

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER
AIR MOBILITY COMMAND**

**AIR MOBILITY COMMAND INSTRUCTION
24-101, VOLUME 20**



12 FEBRUARY 2013

Transportation

**AIR TRANSPORTATION
STANDARDIZATION EVALUATION
(ATSEV) QUALITY ASSURANCE**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

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

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: HQ AMC/A4TR

Certified by: HQ AMC/A4T
(Colonel William Z. Zeck)

Supersedes: AMCI24-101V20,
11 January 2008

Pages: 20

This volume prescribes procedures for Air Transportation quality assurance implementation, maintenance, and guidance for all AMC aerial ports and air terminals. It is to be used in unison with AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program*, AMCI 24-101, Volume 22, *Training Requirements for Aerial Port Operations* and AFI 20-111, *Logistics Compliance Assessment Program*. This guidance is not applicable to Air Force Reserve personnel unless assigned to AMC in an MPA man day status. Reserve aerial ports must follow AFRCI 24-101 for ATSEV program guidance. This volume applies to Air National Guard (ANG) units upon mobilization. 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 through the appropriate functional chain of command to HQ AMC/A4T, 402 Scott Drive, Unit 2A2, Scott AFB IL 62225-5308. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS) Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://www.my.af.mil/afirms/afirms/afirms/rims.cfm>. See Attachment 1 for a glossary of references and supporting information.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This document has been substantially revised and must be completely reviewed. Major changes include: Eliminates the use of forms AF IMT 2519, AMC IMT 1022 and 1026, updated manual

procedures, eliminates the requirement for Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard to comply with the active ATSEV Program, addresses MXG and AMOG roles (Para 2.), requires HQ AMC/A4TR to review updates made to Qualification Training Packages requiring re-accomplishment by units (Para 2.1.5), moves the self-inspection requirement/checklist to Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT) (Para 2.8.10.), and revises waiver requirements.

- 1. TRQ - Quality Assurance (QA) Air Transportation Standardization Evaluation (ATSEV) 2
- 2. Responsibilities. 3
- 3. Program Guidance. 10
- 4. AMC Program Administration/Execution. 13
- Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION 14**
- Attachment 2—EXAMPLE AIR TRANSPORTATION INTEREST ITEM 17**
- Attachment 3—SAMPLE AIR TRANSPORTATION STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION (ATSEV-QA) QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM APPOINTMENT LETTER 18**
- Attachment 4—SAMPLE COMMAND PERFORMANCE STANDARD 19**
- Attachment 5—FORMAT FOR ATSEV-QA MANUAL EVALUATIONS REPORT 20**

1. TRQ - Quality Assurance (QA) Air Transportation Standardization Evaluation (ATSEV)

1.1. General Concepts. Air transportation quality and reliability is the responsibility of all air transportation personnel. The combined efforts of quality assurance personnel, air transportation leaders, and specialists are necessary to ensure high quality process performance and reliability. Air transportation leaders are responsible for excellence, safety, and quality process performance. The TRQ (ATSEV) staff evaluates the quality of air transportation process and task performance within the air transportation organization and performs necessary functions to manage the organization’s Quality Assurance program - Air Transportation Standardization Evaluation. The ATSEV program provides an objective sampling of both the quality of processes and the qualifications of air transportation personnel. The ATSEV staff serves as the primary technical advisory agency in the air transportation organization, helping supervisors and commanders resolve quality problems. The evaluation and analysis of deficiencies and problem areas are key functions of quality assurance. This activity identifies underlying causes of poor quality and non-standardization in air transportation processes. By finding causes of problems and recommending corrective actions to supervisors, ATSEV personnel can significantly affect the quality of air transportation processes within the air transportation organization. The qualities of air transportation processes and personnel proficiency are validated through the ATSEV program and shall be recorded using the ATSEV quality assurance database managed by HQ AMC/A4TR. Contracted organizations shall use the accepted quality program outlined in

their respective contract. If required, submit in writing a request for waiver of any requirements of this publication to HQ AMC/A4TR. Waiver request for a Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL) task due to unavailability of equipment or work center is not required.

1.1.1. Purpose. The TRQ staff (ATSEV) is to provide commanders and HQ AMC/A4T with an assessment of a unit's ability to perform key air transportation processes ensuring standardized, repeatable, technically compliant process execution, while promoting a culture of professional excellence and personal responsibility.

1.1.2. Objective. ATSEV provides the tools to train and evaluate air transportation personnel and processes to a single standard. Specific program objectives are to:

1.1.2.1. Ensure standardized duty position qualification training and performance.

1.1.2.2. Assess air transportation personnel qualifications and capabilities.

1.1.2.3. Comply with all appropriate operational and training directives.

1.1.2.4. Identify trends, determine root causes and ensure corrective actions are put in place.

1.1.3. Applicability. Requirements outlined in this publication apply to AMC active duty Air Transportation units in the MXG/AMS/CRW with 2T2/2T0 and civilian equivalent personnel assigned.

2. Responsibilities. TRQ staff (ATSEV) is responsible to the squadron commander. Within the CONUS *if* the APS is under the MXG the ATSEV will also be responsive to the MXG/CC and may be co-located with the MXG/QA office; enroutes are responsible to the AMS/CC. CONUS Aerial Port ATSEV functions collocated with the Maintenance Group QA, remain administratively under and report to the Aerial Port Commander as approved by HQ USAF/A4 and outlined in AMCI 24-101 V1. ATSEV in CRWs will report to and work directly for the Wing/Group Commander.

2.1. HQ AMC/A4TR will:

2.1.1. Establish policy and administration of the program.

2.1.2. Publish program and other pertinent guidance electronically.
<https://www.my.af.mil/gcss-af/USAF/AFP40/d/1074111948/Files/a4t/a4tr/atsev/hello.html>

2.1.3. Publish Air Transportation Interest Items (ATIIs) (Attachment 2) in response to trend data or when otherwise directed.

2.1.4. Manage Qualification Training Packages.

2.1.4.1. Forward policy/guidance changes to the USAF EC/MOS/MOLT and request review of applicable QTPs.

2.1.4.2. When notified by the USAF EC/MOS/MOLT that updates made to a QTP or Online Training (OT) require units to re-accomplish, ensure affected units are notified and given a time frame for re-accomplishment.

2.1.5. Determine if an ATSEV workshop/conference would be beneficial. If funding is not available or a physical presence of program participants is not required, an online meeting will suffice using Defense Connect Online (DCO) or similar e-tool.

2.1.6. Maintain the ATSEV application used by the 2T2 (and 2T0 community in CONUS Aerial Ports) community to manage and track evaluation requirements, findings, and metrics.

2.1.6.1. Review and brief HQ AMC/A4 leadership on unit evaluation results.

2.1.7. Manage the Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL).

2.1.7.1. Determine if any processes (i.e., mishaps, close-calls, negative evaluation trends, etc) should be evaluated with greater frequency and notify the unit.

2.1.8. Publish Command Performance Standards (CPS) when required.

2.2. USAF EC/MOS/MOLT will:

2.2.1. Develop and maintain all air transportation duty position task training materials and performance standards in consolidated QTPs. Submit request for subject matter experts through HQ AMC/A4TR, when needed.

2.2.1.1. Annually review and validate all QTPs and OT courseware to ensure accuracy and cohesiveness; ensure the most current versions are available to HQ AMC/A4TR.

2.2.1.2. Develop and maintain automated Training Assessments (TAs) in ADLS.

2.2.2. Maintain OT courseware and coordinate to ensure contracted distance learning support agencies are providing customer service and a properly functioning AMC Distributed Learning Service (DLS) system. <https://amc.csd.disa.mil/kc/login/login.asp>

2.2.2.1. Validate each QTP and OT lesson plan. Determine appropriate level of learning. Determine the need for a TA and validate or rescind from the QTP as appropriate. Forward suggested revisions to HQ AMC/A4TR.

2.2.2.2. Advise AMC/A4TR if changes to the QTPs/OTs require individuals to be retrained on a task.

2.2.2.3. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for both initial and revision levels of Instructional Systems Development (ISD).

2.2.2.4. Determine if updates made to a QTP or OT would require re-accomplishment by units. If so notify HQ AMC/A4TR to ensure affected units are notified and given a time frame for re-accomplishment.

2.3. 515/521 AMOW will:

2.3.1. Review the unit metric/trend data for all assigned units.

2.3.2. Review unit responses to ATIIIs and Command Performance Standards for compliance.

2.3.3. Recommend program policy and administrative changes to HQ AMC/A4TR.

2.3.4. Identify in writing an AMOW ATSEV program manager.

2.3.4.1. AMOW ATSEV program manager will ensure units compliance with this instruction and any other related program guidance.

2.4. 515/715/521/721 AMOG will:

2.4.1. Review the unit metric/trend data for all assigned units.

2.4.2. Review unit responses to ATIIIs and Command Performance Standards for compliance.

2.4.3. Ensure the ATSEV requirements are implemented IAW this instruction.

2.4.3.1. Conduct monthly ATSEV summary meetings to assess squadrons performance by reviewing visual information, graphs, narratives, quality trends identified through inspections and evaluations, discussion of common problem areas and descriptions of successful programs or initiatives. Additionally, trends across the enroute enterprise will be identified and solutions formulated for implementation or coordinated with AMOW or functional organizations for assistance.

2.4.3.2. Attendees will include AMOG/CC/CD/CEM, AMS/CC/DO/Aerial Port Ops Officer/Superintendent and AMS ATSEV managers.

2.4.4. Recommend program policy and administrative changes on coordination with AMOW to HQ AMC/A4TR.

2.5. AP/AMS commanders will:

2.5.1. Establish an ATSEV function. AP/AMS CC has overall QA program responsibility. AP/AMS CCs will ensure ATSEV personnel are primarily utilized to perform their responsibilities as outlined in this instruction.

2.5.2. Designate, in writing, a full-time ATSEV manager and full-time evaluators. Appointment letters must specify the primary area(s) the manager and evaluators are assigned to evaluate (Attachment 3). Appointment letters will be maintained in the ATSEV office station files. A copy must also be provided to HQ AMC/A4TR ATSEV Program Manager through e-mail.

2.5.3. Assess unit performance and actions taken to analyze, correct, and improve aerial port processes by convening review boards. Attendees will include; the unit training manager (UTM), ATSEV UPM(s), work center representatives and other senior leaders. Monthly ATSEV briefings attended by the Unit Training Manager (UTM), ATSEV UPM(s), work center representatives and unit's senior leadership meet this requirement.

2.5.3.1. Establish a written response policy for all evaluations with findings rated fail, Technical Data Violation (TDV), Detected Safety Violation (DSV), or Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR). Written policy is only required if the Aerial Port Commander has a policy that is different than 3.2.5.

2.5.3.2. If mandating additional evaluations above the minimum number required in this instruction, establish a written policy governing the required number of evaluations. (See paragraph 2.9.2. for the command minimum evaluation requirement.).

- 2.5.4. Ensure ATSEV self-inspection is completed annually in MICT.
- 2.5.5. Ensure evaluations are captured, reviewed and approved NLT the 7th day the month. If the database is not available, submit evaluations as a spreadsheet utilizing the ATSEV Manual Evaluations Report (Attachment 5).
- 2.5.6. Ensure that during unit deployment periods, the ATSEV program remains staffed.
- 2.5.7. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of USAF EC/MOS/MOLT ISD.

2.6. Contingency Response (CR) Commander(s) will:

- 2.6.1. Establish a viable ATSEV function. If determined operationally more effective, applicable CR Commander may delegate ATSEV to the Contingency Response Group (CRG) Chief of Stan/Eval. If so delegated, this does not alleviate the requirement to brief the applicable CR commander on all metrics, trends, and training data as directed in this volume. If not delegated, all requirements will be accomplished by the CR Commander.
- 2.6.2. Ensure CRW ATSEV personnel possess all the aerial port qualifications required within the unit's mission directive.
- 2.6.3. Ensure ATSEV evaluators are Contingency Support Element (CSE) Chief qualified prior to, or within 90 days, of assuming an ATSEV Evaluator role.
- 2.6.4. Designate, in writing (Attachment 3), ATSEV assigned personnel and list the tasks/areas authorized to evaluate. Contingency Response (CR) unit appointment letter may be signed by the CRG or Sq/CC.
 - 2.6.4.1. If deemed necessary, the appointment of a single ATSEV manager is authorized for the CR unit. If authorized to evaluate, the manager will be designated as both on the letter at Attachment 3.
- 2.6.5. Establish a written policy governing the required number of evaluations during each deployment.
- 2.6.6. Ensure evaluation results of personnel assisting the home unit are forwarded to the CR unit manager.
- 2.6.7. Ensure an annual unit ATSEV self-inspection is completed in Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT).
- 2.6.8. Ensure evaluations are captured, reviewed and approved NLT the 7th day the month. If your database is not available, submit evaluations as a spreadsheet utilizing the ATSEV Manual Evaluations Report (Attachment 5).
- 2.6.9. Establish a written response policy for all evaluations with findings rated fail, TDV, DSV, or UCR. Written policy is only required if the CR Commander has a policy that is different than paragraph 3.2.5. .
- 2.6.10. Assess unit performance and actions taken to analyze, correct, and improve aerial port processes by convening review boards. Attendees will include; the unit training manager (UTM), ATSEV UPM(s), work center representatives and other senior leaders. Monthly ATSEV briefings attended by the Unit Training Manager (UTM), ATSEV UPM(s), work center representatives and unit's senior leadership meet this requirement.

2.6.11. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of USAF EC/MOS/MOLT ISD.

2.7. AP/AMS TRO will:

2.7.1. Nominate to the commander the most qualified individuals to serve as ATSEV manager and evaluator(s).

2.7.2. Recommend the required number of monthly evaluations to the commander. The minimum number of monthly evaluations required is equal to 40 percent of “available” personnel. When determining the required number of evaluations, remember the goal of the evaluation process is to ensure a thorough look at all processes within each section. As with any review, the greater number of evaluations completed will offer the unit a clearer picture and could improve inspection ratings. (See Attachment 1, Terms, “Available Personnel”).

2.7.3. Review the Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL). Determine if any processes (i.e., mishaps, close-calls, negative evaluation trends, etc) should be evaluated with greater frequency within the unit. Note: If the number of critical tasks performed by the unit identified on the CPEL exceeds the minimum number of evaluations required in 2.7.2., the higher number is the minimum.

2.7.4. Attend quarterly ATSEV and unit-level review boards to assess unit performance and actions taken to analyze, correct, and improve aerial port processes. Monthly ATSEV briefings attended by the UTM and unit’s senior leadership meets this requirement.

2.7.5. Ensure monthly metrics/trend data reviews are accomplished with the commander as a minimum to determine if the required CPEL items have been evaluated as required.

2.7.6. Ensure an annual unit ATSEV self-inspection is completed in Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT).

2.7.7. Review all self-inspections and ATSEV evaluation findings receiving a fail, TDV, DSV, or UCR; ensure corrective actions are valid, accurate, and completed in a timely manner.

2.7.8. Ensure seasoned transportation personnel are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of the USAF EC/MOS/MOLT ISD.

2.7.9. Ensure that if a CONUS Aerial Port ATSEV function is collocated with the Maintenance Group QA, they remain administratively under and report to the Aerial Port Commander as approved by HQ USAF/A4 and outlined in AMCI 24-101 V1.

2.8. ATSEV Unit Program Manager will:

2.8.1. Be a NCO in the grade of MSgt or above (or civilian equivalent), with an awarded seven level in the AFSC of 2T2X1. Exceptions require a waiver from HQ AMC/A4TR.

2.8.2. Manage the unit-level ATSEV Program.

2.8.2.1. Decertify any evaluator who fails a LCAP EPE and recertify or replace them.

2.8.3. Assist TM in nominating the most knowledgeable personnel within the unit to serve as quality assurance evaluators. Ensure personnel meet all requirements prior to being nominated to the position.

2.8.4. Ensure the required number of process evaluations are conducted monthly and evaluation results are reported to each respective Flight Commander and Superintendent, TM, Operations Officer, and the Commander.

2.8.4.1. Ensure equal numbers of evaluations (proportional to population) are conducted on each shift and in all work centers.

2.8.5. Track all evaluations rated fail, TDV, DSV, or UCR until resolved. Comply with the written response policy defined by the commander to avoid overdue or overlooked replies. Inform unit leadership on all late replies and repeat findings.

2.8.5.1. Initiate actions when additional attention is required to resolve adverse trends or training problems. Actions include preparing cross-tell information bulletins and conducting briefings to unit personnel.

2.8.6. Monitor HQ AMC metrics for trends.

2.8.6.1. Ensure evaluations are captured, reviewed and approved NLT the 7th day the month. If your database is not available, submit evaluations as a spreadsheet utilizing the ATSEV Manual Evaluations Report (Attachment 5).

2.8.6.2. Program files consist of: Letters of appointment, unit inspection policy, manual evaluations report, annual unit ATSEV self inspections (in MICT), meeting minutes, briefing slides, and the results of any unit inspections/SAVs. Maintain program files for five years IAW AFMAN 33-363, Table 21-09 R 02.00, *Quality Control Inspection/Evaluation Record*.

2.8.7. Provide a monthly summary of evaluations to the unit commander. Commanders may opt to review the evaluation results contained in the ATSEV evaluations application vice a formal briefing. (See Attachment 5)

2.8.8. Ensure ATIs are reviewed, maintained, and appropriate action(s) taken.

2.8.9. Ensure unit compliance with Command Performance Standards (CPS). The CPS will be utilized by ATSEV evaluators, trainers, and the LCAP inspection team to evaluate training, ATSEV and individual/team compliance with the standards. (See Attachment 4)

2.8.10. Ensure an annual unit ATSEV self-inspection is completed in Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT).

2.8.11. Complete the base level Air Force Training Course (formerly known as “Train the Trainer Course”).

2.8.12. Be well versed on the training requirements contained in AMCI 24-101, Volume 22.

2.8.13. Ensure work center trainers use current QTPs from the HQ AMC/A4TR web page.

2.8.14. Ensure supervisors are knowledgeable of and are using Proficiency Assessments (PAs) to determine a previously QTP trained individuals knowledge level when required.

2.8.15. The effectiveness of any formal training course can be directly attributed to the expertise of the individuals selected to serve as SMEs for the ISD. When requested to provide SMEs the ATSEV program manager ensures seasoned transportation personnel

are selected to serve as SMEs for both initial and revision levels of the USAF EC/MOS/MOLT ISD.

2.8.16. Ensure unit Subject Matter Experts (SME's) review QTPs within the timeframe established by HQ AMC/A4TR. The results of the review must be consolidated and submitted.

2.8.17. Develop and administer a local training plan to train all ATSEV personnel, to include augmentees.

2.8.17.1. The basis of the training will be QTP 21.1 ATSEV and must cover evaluation techniques, use of the ATSEV App, documenting evaluations, follow-up on corrective actions and actions to prevent personnel injury or equipment damage. Training will be documented in individual training records.

2.8.18. Conduct an Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation (EPE) on each evaluator, including augmentees, performing one PE and one technical inspection (QVI/SI). Each ATSEV evaluator, permanent or augmentee, must pass the EPEs prior to performing unsupervised evaluations. Document the results in the ATSEV App under CPEL task 21. UPMs will conduct an EPE on all appointed evaluators quarterly. New evaluators will be evaluated by the UPM within 30 days of being appointed the task of evaluator.

2.8.19. Participate in online ATSEV meetings hosted on DCO or similar e-tool.

2.8.20. Manage unit access to the ATSEV evaluations application.

2.8.21. Ensure all evaluations rated fail/observation include a narrative that details the finding, includes a valid reference, and corrective action.

2.9. **ATSEV Evaluators will:**

2.9.1. Be a NCO in the grade of TSgt or above (or civilian equivalent), with an awarded seven level in the AFSC of 2T2X1. Exceptions require a waiver from HQ AMC/A4TR.

2.9.2. Reflect the highest standards of military bearing and professionalism; be impartial, objective, and consistent in all evaluations.

2.9.3. Complete QTPs for all areas they are appointed to evaluate before conducting evaluations.

2.9.4. Complete unit training requirements and QTP 21.1 ATSEV.

2.9.5. Complete the base level Air Force Training Course (formerly known as "Train the Trainer Course").

2.9.6. Be well versed on the training requirements contained in AMCI 24-101, Volume 22.

2.9.7. Be Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in all tasks for which they have been designated to evaluate.

2.9.8. Provide introductory and post-evaluation feedback to personnel, as appropriate to the evaluation.

2.9.8.1. Offer guidance/suggestions as needed during the post-evaluation feedback session.

2.9.9. Enter evaluations into the ATSEV database.

2.9.10. Provide the unit's ATSEV Manager a review of QTPs as outlined by HQ AMC/A4TR.

3. Program Guidance.

3.1. Evaluations are AMC's formal avenue to ensure the effectiveness of air transportation processes and identify areas for improvement. They provide leadership with factual information about the health and effectiveness of the unit and training. Accurate assessments of personnel proficiency and processes are critical to gauging unit effectiveness. This program is intended to enhance cross-tell and facilitate benchmarking, while allowing latitude to adapt it for local needs.

3.2. Process evaluations are assessments of procedures required to accomplish the unit's mission. Every effort should be made to conduct personnel evaluations (PEs) of available personnel while they are performing their daily transportation duties without disruption of the normal work schedule. The focus is on efficient and effective completion of tasks and processes within command standards. Safety is inherent in all processes and an integral part of evaluations. Whenever safety is compromised, leadership will apply risk management principles to prevent mishaps. This may include risk assessments or job safety analysis in accordance with AFI 91-202, *The US Air Force Mishap Prevention Program* or apply an increased focus by ATSEV within tasks/processes involved.

3.2.1. Air Transportation personnel involved in performing the process are subject to evaluation. This includes senior NCOs and civilians.

3.2.2. When conducting evaluations an equal number will be accomplished on each shift whenever possible based on workload/operating hours.

3.2.3. There are four categories of evaluation and three categories of observation: Evaluations are Personnel Evaluation (PE), Quality Verification Inspection (QVI), Special Inspection (SI), and Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation (EPE). Observations are Detected Safety Violation (DSV), Technical Data Violation (TDV), and Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR). Based on the Acceptable Quality Level (AQL) PEs QVIs, SIs and EPEs will be rated PASS/FAIL.

3.2.3.1. Personnel Evaluations (PE) are an over the shoulder evaluation of a specific individual or team of individuals while actually performing a task. The evaluator may start and/or stop the evaluation at any step in the task if a safety issue is discovered and further process completion could result in harm to an individual, an aircraft delay, and/or damage to equipment. Evaluations will accurately assess the proficiency of each individual under evaluation. However, in the case of a team evaluation, the success or failure of the evaluation will be assessed against the task supervisor.

3.2.3.2. Quality Verification Inspections (QVI) are an after-the-fact assessment following a process or task to verify the proper completion of that action. QVI like PE, are attributable to a specific individual or team of individuals and will follow the same rules for assignment of a passed/failed inspection as those outlined for a PE. Because they are assigned to a specific individual or team of individuals, QVI will be

conducted only when reasonable assurance can be obtained through personal observation or inference that the environment in which the task was originally completed has not been significantly altered.

3.2.3.3. Special Inspections (SI) are inspections not otherwise covered by QVI or PE. SI may include, but are not limited to, vehicle and equipment forms inspection, files, housekeeping, etc. Generally, individuals are not assigned responsibility in regards to an SI, because they are unknown or identification would be inappropriate.

3.2.3.4. Detected Safety Violations (DSV) are observations of an unsafe act committed by an individual not undergoing a PE at the time. The evaluator will stop the unsafe act immediately and notify the individual's supervisor.

3.2.3.5. Technical Data Violations (TDV) are observations of any person (not undergoing a PE at the time) performing a task without proper technical data available and/or in use. The evaluator will stop the task being performed immediately and notify the individual's supervisor.

3.2.3.6. Unsatisfactory Condition Reports (UCR) are an observed unsafe or unsatisfactory condition, other than a DSV, which cannot be assigned to a specific individual; however, it can be charged to a specific work center. Document these types of inspection discrepancies as a UCR rather than a DSV when it is not possible to determine who created the unsafe condition.

3.2.3.7. The ATSEV Ratings Standard will be used by an Aerial Port member of the LCAP Team designated by the APS Team Lead to evaluate the ATSEV function. Evaluator Proficiency Evaluations (EPEs) of ATSEV evaluators and will also be conducted by an Aerial Port member of the LCAP Team designated by the APS Team Lead. EPEs can consist of an over-the-shoulder evaluation of an ATSEV evaluator conducting a PE, an evaluator being asked to accomplish the process themselves, and/or an after-the-fact follow-up of a QVI conducted by an ATSEV evaluator. Additionally, ATSEV personnel are subject to DSV and TDV observations.

3.2.4. Rating Criteria. Assign one of the following ratings to every process evaluation:

3.2.4.1. PASS. A pass rating indicates the process/task met or exceeded the acceptable standard.

3.2.4.2. FAIL. A fail rating indicates the process/task did not meet minimum standards due to exceeding the minor finding AQL or identifying a major finding. A minor finding is an unsatisfactory condition that requires correction, but does not endanger personnel, affect safety of flight, jeopardize equipment reliability, or warrant discontinuing a process. Aerial Port AQL is two for all of our tasks. A major finding is an unsatisfactory condition that does not qualify as a minor finding. Conditions that would warrant a DSV, TDV, or UCR rating during an observation are considered major findings and are rated as a fail during a PE.

3.2.4.3. A DSV/TDV rating indicates an OBSERVATION of a process/task that did not meet acceptable standards due to major findings in the areas of safety or technical data violations. A major finding is a condition that would endanger personnel, jeopardize equipment reliability, warrant discontinuing the process, or that could

result in process failure. When a DSV/TDV condition is observed, correct it immediately. Under no circumstance will a safety or equipment reliability error go uncorrected. The evaluator will consider the seriousness of the error when deciding whether or not the member(s) performing the process and the evaluation should continue.

3.2.4.4. A UCR rating indicates the *OBSERVATION* of an unsafe or unsatisfactory condition and it is not possible to determine individual responsibility.

3.2.5. Suspense evaluations receiving a fail, DSV, TDV or UCR to the appropriate work center for corrective action(s). All evaluations defined in this paragraph will be routed and returned to the unit's ATSEV Manager within 5 duty days. Work centers will respond to all findings by stating the action taken/planned to resolve the identified problem(s) to include an "implementation date or estimate closure date" if applicable. Work center responses to findings will be reviewed by the superintendent, flight chief and Ops Officer before the ATSEV-QA application suspense date. Unit commanders will be briefed on work centers not meeting the suspense and open/closed items monthly.

3.2.6. Evaluators must review all individuals' TBA Records for any evaluations receiving a fail, DSV or TDV to verify training documentation (i.e., have individuals been trained, etc.). Periodically review records of those rated pass (as time permits). Identify discrepancies in documentation to the unit training manager for follow-up action. At no time will the evaluation ratings be changed based on TBA Record documentation discrepancies alone.

3.2.7. Results of all evaluations will be recorded in the ATSEV evaluations application or using the manual reporting method when the ATSEV evaluations application is down. Failure to provide data due to computer downtimes and/or problems will not be an acceptable reason during unit inspections.

3.2.8. Evaluations that are rated FAIL and all observations will include a reference to the technical order, instruction, and/or command standard violated. Evaluators will review evaluation results with the person(s)/supervisor evaluated upon completion of each evaluation, and welcome challenges to the factual determination of any given finding.

3.2.9. Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL). The CPEL is a HQ AMC/A4T managed/directed list of critical and non-critical (basic) processes requiring evaluation within an air transportation unit. Critical tasks are those which should be assessed more often than other tasks. Units must evaluate non-critical processes at least once every three months and critical processes monthly unless waived by HQ AMC/A4TR. Current CPEL is available at HQ AMC/A4TR web site.

3.2.10. Command Performance Standard (CPS). The CPS is a command directed task compliance and/or performance tool developed to clarify or establish standards for air transportation tasks not covered in current AMC Aerial Port guidance. The CPS also provides the staff an avenue to address policy shortfalls or A4T interpretation of guidance affecting the field. The CPS will be utilized by ATSEV evaluators, trainers, and the LCAP inspection team to evaluate individual/team process compliance. ATSEV evaluators will determine unit compliance with tasks/processes governed by a CPS and enter the results in the ATSEV evaluation application. (See Attachment 4.)

3.2.10.1. CPS may be developed by any HQ AMC/A4T staff member and submitted to the HQ AMC ATSEV Program Manager.

4. AMC Program Administration/Execution.

4.1. Commanders are vital to a successful ATSEV program. They establish a separate duty section dedicated to the ATSEV quality assurance program. Additional duties must be minimized. Additional duties will not take priority over management/evaluation requirements of the ATSEV program.

4.1.1. Manning for the TRQ - ATSEV office is based on assigned personnel. A minimum of two 2T2 personnel are required to ensure evaluating all areas of the CPEL is possible. One additional person is required for every 50 assigned personnel.

4.1.1.1. Commanders of small active duty units with 50 or less permanently assigned air transportation personnel (including civilian and foreign nationals) are not required to establish an ATSEV function; however, personnel are still required to train and perform to the QTP standard as directed by AMCI 24-101, Volume 22. Commanders that elect to establish an ATSEV function will fully comply with this instruction. Units that are not required to maintain an ATSEV function under this instruction are still subject to inspection.

4.2. Evaluators should represent a cross-section of aerial port personnel who are highly motivated with above-average communicative skills and a record of excellence. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, evaluators will, whenever possible, be assigned to the ATSEV program manager for reporting purposes.

4.2.1. ATSEV evaluators will serve for a minimum of one year, but no longer than 3 years. Commanders should establish a rotation policy to ensure expertise flows in and out of the ATSEV office without disrupting continuity. (Note: Remote (12 month) locations are not required to comply with the minimum requirement)

JOHN C. TOBIN, Col, USAF
Deputy Director of Logistics

Attachment 1**GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION*****References******Adopted Forms*****AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication******Abbreviations and Acronyms*****ADLS—Advanced Distributed Learning Service****AFRC—Air Force Reserve Component****AMC—Air Mobility Command****AMOW—Air Mobility Wing****AMS—Air Mobility Squadron****ANG—Air National Guard****APS—Aerial Port Squadron****AQL—Acceptable Quality Level****ARC—Air Reserve Component (Applies to both Reserve and Guard personnel)****ATSEV—Air Transportation Standardization and Evaluation****ATII—Air Transportation Interest Item****CSE—Contingency Support Element****CFETP—Career Field Education and Training Plan****CPEL—Command Process Evaluation List****CPS—Command Performance Standard****CR—Contingency Response****CRG—Contingency Response Group****DCO—Defense Connect Online****DSV—Detected Safety Violation****EPE—Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation****ECD—Estimate Closure Date****ISD—Instructional Systems Design****LCAP—Logistics Compliance Assessment Program****MICT—Management Internal Control Toolset****MPA—Military Personnel Appropriation****MRS—Manpower Requirement Squadron**

MXG—Maintenance Group

NCO—Non-Commissioned Officer

NGB—National Guard Bureau

PA—Proficiency Assessment

PE—Personnel Evaluation

QA—Quality Assurance

QTP—Qualification Training Package

QVI—Quality Verification Inspection

SAV—Staff Assistance Visit

SI—Special Inspection

SME—Subject Matter Expert

STS—Specialty Training Standard

TA—Training Assessment

TDV—Technical Data Violation

TEC—Task Evaluation Checklist

TM—Terminal Management

TTG—Task Training Guide

UCR—Unsatisfactory Condition Report

UPM—Unit Program Manager

USAF EC/MOS/MOLT—USAF Expeditionary Center/Mobility Operations School/Air Transportation Branch

UTM—Unit Training Manager

OT—Online Training

Terms

Air Transportation Interest Item (ATII)— A process that requires special attention based on current trend data. Much like an AMC/IG special interest item (SII), but applicable to air transportation processes addressed in the ATSEV program. HQ AMC/A4TR is responsible for establishing and rescinding ATII's.

Advanced Distributed Learning Service (ADLS)— The gateway to the official online learning system of Air Mobility Command.

Available Personnel— Available Personnel are those “on station” performing tasks - including augmenting forces. Personnel working at an alternate work site due to a runway closure are considered augmenting forces to the unit where the tasks are being performed. Individuals (except CRW deployed) who are TDY off station or on convalescent leave will not be counted.

Command Process Evaluation List (CPEL)— AMCs command-directed list of processes to be evaluated within an air transportation unit. The list identifies basic and critical processes.

Critical Process— A process within air transportation that if not properly accomplished will cause severe mission degradation or failure.

Defense Connect Online (DCO)— A suite of collaboration tools/services which include web conferencing, instant messaging, collaborative workspaces, and application sharing.

Detected Safety Violation (DSV)— Observation(s) of an unsafe act committed by an individual not undergoing a PE at the time.

Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation (EPE)— An EPE is the direct evaluation of a Quality Assurance individual or any individual performing a quality/compliance assurance function in a unit.

Evaluator— Air transportation personnel who perform evaluations as specified in this instruction.

Management Internal Control Toolset (MICT)— MICT is an interactive application designed to assist managing self-inspection programs.

Observation— Observations are Detected Safety Violation (DSV), Technical Data Violation (TDV), and Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR). Observations do not result from a PE, QVI or SI.

Proficiency Assessment (PA)— An assessment of the individuals' task knowledge/performance level.

Personnel Evaluation (PE)— An over the shoulder evaluation of a specific individual or team of individuals while actually performing a task.

Qualification Training Package (QTP)— An instructional package designed for use at the unit level to train and evaluate personnel in their duty position.

Quality Verification Inspection (QVI)— An after-the-fact assessment following a process or task to verify the proper completion of that action.

Special Inspection (SI)— Inspections not otherwise covered by QVI or PE.

Subject Matter Expert (SME)— SMEs are individuals who have on-the-job experience working in or with the subject/task(s) being analyzed.

Technical Data Violation (TDV)— Observations of any person (not undergoing a PE at the time) performing a task without proper technical data available and/or in use.

Training Assessment (TA)— Assessment (test) of training conducted; prior to completing the TEC. TAs are contained in ADLS and do not require a proctor.

Unsatisfactory Condition Report (UCR)— An observed unsafe or unsatisfactory condition, other than a DSV, which cannot be assigned to a specific individual; however, it can be charged to a specific work center.

Attachment 2

EXAMPLE AIR TRANSPORTATION INTEREST ITEM

THIS MESSAGE HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR RELEASE BY WILLIAM ZECK, COL,
CHIEF, AIR TRANSPORTATION DIVISION DIRECTORATE OF LOGISTICS

FROM: HQ AMC SCOTT AFB IL//A4T

SUBJECT: (U) ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR TRANSPORTATION INTEREST ITEM (ATII)
12-01: AIRCRAFT LAVATORY SERVICING AND TECHNICAL DATA

1. BACKGROUND: A RECENT INCIDENT HAS HIGHLIGHTED THE NEED TO EMPHASIZE LAVATORY SERVICING PROCEDURES ON ALL MISSION DESIGN SERIES (MDS) WITH LAVATORY SYSTEMS, MINIMIZING THE POSSIBILITY OF CORROSION DAMAGE.
2. ACTIONS REQUIRED: UNIT COMMANDERS WILL ENSURE PERSONNEL ARE FOLLOWING THE APPLICABLE TECHNICAL ORDER WHEN SERVICING LATRINES ON ALL MDS.
3. EVALUATOR INSTRUCTIONS: QUALIFICATION TRAINING PACKAGE (QTP) 15.5 IS THE TRAINING OUTLINE FOR LATRINE SERVICING. THIS QTP REFERS SERVICE TECHNICIANS TO THE APPLICABLE AIRCRAFT TECHNICAL ORDERS FOR LATRINE SERVICING. ATSEV-QA EVALUATORS WILL CONDUCT PERSONAL EVALUATIONS OF THE AIRCRAFT LATRINE SERVICING PROCESS (AREA 15.4). SPECIAL EMPHASIS MUST BE PLACED ON THE USE OF AIRCRAFT TECHNICAL ORDERS ASSOCIATED WITH LATRINE SERVICING. EVALUATORS WILL SEEK OPPORTUNITIES TO EVALUATE LATRINE SERVICING ON ALL MDS AS REQUIRED. QTP 15.5 APPLIES. IN THE ATSEV-QA APPLICATION, UNIT PROGRAM MANAGERS WILL CREATE A UNIT DIRECTED INSPECTION TITLED - ATII 12-01, AIRCRAFT LATRINE SERVICING PROCESS - AND DOCUMENT THE RESULTS. PERIOD OF EFFECTIVENESS IS JAN THROUGH DEC 2012.
4. THIS IS A COORDINATED HQ AMC/A4TC/ATSEV-QA MESSAGE.
5. PRIMARY HQ AMC POC FOR THIS ATII IS MSGT TRACY CURTIS. QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS ATII MAY BE REFERRED TO HQ AMC/A4TC AT AMC.A4TCP@US.AF.MIL OR, DSN 779-4434.

//SIGNED//

WILLIAM Z. ZECK, COL, USAF

CHIEF, AIR TRANSPORTATION DIVISION (AMC)

Attachment 3

SAMPLE AIR TRANSPORTATION STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION (ATSEV-QA) QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM APPOINTMENT LETTER

Date

MEMORANDUM FOR HQ AMC/A4TR

FROM:

SUBJECT: Air Transportation Standardization/Evaluation (ATSEV-QA) Quality Assurance
Program

1. The following individuals are designated as ATSEV QA Manager/Evaluators for the Unit, Base, and Location:

<u>RANK / NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DSN PHONE #</u>
MSgt	Manager	779-2540
TSgt	Evaluator	779-2951

2. In accordance with AMCI 24-101, Volume 20, listed below are the areas each individual is qualified to perform evaluations in:

<u>RANK / NAME</u>	<u>AREAS</u>
MSgt	Joint Inspection, Vehicle and MHE Operations
TSgt	Passenger Service, ATOC, Fleet (Clean)

(Task numbers can be used, i.e., 7, 8, 9)

3. This supersedes all previously issued memorandums of the same subject.

NAME, RANK, USAF

Commander

cc: HQ AMC/A4TR Attn: ATSEV Program Manager, send electronically

cc: Individual

Attachment 4

SAMPLE COMMAND PERFORMANCE STANDARD

HQ AMC A4T Command Performance Standard				
Required Performance	Performance Standard	Acceptable Quality Level maximum allowable degree of deviation from requirements before rated a Fail.	QA Surveillance Method	Corrective Actions
Position and secure a single 463L pallet onto a 60K Aircraft Loader.	Position and secure a single 463L pallet onto a 60K Aircraft Loader without damages and within the AQL.	100% Compliance	Random Observation	Direct, Immediate Corrective Action
		SAMPLE		

Attachment 5

FORMAT FOR ATSEV-QA MANUAL EVALUATIONS REPORT

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	ATSEV QA Manual Monthly Evaluation Report										
2	UNIT:										
3	Evaluations Month/Year:										
4	Number of Military 2T2s Available:										
5	Number of Civilian 2T2s Available:										
6	Total:										
7	*Minimum Number of Evaluations Required:										
8	Number of Evaluations Completed:										
9	Total Pass:										
10	Total Fails:										
11	Total Number of Observations:										
12	**Unit Score:										
13											
14	NOTE: *The minimum number of monthly evaluations required is equal to 40 percent of "available" personnel. If the number of critical tasks performed by the										
15	unit identified on the CPEL exceeds the minimum number of evaluations required in 2.9.2., the higher number is the minimum. Fail results and observations must										
16	be detailed on the marked Fails/Observations. Each ATSEV QA Manager (UPM) is responsible to ensure this report is accomplished in its entirety and sent to										
17	HQ AMC/A4TR no later than the 7th of each month. Negative reports are required. File this and all continuation sheets IAW AMCI 24-101, Volume 20 and										
18	maintain for one year. **Total Pass divided by Number of Evaluations Completed MINUS .5% for each Observation.										
19	ATSEV-QA Summary Fails Observations										