



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND**

AFGSCI13-5201V2_AFGSCGM2024-01

10 June 2024

MEMORANDUM FOR 90 OG/CC
91 OG/CC
341 OG/CC
20 AF/A3
532 TRS/CC (AETC)

FROM: AFGSC/A3/6
245 Davis Ave East, Suite 207
Barksdale AFB, LA 71110

SUBJECT: Air Force Global Strike Command Guidance Memorandum to Air Force Global Strike Command Instruction 13-5201V2, *Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Standardization and Evaluation*.

By Order of the Commander Air Force Global Strike Command, (AFGSC), this Guidance Memorandum immediately implements changes to Air Force Global Strike Command Instruction 13-5201V2, *Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Standardization and Evaluation*. Compliance with this memorandum is mandatory. To the extent its direction is inconsistent with other AFGSC publications, the information herein prevails, in accordance with (IAW) Department of the Air Force Manual (DAFMAN) 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*.

This guidance does not apply to United States Space Force. The authorities to waive wing/unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier (“**T-0 or T-3**”) number following the compliance statement. See DAFMAN 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*., for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Ensure all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule located in the Air Force Records Information Management System.

This guidance memorandum incorporates the following changes: corrects continuity errors in document concerning evaluator requirements; clarifies policy concerning evaluation windows and requisites; clarifies downgrade criteria for EWO Commit and EAM Processing; expands Evaluator Objectivity Evaluation (EOE) criteria; corrects procedures for annotating an AF Form 8 for a Q3 evaluation and requalification evaluations; clarifies final approval authority for EOE in regards to the AF Form 8, clarifies language concerning qualifications versus certifications; expands GO/NO-GO procedures.

AFGSCI13-5201V2_AFGSCGM2024-01
ATTACHMENT 1
Guidance Changes

This memorandum becomes void after one-year has elapsed from the date of this memorandum, or upon publishing of an interim change or rewrite of AFGSCI13-5201V2, whichever is earlier.

MICHAEL A. MILLER
Brig Gen, USAF
Director of Operations and Communications

Attachment:
Guidance Changes

- 2.1.4.7. (Change) Develops standardized curriculum or syllabus for training evaluators prior to their qualification.
- 2.1.6.3. (Change) Is a qualified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.
- 2.1.6.4 (Change) Develops and administers the evaluator qualification program.
- 2.1.6.5. (Change) Provides recommendations on evaluator qualification and restriction to OG/CC or OG/CD.
- 2.1.7.2. (Change) Is a qualified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.
- 2.1.8.3. (Change) Recommends to OGV (or OG/CC) squadron crew members for evaluator qualification and assigns, as appropriate to the squadron Stan/Eval (CCV).
- 2.1.9.4. (Change) Will be qualified as an evaluator.
- 2.1.10.4. (Change) May be qualified as an evaluator.
- 2.1.11.2. (Change) Is a qualified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.
- 2.1.11.3. (Change) In support of OG/OGV, administers the evaluator qualification program.
- 2.1.11.4. (Change) Provides recommendations on evaluator qualification and restriction to MS/CC and/or OG/OGV.
- 2.1.12.1. (Change) Is a qualified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.
- 2.1.12.2. (Change) Is a current, qualified and experienced instructor who provides instruction, as required IAW this instruction and AFGSCI 13-5201v1. **(T-3)**
- 2.1.12.3. (Change) Is a qualified instructor and experienced MCCC who maintains, at a minimum, Basic Mission Knowledge (BMK) status. Qualified evaluators should be Combat Mission Ready (CMR); however, if it is determined by the certifying official that the evaluator cannot or should not maintain CMR requirements, then the evaluator can perform evaluator duties if meeting BMK or Basic Mission Capable (BMC) requirements.
- 2.1.12.5. (Change) Previously qualified evaluators may also maintain qualification or requalify to support MS/CCV or HHQ for inspections, visits, and evaluations.

Chapter 3

(Change) REACT OPERATIONS EVALUATOR TRAINING AND QUALIFICATION

3.1. (Change) Evaluator Qualification Program.

- 3.1.1. (Change) The evaluator qualification program is designed to develop, train and qualify ICBM evaluators to conduct effective and objective evaluations in accordance with this instruction. (NOTE: Initial evaluator qualification requirements do not apply to those qualified as an evaluator by virtue of position per AFGSC instructions.)
- 3.1.2. (Change) The OG/CC and MS/CCs will determine the number of required evaluators according to mission requirements. It is recommended that MS/CCs maintain a ratio of one qualified evaluator for every seven CMR crew members.
- 3.2.1 (Change) Evaluator trainees will be observed and supervised by a qualified evaluator during all training activities.
- 3.2.2. (Change) Prior to qualification, evaluator trainees must accomplish the following actions:

3.3. (Change) Evaluator Qualification.

3.3.1. (Change) Only qualified evaluators (or evaluator trainees under direct supervision of an experienced evaluator as determined by OG/OGV, OG/AOGV, or MS/CCV) may conduct and document evaluations.

3.3.2. (Change) Only instructor qualified Missile Combat Crew Commanders (MCCC), as identified by AFGSCI 13-5201v1, *REACT Crew Training and Certification*, will be qualified as evaluators. **(T-3)**

3.3.3. (Change) In order to be qualified, the recommended evaluator must successfully pass an initial Evaluator Objectivity Evaluation (EOE) in the MPT IAW chapter 4 of this instruction.

3.3.3.2. (Change) If the evaluator being observed is not recommended for evaluator qualification during their initial EOE, the OG/OGV, OG/AOGV, or HHQ evaluator will become the evaluator of record.

3.3.3.3. (Change) There is no limit to the number of qualification EOE's it takes for an evaluator to become a qualified evaluator.

3.3.4. (Change) After the evaluator trainee has been trained and passes the initial EOE, the evaluator conducting the EOE recommends evaluator qualification to the appropriate evaluator certifying official.

3.3.6. (Change) OG/CC or OG/CD will certify qualified evaluators using the AF Form 8 and maintain an appointment letter (or Letter of X's) of qualified evaluators.

3.3.7. (Change) Units will update the new evaluator's AF Form 4324, *Aircraft Assignment/Aircrew Qualification Worksheet*, to update the new evaluator's duty code and ARMS profile; however, the AF Form 8 is the source document for the evaluator's qualification.

3.3.8. (Change) Award qualified evaluators a "Q" AFSC prefix IAW AFMAN 36-2100, *Military Utilization and Classification*.

3.4.1. (Change) CMR-qualified evaluators assigned to a MW must receive quarterly evaluation training from OG/OGV. Overall content of recurring training is at the discretion of the OG/OGV; however, must include the following: trends, new online scripts, and changes affecting this instruction. Quarterly training will be documented on an AF Form 1522.

3.4.2. (Change) CMR-qualified evaluators must maintain instructor and missile crew member currency and proficiency requirements. **(T-3)**

3.4.3. (Change) BMC/BMK-qualified evaluators and HHQ evaluators will receive just-in-time training as determined by the OG/OGV or AOGV prior to administering an evaluation.

3.5.1. (Change) An individual may be prohibited from performing evaluator duties without losing evaluator qualification. Evaluators will be suspended from administering evaluations for the following reasons: **(T-3)**

3.5.2. (Change) Evaluator certifying officials may restrict evaluators for any of the reasons listed in paragraph 3.5.1. Certifying officials will restrict evaluators for failing an EOE. If a failed EOE was the reason for restriction, a subsequent passing EOE is required before requalifying the evaluator.

3.5.3. (Change) Units will document evaluator restriction by removing the evaluator from the certifying official's appointment letter (or Letter of X's).

3.6.1. (Change) Once an individual has been certified as a qualified ICBM evaluator, the member will not be required to re-accomplish an entire training program at the new assignment. Individuals will maintain their evaluator code ("E" code on 4324) during a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) to a subsequent missile wing.

3.7.1.5.2. (Change) When conducting HHQ evaluations as part of a HHQ inspection, HQ AFGSC/IG will ensure that enough members of their team are CMR, BMC, or BMK qualified evaluators to fulfill the 1:1 evaluatee/evaluator ratio per para 5.2.3 of this instruction.

4.1.7.3.2. (Change) Failure to pass a recurring qualification evaluation and all requisite exams before the individual's expiration date causes the individual to be placed in NO-GO status. Requisites remain valid that were successfully passed within the crew member's window as described in paragraph 4.1.7.3.1 or 4.1.7.5. BMK personnel must meet all requisite exam requirements only prior to expiration date.

4.1.7.5. (Change) Should a crew member take an evaluation outside of their window, the crew member may elect, provided OGV can support, to complete all phases of a periodic qualification evaluation to advance their expiration date. The six month window will open the day of the supported evaluation (e.g., if an out of window MPT evaluation was accomplished on 2 February then all other requisites must be completed by 31 August).

4.1.7.8. (Change) Instructor Evaluation. All instructors must be evaluated while instructing prior to qualification and during their recurring evaluation window. Instructors must demonstrate proficiency by instructing an actual student or an individual acting as a student in any realistic training environment. The evaluator may require the examinee (instructor) to present verbal explanations of equipment operations, procedures, and techniques pertinent to crew duties and responsibilities. Overall rating for this type of evaluation will be either qualified (Q) or unqualified (U). There is no limit to the number of instructor evaluations it takes for an instructor to become qualified.

4.1.7.9. (Added) If a crew member fails to complete all required evaluation requisites within their window, the individual will be restricted and placed in NO-GO status. Qualification may be re-established by completion of the overdue requisite(s). All evaluation requisites must still be accomplished within a six-month period.

4.4. (Change) Evaluator Qualifications and EOE's.

4.4.2. (Change) HHQ EOE. An evaluation of a qualified evaluator by a HHQ evaluator to determine the objectivity and skill of an evaluator. The overall rating for the EOE will be either qualified (Q) or unqualified (U) for the evaluator. HHQ EOE's may be accomplished as part of a SEV, or requested by OG/OGV, SQ/DO, or above.

4.4.3. (Change) For qualified evaluators, a "U" rating on an EOE results in the individual being restricted from evaluating until retraining and recertification is accomplished. Units will document evaluator restriction on block VI of the AF Form 8. A new AF Form 8 will be completed following successful completion of an EOE.

5.1.3.6. (Deleted)

5.9.3. (Deleted)

7.3.1.2. (Change) Evaluators will use their discretion when determining downgrades and overall evaluation ratings; evaluators will assign the following grades to evaluatees who demonstrate the following list of behaviors:

7.3.2.6.2. (Change) U. Failed to properly accomplish all required EWO commit actions IAW USSTRATCOM EAP-STRAT Vol 1. Failed to accomplish applicable Level A* performance standards.

7.3.3.20.1. (Change) Q. Correct response to EAM IAW all applicable directives. Effectively used checklists.

7.3.3.20.2. (Change) Q-. Used applicable checklists when appropriate, but displayed a lack of proficiency that had an actual or potential adverse impact on operations. Added, skipped, or conducted steps when not required. Action or inaction resulted in errors from the standard performance IAW applicable directives.

7.3.3.20.3. (Change) U. Failed to perform correct procedure in response to an EAM. Failed to analyze problems or take corrective actions. Failed to use checklist(s) or lacked acceptable familiarity with its arrangement or contents. Displayed a lack of proficiency that had a direct adverse impact on operations.

7.3.3.24. (Change) Ability to Instruct

7.3.3.24.1. (Change) Q. Demonstrated sound instructor ability. Clearly defined all mission requirements and any required additional training/corrective action. Instruction was accurate, effective, and timely. Completely aware of mission situation at all times.

7.3.3.24.2. (Change) Q-. Problems in communication or analysis degraded effectiveness of instruction/evaluation.

7.3.3.24.3. (Change) U. Demonstrated inadequate ability to instruct. Unable to perform, teach, or assess techniques, procedures, systems use, or tactics. Did not remain aware of mission situation at all times.

7.4. (Added) Evaluator Objectivity Evaluation Grading Standards.

7.4.1. (Added) Evaluators will use the following grading criteria when conducting EOE. A grade of Q- with corrective training or a U in any area will require an overall rating of Q3. Cumulative deviations will be considered when determining the overall rating of either Q1 or Q3.

7.4.2. (Added) A Q1 rating indicates that the EOE evaluatee complied with HHQ and local Stan/Eval directives, properly briefed and debriefed the examinee, correctly identified discrepancies, awarded the correct grade for each evaluated area, awarded the appropriate overall grade and, if required, assigned appropriate additional training.

7.4.3. (Added) EOE graded criteria:

7.4.3.1. (Added) Compliance with Local and HHQ Stan/Eval Directives.

7.4.3.1.1. (Added) Q. Complied with all directives pertaining to the administration of an evaluation.

7.4.3.1.2. (Added) Q-. Complied with most directives. Deviations did not jeopardize the effectiveness of the evaluation.

7.4.3.1.3. (Added) U. Failed to comply with directives.

7.4.3.2. (Added) Evaluator's Briefing.

7.4.3.2.1. (Added) Q. Thoroughly briefed the crew on the conduct of the evaluation, mission requirements, responsibilities, and grading criteria.

7.4.3.2.2. (Added) Q-. Items were omitted during the briefing causing minor confusion. Did not fully brief the crew as to the conduct and purpose of the evaluation.

7.4.3.2.3. (Added) U. Evaluator failed to adequately brief the crew.

7.4.3.3. (Added) Identification of Discrepancies and Assignment of Area Grades.

7.4.3.3.1. (Added) Q. Identified all discrepancies and assigned proper area grades.

7.4.3.3.2. (Added) Q-. Most discrepancies were identified. Failed to assign Q- grade when appropriate.

7.4.3.3.3. (Added) U. Failed to identify discrepancies or deviations which merited an unqualified grade. Assigned Q/Q- grades which should have been U or assigned U grades for performance within standards.

7.4.3.4. (Added) Assessment of Overall Performance.

7.4.3.4.1. (Added) Q. Awarded the appropriate overall grade based on the crew's performance.

7.4.3.4.2. (Added) Q-. Awarded an overall grade without consideration of cumulative deviations in the crew's performance.

7.4.3.4.3. (Added) U. Did not award a grade commensurate with overall performance.

7.4.3.5. (Added) Appropriate Assignment of Additional Training.

7.4.3.5.1. (Added) Q. Assigned proper additional training if warranted.

7.4.3.5.2. (Added) Q-. Additional training assigned was insufficient to ensure the crew would achieve proper level of qualification.

7.4.3.5.3. (Added) U. Failed to assign additional training when warranted.

7.4.3.6. (Added) Evaluation Critique.

7.4.3.6.1. (Added) Q. Thoroughly debriefed the crew on all aspects of the evaluation. Debriefed all key mission events, providing instruction and references as required.

7.4.3.6.2. (Added) Q-. Failed to discuss all deviations and assigned grades. Did not advise the crew of additional training, if required. Failed to debrief or adequately reconstruct all key evaluation events.

7.4.3.6.3. (Added) U. Did not discuss any assigned area grades or the overall rating. Changed grades without briefing the crew. Did not debrief mission at all. Debriefed few or no key mission events.

7.4.3.7. (Added) Evaluation Documentation.

7.4.3.7.1. (Added) Q. Correctly completed all required documentation.

7.4.3.7.2. (Added) Q-. Made minor errors in documentation which did not affect the validity of the evaluation.

7.4.3.7.3. (Added) U. Failed to complete all required documentation. Major errors caused the validity of the evaluation to be questioned.

7.4.3.8. (Added) Briefing the Supervisor on the Evaluation.

7.4.3.8.1. (Added) Q. Thoroughly debriefed the crew's supervisor.

7.4.3.8.2. (Added) Q-. Debriefed the supervisor, but failed to discuss, as applicable, all discrepancies, grades, or recommended retraining.

7.4.3.8.3. (Added) U. Failed to debrief the crew's supervisor.

7.4.3.9. (Added) Evaluator's Performance.

7.4.3.9.1. (Added) Q. Evaluator performed as briefed and contributed to a thorough evaluation of the crew.

7.4.3.9.2. (Added) Q-. Evaluator committed minor errors which did not detract from the crew's performance.

7.4.3.9.3. (Added) U. Evaluator committed major errors disrupting the crew's performance or preventing a thorough evaluation.

8.2. (Change) AF Form 8. Qualifications are attained through evaluations and documented on the AF Form 8. Certifications are attained through methods other than evaluation and documented in accordance with AFGSCI13-5201v1.

8.2.1.1. (Change) The AF Form 8 is the source document used to record, certify and verify the qualification(s) of a member.

8.2.4.3. (Change) MDS/Crew Position. Enter the examinee's MDS and highest qualification reflecting the evaluation.

8.2.5.3. (Change) Grade. Enter a "P" (for Pass) or an "F" (for Fail) for the SQB and boldface. Enter a "1" (for Q1), "2" (for Q2), or "3" (for Q3) for MPT, Instructor, and EOE as applicable. If a member receives a Q3 qualification rating, document the Q3 rating and subsequent retraining and requalification on the same Form 8.

8.2.5.4.2.1. (Change) SPOT will also be used for members that are completing an AF Form 8 to document an instructor or evaluator qualification.

8.2.5.4.3.2. (Change) REQUALIFICATION – Use when member has completed requalification IAW this instruction. This will establish the individual's evaluation window. This is also used at the completion of RQT to requalify an individual who was previously certified on REACT weapon system (e.g. personnel in leadership positions).

8.2.6.2.2. (Change) The Final Approving Officer will sign and date the AF Form 8 after the Reviewing Officer but prior to the Examinee. As applicable, the Final Approving Officer may recommend a commander-directed downgrade if further action is warranted. The OG/CC is the final approving officer for all EOE's and may delegate this no lower than the OG/CD.

9.6.1. (Change) Units will establish a positive control process that ensures ICBM operators have completed all training and Stan/Eval items required to perform ICBM field operation duties.

AFGSCI13-5201V2_AFGSCGM2024-01

ATTACHMENT 1

Guidance Changes

9.6.4. (Added) Visiting crew members assigned to another installation will send a copy of their Individual Training Summary (ITS) to the local SARM for GO/NO-GO validation prior to accomplishing ICBM alert duties.

10.5.2.2. (Change) Achieve a minimum of four Q1 ratings on MPT evaluations that meet the requirements in paragraph 4.1.6. of this instruction.

ATTACHMENT 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFSC—Air Force Specialty Code

CC—Commander

CCV—Squadron Standardization and Evaluation

CD—Deputy Commander

DAFMAN—Department of the Air Force Manual

DO—Director of Operations

IAW—In Accordance With

ITS—Individual Training Summary

MS—Missile Squadron

SEV—Standardization and Evaluation Visit

STRAT—Strategic Command

USAF—United States Air Force

Office Symbols

AFGSC/IG—Air Force Global Strike Command Inspector General

MS/CC—Missile Squadron Commander

MS/CCV—Missile Squadron Standardization and Evaluation

OG/AOGV—Operation's Group Assistant Chief of Standardization and Evaluation

OG/CD—Operation's Group Deputy Commander

OG/OGV—Operation's Group Chief of Standardization and Evaluation

SQ/DO—Squadron Director of Operations

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER
AIR FORCE GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND**

**AIR FORCE GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND
INSTRUCTION 13-5201 VOLUME 2**



5 JUNE 2023

***Nuclear, Space, Missile, Command and
Control***

***RAPID EXECUTION AND COMBAT
TARGETING (REACT) CREW
STANDARDIZATION AND
EVALUATION***

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 AFGSC/A3TV

Certified by: HQ AFGSC/A3T
(Colonel Matthew McDaniel)

Supersedes: AFGSCI 13-5201V2, 7 February 2022

Pages: 70

This instruction implements Air Force Policy Directive 13-5, *Air Force Nuclear Mission*, and is consistent with Air Force Instruction (AFI) 13-520, *Aircraft and ICBM Nuclear Operations*. This instruction defines roles, responsibilities, and minimum requirements for Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) mission-ready evaluation programs for employment of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) and applies to 13N personnel assigned to Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC), Twentieth Air Force (20 AF), AFGSC Missile Wings (MW), and Air Force Reserve component personnel serving in ICBM operations as Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMA). This instruction does not apply to Air National Guard units or the US Space Force. This instruction references the 532d Training Squadron (532 TRS) as appropriate. This publication requires the collection and/or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by Title 10 U.S.C., Sec 9013, Secretary of the Air Force. The applicable System of Records Notice(s) F036 AF PC C, Military Personnel Records System is (are) available at: <https://dpcl.d.defense.gov/Privacy/SORNsIndex/DOD-Component-Notices/Air-Force-Article-List/> (T-0). Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the DAF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*. This instruction may only be supplemented by 20 AF. Supplements will not be less restrictive than the provisions of this publication and will be coordinated with Headquarters (HQ) AFGSC/A3T prior to certification and publishing. The authorities to waive requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier ("T-0, T-1, T-2, T-

3”) number following the compliance statement. See Department of the Air Force Manual (DAFMAN) 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*, Table 10.1 for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate Tier waiver approval authority, or alternately, to the publication OPR for non-tiered compliance items. Conduct that violates **paragraph 6.3** is a violation of Article 92, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) for military personnel; violations by civilian personnel may result in disciplinary or adverse action under DAFI 36-148, *Discipline and Adverse Actions of Civilian Employees*, and/or civilian criminal or civil sanction. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and disposed of in accordance with Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS) Records Disposition Schedule (RDS). Compliance with attachments **2** and **3** in this publication is mandatory. A future effective date for this instruction may be used to serve as a transition period between the superseded AFGSCI 13-5201V2 and this instruction to allow units/personnel time to prepare for compliance IAW Department of the Air Force Manual (DAFMAN) 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*. Units will implement requirements within this instruction no later than 60 days from its publication date.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This document has been substantially revised to standardize missile operations with Air Force operations. Changes include, but are not limited to, the addition of Pyramid Evaluations and Supplementary Evaluations. The document must be reviewed in its entirety.

Chapter 1—GENERAL	5
1.1. Purpose.....	5
1.2. Objectives.....	5
1.3. Waivers.....	5
1.4. Clarification of Guidance (COG).....	6
1.5. Guidance Change Requests.....	6
Chapter 2—ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	8
2.1. Roles and Responsibilities.....	8
Chapter 3—REACT OPERATIONS EVALUATOR TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION	14
3.1. Evaluator Certification Program.....	14
3.2. Evaluator Training Requirements.....	14
3.3. Evaluator Certification.....	15
3.4. Recurring Evaluator Training Requirements.....	15
3.5. Evaluator Status Requirements.....	16
3.6. Tailored Evaluator Training Program.....	16

3.7.	HHQ Evaluators.....	16
Chapter 4—EVALUATIONS		18
4.1.	Evaluation Process.	18
Table 4.1.	Pyramid Evaluation Examiner Matrix.	18
4.2.	Spot-Evaluation.	21
4.3.	No-Notice Evaluations.....	21
4.4.	Evaluator Certifications and EOE.	22
4.5.	Operations Plan (OPLAN) Revision Evaluation Program Requirements.....	22
Chapter 5—EVALUATION CONDUCT		23
5.1.	Evaluation Scenarios.....	23
5.2.	Evaluation Scenario Conduct.....	24
5.3.	Evaluation Script Development.	25
5.4.	Evaluation Script Execution.	27
5.5.	Evaluation Performance Standards.	28
5.6.	Evaluation Scenario Termination.	29
5.7.	Evaluation Script Management.....	29
5.8.	Evaluation Debrief.....	30
5.9.	Error Determination.....	30
5.10.	Error Consummation.....	31
Chapter 6—ICBM REQUISITE EXAMINATIONS		33
6.1.	Purpose.....	33
6.2.	Scope.....	33
6.3.	Academic Integrity.	33
6.4.	Examination Procedures.	33
6.5.	Examination Sources.	34
6.6.	Grading.	34
6.7.	Failure to Pass a Requisite Exam.....	35
Chapter 7—EVALUATION RATINGS		36
7.1.	Evaluation Ratings.....	36
7.2.	Directed Training.....	36
7.3.	General Grading Standards.....	37

Chapter 8—EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION	46
8.1. Evaluation Documentation.....	46
8.2. AF Form 8, Certificate of Aircrew Qualification.	47
Table 8.1. Evaluation-AF Form 8 Reviewer/Approver Matrix.....	49
Chapter 9—Missile Operations Publications.	51
9.1. Missile Crew Information File (MCIF).	51
9.2. Missile Crew Publications.	51
9.3. Required Volumes.	51
Table 9.1. Required Volumes.	51
9.4. Publications Library.....	52
9.5. Alert Related Special Interest Item (SII).	53
9.6. Go/No-Go Procedures.....	54
Chapter 10—MISCELLANEOUS	55
10.1. Trends.	55
10.2. Supplementary Evaluations.	55
10.3. Stan/Eval Visits (SEVs).....	56
10.4. Stan/Eval Boards (SEB).....	56
10.5. AFGSC Crew Member Excellence (CME) Award.....	57
10.6. New or Upgrade System Requirements.....	57
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION	59
Attachment 2—MCCM EVALUATION FOLDERS	64
Attachment 3—EVALUATION OVERVIEW CHART	65
Attachment 4—MCIF TEMPLATE	67
Attachment 5—AIR FORCE FORM 8 EXAMPLE	68

Chapter 1

GENERAL

1.1. Purpose.

1.1.1. The purpose of the ICBM Standardization/Evaluation (Stan/Eval) program is to provide commanders a tool to ensure missile combat crew members (MCCM) possess the knowledge and skills consistent with the requirements of their assigned crew position as well as the ability to prioritize, manage, and execute tasks to act as efficient and effective combat-ready crew members.

1.1.2. The ICBM Stan/Eval program also provides commanders the means to document individual crew member qualifications and receive feedback on the effectiveness of unit training programs and mission execution.

1.1.3. The day-to-day assigned Emergency War Order (EWO) responsibilities of the unit shall be emphasized through a robust training/evaluation program to meet the operational requirements of Emergency Action Procedures-United States Strategic Command (EAP-STRAT), Emergency Action Procedures-Twentieth Air Force (EAP-20 AF), and this instruction.

1.2. Objectives.

1.2.1. Provide a system to assess and document missile crew members' performance.

1.2.2. Develop and ensure standardization of operational procedures for safe, effective, and reliable management and employment of the ICBM weapon system.

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

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

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

1.3. Waivers.

1.3.1. HQ AFGSC/A3/6 is the highest waiver authority for this instruction. In complying with SecAF and CSAF direction, this document was reviewed and waiver authority pushed down where appropriate. Tiered waiver authority may not be further delegated. Waivers will be granted on an individual and controlled basis.

1.3.1.1. The authorities to waive requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier ("T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3") number following the compliance statement.

1.3.1.2. Waiver requests will be submitted using the AF Form 679, Air Force Publication Compliance Item Waiver Request/Approval, or via SIPR e-mail or memorandum if the request is classified. Reference DAFI 90-160 for more specific guidance on waiver authorities and the waiver process, to include non-tier waivers.

1.3.2. Forward all non-tier, T-1, and T-2 waivers through the chain of command via e-mail to 20 AF/A3TV (20afa3nworkflow@us.af.mil) and HQ AFGSC/A3TV (afgsca3bt@us.af.mil), describing the specific requirement creating the problem and explaining why a waiver is needed. If 20 AF/A3T concurs with the requested waiver, they will forward their recommendation to HQ AFGSC/A3TV, who will forward their recommendation

to AFGSC/A3/6 for a final determination on MAJCOM waivers, if AFGSC/A3T concurs. For waiver requests that involve training and/or operations, AFGSC/A3TV will coordinate with AFGSC/A3TO and AFGSC/A3ON, as required.

1.3.3. Rationale will be provided within the waiver response. Approved waivers will be forwarded to all units that may be affected. Additionally, AFGSC/A3TV will forward approved waivers to AFGSC/IGI and OG/OGVs will forward approved waivers to MW/IGI. Waivers remain in effect for 30 days following the approving commander's change of command unless the new commander renews the waiver or HQ AFGSC/A3/6 states a specific period of time, cancels the waiver in writing, or issues a change that alters the basis for the waiver.

1.3.4. Approved T-3, T-2, and non-tier waivers will be forwarded to AFGSC/A3TV, 20 AF/A3TV, and MW/IG. AFGSC/A3TV will forward approved and relevant waivers to AFGSC/IGI.

1.4. Clarification of Guidance (COG).

1.4.1. Process requests for guidance and clarification on items concerning this instruction and/or the REACT Training and Evaluation Standards Memorandums (TESM) via memorandum or message to HQ AFGSC/A3TV through 20 AF/A3TV. AFGSC/A3TV will coordinate Emergency Action Procedures (EAP) COG responses with AFGSC/A3ON. Clarification requests generated from MWs will describe the issue in sufficient detail. AFGSC/A3TV will provide a response within 15 duty days or notify the unit that further coordination or investigation is required to provide an adequate response and when to expect the response. AFGSC/A3TV will provide a copy of the COG to 20 AF/A3T, 532 TRS/ADO, and a courtesy copy to the operational units. (T-3)

1.4.2. If necessary, HQ AFGSC/A3TV shall seek United States Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM) coordination on requested EAP guidance and clarification. Final approved messages shall include a restatement of the original question.

1.4.3. HQ AFGSC/A3TV will approve/reject and sign the final evaluation COG memorandum. HQ AFGSC/A3ON will produce an additional COG memorandum to all ICBM operations units and staff agencies when the evaluation COG affects operations guidance.

1.5. Guidance Change Requests.

1.5.1. Refer recommended changes for this publication to the OPR, HQ AFGSC/A3TV, 245 Davis Avenue East, Suite 180, Barksdale AFB, LA 71110 or afgsca3bt@us.af.mil using the DAF Form 847 and the HQ AFGSC DAF Forms 847 and Flight Manuals Sharepoint Site located at <https://usaf.dps.mil/sites/AFGSC-HQ/hq/A3-6/a3t/a3tv/af874/SitePages/Home.aspx>.

1.5.2. Coordinate and route DAF Form 847 through the appropriate chain of command.

1.5.3. Recommended changes submitted for approval must include concurrence or non-concurrence recommendations/comments from all affected OGs prior to transmission. Units may also submit "No response received from xx OG after x duty days," if other OGs do not provide change recommendations/comments in a timely fashion.

1.5.3.1. Initiating unit will upload the DAF Form 847 to the “NAF 847s” tab. 20 AF will provide coordination with other OGs and move the request to the “MAJCOM COORD” tab.

1.5.3.2. The publication OPR will maintain all approved DAF Form 847s and is responsible for ensuring all changes are incorporated into the next available interim change or publication rewrite.

Chapter 2

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. Roles and Responsibilities.

2.1.1. HQ AFGSC, Operations and Communications Directorate (A3/6):

2.1.1.1. Sets policy and guides the conduct and execution of the REACT operations Stan/Eval programs.

2.1.1.2. Establishes a Major Command (MAJCOM) OPR (Training, Testing, and Standardization/Evaluation Division (A3T)) to implement the standardization and evaluation programs outlined in this publication.

2.1.2. HQ AFGSC, Training, Testing, and Standardization/Evaluation Division.

2.1.2.1. Establishes a MAJCOM Division OPR (Standardization and Evaluation Branch (A3TV)) to execute the standardization and evaluation programs outlined in this publication.

2.1.2.2. Designates and certifies MAJCOM evaluators.

2.1.3. HQ AFGSC, Standardization and Evaluation Branch (A3TV)

2.1.3.1. Executes the standardization and evaluation programs outlined in this publication.

2.1.3.2. Develops and publishes Training and Evaluation Standards for subordinate units to use for training and evaluation performance standards and scenario development.

2.1.3.3. Conducts semi-annual reviews of the Training and Evaluation Standards, and currency and proficiency event requirements listed in the Ready ICBM Program Tasking Memorandum (RTM) to verify relevance and applicability with current procedures.

2.1.3.4. Provides OG/CCs consolidated quarterly updates on trends and the status of resolution of T.O./instruction limitations or resource issues identified in the Standardization/Evaluation Board (SEB) minutes from prior quarters, if required.

2.1.3.5. Provides guidance on minimum event requirements for each type of evaluation.

2.1.3.6. Conducts Staff Assistance Visits (SAV), at the request of the MW/CC or OG/CC to assess Office of Standardization and Evaluation's (OGV/CCV) ability to meet mission requirements to include Emergency Action Procedures (EAP) mission requirements. The requesting wing or group commander will determine the programs and scope of review.

2.1.3.7. Conducts Stan/Eval Visits (SEV) IAW [chapter 10](#) of this instruction.

2.1.3.8. Provides Stan/Eval Subject Matter Experts to MAJCOM/Inspector General (IG) in support of Unit Effectiveness Inspections and Nuclear Surety Inspections.

2.1.3.9. Office of Coordinating Responsibility (OCR) for the Memorandum of Understanding between HQ AFGSC/A3T and HQ AETC/A3N. HQ AFGSC/A3TO is the Office of Primary Responsibility for this memorandum.

2.1.3.10. HQ AFGSC A3ON (Current Operations Division) serves as the MAJCOM OPR for EAP training, standardization and evaluation programs. Implementation of these procedures will be administered through coordination with AFGSC/A3TV.

2.1.3.11. Hosts monthly ICBM Stan/Eval teleconference meetings and annual ICBM Stan/Eval Conference.

2.1.3.11.1. Monthly teleconference attendance will include, at a minimum, 20 AF/A3TV and OG/OGVs.

2.1.3.11.2. Annual ICBM Stan/Eval conference attendance will include, at a minimum, representation from all OG/OGVs and should include representation from all MS/CCVs.

2.1.3.12. Manages Missile Manual Management Program. Performs MAJCOM oversight functions for operations technical orders. Oversees Missile Control Information File and Special Interest Item programs.

2.1.3.13. Is the final authority for all errors on evaluations conducted by HHQ evaluators.

2.1.4. HQ Twentieth Air Force, Directorate of Operations (20 AF/A3):

2.1.4.1. Ensures EAP operational readiness of subordinate missile wings.

2.1.4.2. Recommends training, standardization, and evaluation policy changes to HQ AFGSC/A3T and EAP policy changes to HQ AFGSC/A3O.

2.1.4.3. Defines EAP specific roles and responsibilities for wings, groups, and squadrons to implement the requirements of this instruction.

2.1.4.4. In coordination with the HQ AFGSC/A3/6 staff, is responsible for interpreting and ensuring compliance with Headquarters Air Force (HAF) instructions and procedures.

2.1.4.5. Provides guidance on implementation and use of Training and Evaluation Standards.

2.1.4.6. Ensures wings and groups implement a standardized evaluator training program that complies with this instruction.

2.1.4.7. Develops standardized curriculum or syllabus for training evaluators prior to their certification.

2.1.4.8. Authors and conducts Scriptwriter's Scenario Course (SSC).

2.1.4.9. When required, augments Higher Headquarters (HHQ) inspection teams.

2.1.4.10. When required, assists HQ AFGSC/A3 to conduct SAVs to assess OGV's ability to meet mission requirements. The requesting wing or group commander will determine the programs and scope of review. (T-3)

2.1.4.11. In conjunction with AFGSC/A3, provide OG/CCs consolidated quarterly updates on trends and the status of resolution of T.O./instruction limitations or resource issues identified in SEB minutes from prior quarters, if required.

2.1.4.12. When necessary, standardizes operations among wings to optimize operations.

2.1.4.13. Monitors wing or operations group standardization and evaluation programs.

2.1.4.14. Provides guidance to subordinate units for error determination when the unit is unable to make a determination and will supply provide HQ AFGSC/A3TV a copy of any error determinations issued. Provide HQ AFGSC/A3ON a copy of any determination regarding EAP procedures. If unable to make an error determination, consult with HQ AFGSC/A3TV and/or HQ AFGSC/A3ON for guidance and final error determination.

2.1.4.15. Provides assistance on problems affecting compliance with this instruction when resolution is beyond the scope of subordinate unit resources. Requests clarification or waivers from HQ AFGSC/A3TV regarding this publication if unable to resolve issue or question.

2.1.4.16. Designates and certifies NAF evaluators.

2.1.4.17. Maintains a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with HQ 2 AF/A3T in order to support 532d TRS initial qualification evaluation requirements IAW **chapter 4** of this instruction.

2.1.5. Operations Group Commander (OG/CC):

2.1.5.1. Ensures standardization of operations procedures and evaluation programs wherever feasible among subordinate units.

2.1.5.2. Chairs a quarterly Stan/Eval Board (SEB). SEB minutes will be sent to 20 AF/A3TV and AFGSC/A3TV IAW this instruction.

2.1.5.3. Establishes a testing facility for use during crew member requisite examinations. A suitable testing facility is one that provides a quiet, distraction-free environment, and allows for easy monitoring of examinees by examination proctors.

2.1.5.4. Designates and certifies Operations Group (OG) evaluators. May delegate this to the OG/CD.

2.1.5.5. Directs supplemental evaluations IAW **chapter 10** of this instruction to assess effectiveness of unit training programs and/or to support the trend program when necessary.

2.1.6. The Chief, Standardization and Evaluation (OG/OGV):

2.1.6.1. Establishes and executes the unit MCCM evaluation program.

2.1.6.2. Establishes and maintains a trend program IAW **chapter 10** of this instruction.

2.1.6.3. Is a certified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.

2.1.6.4. Develops and administers the evaluator certification program.

2.1.6.5. Provides recommendations on evaluator certification and decertification to OG/CC or OG/CD.

2.1.6.6. Is the final authority for all errors on evaluations conducted by evaluators assigned to and administered in the OG.

2.1.6.7. Organizes and conducts SEBs. Produces and forwards SEB minutes and reports, as required. Prepares for and attends monthly HHQ Stan/Eval teleconference. Prepares for and attends annual HHQ Stan/Eval Conferences and/or periodic working groups.

- 2.1.6.8. Authors and programs scripts for use in Missile Procedures Trainer (MPT) evaluations for all required weapon system, codes, and EAP events.
- 2.1.6.9. Develops Secure Question Bank (SQB). Produces open book requisite examinations using SQB.
- 2.1.6.10. Ensures standardization of evaluation practices and operations procedures wherever practical among OG units. Periodically checks compliance and effectiveness of squadron stan/eval programs. Samples unit member evaluation records for completion and quality.
- 2.1.6.11. Establishes unit no-notice program.
- 2.1.6.12. Reviews all new or changed publications for impacts on operations procedures, standardization, and evaluation programs and ensures appropriate offices are notified.
- 2.1.6.13. Coordinates on locally developed publications (operating instructions (OI), supplements, etc.) and training materials that contain or relate to MCC weapon system operation.
- 2.1.6.14. Augments MW/XP and/or MW/IGX for the purpose of nuclear deterrence operations (NDO) exercise design, planning, and execution. Provides inputs for scenario development, observes/evaluates assigned areas, participate in lessons learned and provide inputs to reports.
- 2.1.6.15. Augments MW/IGI as Wing Inspection Team (WIT) lead for the OG and other related functional areas requiring operations personnel. The OG/CC may assign additional members outside of OG/OGV to WIT, however, members should be experienced evaluators or SMEs in the areas in which WIT members are providing support.
- 2.1.6.16. Augments HHQ inspections, visits and evaluation, as required.
- 2.1.6.17. Publishes and maintains OG's Missile Crew Information File (MCIF) and Special Interest Items (SII).
- 2.1.6.18. Manages the Missile Operations Publications Program (TOs/Pubs/847s).
- 2.1.6.19. Checks compliance and effectiveness of OG's training and operations programs IAW AFGSCI publications. Checks compliance and effectiveness of inherent tasks supporting compliance of AFGSCIs.
- 2.1.6.20. Oversees Missile Alert Facility Manager (MAFM) Stan/Eval programs.
- 2.1.7. The Assistant Chief, Standardization and Evaluations (AOGV):
- 2.1.7.1. Assists OG/OGV in executing the unit MCCM evaluation program and assigned tasks IAW this instruction.
- 2.1.7.2. Is a certified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.
- 2.1.8. Missile Squadron Commander (MS/CC):
- 2.1.8.1. Qualifies and/or restricts missile crew members using the AF Form 8.
- 2.1.8.2. Validates corrective training was accomplished as required to recertify missile crew members.

- 2.1.8.3. Recommends to OGV (or OG/CC) squadron crew members for evaluator certification and assigns, as appropriate to the squadron Stan/Eval (CCV).
- 2.1.8.4. Recommends to OG/CC squadron evaluators for assignment to OG/OGV.
- 2.1.8.5. Ensures CCV is adequately supporting OG/OGV to perform responsible functions IAW this instruction.
- 2.1.8.6. Attends SEBs.
- 2.1.8.7. When necessary, uses supplemental evaluations to assess effectiveness of unit training programs and/or to support the trend program for trends that were identified to be unique to the squadron.
- 2.1.9. ADO, Weapons and Tactics (OSK/ADO):
 - 2.1.9.1. Coordinates on all evaluation scripts to ensure proper EAP standards are met.
 - 2.1.9.2. Participates in trend program.
 - 2.1.9.3. Attends SEB.
 - 2.1.9.4. Will be certified as an evaluator.
- 2.1.10. Sq Training Flight (DOT/FLT CC):
 - 2.1.10.1. Ensures corrective training is accomplished, as required, based upon recommendations from the evaluator of record and squadron commander to recertify crew members.
 - 2.1.10.2. Participates in trend program.
 - 2.1.10.3. Attends SEBs.
 - 2.1.10.4. May be certified as an evaluator.
- 2.1.11. The Chief, Squadron Stan/Eval (CCV):
 - 2.1.11.1. In coordination with OG/OGV, executes the unit Missile Combat Crew Member (MCCM) evaluation program IAW this instruction.
 - 2.1.11.2. Is a certified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.
 - 2.1.11.3. In support of OG/OGV, administers the evaluator certification program.
 - 2.1.11.4. Provides recommendations on evaluator certification and decertification to SQ/CC and/or OG/OGV.
 - 2.1.11.5. Executes squadron trend program. Supports OG trend program. Provides inputs for and participates in SEBs. Attends annual HHQ Stan/Eval Conferences and/or periodic working groups, as required.
 - 2.1.11.6. Coordinates on scripts for use in Missile Procedures Trainer (MPT) evaluations.
 - 2.1.11.7. Coordinates on open book SQB.
 - 2.1.11.8. Coordinates standardization of evaluation practices and operations with other MS/CCVs and OG/OGV.
 - 2.1.11.9. Periodically checks compliance and effectiveness of squadron operations.

2.1.11.10. Coordinates on locally developed publications (operating instructions (OI), supplements, etc.), training materials that contain or relate to MCC weapon system operation.

2.1.11.11. Maintains evaluation records for each assigned and attached Basic Mission Knowledge (BMK)/Basic Mission Capable (BMC)/Combat Mission Ready (CMR) qualified individual IAW [Attachment 2](#).

2.1.11.12. Augments MW/IGI as Wing Inspection Team (WIT) as designated by the OG/CC for other related functional areas requiring operations personnel.

2.1.11.13. Augments HHQ inspections, visits and evaluations, as required.

2.1.11.14. Publishes and maintains squadron's Missile Crew Information File (MCIF) and Special Interest Items (SII), as required.

2.1.11.15. Manages the squadron's Missile Operations Publications Program (TOs/Pubs/847s).

2.1.11.16. Checks compliance and effectiveness of squadron training and operations programs IAW AFGSCI publications. Checks compliance and effectiveness of inherent tasks supporting compliance of AFGSCIs.

2.1.12. Evaluator:

2.1.12.1. Is a certified evaluator who conducts evaluations required by this instruction.

2.1.12.2. Is a current, qualified/certified, and experienced instructor who provides instruction, as required IAW this instruction and the AFGSCI 13-5201v1. (T-3)

2.1.12.3. Is a current, qualified/certified and experienced MCCC who maintains, at a minimum, Basic Mission Knowledge (BMK) status. Certified evaluators should be Combat Mission Ready (CMR), however, if it is determined by the certifying official that the evaluator cannot or should not maintain CMR requirements, then the evaluator can perform evaluator duties if meeting BMK or Basic Mission Capable (BMC) requirements.

2.1.12.4. May be assigned to OG/OGV or a MS/CCV. Will assist OG/OGV or MS/CCV, as appropriate, in responsibilities outlined in this instruction.

2.1.12.4.1. Squadron evaluators should not administer evaluations for personnel they have primarily instructed or recommended for upgrade. Primary instructors are those who have conducted 50 percent or more graded events in the designated program.

2.1.12.5. Previously certified evaluators may also maintain certification or recertify, to support MS/CCV or HHQ for inspections, visits, and evaluations.

Chapter 3

REACT OPERATIONS EVALUATOR TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION

3.1. Evaluator Certification Program.

3.1.1. The evaluator certification program is designed to develop, train and certify ICBM evaluators to conduct effective and objective evaluations in accordance with this instruction. (NOTE: Initial evaluator certification requirements do not apply to those certified as an evaluator by virtue of position per AFGSC instructions.)

3.1.2. The OG/CC and SQ/CCs will determine the number of required evaluators according to mission requirements. It is recommended that SQ/CCs maintain a ratio of one certified evaluator for every seven CMR crew members.

3.2. Evaluator Training Requirements.

3.2.1. Evaluator trainees will be observed and supervised by a certified evaluator during all evaluator training activities.

3.2.2. Prior to certification, evaluator trainees must accomplish the following actions:

3.2.2.1. Complete 20 AF evaluator standardized curriculum or syllabus.

3.2.2.2. Observe a minimum of one evaluation in the MPT conducted by a certified evaluator. Observing an evaluation includes participation in pre- and post-evaluation activities and error determination requirements.

3.2.2.3. Receive instruction on the following items:

3.2.2.3.1. Evaluator responsibilities.

3.2.2.3.2. Evaluation presentation techniques.

3.2.2.3.3. Examination proctoring procedures.

3.2.2.3.4. Error identification, error assessment, and evaluation rating determination.

3.2.2.3.5. Proper equipment configuration.

3.2.2.3.6. Evaluation material control procedures.

3.2.2.3.7. Pre- and post-evaluation requirements and activities.

3.2.2.3.8. Documentation requirements.

3.2.2.3.9. Evaluation script and scenario construction.

3.2.2.3.10. Any unit policies and requirements (locally developed).

3.2.2.3.11. Evaluation standards, grading criteria, and constraints.

3.2.3. Evaluators responsible for writing MPT scripts must attend the 20 AF SSC within the current or next quarter when available, unless previously attended as an instructor. (T-3)

3.3. Evaluator Certification.

3.3.1. Only certified evaluators (or evaluator trainees under direct supervision of an experienced evaluator as determined by OG/OGV, OG/AOGV, or MS/CCV) may conduct and document evaluations.

3.3.2. Only experienced, instructor Missile Combat Crew Commanders (MCCC), as identified by AFGSCI 13-5201v1, *REACT Crew Training and Certification*, will be certified as evaluators.

3.3.3. In order to be certified, the recommended evaluator must successfully pass an initial Evaluator Objectivity Evaluation (EOE) in the MPT IAW **chapter 4** of this instruction.

3.3.3.1. The EOE must be conducted by OG/OGV, AOGV, or a HHQ evaluator.

3.3.3.2. If the evaluator being observed is not recommended for certification during their initial EOE, the OG/OGV, OG/AOGV, or HHQ evaluator will become the evaluator of record.

3.3.3.3. There is no limit to the number of qualification EOE's it takes for an evaluator to become a certified evaluator.

3.3.4. After the evaluator trainee has been trained and passes the initial EOE, the evaluator conducting the EOE recommends evaluator certification to the appropriate evaluator certifying official.

3.3.5. OG/OGV or OG/AOGV will provide expectations regarding Stan/Eval mission, philosophy, duties and responsibilities.

3.3.6. OG/CC or OG/CD will certify evaluators using the AF Form 8 and maintain an appointment letter (or Letter of X's) with certified evaluators they have chosen to certify. (T-3)

3.3.7. Units will update the new evaluator's AF Form 4324, *Aircraft Assignment/Aircrew Qualification Worksheet* to update the new evaluator's duty code, however, the AF Form 8 is the record for qualification/certification.

3.3.8. Award certified evaluators a "Q" AFSC prefix IAW AFMAN 36-2100, *Military Utilization and Classification*.

3.4. Recurring Evaluator Training Requirements.

3.4.1. CMR-certified evaluators must receive quarterly evaluation training from OG/OGV. Overall content of recurring training is at the discretion of the OG/OGV, however, must include the following: trends, new online scripts, and changes affecting this instruction. Quarterly training will be documented on an AF Form 1522.

3.4.2. CMR-certified evaluators must maintain instructor and missile crew member currency and proficiency requirements. (T-3)

3.4.3. BMC and BMK-certified evaluators will receive just-in-time training as determined by the OG/OGV or AOGV prior to administering an evaluation.

3.5. Evaluator Status Requirements.

3.5.1. An individual may be prohibited from performing evaluator duties without losing evaluator certification. Evaluators will be suspended from administering evaluations for the following reasons: (T-3)

3.5.1.1. The evaluator receives a Q3 rating from an MPT evaluation. Prior to administering evaluations, the evaluator must be requalified through a requalification evaluation.

3.5.1.2. The evaluator becomes non-current or has demonstrated regression in proficiency for any event and the OG/CC and/or MS/CC determines the loss of currency or proficiency for that event is of sufficient importance to consider the individual unqualified to perform evaluator duties.

3.5.1.3. The individual does not receive quarterly recurring evaluator training. Prior to administering evaluations, the individual must complete the applicable training that was missed. (T-3)

3.5.1.4. Failure to maintain Instructor qualification currency.

3.5.1.5. At the discretion of the evaluator certifying official.

3.5.2. Evaluator certifying officials may decertify evaluators for any of the reasons listed in [paragraph 3.5.1](#) Certifying officials will decertify evaluators for failing an EOE. If a failed EOE was the reason for decertification, a subsequent passing EOE is required before recertifying the evaluator.

3.5.3. Units will document evaluator decertification by removing the evaluator from the certifying official's appointment letter (or Letter of X's).

3.6. Tailored Evaluator Training Program.

3.6.1. Once an individual has been certified as an ICBM evaluator, the member will not be required to re-accomplish an entire training program at the new assignment. Individuals will maintain their evaluator code ("E" code on 4324) during a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) to a subsequent missile wing.

3.6.2. The new evaluator certifying official will ensure that the individual's previous evaluator experience is assessed to ascertain whether an individual requires further training to meet the unit's needs, before recertifying the evaluator.

3.7. HHQ Evaluators.

3.7.1. HQ AFGSC Evaluators will be designated in writing on the HQ AFGSC Evaluator Orders Letter by the AFGSC/A3T.

3.7.1.1. HQ AFGSC Evaluators may conduct ICBM and/or NDO/NC2/NC3 evaluations for subordinate units and augment MAJCOM inspections throughout ICBM training, test, and operations units. These individuals may also be used to augment additional NDO, NC2, or NC3 focused inspections across the nuclear enterprise.

3.7.1.2. HQ AFGSC Evaluators must follow guidance within this instruction when conducting evaluations covered by this instruction.

3.7.1.3. HQ AFGSC Evaluators, regardless of permanent assignment or chain of command, are acting on behalf of AFGSC/A3T and AFGSC/A3/6 when conducting evaluations covered by this instruction.

3.7.1.4. HQ AFGSC Evaluators assigned to HQ AFGSC A3/6 will maintain CMR to maintain proper MAJCOM oversight and guidance.

3.7.1.5. All HQ AFGSC/IG Inspectors are certified evaluators by position.

3.7.1.5.1. AFGSC/IG Inspectors will receive evaluator training from AFGSC A3TV prior to administering HHQ evaluations.

3.7.1.5.2. When conducting HHQ evaluations as part of a HHQ inspection, HQ AFGSC/IG will ensure that enough members of their team are CMR evaluators to fulfill the 1:1 evaluatee/evaluator ratio per [para 5.2.3](#) of this instruction.

3.7.2. HQ 20 AF Evaluators will be designated in writing on the HQ 20 AF Evaluator Orders Letter by the 20 AF/A3T.

Chapter 4

EVALUATIONS

4.1. Evaluation Process.

4.1.1. Units will develop processes to conduct MCCM qualification evaluations, certifications, and provide feedback to individuals and squadron leadership.

4.1.2. Document all qualification evaluations on the AF Form 8.

4.1.3. Units will adhere to a pyramid style (See [Table 4.1](#)) evaluation structure for qualification evaluations. Evaluators will not evaluate an evaluatee senior to them in their chain of command. When no qualified evaluator above the evaluatee in the pyramid evaluation structure, or chain of command, is available during the eligibility period, the best available evaluator will administer the evaluation after approval from AFGSC/A3TV. Report all deviations from pyramid structure in the comments section of the AF Form 8. Units will report deviations from the pyramid structure in the SEB minutes.

4.1.4. Evaluatees requiring a pyramid evaluation with a HHQ Evaluator will consult AFGSC/A3TV for availability if not already scheduled with the OG/CC. If no HHQ examiner is available, AFGSC/A3TV will authorize additional [Table 4.1](#) evaluators to conduct the evaluation. If no appropriate evaluator is available, AFGSC/A3TV will delegate approval to the best available evaluator in coordination with the evaluatee's owning OGV. Document deviations in the additional comments section of the AF Form 8.

Table 4.1. Pyramid Evaluation Examiner Matrix.

Evaluatee	Evaluator
Assigned/Attached to Missile SQ	Any Evaluator
Evaluator assigned/attached to Missile SQ	Any Evaluator (Note 2), MS/CC/DO, OGV, AOGV, OG/CC/CD, HHQ Evaluator
Missile MS/DO	Any Evaluator (Note 2), OGV, AOGV, MS/CC, OG/CD/CC, HHQ Evaluator
Missile MS/CC	OG/CC or HHQ Evaluator (Note 1) , Any Evaluator (Note 2), OGV, AOGV, OG/CD
OGV	Any Evaluator (Note 2), Chief of OGV, AOGV, OG/CD, MS/CC/DO, HHQ Evaluator
Chief of OGV	OG/CC or HHQ Evaluator (Note 1) , OG/CD, MS/CC/DO
OG/CD	OG/CC or HHQ Evaluator (Note 1) , Chief of OGV
OG/CC & WG/CC/CV	HHQ Evaluator (Note 1)
HHQ Evaluator, HHQ CC/CV	Any Evaluator

Note:

1. OG/CC and HHQ Evaluators(s) are the primary evaluators when listed in bold. If, after unit coordination, the OG/CC and/or a HHQ Evaluator are unavailable, subsequent pyramid examiners may be used. If no pyramid options are available, then AFGSC/A3TV may delegate to the most appropriate evaluator available. AFGSC/A3TV will provide formal approval to the requesting unit for pyramid deviations and will be documented on the Form 8.

2. Evaluatee must not be senior to the evaluator in evaluator's chain of command.

4.1.5. A sample of all qualification evaluations should be evaluated by HHQ evaluators over the span of calendar year for each unit. HHQ evaluators will perform a minimum of one evaluator objectivity evaluation at each missile wing over a calendar year.

4.1.5.1. HHQ evaluations may be conducted during SAVs or SEVs.

4.1.5.2. If the HHQ evaluator conducting the evaluation is not assigned to AFGSC/A3TV, evaluation results will be sent directly to AFGSC/A3TV.

4.1.5.3. A Q3 rating will not be awarded without the approval of AFGSC/A3TV.

4.1.6. BMC and CMR qualification evaluations will include requisite exams and MPT evaluations. Additionally, certified instructors will have to complete an Instructor Evaluation as part of their recurring qualification requisites. BMC and CMR qualification evaluations should be comprised of Core Mission Set events and Expanded Mission Set events identified in the AFGSC Ready ICBM Program (RIP) Tasking Memorandum (RTM). Qualification evaluations will contain at least 7 event IDs.

4.1.7. Qualification (QUAL) Evaluations administered by units and HHQ evaluators will be classified into one of the following categories:

4.1.7.1. Initial Qualification Evaluation. Initial qualification evaluations are administered by 532 TRS (AETC) certified instructors or by certified evaluators at the missile wing following a MCCM's completion of Initial Skills Training (IST) or Initial Requalification Training (IRT).

4.1.7.1.1. Initial Qualification Evaluation scenarios will contain, at a minimum, the below events, and be presented IAW this instruction and the REACT TESM: TG00XG, EP00XG, NC01XG, NC03XG, NS00XG, and GB01XG.

4.1.7.1.2. Gaining units will administer the unit's SQB. Successful passing of SQB is required prior to the member certifying as CMR.

4.1.7.1.3. Gaining units may conduct supplemental evaluations IAW this instruction on IST graduates to sample and/or validate the quality of Initial Qualification Evaluations. Pair the graduate with a certified Missile Combat Crew Commander (MCCC).

4.1.7.1.4. Initial qualification evaluations cannot be no-notice.

4.1.7.2. Missile Combat Crew Commander (MCCC) Qualification Evaluation. MCCC Qualification Evaluations are administered upon completion of the MCCC Toolkit or other HHQ approved training. Once the member has completed the MCCC Toolkit or equivalent training the member may be scheduled for the MCCC Qualification Evaluation.

- 4.1.7.2.1. If a MCCM is not certified as a crew commander following the successful completion of all phases of an upgrade evaluation, both MCCMs will be credited with completing a periodic qualification evaluation as a Missileer and expiration dates will be reset.
- 4.1.7.3. Recurring Qualification Evaluation. Recurring qualification evaluations are administered to maintain qualification. Qualification evaluations are good for a period of no more than 18 months. All BMC and CMR crew members must receive qualification evaluations as a recurring check on capability and readiness.
- 4.1.7.3.1. The window for individuals to complete a recurring qualification evaluation begins on the first day of the 13th month and ends on the first day of the 19th month, following successful completion of previous qualification evaluation. All qualification evaluation requirements and requisite examinations must be completed within the 180-day eligibility period in no specific order.
- 4.1.7.3.2. Failure to pass a recurring qualification evaluation and all requisite exams before the individual's expiration date causes the individual to be placed in NO-GO status. BMK personnel must meet all requisite exam requirements only prior to expiration date.
- 4.1.7.4. Each individual is responsible to know and keep track of their evaluation currency date.
- 4.1.7.4.1. OGV will conduct periodic currency checks on qualified individuals.
- 4.1.7.5. Should a crew member support another individual's evaluation, the supporting individual may elect, provided certified evaluator can support, to complete all phases of a periodic qualification evaluation to advance their expiration date. The 180-day window will open the day of the supported evaluation.
- 4.1.7.6. If the MPT evaluation is rated Q3, establish the expiration date by calculating the first day of the 19th month following successful completion of the resulting requalification evaluation and any requisite examinations, as required.
- 4.1.7.7. Requalification Evaluation. An evaluation administered following a failed evaluation or at the completion of Requalification Training (RQT) to requalify an individual who was previously qualified IAW AFGSCI 13-5201v1.
- 4.1.7.7.1. At the discretion of the certifying official, a requalification evaluation may be limited to events driving the requirement for the requalification.
- 4.1.7.7.2. If being administered following a Q3 rating, events that drove the Q3 rating must be evaluated in the requalification evaluation. Evaluate any other requirements not fulfilled during the MPT phase of the qualification evaluation or as requested by the SQ/DO and above.
- 4.1.7.7.3. If conducting a requalification evaluation resulting from an evaluation where only one member of the crew received a Q3, only the unqualified crew member requires a requalification evaluation.

4.1.7.7.4. If being administered to requalify a MCCM previously disqualified for administrative purposes (PCS, medical, Personnel Reliability Program (PRP), etc.), follow guidance in [paragraph 4.1.6](#).

4.1.7.7.5. Upon successful completion of the requalification evaluation, the MCCM will be credited with a qualification evaluation or spot-evaluation as a Missileer.

4.1.7.8. Instructor Evaluation. All certified instructors must be evaluated while instructing prior to qualification and during their recurring evaluation window. Instructors must demonstrate proficiency by instructing an actual student or an individual acting as a student in any realistic training environment. The evaluator may require the examinee (instructor) to present verbal explanations of equipment operations, procedures, and techniques pertinent to crew duties and responsibilities. Overall rating for this type of evaluation will be either qualified (Q) or unqualified (U). There is no limit to the number of instructor evaluations it takes for an instructor to become qualified.

4.1.7.8.1. Instructors shall be evaluated on the accuracy and effectiveness of their instruction.

4.1.7.8.2. A "U" rating on the instructor phase of an evaluation results in the individual being restricted from instructing until retraining and requalification is accomplished. Units will document instructor restriction on block VI of the AF Form 8. A new AF Form 8 will be completed following successful completion of an instructor evaluation.

4.2. Spot-Evaluation.

4.2.1. Spot-evaluations are administered by unit and HHQ evaluators and given to MCCMs to evaluate a specific event or requirement without satisfying the requirements of a qualification evaluation. MCCMs supporting a qualification evaluation who do not wish to advance their evaluation expiration date are given credit for a spot-evaluation. Piecing of multiple MPT spot-evaluations can be combined to satisfy phase requirements for a qualification evaluation. Individuals may choose to meet remaining requirements in [paragraph 4.1.6](#) and extend their evaluation expiration date. Specific events or set of events presented within each spot-evaluation must be presented in a coherent manner to simulate operational conditions for the purpose of evaluating crew members.

4.2.2. Nuclear Surety Inspection evaluations are spot-evaluations.

4.2.3. Spot-evaluations may also be directed or requested by MS/DO and above, or as part of a HHQ evaluation.

4.2.4. Spot-evaluations do affect qualification status. If a member receives a Q3, unqualified rating, applicable task retraining will be directed, and the member will be restricted until training has been accomplished and a successful requalification evaluation is conducted.

4.2.5. For each major weapon system modification, a spot-evaluation may be directed by HQ AFGSC/A3T to verify training and proficiency following supplemental training.

4.3. No-Notice Evaluations.

4.3.1. No-notice evaluation. The no-notice evaluation program provides commanders a sampling of daily crew performance and an assessment of unit training effectiveness.

4.3.2. To maintain the integrity of the no-notice program, crews will be notified no earlier than 18 hours prior.

4.3.3. Qualification evaluations or spot-evaluations may be no-notice.

4.3.4. If MPT no-notice spot-evaluations satisfy the corresponding phase requirements for a qualification evaluation, individuals may choose to meet remaining requirements in [paragraph 4.1.6](#) and reset their evaluation expiration date.

4.3.5. No-notice evaluations should primarily be administered to those MCCMs who are within their evaluation 13-18 month currency window. MCCMs will not be administered more than one no-notice evaluation within the same 18 month evaluation currency period. **(T-3)**

4.4. Evaluator Certifications and EOE's.

4.4.1. **Evaluator Objectivity Evaluations (EOE).** This is an evaluation of the objectivity and skill of an evaluator trainee or certified evaluator in administering an evaluation. Use SPOT as the type of evaluation on the AF Form 8. Overall rating for this type of evaluation will be either qualified (Q) or unqualified (U).

4.4.2. **HHQ EOE.** An evaluation of a certified evaluator by a HHQ evaluator to determine the objectivity and skill of an evaluator. The overall rating for the EOE will be either qualified (Q) or unqualified (U) for the evaluator. HHQ EOE's may be accomplished as part of a SEV, or requested by OG/OGV, SQ/DO, or above.

4.4.3. For certified evaluators, a "U" rating on an EOE results in the individual being restricted from evaluating until retraining and recertification is accomplished. Units will document evaluator restriction on block VI of the AF Form 8. A new AF Form 8 will be completed following successful completion of an EOE.

4.5. Operations Plan (OPLAN) Revision Evaluation Program Requirements.

4.5.1. HQ AFGSC/A3T, AFGSC/A3O, and 20 AF/A3 will review each major EAP change/revision for substantial changes to EAP procedures to determine if a Supplementary Evaluation is required to be administered prior to pulling alerts utilizing the new procedures. If a Supplementary Evaluation is determined to be required, specific requirements should be provided to the units no later than 90 days prior to the EAP change/revision.

Chapter 5

EVALUATION CONDUCT

5.1. Evaluation Scenarios.

5.1.1. A scenario is a specific event or set of events presented in a logical sequence to simulate operational conditions for the purpose of evaluating crew members. Intelligence support should be provided by the Operations Support Squadron (OSS) intelligence shop in developing realistic scenarios in support of the desired evaluation.

5.1.2. Performance standards for evaluation events are identified in the REACT TESMs.

5.1.3. Each MPT session must have the following items available:

5.1.3.1. Training Emergency Action Procedures (TEAP)-20 AF.

5.1.3.2. Training targeting documents [i.e., Handbook for ICBM Targeting (HIT)-20 AF, Training Target and Timing Document (TTATD), Training Reserve Force Target List (TRFTL) and applicable target case prints].

5.1.3.3. Communication and Reporting Directive (CARD)-20 AF.

5.1.3.4. Training Positive Control (PC) documents.

5.1.3.5. Training decode documents (i.e., KTC-D-165, KTC-D-221, KTC-D-2230 and KTC-274).

5.1.3.6. Communications Security (COMSEC), disks, and Simple Key Loader (SKL).

5.1.3.7. Launch key.

5.1.3.8. Applicable directives (i.e., AFI 91-114, *Safety Rules for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile System*, AFGSCI 13-5204-S, AFGSCI 13-5201V5, *Code Control Standardization: Procedures, Training, and Evaluation*, (S)– *Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) Emergency War Order (EWO) Operations*, EAP-STRAT Volume 1, (S) *Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, General*, EAP-STRAT Volume 3, (S) *Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, Positive Control Policy, Procedures and Coded Control Devices*, EAP-STRAT Volume 11, (S) *Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, LERTCON System*, and EAP-STRAT Volume 16, *Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, ICBM Code Component Control Policy and Procedures*).

5.1.3.9. 20 AF Standard Operating Procedures (SOP).

5.1.3.10. Checklists and simulation materials not listed above that are necessary to present a scripted scenario.

5.1.4. Evaluation scenario results are based on successfully meeting each event performance criteria.

5.1.5. Mission planning is mandatory for all qualification evaluations.

5.1.5.1. Prior to evaluations, crews will be provided starting status, relevant mission planning products and materials as described in Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and

Procedures (AFTTP) 3-3.ICBM, *Combat Fundamentals ICBM*, and documents used in local mission planning to conduct mission planning.

5.1.5.2. Scripts must contain relevant mission planning event(s) requiring effective mission planning based upon starting status.

5.1.5.3. OSS will produce a detailed intelligence scenario for each evaluation script that will drive crew EWO mission planning.

5.1.5.4. Evaluators may add additional emergency procedures events, IAW applicable performance standards, to test the MCC's ability to "react to status" and conduct ad hoc mission planning.

5.1.5.5. Both crew members must be present during mission planning.

5.1.5.6. Missile crew mission planning will incorporate applicable aspects outlined in AFGSC instructions.

5.1.5.7. Evaluatees must be provided facilities to conduct mission planning prior to a MPT evaluation. A copy of operations technical orders, nuclear surety and security directives, and any other reference material helpful to mission planning (i.e., AFTTP 3-3.ICBM) in accordance with local procedures must be available.

5.1.5.7.1. Evaluatees may request information from the evaluators concerning starting status during MPT evaluation mission planning.

5.2. Evaluation Scenario Conduct.

5.2.1. Evaluators will ensure all MPT scenario stimuli written in the script are presented to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the crew. This instruction and the REACT TESM will be used to construct evaluation scripts to assist in developing fair and objective based evaluations.

5.2.2. Crew members are permitted to use products developed during the mission planning period prior to the evaluation. Evaluators will review materials used by the crew to ensure they do not supplement technical data.

5.2.3. For all evaluations, there will be at least a one-to-one ratio of evaluators to evaluatees. The one-to-one ratio applies during all events with the exception of mission planning and debrief. A single evaluator may evaluate mission planning and debrief. During the creation of the debrief, an evaluator will be available to provide clarifying statements to the MCC in regards to presented status from the evaluation.

5.2.4. Before conducting an evaluation, evaluators will:

5.2.4.1. Prepare locally generated evaluation worksheets, if applicable.

5.2.4.2. Configure MPT IAW prepared script and unit standardized evaluation setup guides.

5.2.4.3. Coordinate with units to ensure evaluatees meet requirements for an evaluation to include required training.

5.2.5. Knowledgeable Agencies/Persons. The intent of an evaluation is to assess the ability of the crew member(s) under evaluation and not the responses of outside agencies.

5.2.5.1. During a MPT evaluation, the evaluators will not challenge, correct, or prompt the evaluatees as to the validity of the actions performed except to provide proper weapon system status. If the crew passes direction to another LCC or agency, evaluators will take the actions directed by the crew provided that the crew has the authority to direct such actions regardless of the correctness of the direction provided. If direction is provided by the crew that extends beyond their authority, evaluators will not challenge, correct, or prompt any crew actions, but will disregard such actions.

5.2.5.1.1. Other LCCs or agencies will provide guidance as directed by technical orders and applicable directives, as requested. If the crew under evaluation queries an outside agency with a question, yet has the ability to answer the posed question from the resources within their LCC, evaluators will respond to the crew to utilize their respective technical orders and/or directives.

5.2.5.1.2. Evaluatees are only permitted to question the evaluators to clarify a stimulus. Evaluators will not give more information than would normally be available. If the crew does not have the resources within their LCC, evaluators will answer the question as the outside agency would as if they were on alert, without being directive in their response.

5.2.6. Evaluators may ask questions to clarify an evaluatee's response to an event. Evaluators will ensure questions do not interfere with crew actions, interrupt crew actions, or prompt the evaluatee.

5.2.7. If both MCCMs are Mission Lead-certified, then the MPT will be configured as a SCP for the evaluation.

5.2.8. Evaluators must provide status that crew members would normally detect with their senses (heat, air, smoke, etc.) when it cannot be simulated by the MPT or when stimuli may be reasonably considered subjective (EMP/NUDET). Evaluators will ensure proper configuration is programmed whenever possible or briefed to the crew.

5.2.9. Reference RTM for a complete listing of currency and proficiency events and definitions.

5.2.10. Reference the REACT TESMs for a list of standards and constraints.

5.3. Evaluation Script Development.

5.3.1. Units will design and use scripts to conduct MPT evaluation scenarios. Unit-level evaluations will adhere to technical orders, all HHQ evaluation standards, and all NAF guidance.

5.3.2. Chief, OGV is the final approval authority for all MPT evaluation scripts. (T-3) Coordination with the following agencies must be documented with name and date, and will be accomplished prior to final approval: (T-3)

5.3.2.1. ADO, Weapons and Tactics.

5.3.2.2. ADO, Codes (as applicable).

5.3.2.3. ADO, Plans & Scheduling.

5.3.2.4. Wing Weapons Safety (as applicable).

5.3.2.5. Other SME/agency for events outside of expertise (SF/WCP/CE/MX/etc).

5.3.2.6. Unit Intelligence Office

5.3.2.7. Chief, MS/CCV

5.3.3. Present proper configuration and status of MPT so crew members may correctly assess capability and for operational realism.

5.3.4. Evaluation scripts will be technically accurate in accordance with technical orders and applicable directives.

5.3.5. Simulate realistic operational environments in the MPT requiring the evaluatee to prioritize actions.

5.3.5.1. Multiple inputs may be introduced to determine a crew's capability to establish priorities. Do not inject unrelated events or status (example: two events occurring simultaneously where one event does not logically lead to another) while the crew is accomplishing critical phases of Level A performance standards. This does not preclude the presentation of expected follow-on weapon system indications related to previous inputs, provided those indications do not directly interfere with the crew's ability to execute critical actions.

5.3.5.2. Scenarios should be designed to evaluate concepts and avoid presentation of excessive weapon system status. No more than three simultaneous problems will be included in any evaluation script.

5.3.6. Problem presentation and equipment response must comply with the REACT TESM. Evaluators should follow the script as written, unless it would cause inaccurate presentation or prevent an evaluator's ability to effectively assess a crew; use evaluator discretion.

5.3.7. ADO, Weapons and Tactics shall ensure the accuracy and realism of materials containing EAP subject matter.

5.3.8. MPT scenarios will clearly identify the requirement to accomplish daily inspections if they are desired to be evaluated.

5.3.9. Procedural entering arguments specified in technical orders and other directives must not be "masked." Masking means using one element of status to suppress another element of status to the extent that the second element of status is not easily detectable.

5.3.10. Stimuli will be identified by Event ID and description, scenario support personnel, initiation and response agencies, and notes or expected responses (performance standard notes, evaluator notes, expected evaluatee response, etc.).

5.3.11. Use status cards or briefings to introduce stimuli that cannot be presented in a more realistic manner. Status cards and briefs must not prompt, but must have enough information for the evaluatee to clearly understand the input. The use of status cards should not interfere with crew performance and flow of the evaluation.

5.3.11.1. All simulation materials will be marked "For Evaluation Use Only." (T-3)

5.3.12. Do not create actual conditions that could jeopardize personnel safety or cause equipment damage.

5.3.13. Do not use the current operational or exercise duress words (primary or alternate) in evaluation scenarios.

5.3.14. Scripts must have a plan for presentation of problem sequences and events that specify instructions for evaluators, MPT operators, and scenario support personnel, as required. Scripts will include instructions for simulated inputs, status cards, or briefings and will identify proper crew responses. Scripts should include potential responses that the MPT operators may provide to evaluation crews dependent upon crew actions. Use previous evaluations to continuously improve online scripts. For identified trends concerning crew actions specific to script development, consider altering scripts and/or briefing training sections on current trends.

5.3.15. Applicable performance standards must be annotated within the script and IAW the REACT TESM. Grading criteria will be referenced and utilized after completion of the evaluation when determining the qualification level of the crew and during evaluation error determination.

5.3.16. Scenarios should be designed so that all actions can be accomplished as a crew, except where technical orders direct/allow for split crew operations.

5.4. Evaluation Script Execution.

5.4.1. It is the responsibility of the evaluators to conduct appropriate briefings throughout the course of an evaluation.

5.4.1.1. Units will standardize phrases used during evaluation breaks, between script events, and termination. Standardized verbiage eliminates evaluator prompting that could occur when a crew has not completed all required actions before evaluation termination.

5.4.1.2. Evaluators will conduct a pre-brief for evaluatees to set the environment of the evaluation and to ensure the evaluatees clearly understand expectations, responsibilities, limitations, and other rules of engagement before being administered the evaluation.

5.4.1.3. Evaluators may use briefings as necessary for scenario transitions, scenario presentation, and to alleviate the crew from performing unnecessary actions.

5.4.2. When introducing information via status card, clearly state, "I have a status card for the crew," read the card out loud and place the card face up between the two crew members being evaluated. If a Level A performance standard applies, start the time upon completion of reading the status card.

5.4.3. If the crew has correctly accomplished an event, the event re-occurs, and is not intended to be evaluated again, an evaluator may brief the event accomplished when the crew identifies the requirement to re-accomplish the event.

5.4.4. If an event is not intended or not able to be evaluated in that environment, and is not the result of a crew's incorrect action, evaluators may brief the event accomplished when the crew identifies the requirement to accomplish the event.

5.4.5. If unrelated status occurs during a Level A performance standard as the result of equipment malfunction or due to the evaluator, but the status does not have an impact on the crew's ability to effectively execute critical actions, the evaluator will immediately brief the crew to disregard status and adjust the performance standard accordingly. The scenario event is valid.

5.4.6. If unrelated status occurs during a Level A performance standard as the result of equipment malfunction or due to the evaluator, and the status has an impact upon the crew's ability to effectively execute its critical actions, the evaluator will immediately brief the crew to disregard status. The scenario event is invalid and errors as a result of the unrelated status will not be assessed.

5.5. Evaluation Performance Standards.

5.5.1. Performance standards are designed to ensure crew members meet the mission requirements for the operational configuration and performance of the weapon system. Performance standards are captured in the REACT Training and Evaluation Standards Memorandums. Performance standards apply to training and evaluation.

5.5.2. Reference the REACT TESH for event listing and performance standards. These criteria will be used for preparing and presenting evaluation materials.

5.5.3. Performance Standards are divided into three levels.

5.5.3.1. Level A - Events have the greatest potential for mission and/or personnel impacts and drive the most stringent training and evaluation program requirements.

5.5.3.1.1. Asterisked Level A performance standards are not subject to judgment and require strict application and adherence while evaluating crews in the MPT. An asterisked Level A is used where a direct correlation exists between exceeding the time and a tangible undesirable outcome or requires a higher level of proficiency necessary for mission accomplishment.

5.5.3.1.2. Non-asterisked Level A performance standards provide an objective measurement guideline for performances requiring urgent action. Because event outcome may be influenced by outside factors, there is not always a direct correlation between outcome and successful completion of event-associated actions within the specified time parameter(s). Exceeding one of these times may not indicate a serious deficiency based on judgment and assessment of the specific scenario. Non-asterisked performance standards are guidelines to aid evaluators in determining corrective actions.

5.5.3.1.3. When an event has an associated Level A performance standard, do not present new unrelated status until the Level A performance standard has expired or has been successfully accomplished.

5.5.3.1.4. If the subsequent event has a Level A performance standard, time it normally without adjustment for the "pending" original time standard.

5.5.3.1.5. When more than one Level A performance standard is running simultaneously, time them concurrently only if specifically written for concurrent timing; otherwise, time separately and sequentially. The only instance concurrent Level A performance standards should occur is when there are multiple Level A performance standards associated with an event.

5.5.3.2. Level B - Events deemed integral to the performance of other events and required to sustain acceptable weapon system operation and mission execution. Level B tasks apply where no finite time standard can be identified, but depending on the specific task and

scenario, may require expeditious action to prevent mission failure, serious injury, or death (e.g., LCC Blast Door Operations).

5.5.3.3. Level C - Non-Level A or B tasks related to weapons system operations that by themselves have little or no impact on mission execution. The standard is to accomplish the event in accordance with technical orders and governing directives.

5.5.4. Level B and C performances within Level A events must be performed correctly in accordance with technical orders, governing instructions, or other applicable documents.

5.5.5. Level A, B, and C events must be accomplished without outside assistance except as specified by the governing technical order, HHQ instructions, or publications.

5.6. Evaluation Scenario Termination.

5.6.1. Once an evaluation is started, all efforts will be made to complete it. (T-3)

5.6.2. Situations may arise in which early evaluation suspension would be required. Evaluations suspended may be re-initiated from the point activity was originally stopped or the evaluation may be completely re-accomplished.

5.6.3. Before deviating from the approved script and terminating a qualification evaluation, the evaluators must determine if the minimum event coverage has been met. (T-3) Terminate an evaluation when:

5.6.3.1. An evaluatee or evaluator becomes injured or ill.

5.6.3.2. HHQ actions prevent completion of the evaluation.

5.6.3.3. Evaluatee actions prevent completion of required events.

5.6.4. In the event an invalid scenario was presented to evaluatees, the decision to complete a full evaluation or portions of an evaluation rests upon the chief MS/CCV and OG/OGV, or HHQ evaluator.

5.7. Evaluation Script Management.

5.7.1. Units will prioritize script integrity.

5.7.1.1. Units will maintain a minimum of two qualification evaluations online to ensure adequate assessment of crew force proficiency and script integrity.

5.7.1.2. Crew members should not be evaluated on the same script consecutively, unless significant changes to the script have occurred since it was last administered to the crew member(s).

5.7.1.3. Crews will not be informed in advance of the evaluation script selected or provided an opportunity to view any portion of an evaluation script outside of selected information provided for mission planning.

5.7.2. On-line scripts must utilize a system to track changes made throughout the script's effective time. Units will include a List of Effective pages tracking all changes to the script after publication date.

5.7.3. Evaluation scripts will be taken off-line no later than 6 months on-line date. Maintain off-line scripts for at least 12 months. Off-line scripts are not required to be updated after they are no longer being used in evaluations.

5.8. Evaluation Debrief.

5.8.1. The debrief provides an opportunity to conduct critical self-assessment in an effort to continuously improve.

5.8.2. Evaluatees will: (T-3)

5.8.2.1. Accomplish a debrief following any qualification evaluation. MCC may request assistance from leadership which includes, but is not limited to, OG weapons officers, flight commanders, or ADO.

5.8.2.2. Debrief all actions conducted during the evaluation to demonstrate knowledge of requirements and understanding of events performed during that evaluation phase.

5.8.2.3. Present debrief to evaluators. If a preparation period was used, crews will only be required to present notable events.

5.8.3. Evaluators will: (T-3)

5.8.3.1. Not add or remove errors based on the debrief (e.g., if a crew self-identifies an error that the evaluator did not observe prior to the debrief, the evaluator cannot assess the error).

5.8.3.2. At the conclusion of the debrief:

5.8.3.2.1. Present noted errors to the evaluatee(s) and determine if directed training is required IAW [paragraph 7.2](#) If directed training is required (self-study not included), the highest possible rating for the evaluatee(s) is a Q2.

5.8.3.2.2. Provide critiques, recommended focus areas for future training, and additional information, as required.

5.8.3.2.3. The commander or designated representative may determine additional training is required for the evaluatees. This will not alter the AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification*.

5.9. Error Determination.

5.9.1. Upon completion of each evaluation, evaluators will identify, assess, and document errors.

5.9.2. Error determination must be based upon the actions or inactions of the evaluatee regardless of scripted events.

5.9.3. During a scenario, if a crew takes multiple incorrect actions that lead to an action warranting a more severe error, assess only the highest degree error, and fully describe the other incorrect actions in the error description (commonly referred to as snowballing).

5.9.4. Assess errors to only one crew member when, at the evaluator's discretion, the other crew member was not in a position to detect and had no requirement to detect the incorrect action.

5.9.5. Evaluators will use grading criteria outlined in [paragraph 7.3](#) of this instruction.

5.9.6. If OGV cannot ascertain how to assess an error for an evaluation after querying all required on-base agencies (Codes, Missile Maintenance Operations Center (MMOC), Plans, Safety, etc.), contact and initiate a formal request for error determination with 20 AF/A3TV.

5.9.6.1. 20 AF/A3TV will analyze the information passed, make a final determination, and respond back to the unit OGV as soon as possible. A copy of the determination must be provided to HQ AFGSC/A3T.

5.9.6.2. If 20 AF/A3TV is unable to make a final determination, a formal request for error determination must be forwarded to HQ AFGSC/A3T. The information will be analyzed and formally coordinated with appropriate MAJCOM subject matter experts (SME). Final error assessment, error severity, and operational impact will be determined by the MAJCOM SME. HQ AFGSC/A3TV will provide the determination to 20 AF for distribution.

5.9.6.3. If the outcome of the error determination could result in a Q3 evaluation rating, affected crew members will not perform unsupervised alert duties until the evaluation results are finalized.

5.10. Error Consummation.

5.10.1. Assess an error when an evaluatee performs an incorrect action.

5.10.2. Errors are based on decision points and may be consummated at the expiration of Level A performance standard, clock advances, or evaluation termination. Errors will be assessed on incorrect actions at the point of consummation regardless of the scripted outcome. (T-3)

5.10.3. If a crew fails to accomplish a required Level B event action prior to the clock advance, but is able to complete the event after the clock advance, the error may be partially or fully recovered depending on the circumstances, and at the discretion of the evaluator(s).

5.10.3.1. If a clock advance removes the crew's ability to accomplish the required action (reconfigures equipment, removes sortie status, etc.), and the crew has proceeded with the clock advance after determining that all crew actions are complete, award the appropriate error for failure to accomplish the event. The evaluators will determine if directed training is required for the error following the debrief.

5.10.3.2. If a clock advance would result in error consummation, the evaluator will use discretion prior to advancing the clock.

5.10.4. If a script is written to brief a crew out of actions but the crew has performed an incorrect action that could impact future events, allow the crew to continue their actions and augment the script as necessary.

5.10.5. If a crew takes an incorrect action, document the appropriate error. If recovery to a less severe error is possible, document the error and allow the crew the opportunity to correct their action.

5.10.6. An incorrect action directed by the crew or an incorrect report to an outside entity is consummated upon termination of a phone call or report. This error can be corrected to no error if the crew takes corrective actions in the following circumstances:

5.10.6.1. If the crew takes corrective actions prior to expiration of any timing standard, full recovery is possible at the discretion of the evaluator.

5.10.6.2. If the crew takes corrective actions and the event has no timing standard, full recovery is possible at the discretion of the evaluator.

5.10.7. If the crew takes an action that causes degradation to the weapon system and is not immediately corrected, the error is consummated. Severity of the error will be associated with mission impact as determined by the evaluator(s).

5.10.8. Momentary mistakes, due to incorrect status diagnosis, inadvertent actions, or miscalculations, that are corrected on the spot and do not result in weapon systems degradation or negative mission impact, may be recoverable to a less severe error, or no error at all. This determination is at the discretion of the evaluator.

Chapter 6

ICBM REQUISITE EXAMINATIONS

6.1. Purpose.

6.1.1. The ICBM requisite examination program measures crew member knowledge of normal/emergency procedures, threats, and other information essential for the safe and effective operation of the Minuteman weapon system through the administration of written examinations.

6.2. Scope.

6.2.1. This chapter applies to BMK, BMC, and CMR personnel.

6.2.2. Requisite examinations include open book (SQB), and Boldface examinations, as described in [paragraph 6.6](#).

6.3. Academic Integrity.

6.3.1. Conduct that violates this paragraph or subparagraphs by military personnel is a violation of Article 92, UCMJ. Violations by civilian personnel may result in disciplinary or adverse action and/or civilian criminal or civil sanction.

6.3.2. Academic Integrity is uncompromising adherence to a code of ethics, conduct, scholarship, and academic standards related to academic activity. Violations of academic integrity are inconsistent with the Air Force core values and will not be tolerated. All personnel must adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity while participating in any evaluation environment.

6.3.3. Academic Integrity Violation. The act of intentionally giving and/or receiving improper assistance on evaluations or examinations. All personnel shall not engage in, attempt to engage in, or assist others to engage in any act constituting an academic integrity violation. Academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to:

6.3.3.1. Gaining unauthorized access to evaluation or examination materials that have not been released for crew member use;

6.3.3.2. Providing or using unauthorized texts, notes, materials, or other references not authorized for examinations;

6.3.3.3. Copying answers from another's examination;

6.3.3.4. Knowingly permitting another to copy one's answers from an examination paper;

6.3.3.5. Collaborating with other persons on individual assignments except as specifically authorized by the instructor/evaluator.

6.4. Examination Procedures.

6.4.1. Certified evaluators will maintain positive control of all requisite exams, applicable answer sheets, and associated computer-based media. (T-3)

6.4.2. Program Documentation. Units will document the unit-level crew examination program.

6.4.3. Retention of Examination Records. Retain graded evaluation examination answer sheets until final AF Form 8 documenting the qualification evaluation is completed.

6.4.4. Proctoring of Examinations. A certified evaluator will administer and proctor all requisite examinations in a designated examination area/room. (T-3)

6.4.4.1. All SQB examinations should be taken using Patriot Excalibur (PEX).

6.4.4.2. BMK and CMR personnel assigned to duty locations geographically separated from operational ICBM wings will appoint a test proctor to administer the requisite exams as needed.

6.4.4.3. The appointed test proctor will notify the attached unit upon completion of the test for recording the completion and results in the system of record.

6.4.5. SQB exams will consist of 20 of the questions in the database.

6.4.6. Exam Question Review. OG/OGVs will review written examination material semi-annually or after any changes in source documents, if deemed applicable. (T-3)

6.5. Examination Sources.

6.5.1. Requisite Open Book Examinations. Open book questions will be derived from a locally developed SQB created by OGV. SQBs will consist of 100 classified and unclassified questions. (T-3) The SQB should cover publications containing information pertinent to the operation of the Minuteman weapon system and performance of the assigned mission.

6.5.1.1. The open book subject areas and the publications used to generate the exam will be made available to crew members during testing. Electronic publications may be used as references for open book examinations.

6.5.1.2. OGV will produce multiple open book examination versions consisting of at least 20 questions each from the SQB database. (T-3) A time limit should be established for each version to average approximately three minutes per question. If exceeding the required number of questions, the number of questions in each version should support a simplified grading process to assess a passing score of 85 percent.

6.5.1.3. Unit SQBs should be validated annually by 20 AF/A3TV and/or AFGSC/A3TV. Validations may occur during HHQ visits or inspections.

6.5.2. Requisite Boldface Examinations. The boldface examination is derived from AFGSC-published Boldface. If a successful practical demonstration of boldface was accomplished in the MPT, use the date of the MPT evaluation. An additional examination is not required.

6.6. Grading.

6.6.1. Open Book Examinations. Grade written examinations as a percentage of correct answers. The minimum passing grade is 85 percent. All questions missed will be reviewed immediately following the exam. (T-3)

6.6.2. Boldface. Grade Boldface examinations on the two-tier grading system (i.e., Q/U). Satisfactory performance requires writing or verbally explaining the proper actions in the correct sequence, not necessarily a verbatim response. The minimum passing grade is 100 percent. Boldface actions may also be evaluated in the MPT. Crews will not reference

technical orders while completing Boldface items. If an entering argument exists for Boldface procedures, the crew will immediately accomplish the required procedure.

6.7. Failure to Pass a Requisite Exam.

6.7.1. Reexamination Policy. A crew member failing a requisite examination must be afforded an adequate study period prior to reexamination. With the exception of Boldface examinations, the crew member will be reevaluated using an alternate exam. (T-3)

6.7.2. Reexamination Period. Crew members who fail a requisite examination must complete a successful reexamination by the end of the third month following the date of the first failure, or the end of their eligibility period, whichever occurs first. The OG/CC may extend the time allowed to successfully complete the reexamination with a waiver. Document the waiver in the individual's evaluation record.

6.7.3. Reexamination No-go. Crew members failing an open book or Boldface examination will be assigned a "U" rating and will be placed in a No-go status until a successful reexamination is accomplished and all requisite requalification actions are complete. (T-3)

Chapter 7

EVALUATION RATINGS

7.1. Evaluation Ratings.

7.1.1. Overall evaluation ratings will be based on the discretion of the evaluators of record, and with approval of OG/OGV, or OG/AOGV.

7.1.2. HHQ evaluation ratings will be based on the discretion of the evaluators of record, and with approval of AFGSC/A3TV or designated representative.

7.1.3. **Q1.** The crew demonstrated desired performance and knowledge of procedures, equipment and directives within prescribed tolerances specified in the criteria. The evaluator assigns this qualification level when no discrepancies were noted, but may be awarded when discrepancies are noted if:

7.1.3.1. No U grades were awarded for any graded areas.

7.1.3.2. In the judgment of the evaluator, none of the Q- grades precluded awarding of a Q1.

7.1.4. **Q2.** The crew demonstrated the ability to perform duties safely. The evaluator assigns this qualification level if:

7.1.4.1. There were one or more graded area(s) where additional training is recommended.

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

7.1.4.3. In the judgment of the evaluator, a Q2 may be given if there is justification based on Q- performance in one or several graded area(s).

7.1.5. **Q3.** The crew demonstrated an unacceptable level of safety, performance or knowledge. Dual position crew members will always be rated unqualified (Q3) for both positions if rated Q3 in either position. The evaluator assigns this qualification level if:

7.1.5.1. Any critical area graded U.

7.1.5.2. In the judgment of the evaluator, a Q3 may be given if there is justification based on Q-/U performance in one or several non-critical graded areas.

7.2. Directed Training.

7.2.1. All ratings of Q2 or Q3 may require directed training. Certified evaluators will provide recommendation to the owning SQ/CC, OG/CC, or equivalent who will determine training requirements for those receiving the Q2 or Q3.

7.2.2. Directed training may include self-study, classroom instruction or use of the MPT/Minuteman Enhanced Procedures (MEP).

7.2.3. A requalification evaluation including all events with a “U” rating on any critical graded area is required.

7.2.4. Directed training associated with a Q3 rating will be completed prior to accomplishing alert duties.

7.2.5. Document directed training on the AF Form 8.

7.3. General Grading Standards.

7.3.1. Events will be graded individually and have a two-tier Critical Area (Q/U) or three-tier Non-Critical Area (Q/Q-/U) grading system. Discrepancies will be documented against the established events. There is no predetermined number of “Q-” event grades that dictate overall evaluation ratings. A “U” grade on a two-tier event, indicates the evaluatee is not qualified to perform an individually graded event marked as “critical.”

7.3.1.1. Critical areas are areas where marginal performance is unacceptable. Critical areas are graded either “Q” or “U” and include but not limited to Crew Discipline, ICBM Professional Qualities, Nuclear Command and Control, Nuclear Surety, Safety Procedures, and EWO Commit Actions when poor performance results in operational mission failure, endangerment of human life, serious injury, or death.

7.3.1.2. Reference [Attachment 3](#) of the classified REACT TESM for examples of classified two-tier Critical Areas and three-tier Non-Critical Areas. Evaluators will use their discretion when determining overall evaluation ratings; evaluators will assign the following grades to evaluatees who demonstrate the following list of behaviors:

7.3.1.2.1. Q. Crew accomplished all actions correctly and appropriately. Event ID was accomplished successfully with no significant proficiency or knowledge gaps. Task was performed to its completion and the crew can be considered proficient in this area.

7.3.1.2.2. Q-. Crew accomplished all actions but deficiencies were noted. Crew deviated from established procedures and/or demonstrated a lack of proficiency which does not meet the acceptable levels of speed, accuracy, and safety in accordance with defined performance standards. At the judgement and discretion of the evaluator, feedback for retraining will be provided to the SQ/CC who will determine what training will be accomplished.

7.3.1.2.3. U. Crew deviated from established procedures and/or demonstrated a lack of proficiency which does not meet the minimum acceptable levels of speed, accuracy, and safety in accordance with defined performance standards, resulting in an adverse weapon system impact. If a “U” rating occurred in a critical area, the crew will receive an overall Q3 rating which will require retraining and a requalification evaluation for the Event ID(s).

7.3.2. Two-Tier Critical Area Performance Event Grading Criteria:

7.3.2.1. Crew Discipline (Critical).

7.3.2.1.1. Q. Demonstrated strict professional crew discipline throughout all phases of the mission.

7.3.2.1.2. U. Failed to exhibit strict crew discipline. Violated or ignored rules or regulations.

7.3.2.2. ICBM Professional Qualities (Critical).

7.3.2.2.1. Q. Executed the assigned mission in a professional, timely, and efficient manner. Conducted the alert with a sense of understanding and comprehension. Aware of performance of self and other crew/flight/squadron members. Recognized, verbalized, and acted on unexpected events.

7.3.2.2.2. U. Decisions or lack thereof resulted in failure to accomplish the assigned mission. Demonstrated poor judgment or situational awareness to the extent which safety or mission execution could have been compromised. Resources were not always effectively used to the extent which specific mission objectives were not achieved.

7.3.2.3. Nuclear Command and Control (NC2) (Critical).

7.3.2.3.1. Q. Effectively ensured all NC2 capabilities were maintained in the appropriate configuration IAW applicable directives.

7.3.2.3.2. U. Did not maintain NC2 capabilities when required/able. Failed to initiate, direct, or coordinate actions in regards to alert status changes and mission capable status. Caused a Non-Mission Capable (NMC) condition IAW Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 21-202, *Missile Maintenance Management*.

7.3.2.4. Nuclear Surety (Critical).

7.3.2.4.1. Q. Complied with all applicable Nuclear Surety requirements to include Weapon System Safety Rules, two-person concept and no-lone zone requirements. Reported any violations of two-person concept or no-lone zone requirements.

7.3.2.4.2. U. Violated Nuclear Surety requirements to include Weapon System Safety Rules, two-person concept and no-lone zone requirements. Failed to report two-person concept or no-lone zone violations.

7.3.2.5. Safety Procedures (Critical).

7.3.2.5.1. Q. Aware of and complied with all safety factors required for safe operations and conduct of the mission.

7.3.2.5.2. U. Was not aware of or did not comply with all safety factors required for safe operations or conduct of the mission. Failed to correctly accomplish Boldface procedures. Operated the equipment in a dangerous manner that could reasonably be expected to result in serious injury or death.

7.3.2.6. EWO Commit Actions (Critical).

7.3.2.6.1. Q. Accomplished all required EWO commit actions.

7.3.2.6.2. U. Failed to properly accomplish all required EWO commit actions.

7.3.3. Three-Tier Non-Critical Area Performance Event Grading Criteria:

7.3.3.1. Mission Lead.

7.3.3.1.1. Q. Established and maintained effective wing execution of assigned tasks utilizing published and briefed procedures. Planned/briefed effective wing deconfliction plan. Effective wingman consideration. Ensured adherence to wing deconfliction contracts and full situational awareness of all squadrons. Planned ahead and made timely decisions.

7.3.3.1.2. Q-. Planned/briefed ineffective wing execution of assigned task, but did not compromise safety or wing execution/deconfliction. Made minor errors from published and or briefed procedures. Demonstrated limited wing task management. Did not always plan ahead or make timely decisions.

7.3.3.1.3. U. Execution of wing assigned tasks was not accomplished in accordance with published and/or briefed procedures. Failed to account for management of squadron responsibilities to include proper delegation of ACP/SCP responsibilities. Provided little wingman consideration. Indecisive. Failed to maintain wing deconfliction contracts.

7.3.3.2. Mission Planning.

7.3.3.2.1. Q. Developed a sound plan to accomplish the mission. Accurately and efficiently accomplished mission preparation. Established objectives for the mission. Checked all factors applicable to execution in accordance with applicable directives. Aware of alternatives available, if mission execution cannot be completed as planned.

7.3.3.2.2. Q-. Completed mission planning effectively with minor errors, omissions, and/or errors which did not detract from mission effectiveness. Knowledge of performance capabilities or approved operating procedures/rules was marginal in some areas.

7.3.3.2.3. U. Major errors, omissions, and/or errors that would preclude safe/effective mission accomplishment. Displayed faulty knowledge of operating data or procedures.

7.3.3.3. Debrief.

7.3.3.3.1. Q. Thoroughly debriefed the mission (or applicable portions). Accomplished a complete and accurate reconstruction of mission execution. If reconstruction is evident through “whiteboard” flows or evaluator observation during the preparation phase, reconstruction does not need to be fully accomplished during the graded presentation. Adequately compared mission execution results with initial mission objectives which were established for the mission. Correctly identified errors and relevant debrief focal points (DFP). Conducted root cause analysis and provided relevant lessons learned and/or instructional fixes for DFPs. Constructed relevant learning points, or best practices, as appropriate in the absence of errors/DFPs.

7.3.3.3.2. Q-. Limited debriefing. Did not thoroughly debrief the mission (or applicable portions). Reconstruction lacked accuracy. Did not adequately compare mission execution results with initial mission objectives. DFPs, root causes, lessons learned and/or instructional fixes were not presented for each error or lacked relevancy. Did not provide relevant learning points, or best practices, as appropriate in the absence of errors/DFPs.

7.3.3.3.3. U. Demonstrated inability to self-assess and communicate assessment of performance. Made no attempt to reconstruct mission execution or compare results with initial mission objectives.

7.3.3.4. Crew Coordination/Crew Resource Management (CRM).

7.3.3.4.1. Q. Effectively coordinated with crew partner/flight/squadron members during all phases of the mission. Effectively used CRM.

7.3.3.4.2. Q-. CRM/Coordination was lacking with crew partner, and/or other squadron crew members/flight area members to the extent minor errors or omissions caused delays, confusion, degraded the successful accomplishment of assigned task,

and/or crew situational awareness. Crew communications were confusing and/or not well understood. CRM was the minimum acceptable.

7.3.3.4.3. U. Breakdown in coordination with crew partner, and/or other squadron crew members/flight area members precluded mission accomplishment or jeopardized safety. CRM was lacking to the extent the mission accomplishment was severely degraded. Created confusion or delays which could have endangered the missile crew and on-site personnel or prevented reliable mission execution.

7.3.3.5. Task Prioritization.

7.3.3.5.1. Q. Demonstrated the ability to correctly identify, prioritize, and manage tasks based on existing and new information which assured mission success. Used available resources to manage workload, communicated task priorities to crew/flight/squadron members. Asked for assistance when overloaded. Displayed sound knowledge of systems. Effectively identified contingencies and alternatives. Gathered and crosschecked available data before acting. Clearly stated decisions and ensured they were understood. Investigated doubts and concerns of other crew members when necessary.

7.3.3.5.2. Q-. Made minor errors in prioritization, management of tasks, or system knowledge which did not affect safe or effective mission accomplishment. Did not completely communicate task priorities to other crew/flight/squadron members. Made minor errors in identifying contingencies, gathering data, or communicating a decision which did not affect safe or effective mission accomplishment.

7.3.3.5.3. U. Incorrectly prioritized or managed tasks. Displayed lack of systems knowledge causing task overload which seriously degraded mission accomplishment or safety of personnel. Failed to communicate task priorities to other crew/flight/squadron members. Failed to ask for assistance when overloaded. Improperly or ineffectively identified contingencies, gathered data, or communicated a decision which seriously degraded mission accomplishment or personnel safety.

7.3.3.6. COMSEC.

7.3.3.6.1. Q. Correctly complied with procedures and regulations. Knowledgeable of procedures and regulations. Able to recognize violations. Utilized correct reporting procedures.

7.3.3.6.2. Q-. Accomplished COMSEC procedures correctly, but demonstrated a lack of proficiency that requires further self-study or supplemental training at the discretion of the evaluator. Made minor errors while completing COMSEC actions but did not detract from mission effectiveness.

7.3.3.6.3. U. Failed to comply with procedures and regulations. Unable to recognize violations. Unfamiliar with reporting procedures or failed to submit report.

7.3.3.7. Targeting.

7.3.3.7.1. Q. Accomplished all targeting actions correctly IAW checklist and within applicable timing constraints. No significant proficiency or knowledge gaps were identified.

- 7.3.3.7.2. Q-. Accomplished targeting actions correctly, but demonstrated a lack of proficiency that requires further self-study or supplemental training at the discretion of the evaluator. Made minor errors while completing targeting actions but did not detract from mission effectiveness.
- 7.3.3.7.3. U. Failed to accomplish targeting actions correctly and/or within applicable timing constraint. Actions led to significant mission degradation or mission failure.
- 7.3.3.8. Launch Facility (LF) Faults.
- 7.3.3.8.1. Q. Accomplished all required tasks within LF Faults correctly IAW checklist and within applicable timing constraints. No significant proficiency or knowledge gaps were identified.
- 7.3.3.8.2. Q-. Accomplished all required tasks within LF Faults correctly, but demonstrated a lack of proficiency that requires further self-study or supplemental training at the discretion of the evaluator. Made minor errors while completing LF Faults actions but did not detract from mission effectiveness.
- 7.3.3.8.3. U. Failed to accomplish required LF Faults procedures correctly and/or within applicable constraints. Incorrect actions led to violations of WSSR, EAP-STRAT Volume 16, or security regulations and/or safety warnings associated with LF Faults. Actions led to significant mission degradation or failure.
- 7.3.3.9. LF Activity/Maintenance.
- 7.3.3.9.1. Q. Accomplished LF Activity procedure correctly IAW checklist. No significant proficiency or knowledge gaps were identified.
- 7.3.3.9.2. Q-. Accomplished LF Activity procedures correctly, but demonstrated a lack of proficiency that requires further self-study or supplemental training at the discretion of the evaluator. Made minor errors while completing LF Activities but did not detract from mission effectiveness.
- 7.3.3.9.3. U. Failed to accomplish LF Activities procedures correctly. Incorrect actions led to violations of WSSR, EAP-STRAT Volume 16, or security regulations and/or safety warnings associated with LF Activities. Actions led to significant mission degradation or mission failure.
- 7.3.3.10. LCC Faults.
- 7.3.3.10.1. Q. Accomplished LCC Faults correctly IAW checklist. No significant proficiency or knowledge gaps were identified.
- 7.3.3.10.2. Q-. Accomplished LCC Faults correctly, but demonstrated a lack of proficiency that requires further self-study or supplemental training at the discretion of the evaluator. Made minor errors while completing LCC Faults but did not detract from mission effectiveness.
- 7.3.3.10.3. U. Failed to accomplish LCC Faults correctly. Incorrect actions led to violations of WSSR, EAP-STRAT Volume 16, or security regulations and/or safety warnings associated with LCC Faults. Actions led to significant mission degradation or failure.

7.3.3.11. MAF Activity/Maintenance.

7.3.3.11.1. Q. Accomplished MAF Activity procedures correctly IAW checklist. No significant proficiency or knowledge gaps were identified.

7.3.3.11.2. Q-. Accomplished MAF Activity procedures correctly, but demonstrated a lack of proficiency that requires further self-study or supplemental training at the discretion of the evaluator. Made minor errors while completing MAF Activities but did not detract from overall mission effectiveness.

7.3.3.11.3. U. Failed to accomplish MAF Activities procedures correctly. Incorrect actions led to violations of WSSR, EAP-STRAT Volume 16, or security regulations and/or safety warnings associated with MAF Activities/Maintenance. Actions led to significant mission degradation or mission failure.

7.3.3.12. Communications Faults.

7.3.3.12.1. Q. Accomplished Communication Faults and procedures IAW checklist. No significant proficiency or knowledge gaps were identified.

7.3.3.12.2. Q-. Accomplished Communications Faults and procedures correctly, but demonstrated a lack of proficiency that requires further self-study or supplemental training at the discretion of the evaluator. Made minor errors while completing Communications Faults checklists but did not detract from overall mission effectiveness.

7.3.3.12.3. U. Failed to accomplish Communication Faults and procedures correctly. Incorrect actions led to significant mission degradation or mission failure (removal of communication capability over a single platform does not constitute a significant mission degradation or mission failure).

7.3.3.13. Emergency Procedures.

7.3.3.13.1. Q. Correct response to emergency IAW all applicable directives. Met all applicable Level A and A* performance standards outlined in the REACT TESM. Effectively used checklists.

7.3.3.13.2. Q-. Used applicable checklists when appropriate, but displayed a lack of proficiency that had an actual or potential adverse impact on operations. Added, skipped, or conducted steps when not required. Action or inaction resulted in errors from the standard performance IAW applicable directives.

7.3.3.13.3. U. Failed to perform correct procedure in response to emergency. Failed to analyze problems or take corrective actions. Failed to meet applicable Level A and/or A* performance standards outlined in the REACT TESM. Failed to use checklist(s) or lacked acceptable familiarity with its arrangement or contents. Displayed a lack of proficiency that had a direct adverse impact on operations.

7.3.3.14. MCC Contingency/Severe Weather.

7.3.3.14.1. Q. Correct response to MCC Contingency/Severe Weather situation IAW applicable directives. Clearly recognized the situation and took steps to gain situational awareness. Met all applicable Level A performance standards outlined in the REACT TESM. Reported all required information. Effectively used checklists.

- 7.3.3.14.2. Q-. Correct response to MCC Contingency/Severe Weather situation IAW applicable directives. Met applicable Level A performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM. Used applicable checklists when appropriate, but displayed a lack of proficiency that had an actual or potential adverse impact on operations. Notifications completed, but contained errors, omitted information/personnel. Gained a limited level of situational awareness.
- 7.3.3.14.3. U. Incorrect response or failed to respond to an MCC Contingency/Severe Weather situation IAW applicable directives. Failed to meet applicable Level A performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM. Failed to use applicable checklists. Displayed a lack of proficiency that had a direct adverse impact on operations. Failed to gain situational awareness.
- 7.3.3.15. Security Indications.
- 7.3.3.15.1. Q. Correctly responded to security indications. Reported all required information. Effectively used checklist(s). Correctly accomplished associated actions and required reports. Met all applicable Level A performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM.
- 7.3.3.15.2. Q-. Responded to security indications. Failed to report all required information. Accomplished associated actions and required reports, but displayed a lack of proficiency that had an actual or potential adverse impact on operations. Met applicable Level A performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM.
- 7.3.3.15.3. U. Failed to respond to security indications. Failed to report all required information. Failed to meet applicable Level A performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM.
- 7.3.3.16. Guarding.
- 7.3.3.16.1. Q. Requested correct guarding IAW applicable directives. Knowledgeable of guarding measures/requirements/procedures and associated directives.
- 7.3.3.16.2. Q-. Requested incorrect guarding IAW applicable directives. Displayed a lack of proficiency/knowledge that had an actual or potential adverse impact on guarding.
- 7.3.3.16.3. U. Failed to request guarding IAW applicable directives. Displayed a lack of proficiency/knowledge that had a direct adverse impact on guarding.
- 7.3.3.17. Security Measures.
- 7.3.3.17.1. Q. Correctly implemented/complied with security measures IAW applicable directives. Knowledgeable of security measures/requirements/procedures and associated directives.
- 7.3.3.17.2. Q-. Implemented/complied with required security measures. Displayed a lack of proficiency/knowledge that had an actual or potential adverse impact on security.
- 7.3.3.17.3. U. Failed to comply with security measures IAW applicable directives. Displayed a lack of proficiency/knowledge that had a direct adverse impact on security.

7.3.3.18. Codes.

7.3.3.18.1. Q. Knowledgeable of requirements/procedures directed by the EAP-STRAT Volume 16 and complied with requirements/procedures. Recognized/reported possible violations appropriately.

7.3.3.18.2. Q-. Recognized codes issues but demonstrated a lack of knowledge or recognized/reported issue by happenstance.

7.3.3.18.3. U. Failed to recognize/report possible codes violations. Violated or demonstrated a complete lack of knowledge in regards to EAP-STRAT Volume 16 requirements/procedures.

7.3.3.19. LF Activities Contingencies.

7.3.3.19.1. Q. Correctly recognized and responded to indications IAW applicable directives. Met Level A* performance standards outlined in the REACT Training and Evaluation Standards Memorandums. Utilized correct authentications procedures.

7.3.3.19.2. Q-. Failed to recognize requirement or did not prioritize steps in the right sequence. However, requirements were accomplished IAW applicable directives. Met Level A* performance standards outlined in the REACT Training and Evaluation Standards Memorandums.

7.3.3.19.3. U. Failed to respond to indications IAW applicable directives. Failed to meet Level A* performance standards outlined in the REACT Training and Evaluation Standards Memorandums. Did not receive authentications or used incorrect authentication procedure(s).

7.3.3.20. Emergency Action Message (EAM) Processing.

7.3.3.20.1. Q. Correct response to EAM IAW all applicable directives. Met all applicable Level A and A* performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM. Effectively used checklists.

7.3.3.20.2. Q-. Met all applicable Level A* performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM. Used applicable checklists when appropriate, but displayed a lack of proficiency that had an actual or potential adverse impact on operations. Added, skipped, or conducted steps when not required. Action or inaction resulted in errors from the standard performance IAW applicable directives.

7.3.3.20.3. U. Failed to perform correct procedure in response to an EAM. Failed to analyze problems or take corrective actions. Failed to meet applicable Level A* performance standards outlined in the REACT TISM. Failed to use checklist(s) or lacked acceptable familiarity with its arrangement or contents. Displayed a lack of proficiency that had a direct adverse impact on operations.

7.3.3.21. Reporting.

7.3.3.21.1. Q. Correctly sent/submitted required operational report(s) IAW applicable directives.

- 7.3.3.21.2. Q-. Submitted operational report when required. Report included minor errors/omissions. Demonstrated a lack of knowledge/proficiency of operational reporting procedures.
- 7.3.3.21.3. U. Failed to send an operational report or submitted an operational report with mission impacting errors. Failed to comply with applicable directives.
- 7.3.3.22. Instructor Briefing/Debriefing.
- 7.3.3.22.1. Q. Presented a comprehensive and instructional briefing/debriefing. Made excellent use of training aids/references. Excellent analysis of all events. Clearly defined objectives. Gave positive and negative performance feedback at appropriate times. Feedback was specific, objective, based on observable behavior, and given constructively. Re-capped key points/compared mission results with objectives. When appropriate, took the initiative and time to share operational knowledge and experience.
- 7.3.3.22.2. Q-. Minor errors or omissions in briefing/debriefing or mission critique. Occasionally unclear in analysis of events or procedures. Some feedback given, but was not always given at appropriate times and not always a positive learning experience for the crew. Debrief covered the mission highlights but was not specific enough.
- 7.3.3.22.3. U. Major errors or omissions in briefing/debriefing. Analysis of events was incomplete, inaccurate, or confusing. Did not use training aids/reference material effectively. Briefing/debriefing below the caliber of that expected of instructors. Failed to define mission objectives. Feedback not given or given poorly. Attempted to hide mistakes. Elected not to conduct debrief.
- 7.3.3.23. Instructor Knowledge.
- 7.3.3.23.1. Q. Demonstrated in-depth knowledge of procedures, requirements, weapon system characteristics, mission, and tactics beyond the expectation of non-instructors.
- 7.3.3.23.2. Q-. Deficiencies noted in the depth of knowledge, comprehension of procedures, requirements, weapon system characteristics, mission, or tactics.
- 7.3.3.23.3. U. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, weapon system characteristics, mission, or tactics. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness.
- 7.3.3.24. Ability to Instruct/Evaluate.
- 7.3.3.24.1. Q. Demonstrated sound instructor/evaluator ability. Clearly defined all mission requirements and any required additional training/corrective action. Instruction/evaluation was accurate, effective, and timely. Completely aware of mission situation at all times.
- 7.3.3.24.2. Q-. Problems in communication or analysis degraded effectiveness of instruction/evaluation.
- 7.3.3.24.3. U. Demonstrated inadequate ability to instruct/evaluate. Unable to perform, teach, or assess techniques, procedures, systems use, or tactics. Did not remain aware of mission situation at all times.

Chapter 8

EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION

8.1. Evaluation Documentation.

8.1.1. Administration of the MCCM qualification evaluation program requires accurate documentation to ensure a combat-ready force.

8.1.2. AF Form 8 will be used for each evaluated individual to document details of administered evaluations. Units choosing to use electronic evaluation folders should use Patriot Excalibur (PEX) or equivalent system or database. Units using PEX will allow access to HHQ evaluators and inspectors that request access. Units will use electronic signatures for any required signatures on Stan/Eval forms within PEX to the maximum extent possible. The AF Form 8 will be filed in Section 2 of the individual's evaluation folder. In addition to evaluator and evaluatee information, the following information must be included on the evaluation report:

8.1.2.1. Evaluation details. Evaluation date, location, no-notice applicability, and all Event IDs presented must be annotated.

8.1.2.2. Document all errors and downgrades on the AF Form 8. Note errors which require directed training in Section IV of the AF Form 8.

8.1.2.3. Expiration date information will be listed on the evaluation report even if there is no change (e.g., spot-evaluations).

8.1.3. Following HHQ administered evaluations, HHQ evaluators or inspectors will provide evaluation paperwork in writing to the unit identifying the rating, type of evaluation, errors/downgrades, and events in which errors were assessed. OGV will create and coordinate an evaluation report to be maintained for documentation purposes.

8.1.3.1. HHQ evaluation paperwork will be maintained along with the associated local evaluation report. This will provide source documentation for future questions on evaluation conduct or content.

8.1.4. Evaluation records will be maintained for each evaluatee.

8.1.4.1. When retraining is required, the appropriate training office must receive copies of the evaluation report for training purposes. Once training is completed, the appropriate agencies will document the accomplishment of training on the evaluation report and return to OGV.

8.1.4.2. The evaluation report will be coordinated through all appropriate agencies to ensure all evaluatee records are kept current.

8.1.5. Quarterly Evaluation Record Review

8.1.5.1. Certified evaluators will compare crew qualification evaluation dates, accomplished and expiration, in active evaluation records with the Aviation Resource Management System (ARMS) database to ensure the correct dates were inputted into ARMS. (T-3) Reviews of evaluation records for personnel in inactive status is not required.

8.1.5.2. Certified evaluators will coordinate with the Squadron Aviation Resource Management (SARM) to gain ARMS datasheets for comparison.

8.1.5.3. The reviews must be accomplished within each quarter.

8.2. AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification.*

8.2.1. Purpose.

8.2.1.1. The AF Form 8 is the source document used to record and verify the qualification/certification of a member.

8.2.1.2. Completion of an AF Form 8 is accomplished by a signature from four individuals: the Flight Examiner (i.e., evaluator), a Reviewing Officer, a Final Approving Officer, and the Examinee.

8.2.1.3. In all instances of data entry, if an electronic form is used, the format required by the electronic form will be used and in most cases will automatically input information derived from PEX.

8.2.1.4. Should a paper version of the AF Form 8 be required, annotate all information IAW the electronic AF Form 8.

8.2.2. General Data Entry.

8.2.2.1. For date fields, use a two-digit day, three-letter month, and two-digit year format (e.g. 26 Nov 22).

8.2.2.2. The “Eligibility Period” and “Expiration Date of Qualification” blocks will use a three-letter month and two-digit year format (Nov 19). Evaluation currency will expire after the last day of the annotated month.

8.2.2.3. Except where specifically noted otherwise (i.e. annotating the type evaluation, “QUAL”), use upper and lower case letters.

8.2.2.4. Requirements for font, indentation, and justification (right, left, or centered) of data are not specified.

8.2.3. Date Completed.

8.2.3.1. Use the latest completion date of the evaluation requisites or the additional training if assigned.

8.2.4. Section I. Examinee Identification.

8.2.4.1. Enter Name, Rank (should use USAF-standard abbreviated or non-abbreviated rank), and last four of Social Security Number (SSN).

8.2.4.2. Organization and Location. Enter the unit designation and location where the examinee is assigned/attached.

8.2.4.3. MDS/Crew Position. Enter the examinee’s MDS and highest qualification/certification reflecting the evaluation.

8.2.4.4. Eligibility Period. Enter the 180-day period preceding the expiration date from the last qualification evaluation.

8.2.5. Section II. Qualification.

8.2.5.1. Examination/Check. Make an entry for each requisite exam/evaluation. Discrepancies will be noted in the examiner's remarks. If requisites exceed available lines, make combined entries or document additional requisite completion in the Comments Section.

8.2.5.2. Date. Enter the date that the requisite is successfully completed.

8.2.5.3. Grade. Enter a "P" (for Pass) or an "F" (for Fail) for the SQB and boldface. Enter a "1" (for Q1), "2" (for Q2), or "3" (for Q3) for MPT, Instructor, and EOE as applicable.

8.2.5.4. Evaluation Type and Prefix. Use the following evaluation types as required:

8.2.5.4.1. QUAL – Use when the crew member's Event ID GB05XG is to be reset and their evaluation window is advanced.

8.2.5.4.2. SPOT – Use when a crew member completes any phase of an evaluation, but does not complete all phases of the 18-month evaluation cycle. This will not advance the individual's evaluation window. MPT spot-evaluations that are combined to satisfy phase requirements for a qualification evaluation (advance an individual's evaluation window) will be documented on one AF Form 8. The single AF Form 8 will document all the Event IDs presented for each MPT spot-evaluation and specifically annotate that the evaluation was combined. The combined Form 8 will document all the Event IDs presented and specifically annotate that the evaluation was combined.

8.2.5.4.2.1. SPOT will also be used for members that are completing an AF Form 8 to document an instructor upgrade or evaluator certification.

8.2.5.4.3. The following prefixes should be used, as applicable, to describe the evaluation type:

8.2.5.4.3.1. INITIAL – Use when a crew member has completed their initial evaluation. This will establish the individual's evaluation window.

8.2.5.4.3.2. REQUALIFICATION – Use when member has completed requalification IAW this instruction. This will establish the individual's evaluation window. This is also used at the completion of RQT to requalify an individual who was previously certified on REACT weapon system (e.g. personnel in leadership positions). If a member receives a Q3 qualification rating, close out the Form 8 with the Q3 rating. Once the disqualified member requalifies with a Q1 or Q2 qualification rating, a new Form 8 will account for the requalification.

8.2.5.4.3.3. RECURRING – Use when a crew member has entered their evaluation window and successfully completed all phases of the evaluation. This will advance the individual's evaluation window.

8.2.5.4.3.4. UPGRADE – Use when a crew member is upgrading from Missileer to MCCC. This will advance the individual's evaluation window.

8.2.5.5. Qualification Level. Annotate the examinee's overall qualification level IAW the definitions in this instruction. Enter a "1" (for Q1) or "2" (for Q2) in the qualified block or a "3" (for Q3) in the unqualified block.

8.2.5.6. Expiration Date of Qualification. For evaluations that establish a new eligibility period, enter the month and year that is 19 months after the last phase of the evaluation was successfully completed.

8.2.6. Section VII. Qualification Signatures.

8.2.6.1. Flight Examiner. The Flight Examiner is the evaluator of record identified in **Table 4.1** that signs Section VII of the AF Form 8 is responsible for the content of the AF Form 8, and will not sign Section VII until verifying all required items are documented. The Flight Examiner also makes comments in the comments block as needed.

8.2.6.2. Reviewing and Final Approving Officers. The Reviewing and Final Approving Officers will review the content of the AF Form 8 and the evaluator's overall assessment, ensuring all required additional comments reflect the noted deficiencies. Refer to **Table 8.1** for determination of Reviewing and Final Approving Officers. NOTE: For HHQ evaluations, the reviewing officer will be the local OG/OGV and the final approving officer will be AFGSC/A3TV.

8.2.6.2.1. The Reviewing Officer will sign and date the AF Form 8 after the Flight Examiner, but prior to the Final Approving Officer.

8.2.6.2.2. The Final Approving Officer will sign and date the AF Form 8 after the Reviewing Officer but prior to the Examinee. As applicable, the Final Approving Officer may recommend a commander-directed downgrade if further action is warranted.

8.2.6.2.3. The same individual will not sign as both the Reviewing and Final Approving Officer.

8.2.6.2.4. The SQ/CC or next higher available level of supervision will serve as the Reviewing or Approving Officer in cases of extended TDY or deployment.

8.2.6.3. Examinee. The Examinee will sign and date after the Final Approving Officer certifying that they have been outbriefed and understand the action(s) being taken.

8.2.7. AF Form 8 requires final completion, signatures, and review prior to an individual PCS from the missile wing.

Table 8.1. Evaluation-AF Form 8 Reviewer/Approver Matrix.

Evaluatee	Reviewing Officer	Final Approving Officer
Assigned to SQ	MS/DO, MS/ADO	MS/CC
Attached to SQ	Attached MS/DO, MS/ADO	Attached MS/CC
MS/DO	OG/OGV, AOGV, MS/CC, or OG/CD	OG/CC, OG/CD, or MW/CC
MS/CC	OG/OGV, AOGV, OG/CD, or MW/CC	OG/CC, OG/CD, or MW/CC
Evaluator SQ Assigned/Attached	MS/DO, MS/ADO	MS/CC, OG/CC, or OG/CD

OGV	OG/OGV, AOGV, or OG/CD	OG/CC, OG/CD
OG/OGV	Attached MS/CC or OG/CD	OG/CC, OG/CD
OG/CC, OG/CD, WG/CC, WG/CV	Attached MS/CC, MS/DO	OG/CC or Examinee's Supervisor
HHQ, HHQ/CC, HHQ/CV	Attached MS/CC, MS/DO	OG/CC or Examinee's Supervisor

Chapter 9

MISSILE OPERATIONS PUBLICATIONS.

9.1. Missile Crew Information File (MCIF).

9.1.1. Units will establish and maintain a library consisting of a current read file and publications. This library will consist of the items listed in **Table 9.1** in either hardcopy or electronic format. If a unit establishes a paper library, it will be organized into volumes as shown in the **Table 9.1** MCIFs may be issued to crew members for T.O.s or AFIs that affect alert operations, but actual publication changes must be accomplished IAW established procedural guidance, to include DAFI 90-160 (as applicable) and T.O. 00-5-1, *Air Force Technical Order System*. (T-3)

9.2. Missile Crew Publications.

9.2.1. Unit commanders are responsible for ensuring crew members are aware of all information published in current T.O.s and flight-related publications before alert. Unit commanders will notify crew members through Volume 1, Part B of the unit MCIF and Go/No-Go procedures to ensure they review new changes and supplements prior to their next alert. (T-3) MCIF items that contain weapon system data will be controlled IAW the applicable distribution statement in the governing T.O.

9.3. Required Volumes.

9.3.1. The MCIF serves as the master copy for crew publications and must be accurately posted. If required publications are on order, place a MFR in the appropriate locations in the library binders. At the OG/CC's discretion, the MCIF library may be electronic, provided measures are in place to ensure currency of publications and unrestricted access by crew members. (T-3)

9.3.2. Volume I is a Table of Contents for all volumes and Current Read File items, Volumes II through IV are made up of publications and alert procedures, and Volume V (optional) is reserved for applicable miscellaneous information. If units choose hardcopy format and the contents of any volume exceed the capacity of its binder, use an additional binder and identify the first and subsequent binders by a letter of sequence (e.g., IIIA, IIIB).

9.3.3. Wing/group agencies who wish to disseminate information through an MCIF will submit the information to OGV for coordination and distribution. Items entered into Volume I will be limited to those items that contain information temporary in nature. To prevent overwhelming the crew members with unnecessary details, salient points may be extracted from lengthy documents or highlighted if inclusion in Volume I is necessary. Above the wing/group level, HQ AFGSC/A3TV or 20 AF/A3TV is the focal point for MCIF information. (T-3)

Table 9.1. Required Volumes.

Volume	Title
Volume I	Table of Contents/Current Read File
Volume II	Publications—Air Force Directives/MAJCOM Supplements

Volume	Title
Volume III	Publications—CCMD/MAJCOM/NAF/Local Directives
Volume IV	Checklists/Crew Aids/Technical Orders
Volume V (Optional)	Miscellaneous Information

9.3.4. 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 an optional Part C). The MAJCOM may add additional components to Volume I as appropriate.

9.3.4.1. Part A is a Table of Contents listing all material contained in MCIF Volumes I through V.

9.3.4.2. Part B is the Current Read File of MCIF messages. Messages contain information temporary in nature and are directly pertinent to safe and secure alert operations. Crew members must read new postings to Part B prior to departing for the first alert following the MCIF posting or while on alert if the posting is available to them. (T-3)

9.3.4.3. Part B entries will not remain in the MCIF Index longer than one year from date of issue. (T-3) Post information no later than the posting date. OGV will reissue MCIFs upon expiration as applicable, unless specifically directed to remove the MCIF by HHQ. OGV may also rescind MCIFs through appropriate coordination with the posting authority. (T-3) File Part B items in reverse numerical sequence with the latest item on top. Cross-reference classified entries to the appropriate location. If unit PEX database is contained on an unclassified net and a classified Part B MCIF is issued, the MCIF will cross reference the specific location where crew members can review classified message.

9.3.4.4. Part C is the Current Read File that contains information temporary in nature but not related to safe and secure alert operations and is not required to be read prior to departing for alert and will not impact Go/No-Go status. These items should be reviewed at the earliest possibility.

9.3.4.5. Part C is optional and may be rescinded at any time at the discretion of the posting authority. File Part C items in reverse numerical sequence with the latest item on top. If unit PEX database is contained on an unclassified net and a classified Part C MCIF is issued, the MCIF will cross reference the specific location where crew members can review the classified message.

9.3.4.6. Refer to [Attachment 4](#) for a sample MCIF format.

9.4. Publications Library.

9.4.1. Volumes II through V will consist of an MCIF Functional Publications Library according to MAJCOM directives. (T-3) HQ AFGSC/A3TV designates the minimum list of publications that require printed copies in the MCIF library. 20 AF/A3TV will publish an MCIF Index of Publications on the NAF SharePoint and provide periodic updates as required. Ensure changes to the published Index of Publications are easily identifiable (i.e., highlighted). The unit's basic index will reflect, at a minimum, those instructions and T.O.s that are listed in the MCIF Index of Publications. Units may add other publications at the discretion of unit OGV, but must maintain these publications with the most current versions available. Units

will place the index in Volume I, Part A. Notification of publications or index of publications changes may be accomplished by HHQ release of a new MCIF Index of Publications. Units have five working days from notification to post the affected publication. (T-3) Units will notify 20 AF/A3TV if a newer version of a publication is available and not listed on the MCIF Index of Publications.

9.4.2. All publications in the library will be current and complete. (T-3)

9.4.3. Units will establish and maintain a Table of Contents for the publications library containing, at a minimum, a listing of basic publications numbers and short titles. Publication dates, supplements, and changes are not required.

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

9.4.5. Documents in the MCIF library will be made available for crew members on alert via either electronic or hardcopy means.

9.5. Alert Related Special Interest Item (SII).

9.5.1. Alert Related SIIs are items of emphasis relating to existing procedure(s) designed to mitigate or eliminate specific risks or trends.

9.5.1.1. SIIs do not add to or amend established procedures.

9.5.1.2. SIIs will be based on identification of risks and trends from a variety of sources to include operational, safety or security related incidences, trend analysis, and potential problems with equipment/procedures. (T-3)

9.5.2. SIIs will be issued through the same process used to release MCIFs with the following elements: (T-3)

9.5.2.1. References (T.O., instruction, SEB, etc.).

9.5.2.2. Risk factors and trend details.

9.5.2.3. Specific emphasis actions to reduce/eliminate the risk or trend that generated the SII.

9.5.2.4. Effective date of rescission.

9.5.2.5. SME/Point of Contact (POC) for further information.

9.5.3. SIIs will be of limited duration (generally not to exceed 90 days).

9.5.4. SIIs may be issued/rescinded from AFGSC, 20 AF, or OGV.

9.5.5. Units will place all applicable SIIs into the MCIF, Volume 1, Part B for dissemination to crew members.

9.5.6. All current CRM/Operational Risk Management (ORM) or safety related SIIs will be briefed during mission planning for the duration of the SIIs. Mission-specific SIIs need only be briefed on those missions for which the SII is relevant.

9.6. Go/No-Go Procedures.

9.6.1. Units will establish a positive control system that ensures crew members have completed all ground training and Stan/Eval items required for alert. Units will provide guidance on this system in the unit supplement. (T-3)

9.6.2. At a minimum, the Go/No-Go system will monitor:

9.6.2.1. AF Form 8 qualification or appropriate ARMS products.

9.6.2.2. Alert and MPT currency and proficiency items required for alert IAW AFGSCI 13-5201v1.

9.6.2.3. Any Duties Not to Include Alert (DNIA) status.

9.6.2.4. Currency on all MCIF Volume 1, Part B items.

9.6.2.5. Individuals will accomplish an initial review and certification of all volumes prior to their first alert.

9.6.3. Units will designate person(s) to verify Go/No-Go status prior to releasing crew members for alert.

Chapter 10

MISCELLANEOUS

10.1. Trends.

10.1.1. The scope of the Trend Program includes trend analysis of all evaluations, operations, and training that affects operations.

10.1.2. The trend program will track discrepancies and missed examination questions to compile data for trend analysis.

10.1.2.1. At a minimum, unit trend programs should contain a sample size and threshold for determining a trend. For example, a deficiency meets the threshold of a trend when:

10.1.2.1.1. A question missed 20 percent of time with a sample size greater than 5 attempts.

10.1.2.1.2. An evaluation area/sub area downgraded on 20 percent of administered evaluations.

10.1.2.1.3. A requisite examination question missed more than twice during a semiannual period with a sample size less than five.

10.1.2.1.4. The Chief of MS/CCV or OG/OGV has the discretion to designate any deficiency as a trend despite not meeting trend threshold. Consideration for trend identification should be determined by the level of risk to safety or mission accomplishment.

10.1.3. Consider other common factors when attempting to determine the source of the trend (e.g. same instructor/evaluator, event/scenario, etc.).

10.1.4. When trends are noted, MS/CCV and/or OG/OGV will accomplish the following:

10.1.4.1. Recommend an OPR/Office of Collateral Responsibility (OCR).

10.1.4.2. Recommend corrective action and a method to verify that this trend has been corrected.

10.1.4.3. Ensure the trend is closed when corrective action is successfully implemented and verified by the OPR/OCR. The trend should only be closed after the OPR verifies the deficiency in performance or knowledge no longer exists and the appropriate commander approves.

10.1.4.4. Report trends and status to the OG/CC during SEB until closed. HQ 20 AF/A3TV and HQ AFGSC/A3TV will analyze reported trends for commonalities between units and address trends from the NAF and/or MAJCOM level appropriately.

10.1.5. MS/CCs and/or OG/CC may use supplemental evaluations to identify and close trends.

10.1.6. Consider issuing a SII or MCIF to address an identified trend.

10.2. Supplementary Evaluations.

10.2.1. Purpose. Supplementary evaluations are optional administrative tools used by a commander to ensure standardization of operations and to identify and evaluate implemented

solutions to operational problems, such as negative evaluation trends. The form and content of a supplementary evaluation is at the discretion of the commander.

10.2.2. Supplementary evaluations may be administered in conjunction with a missile crew evaluation. Supplementary evaluations are not missile crew evaluations and will not affect grading or the Qualification Level and will not be documented on an AF Form 8/8A.

10.2.3. The commander directing the supplementary evaluation determines the areas to be evaluated. The Stan/Eval function directly under the commander will determine the method of evaluation and is responsible for administrative management of data collection. Once complete, the Stan/Eval function reports results to the commander. (T-3)

10.2.4. Commanders may appoint anyone to conduct supplementary evaluations.

10.2.5. At a minimum, supplementary evaluations results are documented in Standardization and Evaluation Board minutes.

10.3. Stan/Eval Visits (SEVs).

10.3.1. HHQ staff will conduct Standardization/Evaluation Visits as requested/required. SEVs may be no-notice and will be coordinated and scheduled with the Wing IG Gatekeeper IAW AFI 90-201; routine qualification and recurring pyramid, no-notice, and SPOT evaluations are exempt from Gatekeeper coordination.

10.3.2. Purpose and Goals:

10.3.2.1. Verify and validate unit Stan/Eval program adherence to AFGSCI 13-5201v2 policy and guidance.

10.3.2.2. Determine the effectiveness of the Stan/Eval program and compliance with applicable AFIs/AFMANs and associated supplements.

10.3.2.3. Assess the capability of the Chief of Stan/Eval, Flight Examiners, instructors and unit crewmembers to evaluate, instruct and perform the operational mission.

10.3.2.4. Identify operational or training factors adversely affecting missile crew capability to accomplish the assigned mission and initiate corrective actions as required.

10.3.2.5. Verify missile crew compliance with regulations.

10.3.2.6. Provide meaningful feedback to commanders from a broad viewpoint as well as the specific evaluation of the existing evaluation criteria.

10.3.3. Summary Report. Operations Group Commanders may request a summary report detailing the results of completed SEVs. Reports will be available within 20 working days of SEV completion.

10.4. Stan/Eval Boards (SEB).

10.4.1. The purpose of the SEB is to consolidate and communicate information regarding the status of unit Stan/Eval programs to 20 AF and AFGSC. At a minimum, include the following: manning concerns, evaluation activity and results (qualification, spot, supplemental, FM evals), waivers and extensions, MCIFs/SIIs, no-notice program status, trends, stan/eval program inspections, evaluation trends, publication issues. OGs will forward a consolidated quarterly SEB report to 20 AF/A3TV and AFGSC/A3TV within 15 working days following

the completion of the SEB and additionally when the convening commander deems a report is appropriate.

10.4.1.1. The report will include the required topics in this paragraph, the disposition or status of open items from the previous report, and request for HHQ assistance, as applicable.

10.4.1.2. Units may reference the AFGSC/A3TV SharePoint (<https://usaf.dps.mil/sites/AFGSC-HQ/hq/A3-6/a3t/a3tv/SitePages/Home.aspx>) for example formats meeting these requirements.

10.4.2. The SEB is chaired by the OG/CC. Attendees will include squadron commanders and OGV/squadron evaluators. Required, but absent SEB members will, at a minimum, read SEB minutes.

10.4.3. AFGSC/A3TV will consolidate and analyze data collected from SEBs and send a report to 20 AF/A3TV within 10 working days of the date the last unit SEB report was received. This report will summarize relevant and useful information to assist unit cross-talk, trend analysis and solutions, and responses to received requests.

10.4.3.1. 20 AF/A3TV will review the report and provide supplemental guidance, as required, within 5 working days of receiving the report from AFGSC.

10.4.3.2. HHQ will maintain a minimum of five years of reports.

10.4.3.3. Units will maintain a minimum of two years of reports.

10.5. AFGSC Crew Member Excellence (CME) Award.

10.5.1. This award recognizes MCCMs who have sustained an excellent record of performance while serving as a crew member within AFGSC.

10.5.2. To be eligible for the CME Award, an individual must:

10.5.2.1. Be an experienced MCCC, as identified in AFGSCI 13-5201v1.

10.5.2.2. Achieve a minimum of four Q1 qualification evaluation ratings.

10.5.3. The OG/CC is the final approval authority for the CME Award. The OG/CC will review the nomination letter forwarded by the respective MS/CC and will consider the individual's overall performance as a crew member when approving selected individuals for the CME Award.

10.5.4. Approved individuals will receive an AFGSC Form 56, *Air Force Global Strike Command Crew Member Excellence Award*, recognizing their evaluation performances.

10.6. New or Upgrade System Requirements.

10.6.1. For new or upgraded missile systems, the unit OGV will develop the evaluation program to meet requirements within this instruction and AFGSCI 13-5301v3.

10.6.2. The unit OGV will develop specific requirements for planning a new evaluation program to include a validation plan and program approval strategy.

10.6.3. The unit commander will appoint a limited number of SMEs in writing. The primary duty of the SME is to develop technical documentation, evaluation materials, and to conduct

CMR evaluations. Document SME appointment. Forward the memorandum to 20 AF/A3 and HQ AFGSC/A3T.

10.6.4. SMEs who conduct CMR evaluations or initial [post-Initial Operational Capacity (IOC)] system operations must be CMR certified. To maintain CMR status, they must be evaluated on all applicable events or complete a qualification evaluation within 60 calendar days of removal from SME status or within 90 calendar days from system IOC (whichever is sooner).

10.6.5. Once evaluations are complete and an individual is qualified, document qualification on the AF Form 8.

10.6.6. MCCMs trained by the SMEs will be evaluated within 90 calendar days from system IOC.

MICHAEL A. MILLER
Brig Gen, USAF
Director of Operations and Communications

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

DAFI 36-148, *Discipline and Adverse Actions of Civilian Employees*, 27 September 2022

DAFI 90-160, *Publications and Forms Management*, 13 April 2022

DAFMAN 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*, 14 April 2022

AFPD 13-5, *Air Force Nuclear Mission*, 17 July 2018

AFI 13-520, *Aircraft and ICBM Nuclear Operations*, 26 July 2021

AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, 23 March 2020

AFI 91-114, *Safety Rules for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Systems*, 1 November 2018

AFMAN 21-202, *Missile Maintenance Management*, 29 August 2019

AFTTP 3-3.ICBM, *Combat Aircraft Fundamentals ICBM*, 11 March 2022

AFGSCI 13-5201v1, *Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Training and Certification*, 5 January 2022

AFGSCI 13-5201v2, *Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Standardization and Evaluation*, 6 February 2022

AFGSCI 13-5201v5, *Code Control Standardization: Procedures, Training, and Evaluation*, 16 July 2020

AFGSCI 13-5301v3, *Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Operations*, 4 June 18

EAP-STRAT Volume 1, *Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, General*, 1 October 2022

EAP-STRAT Volume 1 Annex A, *(S) Security Classification Guide*, 1 October 22

EAP-STRAT Volume 3, *(S) Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, Positive Control Policy, Procedures and Coded Control Devices*, 1 October 2022

EAP-STRAT Volume 11, *(S) Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, LERTCON System*, 1 October 2022

EAP-STRAT Volume 16, *Commander USSTRATCOM Emergency Action Procedures, ICBM Code Component Control Policy and Procedures*, 1 Jun 2022

T.O. 00-5-1, *Air Force Technical Order System*, 30 Aug 2022

Prescribed Forms

AFGSC Form 56, *Air Force Global Strike Command Crew Member Excellence Award*

Adopted Forms

AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification*

DAF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

AF Form 942, *Record of Evaluation*

AF Form 4324, *Aircraft Assignment/Aircrew Qualification Worksheet*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADO—Assistant Director of Operations

AETC—Air Education and Training Command

AF—Air Force

AFB—Air Force Base

AFGSC—Air Force Global Strike Command

AFGSCI—Air Force Global Strike Instruction

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFRIMS—Air Force Records Information Management System

AFTTP—Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures

AOGV—Assistant Chief, Standardization and Evaluation

ARMS—Aviation Resource Management System

BMC—Basic Mission Capable

BMK—Basic Mission Knowledge

CARD—Communication and Reporting Directive

CME—Crew Member Excellence

CMR—Combat Mission Ready

COG—Clarification of Guidance

COMSEC—Communication Security

CRM—Crew Resource Management

CTS—Course Training Standard

DNIA—Duties Not to Include Alert

EAM—Emergency Action Message

EAP-20 AF—Emergency Action Procedures-Twentieth Air Force

EAP—Emergency Action Procedures

EAP-STRAT—Emergency Action Procedures- United States Strategic Command

EMP—Electromagnetic Pulse

EOE—Evaluator Objectivity Evaluation
EP—Execution Plan
EQW—Evaluator Qualification Workbook
ERM—Execution Reference Matrix
EWO—Emergency War Order
FM—Facility Manager
FSC—Flight Security Controller
FSR—Force Status Readiness
HAB—High Altitude Burst
HAF—Headquarters Air Force
HHQ—Higher Headquarters
HIT—Handbook for ICBM Targeting
HQ—Headquarters
ICBM—Intercontinental Ballistic Missile
ICT—Initial Commit Time
IG—Inspector General
INFOSEC—Information Security
IOC—Initial Operational Capacity
IST—Initial Skills Training
LCC—Launch Control Center
LF—Launch Facility
MAF—Missile Alert Facility
MAJCOM—Major Command
MCCC—Missile Combat Crew Commander
MCC—Missile Combat Crew
MCCM—Missile Combat Crew Member
MCIF—Missile Crew Information File
MDS—Mission Design Series
MEP—Minuteman Enhanced Procedures
MFR—Memorandum for Record
MIIDS—Missile Interior Intrusion Detection System
MMOC—Missile Maintenance Operations Center

MPT—Missile Procedures Trainer
MSG—Message
MW—Missile Wing
NC2—Nuclear Command and Control
NMC—Non-Mission Capable
NSI—Nuclear Surety Inspection
NUDET—Nuclear Detonation
OG—Operations Group
OGV—Office of Standardization and Evaluation
OI—Operating Instruction
OPLAN—Operations Plan
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
OPSEC—Operations Security
ORM—Operational Risk Management
OSK—Weapons and Tactics
OSS—Operations Support Squadron
PC—Positive Control
PCS—Permanent Change of Station
PEX—Patriot Excalibur
PLCA—Preparatory Launch Command-A
PLCB—Preparatory Launch Command-B
PLC—Preparatory Launch Command
POC—Point of Contact
PRP—Personnel Reliability Program
PS—Performance Standard
Q1—Qualification Level 1
Q2—Qualification Level 2
Q3—Qualification Level 3
RDC—Remote Data Change
RDS—Records Disposition Schedule
REACT—Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting
RQT—Requalification Training

RS/RV—Reentry System/Reentry Vehicle
RTM—Ready ICBM Program Tasking Memorandum
SACCS—Strategic Automated Command and Control System
SARM—Squadron Aviation Resource Management
SAV—Staff Assistance Visit
SCC—Security Control Center
SEB—Standardization/Evaluation Board
SII—Special Interest Item
SKL—Simple Key Loader
SME—Subject Matter Expert
SOP—Standard Operating Procedures
SQB—Secure Question Bank
SQ—Squadron
SSC—Scriptwriter’s Scenario Course
SSN—Social Security Number
STAN/EVAL—Standardization/Evaluation
T.O.—Technical Order
TAV—Technical Assistance Visit
TCG—Target Constants Generation
TEAP—Training Emergency Action Procedures
TESM—Training and Evaluation Standards Memorandum
TRFTL—Training Reserve Force Target List
TRS—Training Squadron
TTATD—Training Target and Timing Document
UCMJ—Uniform Code of Military Justice
USSTRATCOM—United States Strategic Command
VLF—Very Low Frequency
WSSR—Weapon System Safety Rules

Attachment 2

MCCM EVALUATION FOLDERS

A2.1. Missile Evaluation Folders. OGV or missile squadrons will maintain individual evaluation documentation in a missile evaluation folder for all BMK, BMC, and CMR personnel. Each individual will have a separate record.

A2.1.1. Electronic formatted evaluation folders are authorized and recommended. If evaluation folders are not maintained in PEX or equivalent system, then two electronically maintained folders must be created/maintained for each individual with proper security measures, backup capability, and sustainment plans in place. Folder title and contents will be in accordance with the following guidance:

A2.1.1.1. Folder 1 – Record of Evaluations. The chronological history of evaluations for a crew member will be recorded on the AF Form 942, *Record of Evaluation*, filed in this folder. During the transition to the AF Form 942, units may use the AFGSC Form 91, *Record of Qualifications, Certifications, and Associated Events*, as the historical record while recording any new evaluations on the AF Form 942.

A2.1.1.2. Folder 2 – Evaluation Reports. Include each permanent AF Form 8 in this folder. Applicable waivers and/or associated MFRs to support actions taken that affects an individual's qualification/certification will be maintained in the appropriate folder. Create subfolders as needed to organize documents for ease of reference.

A2.1.2. If the OGV or missile squadrons maintains hardcopy records, the evaluation folder will have two sections and will be maintained according to the following guidance:

A2.1.2.1. Section 1 – Record of Evaluations. The chronological history of evaluations for a crew member will be recorded on the AF Form 942 filed in this folder. During the transition to the AF Form 942, units may use the AFGSC Form 91 as the historical record while recording any new evaluations on the AF Form 942.

A2.1.2.2. Section 2 – Evaluation Reports. Include each permanent AF Form 8 in this folder. Applicable waivers and/or associated MFRs to support actions taken that affects an individual's qualification/certification will be maintained in the appropriate folder.

A2.1.2.3. File most recent AF Form 8 on top.

A2.1.3. Units will develop a plan to ensure adequate security procedures are in place to prevent tampering by unauthorized personnel and to document timely back-up and recovery procedures. Regardless of format (hardcopy or electronic), the unit is ultimately responsible for the information contained on these forms.

A2.1.4. Units will add required documents to the evaluation folder within one week following completion of any event requiring documentation.

A2.1.5. Units will provide the evaluation folder to the individual upon their PCS for transfer to gaining unit if data is not in PEX.

Attachment 3

EVALUATION OVERVIEW CHART

Table A3.1. Evaluation Overview Chart.

Evaluation Category	Evaluation Type	Evaluated By	Evaluation Required	Advances Expiration Date	New Expiration Date
Qualification	Initial	532 TRS	At completion of IST	With a Q1 or Q2 rating	1st day of 19th month
	No-notice	Any certified evaluator or HHQ	At discretion of OGV or HHQ	With a Q1 or Q2 rating on MPT phase, 85% on requisite exams (exception: 100% on Boldface)	1st day of 19th month
	Requalification	Any certified evaluator or HHQ	Following any Q3 rating, at completion of RQT, or for individuals previously disqualified	With a Q1 or Q2 rating on MPT phase, Q on Instructor eval (if required), 85% on requisite exams (exception: 100% on	1st day of 19th month
	Recurring	Any certified evaluator or HHQ	During eligibility period of 13-18 months after last successful qualification or requalification evaluation	With a Q1 or Q2 rating on MPT phase, Q on Instructor eval (if required), 85% on requisite exams (exception: 100% on Boldface)	1st day of 19th month
Spot	No-notice	Any certified evaluator or HHQ	At the discretion of OGV, unit leadership, or HHQ	N/A	N/A
	Support	Any certified evaluator or HHQ	At the discretion of OGV, unit leadership, HHQ, or following any evaluation where the MCCM wishes not to reset their expiration date	N/A	N/A

Attachment 4
MCIF TEMPLATE

Table A4.1. MCIF Template.

Note: Below is an example template organizations may use when drafting an MCIF.

MEMORANDUM FOR (SEE DISTRIBUTION).

FROM: (UNIT'S COMPLETE ADDRESS).

SUBJECT: The Subject Line contains the MCIF number and title of the MCIF (if applicable).

1. Applicability paragraph. This paragraph lists the units the MCIF item is applicable to.
2. Directive paragraph. Use this paragraph to give direction to crews regarding procedures or guidance. This information should be placed immediately following the applicability paragraph in order to ensure a consistent place for new procedures or guidance.
3. Amplification paragraph. This paragraph should focus on background information for the crews or any other amplifying data deemed necessary by the MCIF item author. The MCIF item should be limited to one or two pages in length. Additional supporting background documentation should be included as attachments or references.
 - a. Amplifying data may be organized into subparagraphs or follow-on paragraphs.
 - b. If follow-on paragraphs are used, ensure paragraphs are numbered correctly.
4. Administrative paragraph. Use this paragraph to show where the MCIF item is to be placed (Part B or C) and for how long the MCIF item is to remain in effect. Other items of an administrative nature may also be placed in this paragraph.
5. Receipt/POC paragraph. This paragraph directs units to acknowledge receipt of the MCIF item within a desired period of time, MCIF item POC(s), and the POC phone number and e-mail address.

Attachment 5

AIR FORCE FORM 8 EXAMPLE

Figure A5.1. Form 8 Example.

CERTIFICATE OF AIRCREW QUALIFICATION				DATE COMPLETED		
				31 Oct 22		
I. EXAMINEE IDENTIFICATION						
NAME (Last, First, Middle Initial) Keim, Thomas P.		GRADE O-4	DoD ID 1234567890	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD Jul 22 – Dec 22		
ORGANIZATION AND LOCATION 321 MS, FE Warren AFB		MDS/CREW POSITION LGM-30G/EMCCC				
II. REQUISITE INFORMATION			III. AIRCREW EVALUATION INFORMATION			
REQUISITES	DATE	RESULTS	AIRCREW EVALUATION	DATE		
MPT	31 Oct 22	1	Recurring QUAL	31 Oct 22		
SQB	22 Oct 22	P				
Boldface	22 Oct 22	P				
Instructor	30 Oct 22	1				
IV. QUALIFICATION LEVEL		V. ADDITIONAL TRAINING				
QUALIFIED	UNQUALIFIED	DUE DATE(S)		DATE ADDITIONAL TRAINING COMPLETED		
1						
EXPIRATION DATE(S) OF QUALIFICATION(S)		CERTIFYING OFFICIAL, GRADE, ORGANIZATION		SIGNATURE	DATE	
Apr 24						
VI. OTHER						
<input type="checkbox"/> RESTRICTIONS <i>(Explain in Comments on Back)</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED <i>(Explain in Comments on Back)</i>		<input type="checkbox"/> COMMANDER-DIRECTED DOWNGRADE <i>(Explain in Comments on Back)</i>		
VII. ENDORSEMENT						
TYPED NAME AND GRADE	ORGANIZATION	CHECK			SIGNATURE	DATE
		C O N C U R	D O C U M E N T	R E M A R K S		
1 FLIGHT EXAMINER Mitchell S. Woodley, O-3	90 OGV/AOGV	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	//Signed//	31 Oct 22
2 REVIEWING OFFICER Eric S. Buss, O-5	321 MS/CC	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	//Signed//	31 Oct 22
3 FINAL APPROVING OFFICER Jared C. Nelson, O-6	90 OG/CC	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	//Signed//	31 Oct 22
I CERTIFY that I have been briefed and understand the action being taken this date.						
DATE 31 Oct 22	TYPED NAME AND GRADE OF EXAMINEE Thomas P. Keim, O-4			SIGNATURE //signed//		

Figure A5.2. Form 8 Example Cont.

VIII.	COMMENTS		
<p>RESTRICTION(S) (if required):</p> <p>EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED (if desired/when used):</p> <p>EXAMINER'S REMARKS:</p> <p>A. Mission Description.</p> <p>TG02XG, LF09XG, NS01XG, NC17XG, NC23XG, NS02XG, EP02XG</p> <p>B. Discrepancies.</p> <p>None</p> <p>C. Recommended Additional Training (if not used, enter "None").</p> <p>None</p> <p>D. Additional Comments (if not used, enter "None").</p> <p>None</p>			
<p>REVIEWING OFFICER REMARKS (if Sec VII "Remarks" checked, if not used, enter "None"):</p> <p>None</p>			
<p>FINAL APPROVING OFFICER REMARKS (if Sec VII "Remarks" checked, if not used, enter "None"):</p> <p>None</p>			
<p>ADDITIONAL REVIEWS (Optional):</p> 			
INITIAL EVALUATOR INFORMATION			
INITIAL EVALUATOR NAME AND GRADE N/A	ORGANIZATION	SIGNATURE	Date
PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT			
<small> AUTHORITY: 10 USC 8013 PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: Source document used to establish and record aircrew qualification. DISCLOSURE IS VOLUNTARY: Failure to provide information may prevent qualification authorization and result in a loss of records establishing qualification. SYSTEM OF RECORD: F011 AF XO Aviation Resource Management System (ARMS). </small>			