reviews. Unit stan/eval will review all steps of the performance evaluations for accuracy, feasibility, and correct process steps semi-annually. **(T-3)**

**6.3. Grading System.**

6.3.1. A two-step grading system is used to evaluate and document crewmember performance.

6.3.1.1. In the first step, individual grades are assigned against each area and subarea of the evaluation criteria established for the appropriate cybercrew position.

6.3.1.2. In the second step, an overall qualification level is assigned based on a compilation of all individual area/subarea grades IAW Chapter 5.

6.3.2. Performance Areas/Subareas.

6.3.2.1. Areas/subareas have a two-tier (Q/U) grading system for critical areas/subareas or three-tier (Q/Q-/U) grading system for non-critical areas/subareas in accordance with the appropriate lead MAJCOM guidance. **(T-3)** Document discrepancies against the established areas/subareas.

6.3.2.1.1. Q indicates the examinee demonstrated both a satisfactory knowledge of all required information and performed cybercrew duties within the prescribed tolerances.

6.3.2.1.2. Q- indicates the examinee is qualified to perform the assigned area/subarea tasks, but requires debriefing or additional training as determined by the SEE. Deviations should not exceed the prescribed Q- tolerances, jeopardize safety, or be a breach of CWS discipline.

6.3.2.1.3. U indicates that performance was outside allowable parameters, thereby compromising safety; that deviations from prescribed procedures/tolerances adversely affected mission accomplishment; and/or that evaluated performance constituted a breach of CWS discipline.

**6.4. Conduct of a Performance Evaluation.**

6.4.1. The examiner grades the areas/subareas as necessary within NAF-approved evaluation criteria.

6.4.2. In addition to required areas/subareas, the examiner will grade any area/subarea observed during an evaluation that was incidental to the task(s) being performed and the

examiner observed less than acceptable performance which could adversely impact operations or overall safety. **(T-3)**

6.4.3. Minor momentary deviations are acceptable, provided the examinee applies prompt corrective action and such deviations do not jeopardize safety. Consider cumulative deviations when determining the overall area/subarea grade.

**6.5. Remedial Action.** An examinee receiving an area/subarea grade of Q- or U requires debriefing and/or additional training, as determined by the SEE.

6.5.1. Debriefed Discrepancy. Examiners will explain the discrepancy to ensure that the examinee has gained the necessary knowledge or proficiency. **(T-3)**

6.5.2. Additional Training. Any training recommended by the examiner to remedy deficiencies identified during an evaluation.

6.5.2.1. May include self-study, use of a simulator, supervised operations on the “live” network, or operations in a range environment.

6.5.2.2. Commanders will ensure that the training is complete 30 days following the date of the discrepancy **(T-3)**. For ARC units, commanders will ensure that the training is complete within 90 calendar days after the date of the discrepancy. **(T-3)**

6.5.2.3. If a cybercrew member exceeds the allotted time for completion of additional training, the certifying official will review the situation, direct appropriate action, and document the circumstances on the AF Form 4420. **(T-3)**

6.5.2.4. Document additional training on the AF Form 4418.

6.5.2.5. Requires a SPOT evaluation of the area(s)/subarea(s) in which additional training was prescribed within 30 days of additional training completion. Document SPOT evaluation on a separate AF Form 4418.

**6.6. Supervised Status Requirement.** Place personnel who fail performance examination in supervised status until successful retesting is completed.

**6.7. Re-Evaluation.**

6.7.1. Unit stan/eval will administer an alternate examination upon completion of retraining, but no later than the last day of the first month following the date of the discrepancy. **(T-3)** Unit stan/eval should accomplish re-testing prior to the end of the crewmember's eligibility window. ARC units will administer an alternate examination within 90 calendar days after the date of the first failure. **(T-3)**

6.7.2. The authority to extend the time allowed to successfully complete the examination is the OG/CC.

## Chapter 7

### CYBERCREW WRITTEN EXAMINATION PROGRAM

**7.1. Purpose.** The examination program measures knowledge, procedures, and other information for effective operations through the administration of written, computer-based, or electronic examinations. Poor testing performance on examinations indicates areas requiring increased training emphasis.

**7.2. General.**

7.2.1. Examination Management. Unit stan/eval will develop and maintain a minimum of two different examinations for each position, or generate a unique test for each person requiring an exam. **(T-3)**

7.2.1.1. A closed-book exam is required as a prerequisite to a QUAL or MSN evaluation. An open book exam may also be administered as a prerequisite to a QUAL or MSN evaluation in conjunction with the closed-book exam. If both an open- and a closed-book exam are administered, the scores are considered separately when determining the overall qualification level. For example, if the examinee fails the closed-book exam on the first attempt, but scores 100% on the open-book, upon passing the closed-book exam the highest overall rating allowed is Q-2.

7.2.1.2. Unit stan/eval will change a minimum of 25 percent of the questions on each examination every calendar year. **(T-3)**

7.2.2. Examination Reviews. Unit stan/eval will review all MQFs and prepared exams for accuracy annually and after any changes in source documents. **(T-3)** If a complete review was accomplished due to a source document change, it may be annotated as the annual review.

7.2.3. Examination Security. Unit stan/eval will maintain positive control of all exams, applicable answer sheets, and associated computer-based/electronic media. **(T-3)**

7.2.4. Examination Question Sources.

7.2.4.1. Open Book Exams (Optional). Open book exams are derived from technical orders, manuals, handbooks, or instructions containing information pertinent to the operation and performance of the assigned mission. They cover information which may not require immediate recall or be regularly referenced.

7.2.4.2. Closed Book Exams (Required). Questions in closed book exams are derived from MQFs, and emphasize system knowledge, time-sensitive information, and information required to be immediately recalled for quick responses.

7.2.5. End-of-Course Examinations. Formal training units (FTU) administering USAF formal school courses listed in the *Air Force Education and Training Course Announcement (ETCA)* database (<https://etca.randolph.af.mil/>) may use end-of-course (EOC) examinations to fulfill the requirements of the open book and closed book requisite examinations.

7.2.5.1. The MAJCOM stan/eval responsible for the USAF formal training will coordinate with AF/A6CF to ensure the EOC examination meets the requirements of this instruction and applicable instructional supplements before awarding credit for requisite completion.

7.2.5.2. EOC examination test questions do not need to incorporate NAF-approved MQFs; however, all questions should reflect the latest changes to all systems and/or operational procedures and not conflict with any MQFs.

7.2.5.3. Grade all EOC examinations that fulfill the requirements of requisite examinations according to this AFI and appropriate lead MAJCOM guidance, and enter the results on the stan/eval qualification documentation.

### 7.3. Grading System.

7.3.1. The total number of questions on a written exam should be determined by the total number of areas graded within the appropriate lead MAJCOM guidance. The minimum passing grade for all stan/eval examinations is 80 percent.

### 7.4. Conduct of Written Examinations.

7.4.1. For open book exams, examiners will make available to examinees all source publications used to generate the exam. **(T-3)**

7.4.2. Unit stan/eval will leverage computer-based or electronic examinations when feasible.

7.4.3. Unit stan/eval will retain graded exam answer sheets/computer records until the stan/eval qualification documentation is completed.

**7.5. Remedial Action.** An examinee receiving a failing grade on a written examination requires debriefing and additional training (as determined by the SEE) and a retest. Notify the examinee's supervisor of the exam failure immediately.

7.5.1. The examiner should provide instruction concerning the missed test questions to ensure the examinee understands the areas/subareas that should be addressed. **(T-3)**

7.5.2. Remedial Training. The examinee will complete remedial training with the assistance of an instructor, as needed; remedial training may include self-study, use of a simulator, supervised operations on the "live" network, or operations in a range environment. **(T-3)**

7.5.2.1. The examinee will complete remedial training by the last day of the first month following the date of the discrepancy (e.g., for an evaluation on 21 February, remedial training must be accomplished by 31 March). **(T-3)** For ARC units, the examinee will complete remedial training within 90 calendar days after the date of the discrepancy. **(T-3)**

7.5.2.2. If a cybercrew member exceeds the allotted time for completion of remedial training, the certifying official reviews the situation, directs appropriate action, and documents the circumstances with a memorandum for record (MFR) to be included with the AF Form 4418. **(T-3)**

7.5.2.3. Document additional training on the AF Form 4418.

7.5.3. In the event of a second failure on an exam, notify the certifying official, who will direct required actions to be taken. **(T-3)** Do not administer further examinations until directed by the certifying official.

**7.6. Supervised Status Requirement.** Commanders will ensure that personnel who fail a requisite open book or closed book examination are placed in supervised status until successful retesting is completed. **(T-3)** For personnel who maintain multiple qualifications, supervised status resulting from failure of either an open or closed book examination applies only to the position for which the examination was administered.

**7.7. Retest.**

7.7.1. Unit stan/eval will administer an alternate exam upon completion of retraining, but no later than the last day of the first month following the date of the failure. **(T-3)** For ARC units, unit stan/eval will administer an alternate examination within 90 calendar days after the date of the first failure. **(T-3)**

7.7.2. The authority to extend the time allowed to successfully complete the examination is the OG/CC. However, if the eligibility window falls within 30 days, every effort should be made to re-examine prior to expiration.

7.7.3. Commanders will ensure that a person failing a written examination is afforded an adequate study period prior to re-examination. **(T-3)**

7.7.4. A person failing a written examination may not receive an overall qualification rating greater than Q2 after passing the retest.

## Chapter 8

### DOCUMENTATION

**8.1. Scope.** Administration of the Qualification Evaluation Program requires accurate and standardized documentation. The qualifications and authorizations for which a person is to be evaluated are determined from the unit certification document. The results of evaluations are recorded on AF Form 4418, which certifies the member's qualification.

8.1.1. Record the results of cybercrew evaluations on AF Form 4418 and the chronological history of evaluations for a member on AF Form 4420. Maintain these forms in the IQF.

8.1.2. The use of electronic forms is authorized, to include use of electronic signatures and wholly electronic IQFs IAW lead MAJCOM guidance. In all instances, computer-generated forms should include the same information/data as AF Forms as published on the USAF E-Publishing web site.

**8.2. Electronic Database.** Units are highly encouraged to use electronic database files for record keeping, trend analysis, printing of standard forms, etc. The lead MAJCOM will establish standards for archiving and assessment of electronic files. Units not using an electronic database will maintain hard-copy records in accordance with this instruction.

**8.3. AF Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew/Spacecrew Qualification.***

8.3.1. Purpose. Use the AF Form 4418 as the source document to record and verify the qualification of a cybercrew member on a CWS.

8.3.2. Completion of an AF Form 4418 is accomplished by three individuals; the examiner, a final approving officer, and the examinee. Exception: for an AF Form 4418 which documents a Commander-Directed Downgrade, only the commander, as the final approving authority, and the individual affected sign the form.

8.3.3. Use a separate AF Form 4418 for all positional phase rechecks.

**8.4. AF Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualification.*** The AF Form 4420 is an index providing pertinent information extracted from all the AF Forms 4418 accomplished for the member. A computer generated AF Form 4420 may be used as long as cumulative entries are retained.

**8.5. Individual Qualification Folder (IQF).** The IQF contains the source documents that constitute the history of certification for each member. The AF Form 4418 is the source document used to record certification of a member. A complete history of the AF Forms 4418 in an IQF is maintained on an accompanying AF Form 4420. Software applications capturing the same information are authorized provided the unit gains approval by the MAJCOM stan/eval office prior to use.

8.5.1. Electronic format IQFs are authorized provided proper security measures, backup capability, and sustainment plans are in place. If electronic IQFs are used, the Chief of Stan/Eval (or equivalent) will publish guidance on storage and layout. **(T-3)**

8.5.2. Maintaining IQF. Commanders will ensure that each member who is in a MR/CMR position has an IQF, which includes all AF Forms 4418 and 4420.

8.5.2.1. A stan/eval functional office, normally in the organization to which the individual is assigned or attached for operational duties, will maintain the IQF. **(T-3)**

8.5.2.2. HHQ personnel on active operational status may have their IQFs maintained by the stan/eval function at their assigned stations.

8.5.2.3. Maintain IQFs for personnel in inactive operational status within a collocated stan/eval office.

8.5.2.4. Describe IQF maintenance in a supplement to this instruction.

8.5.2.5. Individuals assigned or attached to other than USAF units may use the format of the service to which they are assigned/attached to document their history of qualification/certification.

8.5.3. Contents of IQF. If the IQF is maintained as a hard-copy record, divide it into two sections:

8.5.3.1. Section I (left side). This section contains AF Form 4420.

8.5.3.1.1. Place AF Forms 4420 on top of Tab 1 in this section in chronological order with the most recent on top.

8.5.3.1.2. If used, file electronic storage media in Section I of the IQF.

8.5.3.2. Section II (right side). This section contains AF Forms 4418 and MFRs for all evaluations listed on the AF Form 4420 in Section I.

8.5.3.2.1. File AF Form 4418s in chronological order with the most recent on top. Individuals who maintain qualification in two or more positions in the same CWS will file AF Form 4418s in chronological order, without consideration of CWS or position. **(T-3)**

8.5.3.2.2. File MFRs documenting waivers and extensions on top of the affected AF Form 4418. When action is complete, incorporate the information contained in the MFR onto the affected AF Form 4418 under Examiner Remarks paragraph D, Additional Comments and remove the MFR from the IQF. File permanent MFRs documenting major discrepancies relating to qualification immediately above the latest affected AF Form 4418. In cases where the MFR is for other items than those found on the AF Forms 4418, they are filed in chronological order with AF Forms 4418. MFRs become a permanent part of the IQF only when the major discrepancy addressed by the MFR is *not* addressed or corrected by a later Form 4418.

8.5.3.2.3. File MFRs documenting major discrepancies of a particular AF Form 4418 on top of that AF Form 4418 regardless of the date the discrepancy is discovered.

8.5.3.2.4. File MFRs documenting similar discrepancies found on multiple AF Form 4418s on top of the latest affected AF Form 4418.

8.5.3.2.5. Copies of these source documents may be filed with other organizations for evaluation program management.

8.5.4. Review of IQF. Document the procedures on how to accomplish an initial review and how to implement the periodic review of IQFs in the supplemental guidance to this instruction.

8.5.4.1. Initial Review. The unit will review the IQF for all newly assigned members to establish their currency and qualification prior to their first mission, and document this review on the AF Form 4420. **(T-3)** Review previous AF Form 4420 entries to determine all applicable qualifications/certifications of the new assigned/attached member. The gaining unit commander will document acceptance of applicable qualifications/certifications on a new AF Form 4420 with “Initial Review” signed by the commander as the last entry. **(T-3)**

8.5.4.1.1. The unit commander is responsible for establishing the currency and qualification of the member as determined from the latest applicable documentation in sections I and II of the IQF. Following determination of the currency and qualification of the member, the unit maintaining the IQF is responsible only for documentation subsequently placed in the IQF.

8.5.4.1.2. If the IQF of HHQ personnel on active operational status is maintained by the stan/eval function at their assigned stations, that stan/eval function will also review the IQF prior to operations. **(T-3)**

8.5.4.2. Posting Review. The stan/eval function will review each AF Form 4418 when it is placed in the IQF to ensure accuracy and completeness **(T-2)**. This review will confirm that the eligibility period and qualification as documented are correct, all required evaluation events and requisites were accomplished within the eligibility period, and that the AF Form 4418 contains all signatures and initials within allotted time.

8.5.4.3. Periodic Review. The stan/eval function reviews all unit IQFs to confirm expiration dates used to track required qualification evaluations are the same as those listed in the IQFs. The stan/eval function will ensure that the interval between reviews does not exceed the qualification period window established by paragraph 5.7. Document the periodic review IAW instructional supplements. Periodic review of IQFs for personnel in inactive status is not required.

8.5.5. IQF Discrepancies. IQF Discrepancies include those on the AF Form 4418s and AF Form 4420.

8.5.5.1. Categories of Discrepancies. Discrepancies are categorized by their impact on qualification/certification and are either major or minor.

8.5.5.1.1. Discrepancies that alter the qualification/certification of the affected member are considered major (i.e., expired qualification).

8.5.5.1.2. Those discrepancies that do not alter the qualification/certification of the affected member are considered minor (i.e., typos, formatting, or misspellings).

8.5.5.2. Disposition of Major Discrepancies. Document major discrepancies on an MFR filed in Section II immediately above the affected AF Form 4418. Remove MFRs created to document late evaluations, Group CC waivers, etc., from the IQF once the information is incorporated onto the completed affected AF Form 4418 under examiner remarks paragraph D, Additional Comments. MFRs become a permanent part of the IQF only when the major discrepancy addressed by the MFR is *not* addressed or corrected by a later AF Form 4418.

8.5.5.3. Disposition of Minor Discrepancies. Document minor discrepancies on a non-permanent record as defined by supplements to this instruction. The record of minor discrepancies ensures standardization of AF Forms 4418, AF Form 4420, and member IQFs.

8.5.5.4. Corrections.

8.5.5.4.1. AF Form 4418. Because it is a source document, the AF Form 4418 may not be corrected by use of white-out/over-print or pen and ink alteration of the original document.

8.5.5.4.2. AF Form 4420. AF Forms 4420, not being source documents, may be altered without restriction to reflect the assignment of the affected member and the contents of Section II of the IQF.

8.5.6. Transfer of IQF. The losing unit will coordinate with the member and the gaining unit to transfer the IQF (T-3). The IQF may be either hand-carried by the member or, in the case of digital or classified files, transmitted electronically or by appropriate secure means.

## Chapter 9

### ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS (CIF, CII, GO/NO-GO, TREND ANALYSIS, SEB)

**9.1. Scope.** This chapter provides guidance on additional programs administered by stan/eval.

**9.2. Crew Information File (CIF).** Units will establish and maintain a CIF (**T-3**). The CIF is a library consisting of a current read file and publications. This library consists of volumes as listed in Table 9.1, in either hardcopy or electronic format (**T-3**). All publications in the CIF should be current and complete.

**Table 9.1. CIF Volumes**

<b>VOLUME</b>	<b>TITLE</b>
VOLUME I	Table of Contents and Current Read File
VOLUME II (optional)	Publications—Air Force Directives/MAJCOM Supplements
VOLUME III (optional)	Publications—MAJCOM/NAF/Local Directives
VOLUME IV (optional)	Manuals/Checklists/Crew Aids/Technical Orders
VOLUME V (optional)	Safety Information – refer to Squadron safety program IAW AFI 91-202 and 91-203.

9.2.1. Current Read File. Volume I consists of a minimum of two parts to include an index (Part A) and current read files (Parts B and C (*Note:* Part C is optional)). MAJCOMs may add additional components to Volume I as appropriate.

9.2.1.1. Part A is a table of contents listing all material contained in CIF Volumes I through V.

9.2.1.2. Part B is the Current Read File of CIF messages. These messages contain information temporary in nature, directly pertinent to the safe conduct of operations, and must be read by all cybercrew members before operations (**T-3**). Forward CIFs that contain system-related information to all using MAJCOMs.

9.2.1.3. Part C is the current read file that contains information temporary in nature but not related to the safe conduct of operations and not required to be read before operations.

9.2.2. Publications Library. Volumes II through IV, if used, consist of a CIF Functional Publications Library according to MAJCOM directives. See AFI 33-360 for basic library requirements.

9.2.2.1. All publications in the library should be current and complete. MAJCOMs may authorize units to withhold posting of information that does not apply based on system configuration.

9.2.2.2. Units will establish and maintain a table of contents for the publications library containing, at a minimum, a listing of basic publication numbers and short titles. (**T-3**) Publication dates, supplements, and changes are not required.

9.2.2.3. MAJCOMS may waive Volumes II-V requirements for special training units (i.e., 57 IAG).

9.2.2.4. File the CIF index and library IAW AFI 33-360, regardless of whether these are in hardcopy or electronic format.

9.2.2.4.1. If any part of the CIF library is maintained electronically and not specifically addressed above (or in AFI 33-360 and/or TO 00-5-1), units will ensure that the information is current and accessible for concurrent viewing by multiple cybercrew members. **(T-2)**

9.2.2.4.2. At a minimum, units will maintain the required index and location of electronic files in a hard-copy binder in the CIF library. **(T-3)**

9.2.2.4.3. Make documents in the CIF library available for deployments via either electronic or hardcopy means.

**9.3. Stan/Eval Command Interest Items (CII).** CIIs are a tool to train members on training deficiencies, new systems/procedures, or trends.

9.3.1. CIIs are emphasis items of existing procedures designed to mitigate or eliminate specific risks or trends. CIIs do not add to or amend established procedures. Base CIIIs on analysis of risks and trends from a variety of sources. They may be issued by AFSPC, NAF, or units to address incidents, trends, deployed area operations, or potential problems with equipment/procedures. Only the issuing organization may rescind the CII.

9.3.1.1. The Chief of Stan/Eval, at the discretion of the command authority, establishes stan/eval CIIIs.

9.3.1.2. CIIIs should not be used as a routine message-passing vehicle; they should only be used to draw attention to changes or deficiencies in the certification and qualification processes.

9.3.2. When an item is designated for review and evaluation as a stan/eval CII, the stan/eval OPR assigns a CII number. The CII number is based upon the calendar year and numbered consecutively (i.e., I-NOSC CII 98-01, 26 NOG CII 99-01, or RAMSTEIN ESU CII 00-01). The OPR will then transmit a CII message to all affected subordinate units. **(T-3)** *Note:* CIIIs may be published locally at any unit that maintains a stan/eval function.

9.3.3. The message that announces a new stan/eval CII includes applicable checklists and procedures, an expiration date, and a statement that identifies units and/or positions for which the CII is necessary. Publish CII messages and all pertinent information IAW the CEF requirements. Once the CII expires, all unit stan/eval functions shall incorporate the CII procedures into the permanent program wherever applicable. **(T-3)**

9.3.4. Do not establish a CII for a period longer than one year.

9.3.5. Commanders will ensure that all cybercrew positional and Crew Resource Management/Operational Risk Management (CRM/ORM) related CIIIs are addressed in detail during turnover briefings for the duration of the CIIIs. **(T-3)** Mission-related CIIIs need only be briefed on those missions for which the CII is relevant.

9.3.6. Units will document CIIIs in SEB minutes which should be maintained for historical purposes.

**9.4. Go/No-Go Program.** The Go/No-Go program ensures individual cybercrew members are current, qualified, or adequately supervised to perform operations and have reviewed CIF Volume 1, Part B prior to crew operations/shift change.

9.4.1. Units will establish a control system to ensure cybercrew members have completed all training and stan/eval items required for duty prior to shift turn over. **(T-3)**

9.4.2. The unit commander will appoint a scheduler who ensures Go/No-Go status is utilized for scheduling cybercrew members for operations.

9.4.3. The senior controller from the previous day/shift or unit commander's designated representative will certify the oncoming cybercrew prior to conducting operations. **(T-3)**

9.4.4. At a minimum, the Go/No-Go monitor will verify the following **(T-3)**:

9.4.4.1. The training items from AFI 10-1703, Volume 1 required for cybercrew duty.

9.4.4.2. The stan/eval testing items required for cybercrew duty from any unit supplement to this instruction.

9.4.4.3. Any mandatory training items not involving cybercrew duty but included at the discretion of the commander.

9.4.4.4. Currency on all CIF (Volume I, Part B) items. Accomplish an initial review and certification of all volumes prior to an individual's first operational mission. Assigned or attached cybercrew members on extensive absence from operational missions (90 days or more) will accomplish a complete review of all volumes and recertification prior to operations. **(T-3)**

9.4.5. Units will define and publish their control system in the unit supplement to this instruction. **(T-3)** Use the Go/No-Go procedures to document the review, certification, and acknowledgment of Volume 1, Part B information by assigned, attached, and visiting cybercrew members. Volume 1, Part C may be monitored by using Go/No Go procedures at unit discretion.

**9.5. Trend Analysis Program.** Trend analysis refers to the collecting of information to identify a pattern or predict future events. Each stan/eval function will establish a trend analysis program to identify, document, report, and recommend corrective action for all negative trends. **(T-3)** The trend analysis program is used to identify and track written, positional and periodic evaluation data for adverse trends. Group stan/eval will publish and define their trends program in a supplement to this instruction. **(T-3)**

9.5.1. Trend Analysis Monitor. The appointed trend analysis monitor will identify, track and record questions that are all incorrect (i.e. same question is not missed) or questions that are consistently missed (i.e. a question is missed by the majority) and all discrepancies or overt consistencies (lack of errors) on positional evaluations to create trend data. **(T-3)** The trend analysis monitor will compile and analyze the trend data on a quarterly basis to determine if any adverse, negative, or positive trends exist. **(T-3)**

9.5.2. Defining Trends. A positive trend is based on exceptional performance. An adverse or negative trend is defined as sustained poor, substandard performance by a group of members in a specific evaluation area over a period of time. The number of similar discrepancies

required to constitute a trend varies depending upon the number of evaluations administered for a particular position.

9.5.3. Trend Responses. If a trend is identified by the above criteria, the trend analysis monitor will:

9.5.3.1. Notify the commander in writing through the Chief of Stan/Eval of the trend identification and recommend appointment of OPR. **(T-2)**

9.5.3.2. Research and recommend corrective actions for negative trends. **(T-2)**

9.5.3.3. Assign an Office of Collateral Responsibility (OCR). **(T-2)**

9.5.3.4. Identify the suspense date by which corrective actions should be in place. **(T-2)**

9.5.3.5. Follow-up on open trends to verify the actions taken to correct the trend. **(T-2)**

9.5.3.6. Ensure all trends are widely publicized in the unit using read files, bulletin boards, newsletters, or other means. **(T-2)**

9.5.3.7. Ensure trends are briefed at the SEB and included in minutes until closed. **(T-2)**

9.5.4. Closing Trends. Close trends only when a subsequent quarterly trend analysis indicates the adverse trend no longer exists.

**9.6. Stan/Eval Board.** An SEB is a forum convened at the group level to review and resolve stan/eval related issues. Examples include evaluation results, trends noticed during evaluations, stan/eval manning, waiver/extensions of evaluations, inspection results, and memoranda of agreement. Group stan/eval will publish and define its SEB program in a supplement to this instruction. **(T-3)**

**9.7. Disposition of Documentation.** Dispose of IQFs and other related material according to the AF Records Disposition Schedule (RDS), Table 36-12, Rule 02.00, and AF guidance concerning the protection of Personally Identifiable Information.

BURTON M. FIELD, Lt Gen, USAF  
DCS Operations, Plans & Requirements

**Attachment 1****GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION*****References***

AFPD 10-9, *Lead Command Designation and Responsibilities for Weapon Systems*, 8 March 2007

AFPD 10-17, *Cyberspace Operations*, 31 July 2012

AFI 10-1703, Volume 1, *Cybercrew Training*, 5 April 2014

AFI 33-150, *Management of Communication Activities*, 30 November 2011

AFI 33-210, *AF Certification and Accreditation (C&A) Program (AFCAP)*, 23 December 2008

AFI 33-324, *The Air Force Information Collections and Reports Management Program*, 6 March 2013

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013

AFI 36-2101, *Classifying Military Personnel (Officer and Enlisted)*, 14 June 2010

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

AFI 36-2605, *Air Force Military Personnel Testing System*, 24 September 2008

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

AFI 91-202, *The US Air Force Mishap Prevention Program*, 5 August 2011

AFI 91-203, *Air Force Consolidated Occupational Safety Instruction*, 15 June 2012

AFMAN 33-282, *Computer Security (COMPUSEC)*, 27 March 2012

AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008

AFMAN 36-2236, *Guidebook for Air Force Instructors*, 12 November 2003

T.O. 00-5-1 *AF Technical Order System*, 1 October 2007

AF Records Disposition Schedule (RDS), located in AFRIMS (<https://www.my.af.mil/afrims/afrims/afrims/rims.cfm>)

***Prescribed Forms***

AF Form 4418, *Certificate of Cybercrew/Spacecrew Qualification*

AF Form 4420, *Individual's Record of Duties and Qualifications*

***Adopted Forms***

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*.

AFTO Form 22, *Technical Manual Change Recommendation and Reply*

***Abbreviations and Acronyms***

**ARC**—Air Reserve Component

**BMC**—Basic Mission Capable

**CIF**—Cybercrew Information File  
**CII**—Command Interest Item  
**CMR**—Combat Mission Ready  
**CRM**—Crew Resource Management  
**CWS**—Cyberspace Weapon System  
**DO**—Director of Operations  
**EQ**—Exceptionally Qualified  
**EOC**—End of Course  
**EPS**—Evaluation Performance Standard  
**ETCA**—Education and Training Course Announcement  
**FTU**—Formal Training Unit  
**HHQ**—Higher Headquarters  
**IAW**—In accordance with  
**IMT**—Information Management Tool  
**INIT**—Initial Evaluation  
**INSTR**—Instructor Qualification Evaluation  
**IQT**—Initial Qualification Training  
**ISD**—Instructional Systems Development  
**MA**—Mission Area  
**MFR**—Memorandum for Record  
**MQF**—Master Question File  
**MQT**—Mission Qualification Training  
**MR**—Mission Ready  
**MSN**—Mission Qualification Evaluation  
**N-BMC**—Non-Basic Mission Capable  
**N-CMR**—Non-Combat Mission Ready  
**N-MR**—Non-Mission Ready  
**OCR**—Office of Collateral Responsibility  
**OGV**—Operations Group Stan/Eval  
**OPR**—Office of Primary Responsibility  
**ORM**—Operational Risk Management  
**PCS**—Permanent Change of Station

**PE**—Performance Evaluation  
**Q**—Qualified  
**RT**—Recurring Training  
**RQ**—Requalification evaluation  
**SAV**—Staff Assistance Visit  
**SEB**—Standardization and Evaluation Board  
**SEE**—Standardization and Evaluation Examiner  
**SELO**—Standardization and Evaluation Liaison Officer  
**SIM**—Simulator Evaluation  
**SOP**—Standard Operating Procedure  
**SPOT**—Spot Qualification Evaluation  
**Stan/Eval**—Standardization and Evaluation  
**TF**—Training Folder  
**TO**—Training Officer  
**TR**—Training Requirements  
**TRS**—Training Squadron  
**TTP**—Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures  
**UQ**—Unqualified  
**UTA**—Unit Training Assembly

### *Terms*

**Additional Training.**—This includes any training or action recommended by a SEE that must be completed following an evaluation. The TO determines training requirements (TRs) to correct deficiencies identified by stan/eval. Accomplish this training within 30 days (2 UTAs).

**Attached Personnel.**—This includes anyone not assigned to the unit but maintaining qualification through that unit. AFRC, ANG, and HAF augmented personnel are an example of attached personnel.

**Basic Mission Capable. A cybercrew member who has satisfactorily completed IQT and MQT, but is not in fully**—certified MR/CMR status. The cybercrew member must be able to attain MR/CMR status to meet operational taskings as specified in the applicable instructional supplements. This status is primarily for individuals in units that perform weapon system-specific operational support functions (i.e., formal training units, operational test and tactics development). BMC requirements will be identified in the appropriate lead MAJCOM-provided guidance.

**Certification.**—Designation of an individual by the certifying official (or his/her designee) as having completed required training and evaluation and being capable of performing a specific duty.

**Combat Mission Ready.**—A cybercrew member who has satisfactorily completed IQT and MQT, and maintains certification, currency and proficiency in the command or unit combat mission.

**Commander Interest Item.**—This is an operational area of concern designated by stan/eval functions for local units and all subordinate units. CIIs are intended to focus special attention on areas of concern and should be evaluated during formal stan/eval visits and positional evaluations.

**Critical Task.**—These are tasks where strict adherence to procedures and directives is mandatory; failure to satisfactorily accomplish this task directly impacts overall mission success.

**Cyberspace Weapon System. A combination of one or more weaponized cyber**—capabilities with all related equipment, materials, services, personnel, and means of delivery and deployment required for self-sufficiency.

**Cybercrew Information File. A collection of publications and material determined by the MAJCOM and unit as necessary for day**—to-day operations.

**Downgrade. The downgrading of an individual from Q to UQ status due to failure of any positional evaluation, failure to complete a recurring evaluation by the scheduled date, or the unit commander determines the individual to be non**—proficient.

**Evaluation.**—This includes positional and written examinations used to determine proficiency as prescribed by governing directives.

**Formal Visit.**—This is a visit conducted by the stan/eval function to subordinate units. The purpose is to evaluate the effectiveness of the unit stan/eval program and cybercrew and individual proficiency.

**Individual Qualification Folder.**—The IQF contains the basic documents that show the history of an individual's positional qualification. Only one IQF will be developed/maintained for an individual in accordance with paragraph 7.6. IQFs shall only be maintained by stan/eval.

**Informal Visit.**—This is an announced visit by the stan/eval function to subordinate units for proficiency training or for orientation.

**Initial Qualification Training.**—One or more courses covering system specific and/or positional specific training as a prerequisite to Mission Qualification Training (MQT).

**Instructor.**—An experienced individual qualified to instruct other individuals in mission area academics and positional duties. Instructors will be qualified appropriately to the level of the training they provide.

**Master Question File.**—A headquarters developed and published bank of questions for each crew position covering those aspects of the position that are common throughout the AF. Stan/Eval functions use the MQF in constructing written examinations that this instruction requires.

**Mission Area.**—A logical grouping by heading of position qualification criteria. Some MAs are broken into subareas to more closely break out large topics.

**Mission Evaluation.**—Qualifies a cybercrew member to employ the member's assigned system in accomplishing the unit's operational or DOC statement mission. Requires AF Form 4418 documentation.

**Mission Qualification Training.**—Training needed to qualify for cybercrew duties in an assigned cybercrew position for a specific CWS.

**Mission Ready.**—A cybercrew member who has satisfactorily completed IQT and MQT, and maintains qualification, currency and proficiency in the command or unit operational mission.

**No—Notice Evaluation.** An evaluation administered without prior notice or warning to test an individual's current skills.

**Objectivity Evaluation.**—The unit Chief of Stan/Eval (or his/her designated representative) gives this evaluation to unit SEEs to determine their ability to perform SEE duties. Document qualification as a SEE on an AF Form 4418 and designate the individual by letter upon completion of this evaluation.

**Qualification.**—Designation of an individual by the unit commander as having completed required training and evaluation and being capable of performing a specific duty.

**Qualification Evaluation.**—A written and/or positional evaluation conducted to check an individual's proficiency in performing operational duties or to let an examinee demonstrate to the SEE the academic knowledge and ability to do assigned position functions effectively. Types of qualification evaluations are Qualification (QUAL), Mission (MSN), and SPOT. Document qualification evaluations on AF Form 4418.

**Recurring Training.**—Academic and positional training required to maintain CMR and BMC status.

**Requalification Evaluation.**—An evaluation administered to remedy a loss of qualification due to expiration of a required periodic evaluation, loss of currency exceeding six months (as specified in applicable lead MAJCOM guidance), a recheck following a failed evaluation or a commander directed downgrade. Requires AF Form 4418 documentation.

**SPOT Evaluation.** Conduct this qualification evaluation to ensure correction of identified discrepancies or to spot check an individual's proficiency. A SPOT evaluation is normally limited in scope. It may be either a positional evaluation and/or a written examination. These evaluations may be either no—notice or given with prior coordination.

**Standardization/Evaluation Examiner.**—A SEE is an individual who has completed an objectivity evaluation and is designated to perform evaluation duties as specified by this instruction. SEEs must be current and qualified in the position they are evaluating.

**Time Periods.**—The following definitions are provided for interpretation of timing requirements specified in this instruction:

(a) **Day**— Unless otherwise specified, "day" means calendar days. When "work days" are specified, only count duty days. Do not count scheduled unit down days against this time limit.

(b) **Month**— The term "month" means calendar months, not 30-day periods.

**Unit.** For the purposes of this instruction, a unit is defined as a group/squadron/flight, I—NOSC squadron/detachment, or any operations section required to establish its own stan/eval program.

**Unqualified.** Previous CMR crewmembers whose CMR status has lapsed due to any of the reasons contained in AFI 10—1703, Volume 1, paragraph 2.4.

**Attachment 2****MASTER QUESTION FILE**

**A2.1.** Use the following information when developing questions for the Master Question File:

A2.1.1. Write questions for all knowledge level (A, B, C, D) tasks identified on the approved Master Training Task List. Questions may also be written covering the knowledge aspect of performance level (i.e. 2b, 3c, 4a etc...) tasks.

A2.1.1.1. Develop a minimum of two questions for each knowledge level task.

A2.1.2. Use AFMAN 36-2236, *Guidebook for AF Instructors*, Chapter 22 as a guide for question development.

A2.1.3. The preferred question format for MQFs is multiple-choice. Avoid true/false questions.

A2.1.4. Questions will include a reference for the correct answer. The reference will not be visible to the examinee when the question is administered. The reference will be used for validation as well as after-exam support in the event a question is challenged.

A2.1.4.1. Units will maintain a listing of all references used in exam questions to aid in determining if source material has changed when conducting annual exam reviews.

A2.1.5. The Group Chief of Stan/Eval will approve MQFs before submitting them to the NAF for final format review and approval.

### Attachment 3

#### EVALUATION CRITERIA

**A3.1.** The following information provides assistance in developing evaluation criteria:

A3.1.1. Identify areas/subareas essential for mission accomplishment.

A3.1.2. Define the area criticality level (Critical (C), Major (M) or Minor (m)).

A3.1.3. Group like tasks/subtasks and consolidate in a comprehensive area/subarea.

A3.1.3.1. Critical Area/Subarea. These are tasks that could result in mission failure, endanger human life, or cause serious injury or death. Critical areas/subareas have the greatest potential for extreme mission or personnel impacts and drive the most stringent training and evaluation program requirements. Critical areas/subareas apply to time-sensitive tasks or tasks that must be accomplished as expeditiously as possible without any intervening lower priority actions that would, in the normal sequence of events, adversely affect task performance/outcome.

A3.1.3.2. Major Area/Subarea. These are tasks deemed integral to the performance of other tasks and required to sustain acceptable weapon system operations and mission execution. Major areas/subareas drive significant training requirements.

A3.1.3.3. Minor Area/Subarea. These are rudimentary or simple tasks related to weapons system operations that by themselves have little or no impact on mission execution. Minor areas/subareas require the least stringent training requirements.

A3.1.4. For each area/subarea, identify the cybercrew position, Master Training Task List items included under the area/subareas, and the grading criteria for evaluation. Critical areas/subareas are graded either Q or U and Major/Minor area/subareas are graded with either a Q, Q- or U rating. Areas/subareas should also be marked with an "R" if required to be included on all evaluations. If not required on both a QUAL and MSN evaluation, precede the "R" with a Q for QUAL or M for MSN.

A3.1.5. Use the sample areas/subareas on the next pages as examples of required formatting only.

**Table A3.1. (Sample) Critical Area Requirements**

<b>AREA 1: PERFORM EMERGENCY ACTION PROCEEDURES (C) - R</b>
<b>MTTL TASK(S)</b>
E01A: Execute Fire Response E01B: Execute Bomb Response E01C: Execute Severe Weather Response
<b>EVALUATION STANDARD</b>
Q. Obtained the correct checklist based on the scenario presented. Executed all required steps.
U. Failed to locate and/or utilize the appropriate checklist based on the scenario presented. Did not perform checklist steps correctly. Failed to meet one or more of the performance standards.

**Table A3.2. (Sample) Major Area Requirements**

<b>UTILIZE COLLABORATION TOOLS (M)</b>
<b>MTTL Task(s)</b>
B01A: Utilize Defense Connect Online B01B: Utilize mIRC Software
<b>EVALUATION STANDARD</b>
Q. Tool(s) utilized properly and in accordance with established standards. Knowledge on tool use was satisfactory.
Q-. Tool(s) utilized satisfactorily with minor errors in use not affecting overall mission execution. Knowledge on tool use was marginal.
U. Tool(s) utilized in an unsafe or inappropriate manner. Functions of tool(s) were unknown and/or could not demonstrate functions required of position. Knowledge on tool(s) use was unacceptable.

**Table A3.3. (Sample) Minor Area Requirements**

<b>MODIFY SITUATIONAL AWARENESS BRIEFING (M) - QR</b>
<b>MTTL TASK(S)</b>
B04A: Modify cybercrew changeover briefing
<b>EVALUATION STANDARD</b>
Q. All performance standards met.
Q-. Failed to meet one or more of the performance standards.
U. Performance standards were not met.

## Attachment 4

## STAN/EVAL BOARD MINUTES

**A4.1. Note.** The information below is an example of the minimum information a board should address. Use this template, although not all fields may necessarily be needed in each report.

**Figure A4.1. Stan/Eval Board Minutes**

<p>MEMORANDUM FOR (SEE DISTRIBUTION)</p> <p>FROM: (UNIT'S COMPLETE ADDRESS)</p> <p>SUBJECT: STAN/EVAL BOARD MINUTES</p> <p>1. Personnel Attending (name and organization)</p> <p>2. Overview.</p> <p>a. Manning. (Enter any stan/eval manning problems discussed or deviations from authorized manning. Record all current SEEs including attached HHQ and/or attached squadron SEEs.) Include any OG/CC designated additional OGV SEEs.</p> <p>b. Summary.</p> <p>(1) Evaluations. Report CWS evaluations by cybercrew position and type of evaluation (QUAL and MSN as outlined in the appropriate lead MAJCOM provided guidance). Include SPOT, N/N, and INIT INSTR evaluations, when applicable. Show qualification levels, sub-levels, and rates (rate = number of each type of test given divided by total given).</p> <p>(a) Q1s</p> <p>(b) Q2s</p> <p>(c) Q3s</p> <p>(d) Total evaluations for each cybercrew position</p> <p>(2) Examinations. Report examination results by cybercrew position and type of examination (open book, and closed book).</p> <p>(3) Waivers and Extensions. Identify all waivers and extensions as identified in this AFI.</p> <p>(4) Trends. Identify new, continuing, and resolved trends. Where necessary, report corrective action as OPEN/CLOSED, the OPR(s) and any suspense date.</p> <p>(5) Report progress toward achievement of no-notice requirements, if applicable.</p>
--

c. Stan/Eval Program Inspections and Reviews (if applicable).

d. Cybercrew Publications. Review open AF Form 847s.

3. Old Business. Enter the disposition of any items left open at the last board meeting. If final action was taken on an item during the quarter, state the action taken and then close the item if closure is approved by the board chairman. If an item remains open, list the action taken since the last board. Findings from formal stan/eval inspections will be addressed and covered until they are closed out.

4. New Business. Enter all new business discussed during the board. The new business items are those included on the published agenda along with any unplanned items discussed.

5. Other: This is an optional paragraph that can be used as necessary.

6. Problems Requiring HHQ Assistance. Enter problems that, based on board resolution, require HHQ assistance. The assistance may be in any form (for example, staff assistance visit requests, clarification of directives, change of directives, and so forth).

(SIGNATURE BLOCK)

**Attachments:**

1. Board Agenda
2. Weapon System Examiner Roster Reviewed
3. As Required

## Attachment 5

### PERFORMANCE EXAMINATION SCENARIO

**A5.1.** Use the following guidelines when developing a performance examination scenario:

A5.1.1. Unit stan/eval will develop and maintain a minimum of two scenarios per weapon system position.

A5.1.2. Scenarios will be mission based as compared to task oriented. The scenario should enable the examinee to move through events as they would normally when executing operational duties in the evaluated position.

A5.1.3. Scenarios will be as realistic as possible. Account for normal cybercrew structures and consider evaluating in a cybercrew setting rather than a one-on-one setting.

A5.1.4. Scenarios will reflect current approved evaluation criteria as well as current operations. As operations change, update evaluation criteria and scenarios as required.

A5.1.5. Scenarios will identify the area(s)/subarea(s) being evaluated, the supporting material/people required and any system configurations required.

A5.1.5.1. Develop supporting inject material at the same time as the scenario and label it in a manner that can be easily referenced in the scenario.

A5.1.6. Scenario developers should anticipate all possible responses (correct or incorrect) the examinee could take in response to injects and anticipate any possible safety or security concerns.

A5.1.7. The Group Chief of Stan/Eval will approve scenarios prior to their implementation.

A5.1.7.1. Unit stan/eval personnel will conduct a dry run on the scenario prior to submitting it for approval.

A5.1.7.2. The scenario will indicate the individual(s) involved in the scenario development, the date of dry-run and a signature block for the Group Chief of Stan/Eval.

A5.1.8. Re-certify scenarios at a minimum annually.