

**BY ORDER OF THE COMMANDER
OF COMBAT FORCES COMMAND**

**COMBAT FORCES COMMAND
MANUAL 13-602RG-1, VOLUME 2**

7 MAY 2026



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

***RG-1 – STANDARDIZATION &
EVALUATION PROGRAM***

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

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

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: CFC/S35Z

Certified by: CFC/S35Z

Pages: 29

This manual implements Air Force Instruction (AFI) 13-602, Volume 2, *Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*. This publication applies to all United States Space Force (USSF) and United States Air Force (USAF) uniformed members, Department of Defense (DoD) civilian personnel, civilian contractors (as applicable per contract documentation), allied mission partners (as applicable per international agreement) performing space operations duties for the Reconnaissance GEO (RG-1) “Harbinger” Weapon System (WS) in support of USSF or a Combatant Command (CCMD). This manual requires the collection and/or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by 10 U.S.C. 9013, Secretary of the Air Force. The applicable System of Record Notice(s) (SORN) F011 AF AFMC B, *Patriot Excalibur (PEX) System Records* is available at: <https://pclt.defense.gov/DIRECTORATES/Privacy-and-Civil-Liberties-Directorate/Privacy/SORNsIndex/DOD-Component-Notices/Air-Force-Article-List/>.

Ensure all records generated as a result of processes prescribed in this manual adhere to AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and are disposed of in accordance with (IAW) the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule, which is located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the Department of the Air Force (DAF) Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Product*; route DAF Forms 847 from the field through the appropriate functional chain of command. This manual may not be supplemented. The authorities to waive wing, unit, or delta level requirements in this manual are identified with a tier (“T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3”) number following the compliance statement. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate tier waiver approval

authority, or alternatively, to the publication OPR for non-tiered compliance items, IAW [paragraph 1.4](#).

Chapter 1—GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1. General.....	4
1.2. Objective.....	4
1.3. Scope.....	4
1.4. Waivers.....	4
Chapter 2—ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	5
2.1. Scope.....	5
2.2. Space Base Delta (SBD) Commanders.....	5
2.3. Mission Delta 9 Commander (MD 9/CC).....	5
2.4. MD 9 S9/Chief of Stan/Eval.....	5
2.5. Force Generation Squadron Commander (FGS/CC).....	7
2.6. Squadron Tactics and Training Element, Commander (TTE/CC).....	7
2.7. Senior Line Evaluator.....	7
2.8. Line Evaluator.....	8
Chapter 3—EVALUATORS	9
3.1. Evaluator Selection.....	9
3.2. Evaluator Qualification.....	9
3.3. Evaluator Observation and Grading Criteria.....	10
3.4. Evaluator Disqualification.....	10
Chapter 4—EVALUATIONS	12
4.1. General.....	12
4.2. Spacecrew Evaluations.....	12
4.3. QUAL Evaluations.....	12
4.4. Proficiency Validation Evaluations (ProVal).....	13
4.5. Supplemental (SUPP) Evaluations.....	13
4.6. Re-evaluations.....	14
4.7. Remedial Action.....	14
4.8. No-Notice Evaluation Procedures and Guidance.....	14

Chapter 5—SPACECREW EVALUATIONS CRITERIA	15
5.1. General.....	15
5.2. Examinations and Performance.	15
5.3. Crew Position Evaluation Criteria.	15
Table 5.1. Evaluation Criteria.	16
5.4. Additional Considerations.	17
5.5. Qualification Levels.....	17
5.6. Remedial Actions.....	18
5.7. Individualized Training.....	19
5.8. Failure to Pass a Positional Upgrade Evaluation.	19
5.9. Commander-Directed Downgrade.	19
Chapter 6—EVALUATION PROCEDURES	21
6.1. Pre-evaluation requirements.	21
Table 6.1. Out Brief Attendees.	22
6.2. During the Evaluation.	22
6.3. Post-Evaluation Actions.	22
6.4. Evaluation Out brief.....	23
6.5. Training Feedback.	23
Chapter 7—SCRIPTS	24
7.1. Evaluation Scenarios.....	24
7.2. Evaluation Scripts.	24
Chapter 8—DOCUMENTATION	26
8.1. Scope.....	26
8.2. Documentation Requirements.....	26
8.3. Patriot Excalibur (PEX).	26
8.4. Quarterly Audits.	27
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION	28

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. General. This manual prescribes basic guidance for standardization and evaluation for United States Space Force (USSF) crewmembers according to AFI 13-602V2, *Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*. In the context of this document, Weapon System (WS) can describe either a specific WS or a grouping of similar systems into a single category.

1.1.1. Evaluators will use this manual when conducting spacecrew evaluations and will refer to this manual for evaluation standards. **(T-2)**

1.1.2. This manual provides standardization and evaluation (Stan/Eval) processes, requirements, roles, and responsibilities pertaining to evaluation grading criteria for each crew position, instructor upgrade qualification, and unit evaluations.

1.2. Objective. The spacecrew Stan/Eval program objective is to provide commanders validation and documentation of spacecrew training, readiness, operational effectiveness, member qualifications, Combat Mission Ready (CMR) certifications, and capabilities.

1.3. Scope. This manual was developed to define standardizations and evaluations for the RG-1 WS. It is applicable to all spacecrew members performing operations on the RG-1 WS in support of the USSF or a Combatant Command. Applicability includes USSF and United States Air Force (USAF) uniformed members, Department of Defense civilian personnel, civilian contractors (as applicable per contract documentation), allied mission partners (as applicable per international agreement), and other selected personnel performing, instructing, or evaluating CMR and operations duties on the RG-1 WS. A spacecrew consists of officers, enlisted, and DAF civilians and contractors who conduct space operations and are assigned to the RG-1 WS.

1.4. Waivers. Units requiring a waiver will submit a new Department of the Air Force (DAF) Form 679, *Department of the Air Force Publication Compliance Item Waiver Request/Approval*, and route it to the appropriate level. **(T-2)**

1.4.1. CFC/CC delegated T-2 waiver authority to CFC/CD and CFC/MA in the CFC/CC *Delegations and Withholding of Authorities Memo* (18 Nov 25).

1.4.2. The following organizations will provide coordination in Section II of the DAF 679.

1.4.2.1. Force Generation Squadron Commander (FGS/CC)

1.4.2.2. Mission Delta Commander (MD/CC)

1.4.2.3. CFC/S35Z

1.4.2.4. CFC/73

1.4.3. Place a copy of approved waivers in the individual's training folder in the current records management system, Patriot Excalibur (PEX), or its successor programs. PEX can be accessed at <https://legacy.omni.af.mil/ePex/Login>

1.4.4. For more detailed guidance, reference DAF Manual (DAFMAN) 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*, or contact CFC/S357T for questions on the waiver coordination process.

Chapter 2

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. Scope. This chapter defines organizational roles and responsibilities for Ready Spacecrew Program (RSP) standardization and evaluation. For this instruction, Higher Headquarters (HHQ) includes Headquarters Space Force (HQ USSF) and Field Command (FLDCOM) Stan/Eval functions.

2.2. Space Base Delta (SBD) Commanders. SBD Commanders will provide base services to support operational unit needs and ensure Host Support Agreements, Memoranda of Agreement, and Memoranda of Understanding remain current.

2.3. Mission Delta 9 Commander (MD 9/CC). MD/CCs are responsible for standardization and evaluation of all spacecrew members in their Mission Delta. The Stan/Eval program is the responsibility of the MD/CC, therefore all certified Stan/Eval and Line Evaluators represent the MD/CC when performing evaluator duties and share the same roles and responsibilities. MD/CC standardizes execution of the RSP.

2.3.1. The MD/CC certifies all evaluators.

2.3.2. The MD/CC designates additional evaluators based on FGS recommendations to meet unit requirements.

2.3.3. All evaluators represent the MD/CC as line evaluators when conducting evaluator duties. Line evaluators may conduct all types of evaluations in support of either the training unit or operational unit

2.3.4. The MD/CC directs and oversees the Stan/Eval program.

2.3.5. Provides personnel to Stan/Eval functions to execute duties directed by this manual.

2.3.6. Appoints a Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval in writing.

2.3.7. Certifies all unit evaluators after completion of an Evaluator Qualification Course (EQC). The main purpose of qualification is to convey the MD/CC's evaluation philosophy and emphasis areas. The MD/CC determines evaluator qualification methodology.

2.3.8. Approves procedures to implement utilization of PEX.

2.3.9. Reviews and approves any local evaluation criteria.

2.3.10. Establishes and chairs the quarterly Standardization and Evaluation Board (SEB).

2.3.11. Establishes and maintains the Crew Information File (CIF) publications programs.

2.3.12. Establish and maintain a spacecrew TO program IAW TO 00-5-1, *AF Technical Order System*.

2.3.13. Establish and maintain a spacecrew MD 9 CIF program.

2.4. MD 9 S9/Chief of Stan/Eval. Responsible for standardization across the Mission Delta, oversight of all evaluations and evaluation products, to include scripts, procedures, evaluation plans, and evaluation documentation. This oversight is necessary to ensure standardization across the Mission Delta. The Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval will:

- 2.4.1. Approves all evaluation products produced by line evaluators.
- 2.4.2. Oversee the administration of evaluations, evaluation scheduling, error determination, and out briefs.
- 2.4.3. Direct and enforce proper conduct of Line Evaluator cadre, on behalf of the MD/CC.
- 2.4.4. Develop evaluation policies and guidelines to ensure compliance with evaluation requirements, to include minimum number of evaluations necessary for an evaluator to administer to maintain qualification.
- 2.4.5. Work within the MD 9 Staff, S9 but report directly to the MD/CC regarding the Stan/Eval program.
- 2.4.6. Be a formerly qualified Line Evaluator that previously held CMR certification but is not required to maintain Basic Mission Qualification (BMQ) or CMR certification.
- 2.4.7. Establish and maintain a spacecrew publications program IAW DAFI 90-160, *Publications and Forms Management*, and DAFMAN 90-161.
 - 2.4.7.1. Establish and maintain a spacecrew TO program IAW TO 00-5-1.
 - 2.4.7.2. Establish and maintain a spacecrew MD 9 CIF program.
- 2.4.8. Ensure Mission Delta Stan/Eval personnel maintain proficiency to train and evaluate Line Evaluators
- 2.4.9. Develop and maintain curriculum for the EQC. At a minimum, the EQC will familiarize evaluator candidates on the proper manner to administer evaluations, assess errors, rate evaluations, techniques for evaluation out-briefs, and use of necessary forms. Additionally, they will:
 - 2.4.9.1. Manage and conduct the EQC.
 - 2.4.9.2. Ensure all newly selected evaluators complete EQC requirements.
- 2.4.10. Submit trends and status to the applicable MD/CC quarterly during the SEB until closed. Maintains an archive of trend data for three years.
 - 2.4.10.1. Trends are defined as either positive or negative changes in evaluation results from one quarter to the next. The number of Q1s, Q2s, and Q3s for each position should be noted, along with the number of evaluations that quarter. The percentages of each should be compared to the quarter before to see how the evaluation results have changed.
 - 2.4.10.2. Recommend corrective action when negative trends are noted and assigns an Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) and Office of Collateral Responsibility (OCR). Report mitigation actions and impact of those actions for each trend at the SEB.
- 2.4.11. Coordinate with CFC Stan/Eval (spoc.staneval.workflow@spaceforce.mil) for regular Staff Assistance Visits (SAVs) to ensure units are adhering to regulations under 13-602 series and applicable CFC/CC guidance.
 - 2.4.11.1. Assigns Points of Contact (POC) for discrepancy resolution and tracks progress towards compliance.
- 2.4.12. Creates a local repository for all items regarding RSP Training and Stan/Eval. This repository will be accessible to units for uploading RSP products, including appointment

letters, lesson plans, scripts, Instructor Qualification Course (IQC) and EQC materials, and Annual Training Program (ATP) items such as Master Task Lists (MTLs), Annual Plan of Instruction (APOI), and related documentation. Establishing a centralized repository enables the Chief of Stan/Eval to maintain visibility of products within their purview and supports continuous oversight, reducing repetitive requests to units for documentation. Repositories will be maintained at the appropriate classification level. For example, the primary repository may be hosted on NIPRNet. If products reside on SIPRNet, JWICS, or SGN, units will upload a cross-reference index identifying the storage location and classification level of those materials. It is recommended to use the DD Form 2861, *Cross-Reference*.

2.5. Force Generation Squadron Commander (FGS/CC). The FGS/CC will:

- 2.5.1. Ensure their spacecrew members are trained, evaluated, and certified.
- 2.5.2. Appoint a Senior Line Evaluator.
- 2.5.3. Ensure spacecrews maintain the required qualifications and proficiency for combat missions.
- 2.5.4. Act as the certifying authority for CMR certifications. In FGS/CC absence, certification authority may be delegated in writing to designee. The certifying official is the final signatory of CMR certifications in PEX (e.g., evaluation AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification*). **(T-2)**
- 2.5.5. Recommend Line Evaluator candidates to the MD/CC.
- 2.5.6. Maintain sufficient certified Line Evaluators to meet mission requirements.
- 2.5.7. Attend the Mission Delta SEB or has a designated representative.
- 2.5.8. Establish and maintain a spacecrew publications program IAW DAFI 90-160 and DAFMAN 90-161.
- 2.5.9. Establish and maintain a spacecrew TO program IAW TO 00-5-1
- 2.5.10. Establish and maintain a spacecrew MD 9 CIF program in PEX.
- 2.5.11. Ensure simulators are available for evaluation use.

2.6. Squadron Tactics and Training Element, Commander (TTE/CC).

- 2.6.1. Manages the scheduling and coordination of necessary maintenance for simulators.
- 2.6.2. Attends the Mission Delta SEB.
- 2.6.3. Trains Line Evaluators on the use of simulators.

2.7. Senior Line Evaluator. The Senior Line Evaluator is not required to be assigned to an operational crew and participate in SPAFORGEN. It is recommended that they work in the TTE. In addition to responsibilities outlined in AFI 13-602V2, Senior Line Evaluator responsibilities include:

- 2.7.1. Acts as liaison with Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval.
- 2.7.2. Oversees all evaluation activities at the unit level, to include evaluations, error determination, out briefs, and completion of proper documentation.

2.7.3. Assists Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval in implementing the CIF and publications programs.

2.7.4. Ensures Line Evaluators under their purview complete all requirements to finalize their Evaluator qualification.

2.7.5. Oversees the conduct of the Line Evaluators under their purview and assists them with the creation or maintenance of evaluation scripts, to route up to MD 9/S9 Chief of Stan/Eval for approval before implementation.

2.7.6. Provides unit data for the SEB.

2.7.7. Attends the SEB.

2.7.8. Performs PEX updates, or coordinates with PEX admins, to include any changes in personnel status, qualification(s), evaluation(s), CIF, and Temporary Procedures administration.

2.7.9. Acts as reviewing officer in PEX for all RG-1 evaluations to ensure proper AF Form 8, AF Form 942, *Record of Evaluation*, and AF Form 4348, *USAF Aircrew Certifications*, utilization. Reference CFC PEX Standardization Memo for complete direction.

2.7.10. Tracks and regularly reports squadron's CMR status to FGS/CC.

2.8. Line Evaluator. Line Evaluators are primarily responsible for conducting evaluations in any crew position they are current and qualified BMQ. Line Evaluators will:

2.8.1. Be assigned to an operational crew and perform operational duties. **(T-2)**

2.8.2. Maintain CMR status, evaluator qualification, and associated currencies.

2.8.3. Conduct Initial Qualification evaluations and Proficiency Validation evaluations IAW AFI 13-602V2 and this publication.

2.8.4. Conduct evaluations and maintain documentation IAW all requirements, to include the proper utilization of PEX.

2.8.5. Ensure standardization within the squadron

2.8.6. Attends Mission Delta SEBs as required.

2.8.7. Complete Mission Delta EQC prior to being considered for qualification by the MD/CC. Line Evaluator qualification and disqualification requirements are determined by the MD/CC.

Chapter 3

EVALUATORS

3.1. Evaluator Selection.

3.1.1. Line Evaluator candidates will be designated by the MD 9/CC and recommended by the FGS/CC (or designee) via official registration Memorandum for Record (MFR) sent to MD 9/S9 Chief of Stan/Eval. **(T-2)**

3.1.2. Line Evaluators should be Experienced (EXP) or Highly Experienced (HEXP) in their crew position and should be selected based on merit, technical knowledge, and professionalism.

3.1.3. Although highly recommended, it is not required for Line Evaluator candidates to have served as instructors.

3.2. Evaluator Qualification. The Mission Delta EQC is designed to equip Line Evaluators candidates with the knowledge and tools to successfully carry out spacecrew evaluations.

3.2.1. The MD/CC holds overall responsibility for EQC, but it is executed by MD 9/S9 Standardization Branch. **(T-2)**

3.2.2. Del 9/S9 Standardization Branch holds an EQC academics course at least quarterly.

3.2.2.1. The EQC Master Task List (MTL) and Plan of Instruction (POI) must be followed and reviewed annually for any applicable changes.

3.2.2.2. EQC academics must include constructing, conducting, and administering the planning, briefing, execution, and debriefing portions of an evaluation IAW AFI 13-602V2 and this publication. **(T-2)**

3.2.2.3. EQC academics concludes with a knowledge test, on which Line Evaluator candidates must score at least 85%.

3.2.2.4. Successful completion of EQC academics is documented in PEX.

3.2.3. The following EQC requirements are executed at the squadron level and overseen by the squadron's Senior Line Evaluator:

3.2.3.1. Training on applicable equipment configuration and scheduling procedures, to include training on the use of simulators.

3.2.3.2. Observing, at a minimum, one certified spacecrew evaluator conducting an evaluation, and then conducting at least one evaluation under the supervision of a certified evaluator.

3.2.3.3. Evaluator observations are not formal evaluations and do not require an AF Form 8. All evaluator training, including required observation events, should be documented in PEX. Upon successful completion of the observation requirement, the member is considered a qualified evaluator.

3.2.3.4. An out brief with the FGS/CC, or designee, and the Chief of Stan/Eval must be accomplished to finalize the process and set expectations.

3.2.3.5. The EQC POI will be filled out as the individual completes these requirements and sent back to MD 9/S9, Standardization when complete.

3.2.3.6. These requirements must be met for each crew position the Line Evaluator candidate will perform evaluations in, in the case of a dual-certified individual.

3.2.4. Following completion of evaluator qualification requirements, as documented by the EQC POI, MD 9/S9 Standardization will then update the Mission Delta Line Evaluator appointment letter and ensure the individual's Form 8 and POI are uploaded into PEX.

3.2.5. The Mission Delta Line Evaluator appointment letter is routed to the MD/CC quarterly (in alignment with the SEB) for signature, and therefore formal designation of the Line Evaluator cadre under his purview.

3.2.6. Once certified, evaluators must give an evaluation at least once every six months. If this stipulation is broken, they must be observed giving an evaluation by another certified evaluator. If the evaluator goes one year without meeting these requirements, they will be decertified.

3.3. Evaluator Observation and Grading Criteria. All Evaluator Observation Criteria must be observed and graded to ensure a complete observation. Evaluator observation will be documented in PEX. The following grading criteria will be considered by Evaluators when conducting Evaluator Observations:

3.3.1. Compliance with Stan/Eval Directives. Evaluator complied with all directed pertaining to the administration of the evaluation.

3.3.2. Stan/Eval Briefing. Evaluator thoroughly briefed the evaluatee on the conduct of the evaluation, mission requirements, responsibilities, grading criteria, and evaluator actions/position during the eval.

3.3.3. Performance Assessment and Grading. Evaluator identified all discrepancies and assigned proper area grade.

3.3.4. Assessment of Overall Performance. Evaluator awarded the appropriate overall grade based on the examinee's performance. Evaluator assigned proper additional training if warranted and briefed the individual's training officer.

3.3.5. Mission Critique. Evaluator thoroughly debriefed the examinee and supervisor on all aspects of the evaluation. Evaluator debriefed all key mission events, providing instruction and references as required.

3.4. Evaluator Disqualification.

3.4.1. Line Evaluator Disqualification/Requalification. Disqualified line evaluators will not perform evaluator duties. Disqualification will be documented in PEX by the Senior Line Evaluator. Disqualified line evaluators may perform spacecrew operations if not disqualified in assigned crew position.

3.4.2. Line Evaluators may be disqualified for the following reasons:

3.4.2.1. Spacecrew member fails to meet recurring evaluator qualification requirements IAW [paragraph 3.2.6](#) within a one-year period.

3.4.2.2. Spacecrew member is no longer needed as an evaluator

3.4.2.3. Spacecrew member no longer possesses the degree of proficiency or professionalism to be an effective evaluator.

3.4.2.4. Spacecrew member permanently departs unit due to a PCS/PCA.

3.4.3. Requirements for requalification of Line Evaluators is at the discretion of the Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval in coordination with the spacecrew member's FGS/CC. All unit/line evaluators must be recertified by the MD/CC prior to conducting evaluator duties. Unit/line evaluators are documented in PEX.

Chapter 4

EVALUATIONS

4.1. General. The spacecrew Stan/Eval Program utilizes operations evaluations to ensure qualification of RG-1 operators and standardization of operations. In concert with training, evaluation is key to identifying readiness shortfalls and is a critical measure of training program effectiveness.

4.1.1. Evaluations will be conducted by a certified evaluator who is current and qualified in the same tasks and subtasks of the evaluatee on the RG-1 WS. **(T-2)** Evaluators will ensure all training requirements are complete and documented in the PEX database with the approved forms IAW CFCMAN 13-602RG-1, Volume 1, *RG-1 – Training*, section 9.2.11. All training forms must be signed before the evaluation may begin.

4.1.2. Individual spacecrew members will be informed by a certified evaluator in advance of being under evaluation. **(T-2)**

4.1.3. Tasks performed during an evaluation may count toward currency requirements for the evaluatee(s). **(T-2)**

4.1.4. When performing evaluations on a live system and conducting simulated actions in a real-world environment, evaluators will utilize applicable procedures and current intelligence to mitigate any operational impact. **(T-2)** Final decision to conduct evaluations on the live system is at the discretion of the on-duty Crew Commander.

4.1.5. Evaluators will not evaluate direct supervisors without FGS/CC approval.

4.1.6. One evaluator can evaluate two evaluatees, if required, although this is not recommended.

4.1.7. Evaluations can be conducted as a spacecrew if practical.

4.1.8. Line Evaluators will provide feedback to the Senior Line Evaluator, who will then relay feedback to the FGS/CC and Chief of Stan/Eval to ensure training shortfalls are addressed.

4.2. Spacecrew Evaluations. There are four types of spacecrew evaluations: QUAL Evaluations, Proficiency Validations (ProVals), Supplemental (SUPP) Evaluations, and Re-evaluations. All evaluations will fall under these categories.

4.3. QUAL Evaluations. QUAL Evaluations are administered to ensure qualification in a space operations crew position to become BMQ. These evaluations qualify a spacecrew member to perform the duties of a particular crew position on the RG-1 WS. An evaluation is required to attain BMQ status; however, spacecrew members do not require an additional QUAL Evaluation to change between BMQ and CMR status. To become CMR, spacecrew members must comply with CT and RT requirements and any additional guidance specified by the Ready Spacecrew Program Tasking Memorandum (RTM). **(T-2)**

4.3.1. QUAL Evaluations are administered upon completion of: **(T-2)**

4.3.1.1. Qualification Training (QT).

4.3.1.2. Positional Upgrade Training (UT).

4.3.1.3. Requalification Training (RqT).

4.3.2. QUAL Evaluations will only be conducted following a SAT pre-evaluation performance assessment administered by a certified instructor, documented in PEX.

4.3.3. QUAL Evaluations are conducted using operationally realistic scenarios. QUAL Evaluations provide a sufficient sample of critical and non-critical tasks to assess the evaluatee's knowledge and proficiency.

4.3.4. Spacecrew members under QUAL Evaluations must conduct at least 75% of critical tasks and 30% of non-critical tasks, not including local/emergency procedures, from the Master Task List (MTL) for the individual's position. **(T-2)**

4.3.5. A QUAL evaluation is followed with a formal out brief to the FGS/CC (or designee IAW [paragraph 6.1.8](#)) as soon as reasonably possible, but no longer than one week.

4.3.6. Evaluators will not administer QUAL evaluations to personnel with whom they have instructed over 50% of their Qualification Training (QT). Additionally, evaluators may not conduct the QUAL evaluation if they conducted the evaluatee's pre-evaluation performance assessment.

4.4. Proficiency Validation Evaluations (ProVal). ProVals are used on a recurring basis to ensure individual proficiency and compliance with established procedures and standards for a given spacecrew position.

4.4.1. ProVals are conducted by line evaluators using offline simulators, real-world systems, or any combination necessary to ensure sufficient task coverage. Each spacecrew member must receive a ProVal within 12 months of their last QUAL or ProVal in the position(s) for which they are qualified. **(T-2)**

4.4.2. Spacecrew members qualified in more than one position receive a ProVal covering tasks common to each position and a sample of unique positional tasks in each position. **(T-2)** These ProVals may be combined into a single event. Common tasks covered may count toward multiple positions but are evaluated against the highest proficiency codes for each task in the Master Task List, when different.

4.4.3. Failure to complete a ProVal by the first day of the 13th month will result in a spacecrew member immediately being Non-Combat Mission Ready (N-CMR) in that position unless the member is in the Commit phase of the SPAFORGEN cycle. Immediately upon returning from Commit, the individual will go N-CMR until a ProVal is accomplished. **(T-2)**

4.4.4. The only approved methods of conducting a ProVal include a formal evaluation script in a simulator, or a spot check evaluation on the operational system. Training events, such as Combat Readiness Verifications (CRVs), are not to be used as evaluation events.

4.4.5. The squadron Senior Line Evaluator is the determining authority for required task coverage for a ProVal. This individual must make an informed decision as to whether task coverage reasonably validates proficiency required for the crew position and experience level of the evaluatee, therefore reducing operational risk on behalf of the CSq/CC.

4.5. Supplemental (SUPP) Evaluations. SUPP Evaluations are used by commanders to ensure standardization of operations and to identify and evaluate implemented solutions to operational problems (e.g., new systems, negative evaluation trends, negative operational trends). The form and content of a SUPP evaluation is at the discretion of the FGS/CC.

4.5.1. Execution. SUPP evaluations are different than crewmember QUAL Evaluations because they are more limited in scope and duration.

4.5.2. The FGS/CC directing the SUPP evaluation determines the areas for evaluation based on recommendation from the Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval or Senior Line Evaluator. The Chief of Stan/Eval or Senior Line Evaluator determines the method of evaluation, is responsible for administrative management of data collection, and reports results as directed by the Commander.

4.5.3. Each SUPP evaluation resets periodic evaluation currency provided they meet or exceed ProVal requirements.

4.6. Re-evaluations. Re-evaluations are used to evaluate spacecrew members after completion of all remedial actions resulting from a Qualification Level 3 (Q3) evaluation rating.

4.6.1. At a minimum, a re-evaluation must include all tasks in which the evaluatee received a U grade and any tasks not administered due to early termination. **(T-2)**

4.6.2. If possible, a different Line Evaluator will conduct the re-evaluation (not the Line Evaluator who conducted the initial evaluation resulting in the Q3 rating).

4.6.3. If an individual earns a Q3 rating on a re-evaluation, an Academic Review Board will be held IAW CFCMAN 13-602RG-1V1, section 3.3.6.

4.6.4. The highest rating achievable following a Q3 is a Q2, regardless of material evaluated.

4.7. Remedial Action. All grades of Qualified-minus (Q-) or U require action to remedy the deficiency in knowledge or performance. Remedial actions may include:

4.7.1. At the discretion of the evaluator, minor remedial re-training may be accomplished by the evaluator during the out brief.

4.7.2. For Q- only, if an evaluatee self-identifies the deviation during the evaluation debrief and, in the evaluator's judgment, demonstrates thorough understanding of correct procedures, root cause, and fix actions, no remedial action is required for that deviation.

4.8. No-Notice Evaluation Procedures and Guidance.

4.8.1. Approval authority from FGS/CC or FGS/CD and current CSq/CC is required. Must regain approval when new leadership takes over. Any of these individuals hold the authority to pause the no-notice evaluation program at any time due to operational limitations.

4.8.2. Approval from the on-duty Crew/CC is required prior to starting the evaluation.

4.8.3. The evaluator must give the specific real-world pre-brief for the evaluatee & on-duty crew from the Evaluator Handbook prior to beginning evaluation.

4.8.4. The Senior Line Evaluator holds the authority to determine if the task coverage observed meets ProVal requirements.

4.8.5. When an evaluation is conducted on the real-world WS and the potential exists for the crew member to be rated Q3, the evaluator must ensure the evaluatee is supervised by line instructor or line evaluator certified in the same crew position until the evaluatee's qualification status is determined or a CMR crew member certified in the same position relieves the evaluatee.

Chapter 5

SPACECREW EVALUATIONS CRITERIA

5.1. General. The grading criteria contained in this chapter apply to evaluations for RG-1 WS spacecrew operators. These criteria were derived from experience, policies, and procedures set forth in WS manuals and other directives. Evaluators should realize that grading criteria contained herein cannot accommodate every situation. Written parameters must be tempered with mission objectives and task accomplishment in the determination of overall spacecrew performance. **(T-2)** Requirements for each evaluation are detailed throughout this chapter.

5.2. Examinations and Performance. The evaluator will follow a pre-planned and approved script and/or scenario to evaluate a member and ensure standardization and consistency of evaluations across the WS.

5.3. Crew Position Evaluation Criteria. Evaluation grading criteria are common to all crew positions and will be used for all applicable evaluations. **(T-2)** Reference AFI 13-602V2 paragraph 4.5 for definitions and guidance on grading and qualifications levels. Failure to satisfy all requirements in a Qualified (Q) may result in a Q- or a U grade. **(T-2)** The Training and Performance Standards (TEPS) are derived from the MTL and will be evaluated with criteria described in the following sections. **(T-2)**

5.3.1. All tasks covered in the evaluation will be graded as Meeting Standards *Q*, Below Standards *Q-*, or Unsatisfactory *U* in accordance with unit-level guidance. Discrepancies will be documented for each task graded as a *Q-* or *U*.

5.3.1.1. “Q” indicates the evaluatee is qualified to perform the task/subtasks at the desired level of performance. The evaluatee demonstrated both satisfactory knowledge and performed all required duties within prescribed tolerances and accomplished the assigned mission.

5.3.1.2. “Q-” indicates the evaluatee is qualified to perform the task/subtasks. The evaluatee demonstrated limited knowledge and/or marginal performance within the established procedures or standards but did not adversely affect mission accomplishment, jeopardize safety, or risk damage to equipment. Q- tolerances must not jeopardize safety or be a breach of discipline. A Q- rating does not dictate additional training, but training can be assigned at evaluator discretion.

5.3.1.3. “U” indicates the evaluatee is not qualified to perform the task/sub task. The evaluatee demonstrated insufficient knowledge and/or performance. The evaluatee performance was outside allowable parameters or deviations from prescribed procedures and tolerances adversely affecting mission accomplishment, compromising safety, or risking damage to equipment. U rating requires additional training to be directed via Form 8.

5.3.2. **Table 5.1** showcases an example of one unclassified essential task, one unclassified non-essential task, and one unclassified critical task. The RG-1 TEPS are classified and are on SGN at 1 SOPS Share (I:) > 1 SOPS TEPS Working Group > TEPS_final_CAO_01MAR2024.pdf.

Table 5.1. Evaluation Criteria.

ESSENTIAL TASK (E)					
D03A	Perform CREW CHANGEOVER	SVO	CCH	CREW/CC	MP
		3c	3c	3c	3c
GRADE					
1. Q Rating.	1.1. Enter crew and/or positional changeover checklist				
2. Q-Rating.	2.1. Failure to review SORDs 2.2. Failure to perform CIF/TP/PEX review 2.3. Failure to perform changeover brief 2.4. Failure to perform positional changeover brief 2.5. Failure to perform shift mission planning or crew debrief 2.6. Failure to review logs and guidance documents				
3. U Rating.	3.1. Failure to enter crew and/or positional changeover checklist 3.2. Failure to comprehend current scenario and execute the appropriate actions, which could result in risk to equipment, personnel, or mission				
NON-ESSENTIAL TASK (N)					
E05A	Perform SL-5 REAL-TIME SCHEDULE CHANGE (N)	SVO	CCH	CREW/CC	MP
		3c			
GRADE					
1. Q Rating.	1.1. Perform Real-Time schedule change				
2. Q-Rating.	2.1. Failure to log actions				

3. U Rating.					
CRITICAL TASK (C)					
*D06G	PERFORM DATA MAINTAINER ACTIONS (C)	SVO	CCH	CREW/CC	MP
				3c	
GRADE					
1. Q Rating.	1.1. Perform TO 3.1.11 Run Data Maintainer				
2. Q- Rating.					
3. U Rating.	3.1. Failure to attempt to perform TO 3.1.11 Run Data Maintainer				

5.4. Additional Considerations.

5.4.1. A Q- rating can be assessed for any incorrect action that does not meet U rating criteria. This includes the following:

5.4.1.1. Evaluatee incorrectly directs/performs required actions, which may include faulty prioritization, but arrives at the correct result.

5.4.1.2. Evaluatee completes all required actions but displays a clear lack of knowledge/proficiency in non-critical portions of a task/subtask.

5.4.1.3. Evaluatee neglects to implement proper checklist discipline resulting in no impact to operations.

5.4.1.4. Any procedural error, omission, or deficiency which is not significant enough to meet U rating criteria.

5.4.1.5. Accomplishing tasks when not required resulting in no impact to operations. This error is subject to evaluator subjectivity and must be assessed with the use of sound judgment.

5.4.2. Grade critical tasks/subtasks as either Q or U. Critical tasks/subtasks are those tasks resulting in operational mission failure, damage to mission equipment, endangerment of human life, serious injury, or death when performed incorrectly.

5.5. Qualification Levels. Upon completion of all portions of an evaluation, evaluators determine and award a member's overall qualification rating as Q1, Q2 or Q3. Q1 and Q2 ratings indicate that a member is qualified to perform unsupervised space operations duties, whereas a Q3 rating indicates that the member is not qualified to perform space operations duties. If at any point

during an evaluation, an evaluator recognizes that an individual's performance will result in a Q3 rating, the evaluator may terminate the evaluation unless other members in a crew evaluation still have a possibility of earning a Q1 or Q2 rating. **(T-2)**

5.5.1. Qualification Level 1 (Q1). The operator demonstrated desired performance and knowledge of procedures, equipment, and directives within tolerances specified in the grading criteria. This will be awarded when no discrepancies were noted or may be awarded when discrepancies are noted if all the following criteria are met: **(T-2)**

5.5.1.1. No tasks were graded as Unsatisfactory (U).

5.5.1.2. Remedial action was accomplished for all discrepancies following the evaluation in a debrief or during the out brief.

5.5.1.3. Evaluators should also consider the Mission Delta 9 Core Competencies (Knowledge, Critical Thinking, Communication, Teamwork, Decision Making Under Stress, Time Management, and Security Consciousness) when determining whether an evaluatee earned a Q1 rating.

5.5.2. Qualification Level 2 (Q2). The operator demonstrated the ability to perform duties safely, but one of the following criteria was met: **(T-2)**

5.5.2.1. There were one or more tasks/subtasks where additional training was assigned.

5.5.2.2. A grade of U was assessed to a non-critical task/subtask (as annotated on the squadron MTL).

5.5.2.3. In the judgement of the evaluator, the member's overall performance did not warrant a Q1 rating. Document rationale for Q2 via AF Form 8. **(T-2)** The evaluator should consider the Mission Delta 9 Core Competencies ([paragraph 5.5.1.3](#)) when making this determination.

5.5.3. Qualification Level 3 (Q3). The operator demonstrated an unacceptable level of performance, knowledge, or safety and one of the following criteria was met: **(T-2)**

5.5.3.1. A grade of U was assessed to a critical task/subtask (as annotated on the squadron MTL).

5.5.3.2. In the judgement of the evaluator, the member is not qualified to perform space operations duties. Document rationale for Q3 via AF Form 8. **(T-2)** The evaluator should consider overall risk to mission and the Mission Delta 9 Core Competencies ([paragraph 5.5.1.3](#)) when making this determination.

5.5.3.3. If an individual earns a Q3 rating on a Positional Upgrade Evaluation, the FGS/CC must be notified to determine appropriate corrective action. The FGS/CC can recommend additional training and re-evaluation, removal from UT, and/or removal of existing BMQ certifications.

5.5.3.4. If an individual earns a Q3 rating on a re-evaluation, reference CFCMAN 13-602RG-1V1, paragraph 3.3.6.

5.6. Remedial Actions. Remedial action is accomplished during the evaluation out brief wherein the evaluator discusses the discrepancy with the evaluatee and determines the evaluatee has gained the necessary knowledge or proficiency to remedy the discrepancy. There is a broad scope of

potential remedial actions based upon the severity of the discrepancy, overall qualification level awarded, and evaluatee's attitude.

5.6.1. If an evaluatee self-identifies the deviation during the evaluation debrief and, in the evaluator's judgment, demonstrates thorough understanding of correct procedures, root cause, and fix actions, no further remedial action is required for the specific deviation.

5.6.2. Minor momentary deviations are acceptable, provided the evaluatee applies prompt corrective action and such deviations do not jeopardize safety or mission accomplishment. Consider cumulative deviations when determining the task/subtask grade.

5.7. Individualized Training. Individualized Training (IT) is remedial training recommended by a Line Evaluator and directed by the FGS/CC to remedy a discrepancy identified during an evaluation that cannot be remedied with remedial action during the evaluation debrief.

5.7.1. A U grade requires IT as recommended by the evaluator.

5.7.2. IT is accomplished by Line Instructors, or TTE Instructors as applicable, and may include classroom instruction and simulator/emulator training.

5.7.3. To deem IT complete, the evaluatee must demonstrate satisfactory knowledge or proficiency to the administering instructor. The instructor conducting the IT will document the training via PEX before the space crewmember returns to operations.

5.7.4. IT resulting from a Q3 evaluation must culminate with a Pre-Eval performance test, as documented in PEX. The member must earn a SAT rating on the Pre-Eval to be eligible for a re-evaluation.

5.8. Failure to Pass a Positional Upgrade Evaluation. When a spacecrew member receives a Q3 on a positional upgrade evaluation, the spacecrew member receives IT prior to a re-evaluation. If the member fails again, the FGS/CC will determine the appropriate corrective actions (i.e., the spacecrew member receives additional training prior to another evaluation, be removed from upgrade training, and/or retain existing qualification to perform duties in previous positions). **(T-2)**

5.9. Commander-Directed Downgrade. FGS/CCs can direct a downgrade independent of an evaluation if a spacecrew member demonstrates deficiencies in real-world operations. (examples of downgrades include: removal of instructor/evaluator qualification, change in experience level, loss of BMQ/CMR, etc.)

5.9.1. For performance-related cases only (e.g., spacecrew discipline and safety), direct observation of an incident can be reported by any current and qualified spacecrew member to an evaluator, who will then assess the situation in consultation with the Senior Line Evaluator and FGS/CC. **(T-2)**

5.9.2. For non-performance related cases that lead a FGS/CC to lose confidence in the member's ability to safely perform their positional duties, do not use a downgrade or disqualification as a substitute for appropriate disciplinary measures (e.g., verbal counseling, Letter of Counseling, Letter of Reprimand, and/or non-judicial punishment). Exceptions to this can be made for crew leadership positions (Crew Commander or Crew Chief) at FGS/CC discretion. Spacecrew leaders should be held to higher standards of good order and discipline.

5.9.3. For downgrades resulting from a Q3 or removal of qualification, the affected spacecrew member will not perform mission duties without instructor supervision until all FGS/CC requirements have been met to return the member to CMR status.

Chapter 6

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

6.1. Pre-evaluation requirements. Pre-evaluation procedures should be followed IAW the Mission Delta 9 Evaluator Handbook.

6.1.1. Ensure evaluation is scheduled via Outlook calendar invitation. Invitation should include evaluator, evaluatee, evaluatee's instructor (if QUAL eval), evaluation support staff (if applicable), Senior Line Evaluator, and MD 9/S9 Standardizations branch personnel. Invitation should also include the location of the evaluation.

6.1.2. Senior Line Evaluator will verify that assigned evaluator did not teach 50% or more of the evaluatee's QT course or administer the pre-evaluation performance test (for QUAL evals) or administer initial eval (if re-evaluation).

6.1.3. Check script exposure log to ensure the evaluatee has not had prior exposure.

6.1.4. Review script for currency, as well as familiarity with task coverage and requisite set-up procedures.

6.1.5. Ensure the evaluatee has accomplished a pre-evaluation performance test with an instructor, resulting in a SAT rating (for QUAL eval).

6.1.6. Check operational status via PEX Go/No-Go for both evaluator and evaluatee.

6.1.7. Evaluators will ensure all required publications (e.g., evaluation scripts, binders) are available and current prior to starting an evaluation. Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval will maintain a list of all required evaluation materials.

6.1.8. Schedule conference room with certifying official for out brief. See **Table 6.1** for out brief attendees. Include optional attendees on calendar invite for situational awareness.

6.1.9. FGS/CC certifying authority can only be delegated to the Senior Enlisted Leader, Deputy Commander, or incoming Combat Squadron Commander. Any designee will back-brief the FGS/CC as soon as possible.

6.1.10. Evaluation pre-brief will be accomplished IAW the Mission Delta 9 Evaluator Handbook. For real-world evaluations, the real-world announcement pre-brief will be given to the on-duty crew.

6.1.11. For real-world evaluations, the on-duty Crew Commander must give approval for the evaluation. Disapproval should only be given due to operational events for which an evaluation could cause mission failure or degradation.

6.1.12. The evaluator will take note of evaluation start time to enforce the associated time limit.

Table 6.1. Out Brief Attendees.

Evaluation Type:	Attendees:	If Q3 Rating:
Initial QUAL	<u>Required:</u> Evaluatee, Evaluator, FGS/CC (or designee IAW para. 6.1.8.), Lead instructor <u>Optional:</u> Senior Line Evaluator, TTE/CC, Chief of Stan/Eval	Required attendees also include Chief of Stan/Eval, Senior Line Evaluator, and TTE/CC. Optional attendees can include FGS/SEL or First Sergeant if deemed appropriate.
ProVal	<u>Required:</u> Evaluatee, Evaluator, FGS/CC (or designee IAW para. 6.1.8.) <u>Optional:</u> Senior Line Evaluator, TTE/CC, Chief of Stan/Eval	

6.2. During the Evaluation.

6.2.1. During the evaluation, the evaluator will follow the script and use conditional responses and standardized verbiage if needed to respond to questions or present information, IAW the Mission Delta 9 Evaluator Handbook.

6.2.2. From official scenario start time, all events observed by the evaluator will be evaluated until the evaluation is officially briefed as terminated.

6.3. Post-Evaluation Actions.

Post-evaluation procedures should be followed IAW the Mission Delta 9 Evaluator Handbook.

6.3.1. Immediately following the evaluation, the evaluatee (whether individual or spacecrew) will be offered the opportunity to perform a debrief. The purpose of which is to self-identify errors or learning points. If errors are self-identified and knowledge of corrective actions is demonstrated, it could potentially impact the grading of the evaluation. This would not negate the error; however, it could factor into any grading aspects where evaluator discretion is utilized for decision making.

6.3.2. The outcome and grading of the evaluation will not be discussed with the evaluatee prior to the formal out brief.

6.3.3. Upon completion of an evaluation, evaluators will determine what, if any, errors were committed, resolve any evaluation issues, document evaluation results and rating, out brief the evaluation, then recommend training and/or certification for the evaluatee, as required.

6.3.4. The evaluator should accomplish error determination as soon as possible after the evaluation. They should consult with at least one other certified evaluator to discuss discrepancies and grade IAW AFI 13-602V2 and [Chapter 4](#) of this document. Subject Matter

Experts should be consulted if necessary to determine potential impacts of evaluatee actions. If considering an overall Q3 rating, the Senior Line Evaluator must be consulted, who will inform the Chief of Stan Eval.

6.3.4.1. Error determination must be based upon the actions/inactions of the evaluatee.

6.3.4.2. Do not assess an error when the evaluatee incorrectly responds to erroneous status due to equipment failure or evaluator error. However, there may be reasons for recommending training and/or restricted status to ensure identified deficiencies are remedied.

6.3.4.3. The evaluator will draft an AF Form 8 IAW **Chapter 6** of this document. The form will be written, reviewed, and printed prior to the out brief.

6.3.5. Determine and document the overall evaluation(s) rating.

6.3.6. Determine appropriate remedial training recommendation, if required, for approval by the certifying official.

6.4. Evaluation Out brief. An out brief is mandatory following the completion of all evaluations. The purpose of the out brief is to inform the evaluatee of his/her overall performance, identify any errors, and complete any remedial actions.

6.4.1. Out briefs are conducted after completion of the evaluation, outside of the evaluation environment, and conducted as soon as practical, but no longer than one week after evaluation completion. Notify evaluatees of the out brief time and location upon completion of the evaluation.

6.4.2. Do not disclose overall qualification level or grades for specific tasks/subtasks to evaluatee(s) prior to the formal out brief.

6.4.3. Out briefs will be conducted with the FGS/CC or designee, IAW **paragraph 6.1.8**. Reference **Table 6.1** for additional attendees.

6.4.4. The formality of the out brief is up to FGS/CC (or designee) discretion; however, it is highly encouraged to conduct a formal out brief for First Term Guardians and Initial QUAL evaluations.

6.5. Training Feedback.

6.5.1. The Senior Line Evaluator provides feedback to the Senior Line Instructor and Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval following all ProVals to identify and track highly missed tasks.

6.5.2. The Senior Line Evaluator provides feedback to the Tactics and Training Element (TTE) and Mission Delta Chief of Stan/Eval following all QUAL evaluations to identify and track high missed Qualification Training (QT) tasks.

Chapter 7

SCRIPTS

7.1. Evaluation Scenarios. Evaluations should mirror the operational environment to the maximum extent possible.

7.1.1. Evaluate performance tasks as identified on the squadron MTL using evaluation scenarios. Scenarios may be for a single task or a sequence of tasks. They may be written for an individual or a spacecrew.

7.1.2. QUAL evaluations and re-evaluations will only be conducted in an off-line environment (e.g. SST).

7.1.3. Evaluations that fail to meet the requirements identified in the AFI 13-602V2 and this instruction will not be considered valid for any certification, will not reset periodic evaluation requirements, will not be recorded in PEX, and will not have any associated post-evaluation actions. **(T-2)**

7.1.4. Base evaluation scenario results on successfully meeting each task/subtask performance standard.

7.2. Evaluation Scripts. Design and use scripts to conduct evaluation scenarios. Include instructions for evaluators, starting status, task coverage, scenario support personnel, simulated inputs, status card inputs, and expected outcomes. **(T-2)**

7.2.1. Describe the process of coordinating any planned actions to prevent the release of simulation information into the real-world environment or conflicts with on-going operations with the required personnel.

7.2.2. Script stimuli will be identified by area/task/subtask, estimated scenario run times, task description, scenario support personnel initiation/response agency, and notes/expected responses (e.g., MTL, notes, evaluator notes, and expected evaluatee response).

7.2.3. All spacecrew members participating in the evaluation will have time allotted to participate in and adhere to all required mission planning, mission briefing, mission execution, and mission debriefing requirements.

7.2.4. Each script should have a specified maximum allowable run time. Script authors should consider any relevant timing standards as well as real-world operational factors that the evaluatees should be effectively prepared for.

7.2.5. Estimated scenario run times are not necessarily the same as task-specific timing standards. Any specified timing standards should also be listed.

7.2.6. Problem presentation and equipment response must comply with MTL and TEPS constraints.

7.2.7. Use status cards to introduce stimuli that cannot be presented in a more realistic manner. Status cards must have sufficient information for the evaluatee to clearly understand the input, without additional clarification. Inputs should be as realistic as possible. Ensure all simulation material is clearly marked.

7.2.8. Create realistic operational environments requiring the evaluatee to prioritize actions.

7.2.8.1. If unrelated status is presented during an execution of a task as the result of equipment malfunction or evaluator/simulator-switch action or inaction, but the status does not have an impact on the crew's ability to effectively execute its actions, the scenario event is considered valid. However, the evaluator should adjust the running time clock to allot for time spent reacting to the unrelated task.

7.2.8.2. If unrelated status is presented during an execution of a task as the result of equipment malfunction or evaluator/simulator-switch action or inaction, and the status has an impact upon the crew's ability to effectively execute its actions, the scenario event is invalid. Do not assess an error if the evaluatee incorrectly responds during invalid events. However, there may be reasons for recommending re-training or remedial action (e.g., errors during the event that demonstrate insufficient knowledge). It is best practice to pause the scenario, if possible, to resolve the unrelated status before proceeding with the remainder of the evaluation.

7.2.8.3. Scenarios should be designed to evaluate concepts and avoid presentation of excessive weapon system status. While maintaining realism to real-world operations, evaluators should make efforts to ensure no more than three simultaneous problems are presented at a time.

7.2.9. For QUAL evaluations and ProVals, units will maintain at least two scripts for each evaluation type and crew position with at least 30% task/subtask variation between scripts. Scripts may be used for multiple crew positions provided they share a significant number of performance tasks (i.e. Mission Planner and Crew Commander).

Chapter 8

DOCUMENTATION

8.1. Scope. Employment of the spacecrew qualification and certification program requires accurate and standardized documentation. The qualifications on which a spacecrew member is evaluated are determined from the MTL.

8.1.1. Evaluators are responsible for ensuring their documentation is accurate and thorough. Use only USSF approved forms to document evaluations, qualifications, and CMR certifications. The following AF forms are maintained in PEX and are transferred with the spacecrew member to all subsequent duty assignments: **(T-2)**

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

8.1.1.2. AF Form 942, *Record of Evaluation*

8.1.1.3. AF Form 4348, *USAF Aircrew Certifications*

8.1.1.4. PEX-generated MFRs, optional for supporting documentation

8.1.2. Evaluation documentation is required for each evaluation event and every individual evaluated/observed.

8.2. Documentation Requirements. The following information will be documented on the AF Form 8. **(T-2)**

8.2.1. All discrepancies will be documented and attributed to a task/subtask on the squadron MTL. Additionally, for each discrepancy, a root cause should be identified IAW the Mission Delta 9 Evaluator Handbook as well as an operational impact and a description of evaluatee actions.

8.2.2. All tasks which the evaluatee was exposed to during the evaluation event, whether simulated or on a real-world system.

8.2.3. Delinquency date. Evaluations are considered current for 12 months, unless the FGS/CC directs a shorter timeline.

8.2.4. Evaluatee strengths, weaknesses, and attitude should be discussed.

8.2.5. Space should be provided for certifying official remarks, to include decisions on corrective actions or general comments, if applicable.

8.3. Patriot Excalibur (PEX). PEX contains the source documents and Memorandums for Record constituting the history and qualification for each member. **(T-2)**

8.3.1. Evaluation records will be maintained in PEX and are authorized provided proper security measures, backup capability, and sustainment plans are in place.

8.3.2. Maintaining Individual Qualification Folders (IQF). FGS/CCs will ensure each member who is CMR has an IQF. FGS/CCs can delegate IQF responsibilities.

8.3.3. PEX will contain a complete record of the spacecrew member's evaluation history across their entire career.

8.3.4. FGS/CCs will establish local guidance to maintain and review unit IQFs and applicable forms.

8.4. Quarterly Audits. The Senior Line Evaluator is responsible for conducting quarterly IQF audits for CMR members. The checks they are conducting should be IAW the 2025 CFC Patriot Excalibur (PEX) Standardized Procedures for CFC, Attachment 2. **(T-2)**

8.4.1. If discrepancies are found, the Senior Line Evaluator will inform the member, along with their Crew/CC or relevant line instructor/evaluator.

8.4.2. Discrepancies should be reported to the Chief of Stan/Eval so all discrepancies can be stated in the final report.

JARED A. HOFFMAN, Col, USSF
Asst. Deputy Commander, Operations, Plans,
Training and Force Development

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

AFI 13-602V2, *Spacecrew Standardization and Evaluation Program*, 11 October 2019
AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, 23 March 2020
CFCMAN 13-602RG-1V1, *RG-1 – Training*, 7 May 2027
DAFI 90-160, *Publications and Forms Management*, 14 April 2022
DAFMAN 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*, 18 October 2023
TO 00-5-1, *AF Technical Order System*, 19 November 2024

Prescribed Forms

None

Adopted Forms

AF Form 8, *Certificate of Aircrew Qualification*.
AF Form 942, *Record of Evaluation*
AF Form 4348, *USAF Aircrew Certifications*
DD Form 2861, *Cross-Reference*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AFI—Air Force Instruction
BMQ—Basic Mission Qualified
CC—Commander
CFC—Combat Force Command
CFCMAN—Combat Force Command Manual
CIF—Crew Information File
CMR—Combat Mission Ready
CRV—Crew Readiness Verifications
CT—Combat Training
DAF—Department of the Air Force
DAFGM—Department of the Air Force Guidance Memorandum
DAFI—Department of the Air Force Instruction
DAFMAN—Department of the Air Force Manual
EQC—Evaluator Qualification Course

EXP—Experienced
FGS—Force Generation Squadron
HQ—Headquarters
IAW—In Accordance With
IQF—Individual Qualification Folder
MD—Mission Delta
MTL—Master Task List
N-CMR—Non-Combat Mission Ready
OCR—Office of Coordinating Responsibility
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
PEX—Patriot Excalibur
ProVal—Proficiency Validation
QUAL—Qualification
RSP—Ready Spacecrew Program
RT—Recurring Training
RTM—RSP Tasking Memorandum
SBD—Space Base Delta
SPAFORGEN—Space Force Generation
SPFGM—Space Force Guidance Memorandum
Stan/Eval—Standardization and Evaluation
TO—Technical Order
TTP—Tactics Techniques, and Procedures
USAF—United States Air Force
USSF—United States Space Force
UT—Upgrade Training
WS—Weapon System

Office Symbols

MD 9 S9—Mission Delta 9 Standardization & Evaluations
CFC/S35Z—Combat Forces Command Space Control Division
CFC/S73—Combat Forces Command Training and Readiness