

**BY ORDER OF THE  
SUPERINTENDENT**

**HQ UNITED STATES AIR FORCE  
ACADEMY INSTRUCTION 36-2401**

**31 DECEMBER 2020**

**Communications and Information**

**MILITARY PERFORMANCE  
APPRAISAL**



**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](http://www.e-publishing.af.mil).

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

---

OPR: USAFA/CWVV

Certified by: USAFA/CWC  
(Col Clarence Lukes)

Supersedes: USAFAI36-2401,  
14 Nov 2013

Pages: 54

---

This instruction implements guidance to Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 36-24, *Military Evaluations*. It prescribes United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) responsibilities for all mission elements (ME) to provide cadet feedback and procedures for the administration of the Military Performance Appraisal (MPA) and the MPA Application in the Cadet Administrative Information System (CAMIS) (to include its replacement, herein referred to as Student Information System (SIS)) and the Learning Management System (LMS), currently Blackboard. This instruction applies to all personnel who evaluate and/or provide feedback to cadets on their aptitude for commissioned service and officership potential. AFPD 36-24 should be reviewed by all USAFA personnel needing further guidance on the cadet evaluation system. This publication does not apply to Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) units or the Air National Guard (ANG). Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using Air Force (AF) Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*. Ensure all records generated as a result of processes prescribed in this publication adhere to Air Force Instruction 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and are disposed in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule, which is located in the Air Force Records Information Management System.

This instruction requires the collection and maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974. The authorities to collect and maintain the data prescribed in this instruction are Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 8013, *Secretary of the AF* and 8032, *The Air Staff General Duties*. System of Records Notice F036 AF-PC M, *Officer Promotion and Appointment*, and F036 AF-

PC Q, *Personnel Data System (PDS)*, apply. Ensure that all records created by this instruction are maintained and disposed of in accordance with AF Records Disposition Schedule.

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

The instruction incorporates updates to Summer MPA policies that were voted on and approved by the Academy Board during Summer 2019. Additionally, the controlled distribution average of Airfield, Athletics, and key special programs (NCLS and SPARK) MPAs have been updated to better account for the time and leadership development that occurs in these activities.

1.	OVERVIEW .....	3
2.	MPA PROGRAM EXECUTION .....	14
3.	SEMESTER MPA COMPONENTS .....	17
4.	MPA OBJECTIVE COMPONENTS AND SCORING GUIDELINES.....	18
5.	MPA SUBJECTIVE SCORING METHODOLOGY AND COMPONENTS .....	19
6.	PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK PROCESS.....	19
7.	AFCW FORM 707, CADET PERFORMANCE REPORT PROCESS .....	23
8.	AFCW FORM 707B, EXTERNAL CADET PERFORMANCE REPORT PROCESS .....	27
9.	EXCEPTIONAL PROGRAMS .....	29
10.	DEFICIENCIES AND PROBATION .....	30
11.	APPEALS AND CORRECTING EVALUATIONS.....	31
12.	PROGRAM OVERSIGHT AND ASSESSMENT .....	32
	<b>Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION</b>	<b>36</b>
	<b>Attachment 3—MPA POINT DISTRIBUTION AND 4.0 CONVERSION SCALE</b>	<b>41</b>
	<b>Attachment 4—EXPANDED MPA RUBRIC AND PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS</b>	<b>43</b>
	<b>Attachment 5—MPA MISSION ELEMENT RUBRICS</b>	<b>49</b>
	<b>Attachment 6—STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM AND LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM</b>	<b>50</b>
	<b>Attachment 7—TABLE A7.1. MAJOR ASSESSMENT EVENT. 110 PTS MAX; 1PT SEPARATION BETWEEN EACH SQUADRON</b>	<b>51</b>
	<b>Attachment 8—Summer MPA</b>	<b>52</b>

## 1. OVERVIEW

1.1. **Purpose.** The purpose and intent of the Military Performance Appraisal (MPA) process is to provide a systematic developmental and evaluation mechanism to develop cadets into officers of character and compare them to their peers. To accomplish this, there are several supportive outcomes required of the MPA system. The first is to establish performance standards and expectations for ratee's, meaningful feedback on how well the ratee is meeting those expectations, and direction on how to better meet those established standards and expectations. The second is to provide a reliable, long-term, cumulative record of performance. The third is to provide supervisors, enlisted leaders, and commanders with sound information to assist in identifying personnel for career and personnel management decisions. The fourth is to document substantive negative behavioral trends that may necessarily preclude future commissioning.

1.1.1. To accomplish these purposes, the evaluation system focuses on performance. How well the individual does their job, and the qualities the individual brings to the job, are of paramount importance to the Air Force. Performance is most important for successful mission accomplishment. It is also important for development of skills and leadership abilities and in determining who will be selected for higher level leadership positions through the Four-class system, and a variety of competitive USAFA programs. The evaluation system emphasizes the importance of performance in several ways--using periodic performance feedback, as the basis for formal evaluations, and routine assessment of the skills, knowledge, and abilities USAFA requires of officer candidates.

1.1.2. The MPA process provides cadets a means to develop through feedback within their cadet chain, and also serves as an assessment tool measuring cadet performance and effectiveness in achieving USAFA Outcomes and Air Force Pre-commissioning requirements. Thus, the MPA program is intentionally aligned with Commissioning Outcomes outlined in AFI 36-2014, *Pre- Commissioning Programs*; Air Force Officer Evaluation criteria from AFI 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems*; and USAFA Institutional Competencies. The Performance Dimensions identified at the core of the performance appraisal process were designed based upon the Commissioning Outcomes outlined in AFI 36-2014, the Air Force Core Values as detailed in AFD-150826-047, *The Little Blue Book*, and key leadership competencies from Air Force Handbook 1, *The Airman Handbook*. The MPA process is intended to be a developmental program for cadets and also serves as a mechanism to assess each cadet's proficiency in the skills, knowledge, and abilities required of them in their respective stage of development.

1.1.3. The MPA process runs over the course of an Academic semester during the normal cadet Academic year, and throughout the summer leadership programs. Final output of this process each semester is a numerical MPA value on a 0.00 to 4.00 scale. MPA value has both objective and subjective components. Overall semester MPA values become part of each cadet's permanent cadet record of performance and represent the military component of each cadet's Overall Performance Average (OPA).

1.2. The objective of the MPA program is to help cadets internalize Air Force Core Values by providing cadets with an accurate reflection of their officership development, using

feedback and the competency-based MPA process. A competency-based rating process ensures the same standard for every cadet.

### 1.3. Roles and Responsibilities.

#### 1.3.1. Line Roles and Responsibilities.

1.3.1.1. Commandant of Cadets. Establish requirements for the MPA System and ensure all USAFA Mission Elements (MEs) understand and support the MPA program. Serves as the rater and primary mentor for the Cadet Wing Commander, also serves as the reviewer and final MPA subjective ranking assigner for all cadets assigned to the authorized Cadet Wing Staff positions each semester and assumes administrative command and control (ADCON) of all cadets assigned to the Cadet Wing Staff each semester.

1.3.1.2. Group AOCs (GAOC). Responsible for oversight and administration of the semester MPA process for cadets temporarily assigned to them each semester on their respective Cadet Group Staffs. The Group AOC serves as the additional rater for their respective cadet group commanders and IAW AFCWI 36-3501, *Cadet Standards & Duties*, Annex A, are their primary permanent party mentors. GAOCs also serve as the reviewer and final MPA subjective ranking assigners for all cadets assigned to their respective authorized Cadet Group Staff positions each semester. GAOCs will review and certify all appraisals for all cadets on their Cadet Group Staff each semester. GAOCs assume ADCON of all cadets assigned to the Cadet Group Staff each semester.

1.3.1.3. Squadron AOCs. Squadron AOCs are responsible for oversight and administration of the semester MPA process for cadets assigned to their squadron. Squadron AOCs serve as the raters for their cadet squadron commanders and, IAW AFCWI 36-3501, *Cadet Standards & Duties*, Annex A, are their primary permanent party mentors. The Squadron AOC also serves as the reviewer and final MPA subjective ranking assigner for all cadets assigned to their authorized squadron positions each semester. AOCs will review and certify all appraisals for all cadets under their command. Squadron AOCs retain ADCON of all cadets assigned to their squadron who are not assigned to Cadet Group or Cadet Wing staff each semester.

1.3.1.4. Squadron Academy Military Trainers (AMTs). As enlisted mentors, AMTs are critical to the cadets' successful development through all stages of the Four-class system. Also, the AMT is responsible for ensuring the squadron organizational structure is loaded correctly into the designated interface. AMTs will have Learning Management System (LMS) access that allows them to review appraisals for all cadets assigned to the squadron. AMTs are encouraged to submit external appraisals on any cadet within their assigned squadron, but they are not required to do so.

1.3.1.5. Cadet Wing Chain of Command (CW CoC). During the semester, each cadet supervisor, as outlined in IAW AFCWI 36-3501, *Cadet Standards & Duties*, Annex A, will provide at a minimum two developmental feedbacks (initial and midterm) and one final evaluation (Cadet Performance Report) to each cadet whom they directly supervise in their squadron of assignment (see AFCWI 36-3501). Each cadet's additional rater will review the evaluation of the cadet before it is sent to the

AOC. The CW CoC will base their feedbacks and assessment on actions observed on-duty in the squadron, group, or wing, and also off-duty when the cadet is not performing any official duty as outlined in the Personal/Interpersonal Team Organizations (PITO) model. This is to provide the CW CoC first-hand understanding of the US Air Force whole-person concept, while giving the cadet a more accurate assessment to promote.

1.3.1.5.1. Cadet Commanders (Wing, Group, and Squadron) shall provide their respective Information Technology (IT) Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) a completed staffing spreadsheet prior to taking command.

1.3.1.5.2. All cadet IT NCOs will report for training for each semester's transition days (see respective CW Notice to Airmen for specific time and location) with a completed Squadron, Group, and Wing Staffing spreadsheet ready for input into LMS.

1.3.1.5.3. All cadet raters throughout the process are required to be familiar with the MPA competencies, so they may make informed ratings after long-term observations.

### 1.3.2. Staff Roles and Responsibilities

1.3.2.1. Cadet Wing (CW) Standardization & Evaluations (Stan/Eval). Stan/Eval serves as the OPR for the MPA program administration. As the OPR, Stan/Eval will:

1.3.2.1.1. Develop, publish, and execute the MPA timeline, integrated with the USAFA master calendar. Stan/Eval has the authority to make timeline adjustments and execution of the USAFA Master Calendar events. See [attachment 2](#) for the normal MPA timeline.

1.3.2.1.2. Develop and conduct required training for all permanent party raters and the cadet wing concerning the MPA process and procedures. Training will occur annually to capture new personnel and cadets, and by semester for each new cadet IT NCO. Stan/Eval will train ME representatives who will act as POCs and will be responsible for training their respective organizations.

1.3.2.1.3. Review and revise AFCWI 36-3501, to ensure that cadet squadrons, groups, and wing are properly aligned and rating chains mirror operational Air Force rating chains. Ensure AOCs and AMTs accurately input positions into LMS.

1.3.2.1.4. Answer procedural or technical questions.

1.3.2.1.5. Functions as MPA Process Owner and leads MPA Working Group.

1.3.2.1.6. Coordinate program reports with system managers to determine trends and issues with a particular competency or rating chain.

1.3.2.1.7. Ensure all raters are informed of whom they will be evaluating, when specific inputs are required, and the due date for completion of the process. The system is designed to maximize inputs for each cadet while minimizing the impact of additional workload on ME participants.

1.3.2.1.8. Tailor statistical data reports with CAMIS Program Management

Office (PMO) or successor SIS PMO, per Cadet Wing Training Support Division (CWTM) change requests.

1.3.2.1.9. Coordinate an MPA Review Committee (MPARC), chaired by the Vice Commandant of Cadets.

1.3.2.2. Cadet Wing Curriculum (CWC). Develop and implement curriculum that equips the cadet chain of command with developmental coaching and feedback skills. Integrate the feedback form (AFCW Form 724 & AFCW Form 707A), *Cadet Performance Report*, and performance dimensions into this training for cadets.

1.3.2.3. HQ USAFA/CCLD. Review and revise as necessary the competencies and performance dimensions described in **Attachment 4** of this instruction in relation to the umbrella Officer Development System (ODS). Assess the structure of the competencies for each class and evaluate the effectiveness of the MPA program in providing feedback and supporting the development of cadets into officers of character. Serve as advisors to the MPA Working Group.

1.3.2.4. Cadet Wing Training Scheduling Division (CWTS). Allocate sufficient time for cadets to implement MPA milestones located in **Attachment 2** into the Cadet Military Training Schedule (CMTS). Specifically, the CMTS must provide time for: initial feedback, mid-term feedback, rater appraisal inputs into LMS, additional rater inputs into LMS, AOC review and certification, and final appraisal debriefs between raters and subordinates.

### 1.3.3. Mission Element Roles and Responsibilities.

1.3.3.1. Dean of Faculty (DF). DF Professional Appraisal. The DF Professional Appraisal component is a qualitative assessment completed by DF instructors prior to the end of the semester in accordance with the MPA timeline published by CW Stan/Eval. The grade will be calculated on a 250 point scale based on a rubric determined by the DF appointed representative (see **Attachment 3**). Multiple ratings will be averaged into one score.

1.3.3.2. Athletic Department (AD) and 306 FTG Professional Appraisals. The AD/306 FTG Appraisal component is a qualitative assessment completed by AD and 306 FTG personnel responsible for cadet performance in their respective mission elements prior to the end of the semester in accordance with the MPA timeline published by CW Stan/Eval. Only cadets on official rosters will receive this rating. The grade will be calculated on a 250 point scale based on a standard rubric (see **Attachment 3**) using a controlled MPA distribution of 86%. Cadets not on an official AD or 306 FTG roster will receive this 250 point component based on an extrapolation of their CW Professional Subjective Appraisal.

1.3.3.2.1. The 306 FTG Appraisal component is a qualitative assessment completed by 306 FTG personnel responsible for cadet performance in their respective mission element for Prog and Final semester professional appraisals. The 306 FTG will abide by the MPA timeline published by CW Stan/Eval. At the beginning of each semester, the 306 FTG will build a roster of those cadets who will be on active flying rosters as Wings of Blue Cadre, Wings of Blue upgraders, Flying Team members, Flying Team upgraders, Soaring Instructor Pilots, and

Soaring Instructor Pilot upgraders. The 306 FTG will notify CW Stan/Eval and squadron AOCs of changes to this roster. Only cadets on the official flying rosters will receive the airfield specific performance appraisal. The grade will be calculated on a 250 point scale based on a standard rubric (see [Attachment 3](#)) using a controlled MPA distribution of 86%. If a cadet is removed from the roster or not on an official 306 FTG active flying roster (e.g., removed from flight program, DNIF, etc.), they will be rated by their squadron under the normal appraisal process with no airfield input applied.

1.3.3.3. Mission Clubs (MC). MCs are cadet clubs that enhance the mission of USAFA (such as Chorale, Drum & Bugle, Falconry, Forensics, Honor Guard, Media, Prior Enlisted Cadet Assembly, Saber Drill). The officer in charge (OIC) of the MC may complete feedback for assigned cadets and are to provide this feedback based on the performance dimensions (displayed within the mentors' scope of observation) listed in [Attachment 4](#). The voluntary feedback should be submitted directly to the AOC using the approved *Cadet Performance Report from an External Rater*, AFCW Form 707B.

1.3.3.4. Other USAFA Permanent Party Not Listed Above. USAFA faculty and staff may request to provide a cadet feedback as an optional mentor. The MPA Process Owner will validate that the cadet falls within the optional mentor's purview. If not, any permanent party member may submit input directly to the AOC/AMT, identifying the applicable competencies observed.

1.3.3.5. All officer-developers, regardless of ME, are responsible for implementing the MPA program as intended and required to attend at least one MPA training event annually. All officer developers throughout the process are responsible for reading this instruction and understanding the intent of the MPA program. Cadet developers are required to be familiar with the MPA competencies, so they may make informed ratings after long-term observations.

1.3.3.6. CAMIS or SIS Program Management Office (PMO). The CAMIS or SIS PMO shall work with CW to ensure CAMIS or SIS effectively automates the MPA process as much as possible.

1.3.3.7. Learning Management System. CW Stan/Eval will contact the A6C Cadet Lifecycle PMO to ensure effective automation of the MPA process across all integrated IT programs.

#### **1.4. Forms Used--Purpose and Its Use.**

1.4.1. AFCW Form 707A, *Cadet Performance Report*. This form is used during each Academic semester to document a cadet's performance in the execution of their duties and their development with regards to professional qualities, leadership, and character. Collectively, these forms are used to document potential and performance over the course of a ratee's career.

1.4.2. AFCW Form 707B, *External Cadet Performance Report*. This form is the primary means to collect otherwise undocumented performance and is the best method to influence a cadet's end-of- semester performance appraisal. For supervisors that do not have direct input into the cadet's MPA, the 707B can be used to give the owning AOC

information to prepare the cadet's final evaluation. It should contain as much detail and accurate information on the ratee's performance as possible. Additionally, raters can request an AFCW Form 707B to collect information from a supervisor, not in the rating chain, that has in-depth knowledge of the ratee's performance outside the squadron.

1.4.3. **Mission Element Performance Assessment.** This is the end-of-semester performance appraisal form used by Mission Elements that have direct input into the MPA system. Generally, these performance assessments are scoreable rubrics. The rater can also provide developmental feedback. This form can also be used to document ratee's that stand out among their peers and identify deficient cadets.

1.4.4. **AFCW Form 724, *Cadet Comprehensive Assessment (CCA) Worksheet.*** This form is used to document formal communication regarding an assessment of a cadet's responsibilities, accountability, critical role in support of the mission, and development in professional qualities, leadership and character.

### **1.5. Evaluator Responsibilities.**

1.5.1. **Commander:** The commander of a unit must review the record of all personnel, regardless of grade, assigned to and/or transferred into his or her command to ensure knowledge of and familiarization with the cadet's punitive administrative action in order to reduce the likelihood that repeat offenses will escape the notice of current, subsequent, or higher level commanders. This responsibility will be conducted by the immediate commander (AOC) of the cadet at the lowest unit level, and it will not be delegated.

1.5.2. **General Evaluator/Reviewer Responsibilities.** All evaluators and reviewers are responsible for performing an administrative review of all evaluations and if necessary, return them for correction/completion before sending them to the next level. At a minimum, this review must ensure:

1.5.2.1. All applicable blocks are completed (marked, dated, and signed).

1.5.2.2. Evaluations contain accurate information (particularly in the rate identification and job description sections).

1.5.2.3. Spelling accuracy and proper bullet structure.

1.5.2.4. Evaluations do not contain inappropriate comments or recommendations.

1.5.2.5. The information in the evaluation is accurate and not inflated.

1.5.2.6. Evaluations are accomplished IAW this instruction.

### **1.5.3. Rater.**

1.5.3.1. Ensures the ratee is aware of who is in his or her rating chain.

1.5.3.2. Must provide a CCA. Official documented CCA does not preclude a rater from performing day-to-day verbal assessments. Additionally, raters are required to perform an assessment at the time the evaluation is presented to the ratee. This assessment at the time the evaluation is presented may be officially documented on the CCA worksheet, but is not required.



1.5.3.3. Must consider the contents of any Unfavorable Information File (UIF) and/or Cadet Personnel Record (CPR-II), if applicable, before preparing the performance evaluation.

1.5.3.4. Assesses and documents the ratee's performance, what the ratee did, how well he or she did it, and the ratee's potential based on that performance, throughout the rating period. The rater differentiates through an evaluation of performance.

1.5.3.5. Receives meaningful information from the ratee and as many sources as possible (i.e. AFCW Form 707Bs from those who supervised the ratee during the reporting period, the AMT), especially when the ratee is involved with activities the rater was unable to supervise (club activity, volunteer efforts, etc.). The ratee is encouraged to provide the rater with inputs on specific accomplishments.

1.5.3.6. Considers the significance and frequency of incidents (including isolated instances of poor or outstanding performance) when assessing total performance.

1.5.3.7. Differentiates between ratee's with similar performance records; especially when making stratification, leadership, and developmental opportunity recommendations when not prohibited by special program specific guidance.

1.5.3.8. Although some evaluators may not know any other ratee serving in a particular job or position, they may rate according to their opinions and impressions of the general level of performance of cadet personnel in the various grades.

1.5.3.9. Records the ratee's performance for the rating period on the applicable form.

1.5.3.10. A rater's failure to perform one or more of the above responsibilities alone will not form the basis for a successful appeal.

#### 1.5.4. Rater's Rater.

1.5.4.1. Must be aware of the contents of any UIF and/or CPR-II, if applicable, and returns evaluation to the rater for reconsideration, if appropriate, to ensure an accurate, unbiased, and uninflated evaluation.

1.5.4.2. Assumes the responsibilities of the rater when the rater is unable to complete the evaluation.

#### 1.5.5. Academy Military Trainer (AMT).

1.5.5.1. Will be aware of the contents of the UIF and/or CPR-II if applicable, on all cadet evaluations and returns the evaluation to the rater for reconsideration, if appropriate, to ensure an accurate, unbiased, and an uninflated evaluation.

1.5.5.2. Will review all cadet evaluations before the commander's review and advise the commander of any quality force indicators.

#### 1.5.6. Ratee.

1.5.6.1. The ratee is equally responsible for ensuring they know their rating chain and that they received an assessment.

1.5.6.2. Ratee Review. Evaluations must be reviewed by the Ratee prior to becoming a matter of record. This is the time to review for typos, spelling, and

inaccurate data and bring it to the attention of the Rater. If the data is administratively accurate and it is just a matter of the Ratee disagreeing with the content, the Rater is not required to change their assessment. When the Ratee signs the evaluation, he or she is not concurring with the content, but rather acknowledging the CCA sessions were performed during the reporting period and the Ratee has reviewed the evaluation for administrative errors.

1.5.6.3. If the Ratee disagrees with the content, (comments and/or ratings) the Ratee may file an appeal IAW **Chapter 8**, after the evaluation becomes a matter of record. **NOTE:** A CCA session is not required upon completion of the CPR. The CPR serves as official documentation of the feedback provided to the Ratee.

## 1.6. Rating Chain Deviations and Evaluator Changes.

1.6.1. The commander determines the rating chain for assigned personnel, based upon the recommendations of the cadet chain of command. Commanders may deviate from the normal (supervisory) rating chain only when necessary to accommodate unique organizational structures and situations where personnel are temporarily loaned or matrixed to other activities outside the ratee's assigned unit (ratee is working on Group Staff, but the Group Commander elects to have the member rated within the squadron). Any deviations must be established at the beginning of the semester, and the ratee must be informed NLT T5.

1.6.2. Removal of Evaluator from Rating Chain. Evaluators are not removed from the rating chain based solely on a rating disagreement, nor are they removed from their evaluator responsibilities automatically. In most cases, being removed from duties for cause often has no effect on the rater's ability to render fair and accurate evaluations on subordinates; therefore, the evaluator will still be responsible for the evaluations of their subordinates. For example, being relieved from a high-visibility job due to a non-duty related incident should not automatically result in the member also being relieved of evaluator responsibilities since there is no threat of reprisal towards subordinates.

1.6.2.1. If it is determined that removal from evaluator responsibilities are necessary (for instance, due to the loss of rank and position), the AOC must provide written notification of the action to the evaluator being removed, with information copies to the removed evaluator's immediate subordinate(s) and any other evaluators in the rating chain.

1.6.2.2. This action must be accomplished, and the evaluator being removed must acknowledge receipt within 7 days from the date, or the date of discovery, of the incident that lead to the removal from evaluator responsibilities.

1.6.2.3. Unless a new rater is placed in the vacated position, the next evaluator in the rating chain (the rater's rater) assumes the responsibilities of the rater.

1.7. **Rater/Ratee Accountability.** Raters ensure cadets they supervise receive a CCA to improve performance and contributions to mission accomplishment. To assist raters in preparing evaluations, all cadets will report to their rater within 72 hours, any disciplinary action taken against them (to include Honor violations, Cadet Disciplinary System infractions, negative AFCW Form 10s, any form of probation placement, and UCMJ actions).

1.7.1. When to document. In deciding whether to document adverse information on the performance evaluation, evaluators must consider the vast majority of cadets serve their entire career with honor and distinction; therefore, failure to document misconduct which reflects departure from the core values of the Air Force is a disservice to all cadets competing for AFSCs, leadership positions, and special programs. Additionally, evaluators must consider items listed below when assessing performance and potential, and specifically mention them in evaluations when appropriate.

1.7.1.1. Impact of the misconduct on the mission (Did the mission suffer in any way? Was unit morale affected?).

1.7.1.2. Impact of the misconduct on the USAFA as an institution (Did it bring discredit on the Air Force and/or United States Air Force Academy?).

1.7.1.3. Impact of the misconduct on, and its relationship to the ratee's duties (Did it affect the ratee's ability to fulfill his or her duties?).

1.7.1.4. Grade, assignment and experience of the ratee (Is the ratee in a position of heightened responsibility? Did the ratee "know better"?).

1.7.1.5. Number of separate violations and frequency of the misconduct (Is this an isolated or repeated incident?).

1.7.1.6. Consequences of the misconduct (Did it result in death, injury, or loss of/damage to military or civilian property?).

1.7.1.7. Other dissimilar acts of misconduct during the reporting period (Is the ratee establishing a pattern of misconduct?).

1.7.1.8. Existence of unique, unusual or extenuating circumstances (Was the misconduct willful and unprovoked, or were there aggravating factors or events?).

1.7.2. What to report. In all cases, when comments are included in performance evaluations, they must be specific, outlining the event and any corrective action taken. Comments such as "conduct unbecoming..." or "an error in judgment led to an off-duty incident..." are too vague. Examples of valid comments are "C1C Smith drove while intoxicated, for which he received an Article 15" and "C2C Jones violated the Honor Code, for which she was placed on Honor Probation."

1.7.3. Disciplinary Infractions. Document any type of probation placement and the reason behind the action. The rater can also include negative behavioral trends and the unit impact.

1.7.4. Organizational Climate: Organizational climate is defined as the way in which members in a unit perceive and characterize their unit environment. All cadets are responsible for creating an organizational climate in which every member is treated with dignity and respect, and one that does not tolerate unlawful discrimination, sexual harassment, or sexual assault in any form. Cadets are not only responsible for creating this environment but are also accountable for it. Cadets can build a healthy organizational climate by: communicating clear direction at all levels of supervision; adhering to and enforcing standards; not tolerating and, when necessary, appropriately responding to any form of sexual harassment, sexual assault, hazing, bullying, unlawful discrimination, or any other conduct harmful to the good order and discipline of the unit;

being accountable for their actions; and cultivating an environment where teamwork, unity and cohesiveness are the standard practice. Failure to maintain a healthy organizational climate can be documented on the performance evaluation.

1.7.5. Equal Opportunity and Treatment (EOT). The expectation is fair and equal treatment of all and enforcement of the same behavior in subordinates. Evaluators must consider a member's commitment to EOT when evaluating performance and making a promotion recommendation. The goal is to ensure fair, accurate, and unbiased evaluations to help ensure the best qualified members are identified for positions of higher responsibility. Evaluations must reflect serious or repeated occurrences of discrimination, to include sexual harassment, as prescribed in AFI 36- 2706, *Military Equal Opportunity (MEO) Program*. Evaluators must also consider commenting on a ratee's membership in groups that espouse supremacist causes or advocate unlawful discrimination, as prescribed in AFI 51-903, *Dissident and Protest Activities*.

## 1.8. Disagreements.

1.8.1. Explain any significant disagreement with a previous evaluator on a performance evaluation. The evaluator who disagrees must specifically state the performance factor in disagreement, the reason for the disagreement and what their rating is, in their comments. On evaluations, a significant disagreement is a change of any rating or any statement that indicates obvious disagreement with the rater.

1.8.2. Comments to support disagreements are required. **Example:** Disagree with rater's assessment of Job Knowledge—C4C Smith was routinely unable to meet knowledge requirements during monthly evaluation; or C2C Jones failed to maintain his room in AMI standards, and it resulted in poor inspection results for his squadron.

1.8.3. Evaluators should discuss disagreements when preparing evaluations. Raters are first given an opportunity to change the evaluation; however, they will not change their evaluation just to satisfy the evaluator who disagrees. If, after discussion, the disagreement remains, the disagreeing evaluator must provide specific comments on an MFR to explain each item in disagreement. The AOC is the final authority on what will be documented on the evaluation.

1.9. **Prohibited Evaluator Considerations and Comments.** Certain items are prohibited for consideration in the performance evaluation process and will not be commented upon on any performance evaluation form. Except as authorized in the following paragraphs, do not consider, refer to, or include comments regarding:

1.9.1. Statements Outside the Scope of Responsibility. Stratification and broad statements outside the scope of the evaluator's responsibility or knowledge are prohibited. Evaluators can only stratify personnel within the confines of their direct rating chain and/or scope of responsibility. A broad statement is one which implies knowledge of members not assigned within the evaluator's realm of knowledge.

1.9.2. Sensitive Information.

1.9.2.1. Classified Information. Do not enter classified information in any section of the form.

- 1.9.2.2. Confidential Statements. Confidential statements, testimony, or data obtained by, or presented to, boards under AFI 91-204, *Safety Investigations and Reports*.
- 1.9.2.3. Appeal Agencies Outside Rating Chain. Actions taken by an individual outside the normal chain of command that represent guaranteed rights of appeal. **Example:** Inspector General, EOT/MEO complaints, Congressional Inquiries, etc.
- 1.9.2.4. Drug or Alcohol Abuse Rehabilitation Programs. Focus on the behavior, conduct, or performance resulting from alcohol or drug use versus the actual consumption of alcohol or drugs or participation in a rehabilitation program. Only competent medical authorities can diagnose alcoholism or drug addiction, and the diagnoses is prohibited on evaluations.
- 1.9.2.5. Medical Information. Only authorized medical officials are in a position to make comments on medical conditions; in extremely rare cases, this is authorized on performance evaluations, and only if the evaluator is a medical professional. It is important for evaluators to focus evaluation comments on the behavior and duty performance of the individual. The medical condition or diagnosis is prohibited.
- 1.9.3. Profanity. Use of profanity in evaluations is prohibited.
- 1.9.4. Potential Discriminatory Factors and/or Information. Race, Ethnic Origin, Gender, Age, Religion, Sexual Orientation or Political Affiliation of the Ratee. Do not refer to these items in such a way that others could interpret the comments as reflecting favorably or unfavorably on the person. This is not meant to prohibit evaluators from commenting on involvement in cultural or church activities, but cautions against the use of specific religious denominations, etc. **Example:** “Cadet Doe is the first female pilot ever selected for ENJPPT”, is an inappropriate reference to gender. You may use pronouns reflecting gender (e.g., he, she, him, her, his, and hers). “Cadet Wing POC for African American Heritage Committee” or “Arranged a blood drive at the Baptist Memorial Hospital” are acceptable comments.
- 1.9.5. Duty History or Performance Outside the Current Reporting Period. Do not comment on duty history or performance outside the current reporting period.
- 1.9.6. Cadet Comprehensive Assessment (CCA). Evaluators do not refer to CCA sessions in any area of the performance evaluation except in the Performance Feedback Certification Block.
- 1.9.7. Conduct Based on Unreliable Information. Raters must ensure that information relied upon to document performance, especially derogatory information relating to unsatisfactory behavior or misconduct, is reliable and supported by substantial evidence.
- 1.9.8. Acquittals or Similar Results. Any action against an individual that resulted in acquittal or a failure to successfully implement an intended personnel action is prohibited. For example, an evaluator cannot say: “C2C Johnson was acquitted of assault charges,” or “Cadet Smith’s involuntary separation action was unsuccessful.” This does not mean, however, that evaluators cannot mention the underlying conduct that formed the basis for the action.

1.9.9. Punishment. Punishment received as a result of administrative or judicial action is prohibited. Restrict comments to the conduct/behavior that resulted in the punishment, and the type of administrative or judicial action taken (i.e., Article 15, LOR, LOC). Comments must emphasize the underlying conduct, or behavior, that led to the action.

1.9.9.1. Prohibited statements would be: “Placed on 6 months Conduct/Aptitude probation,” “Lost Rank and Privileges,” “Placed on 3 months restriction,” etc.

1.9.9.2. Acceptable statements would be: “Drove while intoxicated, received an Article 15” and “Failed to report to duty, received a AFCW Form 10,” etc.

1.10. **Missing Evaluations.** The rater initiates action to try and locate the missing report. If the report is located or can be justly re-accomplished (must be the original evaluators at the time of the closeout), place the original evaluation in the permanent record. If the report is not located, or cannot be justly re- accomplished, the current supervisor will document the missing report on an MFR, along with all relevant performance factors and verifiable accomplishments for the unevaluated period. The AOC must indorse the MFR. The MFR is then filed in the appropriate tab of the ratee’s CPR-II.

## 2. MPA PROGRAM EXECUTION

2.1. **Purpose.** The term “MPA program” is designed to meet the purpose and objectives outlined in [paragraph 1](#) of this instruction. The program has two main phases: developmental and evaluative. The developmental phase will be accomplished in the cadet wing chain of command over the course of a semester and is augmented by permanent party assigned as raters or additional raters of cadets IAW AFCWI 36-3501, *Cadet Standards & Duties*, Annex A. The end of semester evaluation phase is initially accomplished by raters and additional raters. The final aspect of the evaluation phase is completed by the squadron AOC, who serves as the reviewing official for all cadets under his/her command and who assigns and certifies final performance appraisal rankings.

2.2. **Developmental Feedback.** The developmental phase of the MPA process is designed to help each cadet to receive feedback on their performance in terms of a specific set of performance dimensions and to increase self-awareness about how his/her performance is perceived by their chain of command. The performance dimensions outlined in [Attachment 4](#) provide the cadet with a baseline of what is expected of an officer candidate of character at each level of development and are directly related to the officer competencies outlined in Air Force Doctrine Document 1-1, *Leadership and Force Development*. The cadet’s immediate supervisor (see AFCWI 36-3501, *Cadet Standards & Duties*, Attach 2-6) will conduct formal feedback sessions and will set expectations consistent with the performance dimensions listed in [Attachment 4](#).

2.2.1. Fall and Spring Initial Feedback. Commander and supervisor expectations are set during the Initial Feedback Session early in the semester where MPA performance dimensions are reviewed to provide initial direction for cadets. This session sets expectations based on the cadet’s job requirements and the selected performance dimensions. This feedback will be conducted face-to-face, documented on an AFCW Form 724, *Cadet Comprehensive Assessment worksheet*, and available for viewing by the cadet’s chain of command in the member’s CPR-II.

2.2.2. Fall and Spring Mid-Semester Feedback. The cadet will receive mid-semester feedback from their immediate supervisor, creating the opportunity for the cadet to make course corrections prior to being evaluated at the end of each semester. This is intended to give the cadets a mid-semester update on where they stand with regards to their duty performance, professional qualities, leadership, and character. This feedback will be conducted face-to-face, documented on an AFCW Form 724, *Cadet Comprehensive Assessment worksheet*, and available for viewing by the cadet's chain of command in their CPR-II.

2.2.3. Performance Feedback Worksheet (PFW). The information will be summarized in an MPA PFW. Both the supervisor and cadet will digitally sign and Feedback is built from the 10 competencies, respective to class year. A copy of the PFW will be filed in each cadet's personnel records until graduation. If the cadet has concerns, he/she is encouraged to talk to their cadet chain of command.

**2.3. Performance Appraisals.** The end-of-semester subjective appraisals will be evaluative and will count towards the performance appraisal component of the final semester MPA.

2.3.1. Cadet Raters and Additional Raters. The performance appraisal process is the primary responsibility of each cadet's rater and additional rater, with the squadron AOC serving as the reviewing official and stratification certifier. Raters and additional raters will evaluate their assigned subordinate's performance using the AFCW Form 707, *Cadet Performance Report*.

2.3.2. Mission Elements (MEs). USAFA faculty and staff members who interact with cadets throughout the semester also have the opportunity to provide feedback on a cadet's performance to their chain of command. Sources for ME feedback include: DF instructors, CW permanent party members who directly interact with the cadet, AD coaches, 306 FTG commanders, coaches, and instructors, and any optional rater. These entities can provide feedback via the AFCW Form 10, AFCW Form 707A, or 707B. If provided, this ME feedback will be viewable by cadet, cadet's rater, additional rater, and AOC/AMT.

2.3.3. Squadron AOCs. Serves as reviewer and certifier for end of semester performance appraisals for all cadets assigned. Stratifications provided by a cadet squadron's leadership are reviewed by the AOC/AMT for the purpose of certifying the validity of the stratifications and making any adjustments that may be required.

2.3.3.1. By M32 of each semester, squadron AOCs will start reviewing qualitative appraisals from each cadet's rater and additional rater as well as any ME feedback. AOCs shall consider stratification lists by class year based on the qualitative appraisals and recommended stratifications of raters from their chain of command. MEs may elect to have their allotted 250 points be reallocated to CW Professional Appraisal for cadets with unique circumstances, as long as the owning AOC approves and agrees it is best way to reflect true cadet performance. AOCs will notify CW Stan/Eval the list of affected cadets, per CW Stan/Eval published deadlines.

2.3.3.2. Next, the squadron AOC determines the final ranking of each cadet versus his/her peers in the squadron based upon: the aforementioned aggregated performance of their duty performance, professional qualities, leadership and

character, as evaluated by the cadet's rater and additional rater; the descriptive comments from the cadet's rater and additional rater; any ME feedback; and any other information related to cadet performance (e.g., letters of appreciation, recognition, awards, probations, Squadron Commander Review Board minutes, Forms 10, and administrative actions). If there is a significant variation in the evaluations of a given cadet's performance, the AOC will analyze the sources' inputs and/or comments. If concerns exist, the AOC will communicate with the source to gain necessary understanding or clarification.

2.3.3.3. Squadron AOCs are responsible for assigning final rankings of cadets versus peers within their cadet squadron. For cadets assigned to Cadet Group Staff positions, the respective GAOC is responsible for assigning Group Staff subjective rankings versus peers on the Group Staff. For cadets assigned to Cadet Wing Staff positions, the Commandant of Cadets is responsible for assigning Cadet Wing Staff subjective rankings versus peers on the Wing Staff.

2.3.3.4. After the squadron AOC reviews the qualitative appraisals for each cadet and clarifies any concerns about ratings, the AOC determines the final list for each class of cadets in the squadron. Prior to CW Stan/Eval published deadline, the AOC may change rankings on the list based on his/her professional judgment and at his/her sole discretion. There is no limit on the amount of positions the AOC may move a given cadet. If an AOC moves a cadet on the list, the AOC must provide justification to the cadet to explain the reason for the movement. If a cadet's performance is assessed as "deficient" for the rating period, the AOC will flag the cadet as having a "referral report." By definition, a "referral report" is for a cadet whose performance is substandard (an MPA of 1.90 or below).

2.3.4. Subjective MPA Assignment in LMS. After the respective AOC has completed his/her rankings, the AOC enters their respective scores in the LMS. After midterm and final cadet evaluations are complete, the AOC certifies them and submits required information to CW Stan/Eval. CW Stan/Eval will employ the LMS to yield MPAs converted to a number based on a 4.00 grading scale. CW Stan/Eval will deliver this information to either CAMIS or SIS.

2.3.5. Semester MPA Calculation. The final semester MPA number for each cadet is the combination of the subjective MPA and the objective MPA as outlined in the point distribution provided in [Attachment 3](#).

2.3.6. End-of-Semester MPA Debrief. Each cadet's final semester MPA is recorded on the AFCW Form 707A, *Cadet Performance Report*. Each cadet rater will be responsible for providing direct face-to-face feedback from the Cadet Performance Report to their assigned subordinates prior to finals week. Feedback will focus on their duty performance, professional qualities, leadership, and character, and how that led to their stratification versus their peers. Once complete, raters will sign and ensure subordinate signs the Cadet Performance Report and provides it to the AOC. The squadron AOC will review all completed Cadet Performance Reports to certify the final reports and sign them. Squadron AMTs may assist in this certification step as directed by their squadron AOC. Signed reports become part of each cadet's official record.



**2.4. Summer MPA.** Only First and Second Class cadets or Cadre participating in a summer leadership program will receive a Summer MPA. Multiple Summer MPAs will be averaged and one score will be entered into CAMIS or SIS. Summer MPA will be weighted at about 20% of the Overall Performance Appraisal. Cadets not involved with a summer leadership program will receive their cumulative average as an entry for their Summer MPA. AOCs in charge of summer leadership programs will secure CWT endorsement for MPA methodologies for their respective programs, with CW Stan/Eval advice.

**2.5. Post-Subjective Grading.** A cadet's current cumulative MPA will be used by various selection boards (e.g., Air Force Specialty Code selection, and Euro-North Atlantic Treaty Organization Joint Jet Pilot Training) and to calculate Graduation Order of Merit. Only end-of-semester MPA ratings affect the cumulative MPA. Each semester's MPA number counts equitably towards a cadet's cumulative MPA. For graduation, a cumulative rating of 2.00 is the minimum required.

**2.6. Commandant's List.** The Commandant's List is reserved for cadets achieving an overall semester MPA in the top one third by class year. They will retain this status until the end of the next Academic semester IAW United States Air Force Academy Instruction (USAFAI) 36-3510, *USAF Academy Cadet Program Recognizing Cadet Achievement*, (see exceptions in USAFAI 36-3523, *Review and Disposition of Deficient Cadets*, Para 1.1.1. and USAFAI 36-3510, *USAF Academy Cadet Program Recognizing Cadet Achievement*, Para 4.1.).

### 3. SEMESTER MPA COMPONENTS

**3.1. General Guidelines.** The semester MPA score is composed of subjective and objective components. The weighting of subjective and objective components varies by class year as reflected in [Attachment 3](#). The increasing weight of the subjective component as cadet's progress through the four-class system is intentional and maintains alignment with the PITO developmental model.

**3.2. MPA Rating Scale.** All MPA components will make up a portion of a 2000 point scale, as depicted in [Attachment 3](#). At the end of the semester, the total number of points will be converted to a 4.00 rating system. The 4.00 rating system corresponds to the Grade Point Average (GPA) model and is used to give consistency to the MPAs. A rating of 4.00 is the maximum and a rating of 0.00 is the minimum.

**3.3. Semester MPA Objective Rating.** The purpose of this component of the MPA is to support an objective evaluation of cadet performance, which gives cadets direct control over a portion of their MPA rating in a given semester (see [Chapter 4](#)). The MPAs are derived by the cadets' results in each graded component.

#### 3.4. Objective Component Scoring Methodology.

**3.4.1. Purpose and guidelines.** Objective scoring will be executed through a series of cadet-led evaluations of cadet performance. These evaluations are designed to provide a means of assessing accomplishment of knowledge and/or performance objectives. The evaluations will be administered during the learning process and is a means of measuring fulfillment of criterion objectives. Successful completion of an evaluation indicates achievement of the desired knowledge and skill in the area being evaluated.

3.4.1.1. When a unit is being inspected, their Personal Appearance Inspection (PAI) and Ante-Meridian Inspection (AMI) may be executed on the same day. Noon Meal Formation (NMF), which may include PAIs, can be inspected at any point during the evaluation window.

3.4.1.2. Cadets who are not present during respective Saturday Ante-Meridian Inspection (SAMI) evaluations are individually responsible for scheduling make-up inspections. Make-up inspections must be accomplished within the evaluation window or the cadet will receive a zero for the uninspected item.

3.4.1.3. No-Notice Evals. All units are subject to random CW Stan/Eval led inspections. The inspection window starts after the second week of each semester and doesn't end until Finals Week. Scores for No-Notice PAIs or AMIs will be inputted towards the cadet's MPA. This team will provide the results and constructive feedback to the owning AOC/AMT. The AOC/AMT is encouraged to review feedback and resolve discrepancies as appropriate.

#### **4. MPA OBJECTIVE COMPONENTS AND SCORING GUIDELINES**

4.1. **Authorized Graders.** Only graders certified by CW Stan/Eval will be authorized to grade objective components of MPA. To ensure consistency with the evaluation of cadet wing standards, it is paramount that all evaluators receive appropriate training and oversight by CW Stan/Eval. The training will include a comprehensive review of the applicable standards, grading rubric familiarization, a grading demonstration for each major area, documentation requirements, and grade reporting procedures.

4.1.1. To facilitate training, CW Stan/Eval will offer wing-wide training monthly. Anyone that misses the training will not be allowed to grade any major area until they are able to schedule and make-up the training.

4.1.2. AFCW Stan/Eval Officer (a C1C) will maintain a list of authorized graders. If a score is contested and the score was awarded by an unauthorized grader, their score will be nullified and the evaluation must be re-accomplished.

4.1.3. CW Stan/Eval will accomplish periodic spot checks on grader execution. These spot checks can be conducted randomly, scheduled during in advance, or accomplished during the normal execution of planned inspections. A grader that fails to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the standards and/or the ability to grade IAW CW standards will be decertified until they can re-accomplish the necessary training and pass a re-eval.

#### **4.2. Objective Components.**

##### **4.2.1. Individual Components.**

4.2.1.1. PAI. The Personal Appearance Inspection is conducted to ensure the proper wear of the uniform. Graders will use AFCW Form 304, published by CW Stan/Eval for criteria.

4.2.1.2. AMI. AMIs ensure rooms are clean and hygienic on a daily basis. Maintain rooms IAW AFCWI 36-3501 and applicable NOTAMs each semester. In the event there is a conflict between the instruction and NOTAMs, the instruction takes precedence. Graders will use AFCW Form 301, published by CW Stan/Eval for criteria.

4.2.1.3. SAMI. Upon direction of the Commandant, unrecognized cadets will configure and maintain rooms in accordance with AFCWI 36-3501 and applicable NOTAMs each semester. All other cadets will configure rooms in AMI status. Graders will use AFCW Form 300, published by CW Stan/Eval for criteria. Recognized cadets who score less than 70% on any individual components will configure and maintain rooms per SAMI requirements, for all SAMIs that semester.

4.2.1.4. Commissioning Education. CWC is responsible for Commissioning Education course-related scores and delivers the 'final' semester score to CW Stan/Eval. Commissioning Education points constitute 300 possible points for all cadets.

#### 4.2.2. Team/Unit Components.

4.2.2.1. Major Assessment Events (MAEs). MAEs are designed to assess group performance. Each cadet will receive points based on a combination of their individual performance and their team's results. At least one MAE will be evaluated each semester. If more than one MAE is evaluated, each cadet will receive an average of all the scores for their final MAE grade.

## 5. MPA SUBJECTIVE SCORING METHODOLOGY AND COMPONENTS

5.1. **CW Professional Performance Appraisal.** This subjective component is a qualitative assessment by each cadet's rater and additional rater, informed by feedback submitted by MEs, which is reviewed and certified by the AOC (if AOC is not available then respective AMT may complete this function). The subjective MPA rating is based upon each cadet's performance within the four major performance targets: 1.) duty performance; 2.) professional qualities; 3.) leadership (includes teamwork and followership); and, 4.) character (adherence to the AF Core Values). The AOC will then assess their overall performance as compared to their peers and stratify the cadets among the peers in their respective year group.

5.1.1. Mid-Semester (Prog) Qualitative Assessment. A fraction of the cadet's Performance Appraisal points will be awarded at the mid-way point of the semester. This provides formal feedback on their performance to afford cadets with every opportunity to succeed. In the past, many cadets believed they did not have a clear picture of their class ranking until it was too late to make adjustments. Providing a Prog Assessment helps clear up any discrepancies between the direct rater's assessment (which is generally limited to only a few individuals), and their ranking among their peers at the aggregated level. This also increases transparency and will better inform cadets regarding their military performance while they still have time to make corrections.

5.1.2. Final Semester Qualitative Assessment. The assigned percentage will be applied against the remaining performance appraisal points. Due to the inclusion of MEs in the rating system, the points available for the final evaluation will vary by where the cadet elects to pursue excellence. See [Attachment 3](#) for a detailed point distribution.

## 6. PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK PROCESS

6.1. **Purpose.** Cadet Comprehensive Assessment (CCA) is formal communication between a rater and ratee to communicate responsibility, accountability, Air Force culture, a cadet's

critical role in support of the mission, individual readiness, and performance feedback on expectations regarding duty performance and how well the ratee is meeting those expectations to include information to assist the ratee in achieving success. It is intended to increase cadet interaction and support at all levels. If done correctly, mentorship will create and sustain a culture of belonging. The CCA is also intended to provide cadets an opportunity to discuss their personal and professional goals. Raters document the session on the CCA worksheet and use the Performance Feedback in Section IV to assess or discuss the objectives, standards, behavior, and performance with the ratee. Providing this information helps an individual contribute to positive communication, improve performance, and grow professionally. The following information applies to all military personnel.

## 6.2. Responsibilities.

### 6.2.1. The ratee will:

6.2.1.1. Know when CCA sessions are due.

6.2.1.2. If a ratee requests a feedback session, the rater will provide one within 7 days of receipt of the request, provided 10 days have passed, since the last feedback session (i.e., Ratee Requested).

6.2.1.3. Notify the rater and, if necessary, the AMT/AOC, when required or requested CCA did not take place.

6.2.1.4. Complete Section VI on their own. Sign the CCA indicating the date the supervisor conducted the CCA session.

### 6.2.2. The rater will:

6.2.2.1. Conduct CCA sessions as required by this instruction. In addition, CCA sessions will be conducted at the ratee's request or when deemed necessary (provided 10 days have passed since the last CCA session [i.e., Rater Directed]).

6.2.2.2. Prepare for, schedule, and conduct CCA sessions.

6.2.2.3. Understand Cadet Wing standards and expectations and consider them when providing CCA to personnel.

6.2.2.4. Provide realistic assessments to help the ratee improve performance and grow professionally and personally. Realistic assessments include in-depth discussions with the ratee and written comments on the CCA worksheet, not just marks on the form.

6.2.2.5. Provide the original completed and signed CCA worksheet to the ratee.

6.2.2.6. Retain a copy of the signed and dated CCA worksheet. The midterm CCA is a required, mandatory supporting document to be routed with the Cadet Performance Report (CPR), however, it will not be made a matter of the official record. In addition, the Rater will retain a copy of the initial and midterm CCA as this may be needed for any future appeals.

6.2.2.7. The CCA is a communication tool and is not to be used to discover or document behavior which may result in administrative or judicial action. **NOTE:** It is important that behavior representing a significant deviation from expected

standards is recorded in other administrative forms (i.e., LOR, LOC, LOA, Memorandum for Record, AFCW Form 10).

6.2.3. The rater's rater will:

6.2.3.1. Monitor personnel to ensure raters properly conduct CCA sessions.

6.2.3.2. Conduct CCA sessions when, a lower-level rater is not available due to unusual circumstances, or officially assuming the subordinate rater's responsibilities.

6.2.4. The unit commander will:

6.2.4.1. Administer the CCA program.

6.2.4.2. Monitor raters and ratee's to ensure CCA sessions are conducted properly and as required.

6.2.4.3. Consider disciplining and removing from supervisory positions those raters who fail to conduct documented CCA sessions.

6.2.5. Unit will: At the unit commander's request, develop a tracking mechanism to ensure CCAs are conducted. It is the responsibility of individual raters to maintain copies of all completed CCAs.

6.3. **Who requires a CCA?** CCAs are mandatory for all cadets. If an individual requests a CCA session, the rater will provide one within 7 days of receipt of the request, provided 10 days have passed since the last CCA session. Do not prepare a CCA when a ratee is a patient, prisoner, on Administrative Turn- back, on the Commander's Cadet Intermission Program (CCIP), etc.

6.4. **Guidance for conducting CCA Sessions.** CCA sessions will be conducted face-to-face. **EXCEPTION:** Raters may conduct sessions by telephone only in unusual circumstances where face-to-face sessions are impractical, such as when the rater and ratee are geographically separated or the rater and/or ratee is on extended TDY. When a telephonic session is conducted, the rater forwards the CCA worksheet to the ratee to complete Section III and review for discussion Section VII. The finalized form is forwarded to the ratee within 10 calendar days after the session.

6.5. **When to hold documented CCA Sessions.** See [Table 5.1](#)

6.6. **Preparing the CCA Worksheet.** The CCA worksheet should, as thoroughly as possible, outline the issues discussed during the CCA session; however, it is primarily a guide for conducting the assessment session, not a transcript. Therefore, omission of an issue from the form does not, by itself, constitute proof that the issue was not discussed.

6.6.1. The CCA worksheet may be handwritten or typed by the rater providing the assessment.

6.6.2. Section I, Personal Information, is self-explanatory. Fill in all required data.

6.6.3. Section II, Types of Assessment. In the appropriate box, indicate whether the assessment is initial, mid-term, follow-up, ratee requested, or rater directed.

6.6.4. Section III, Job Description, is completed by the rater. This section is used to convey to the ratee their critical role in achieving mission success. Summarize the key

duties from AFCWI 36- 3501, or CoCI 10-100, *Cadet Wing Summer Programs*, as applicable. For areas without a job description, provide the cadet with a clear explanation of their role and responsibilities.

6.6.5. Section IV, Performance Measures. Performance (Performance Dimensions): Duty Performance, Professional Qualities, Leadership, and Character, covers those qualities and skills required of all personnel. Professionalism has four sub-components: Intrinsic Motivation, Expert Knowledge, Develops Others, and Self-Policing Ethic. Leadership has two sub-components: Followership and Teamwork. Character has three sub-components: Integrity, Service Before Self, & Excellence. The rater places a mark in the appropriate block which indicates the ratee's level of performance.

6.6.5.1. Since the primary purpose of the initial CCA session is to establish expectations for the upcoming rating period, a rater is not expected to have already developed a clear-cut opinion of an individual's performance by the time the session is conducted. Therefore, raters will mark the "Initial" block in Section II, Type of Assessment, and will leave blocks in Section IV, Performance: Mark "Initial or Not-Rated," while discussing each area, and the performance expectations for the ratee in each area during the feedback session. It is helpful for the rater to clearly document their expectations in each area.

6.6.5.2. For all other CCA types, the rater will indicate how the ratee is meeting the established expectations by marking one block under each main heading. These markings translate to an aggregate rating on the performance evaluation, and provide an indication of how the ratee is meeting the expectations set forth by the rater while providing the basis for the CCA session discussion. A good practice is to collect feedback from up and down the chain of command before providing feedback, to see if there is anything of importance that you failed to observe. The rater should clearly document the ratee's performance by describing strengths, weaknesses, and improvement areas.

6.6.6. Section V, Additional Expectations. Use this section to highlight any focus areas not already included on the form. For example, the rater can describe their expectations regarding accountability, caring for others, communication, feedback, flexibility, resilience, judgment, physical fitness, or warrior ethos. On the mid-term feedback, the rater should then inform the ratee how well they met expectations with regards to the selected behaviors.

6.6.7. Section VI, Knowing Your Airman, is completed by the ratee. This area provides information to the rater on the ratee's goals, priorities, support system, and where they might need help. The rater should maintain awareness of how the ratee is doing in these areas throughout the reporting period, and offer assistance, as required.

## 6.7. Disposition and Access.

6.7.1. The rater gives the completed CCA worksheet to the ratee and keeps a copy for personal reference. The CCA worksheet will not be made an official part of any personnel record (including PIFs) nor used in any personnel action unless the ratee first introduces it, or alleges either he or she did not receive required CCA or that the sessions were inadequate.

6.7.2. The ratee may use the completed form as he or she desires.

6.7.3. The CCA worksheet may not be reviewed by anyone other than the rater, ratee and authorized personnel, specifically for the purposes of completing performance evaluations (AFCW Form 707). For cadets, the AMT, AOC (Administrative Unit Commander on G-Series orders), Group Superintendent, Group Commander, Command Chief, Vice Commandant, and Commandant are authorized access to the CCA worksheet specifically for the purpose of reviewing performance evaluations.

6.7.4. For cadets on ROTC, Service Academy, or Foreign Exchange, supervisors may conduct assessments and complete CCA worksheets; however, the CCA worksheet will not be sent to the home station rater. A memo will be sent to the home station rater if there are any issues the temporary supervisor may wish to address.

**6.8. Failure of Rater to Conduct or Document a CCA Session.** While documented CCA sessions are required by this instruction, they do not replace informal day-to-day communication and feedback. A rater's failure to conduct a required or requested CCA session, or failure to document the session on a CCA worksheet, will not, of itself, invalidate any subsequent performance report.

**6.9. Tracking CCA Sessions.** Squadron leadership may establish procedures beyond those provided in this chapter to check CCA completion compliance provided those procedures do not violate the privacy of CCA worksheet communications.

## **7. AFCW FORM 707, CADET PERFORMANCE REPORT PROCESS**

**7.1. Purpose.** AFCW Form 707A, *Cadet Performance Report*. This form is used during each Academic semester to document a cadet's performance in the execution of their duties, and their development with regards to professional qualities, leadership and character. Collectively, these forms are used to document potential and performance over the course of a ratee's career.

### **7.2. General Guidelines.**

7.2.1. Access to Evaluations. Evaluations are For Official Use Only and are subject to the Privacy Act. They are exempt from public disclosure under DoDM 5400.7\_AFMAN 33-302 and AFI 33-332, *Privacy Act Program*. Only persons within the agency who have a proper need to know may read the evaluations. The office with custodial responsibility is responsible for determining if a person's official duties require access.

7.2.2. Bullet Format. Bullet format is mandatory. Bullets are limited to a minimum of one line, and a maximum two lines per bullet and white space is authorized. Main bullets begin at the left margin and will have one space after the "-". If unfamiliar with the proper bullet format, refer to "The Bullet Background Paper" in AFH 33-337, *The Tongue and Quill*. Although the Tongue and Quill allows three lines per bullet, evaluations will not have more than two lines per bullet.

7.2.3. Special Formatting. Do not underline, capitalize, or use bold print, unusual fonts or characters, multiple exclamation marks, or headings to emphasize comments, except as required to identify proper names, publication titles, etc.

7.2.4. Ratee Identification Data. The name will be in all uppercase. The remaining data (grade, unit, location) will be in upper/lower case.

7.2.5. Type and Font. Type all evaluations using the electronic version of the form from the CW Stan/Eval Publications website. Do not use old versions of this form--check CW Stan/Eval Publications website for the most recent version.

7.2.5.1. Forms will be typed using "Times New Roman."

7.2.5.2. Forms will be typed using the 12-pitch font. You must use computerized versions with proportional spacing, provided a 12-pitch font is used.

7.2.6. Handwritten Evaluations. Evaluations may be handwritten, only when authorized by the Squadron AOC. When authorized, print or write legible entries in dark blue or black ink.

7.2.7. Nicknames and Acronyms.

7.2.7.1. Nicknames. Do not use call signs, code names, or unusual nicknames on evaluations. However, nicknames which are a form of the ratee's name are permitted. **Example:** Bill/Will for William, Jim for James, Chris for Christopher/Christine, Pat for Patrick/Patricia, etc. are authorized.

7.2.7.2. Acronyms. Uncommon acronyms must be spelled out. When used, first spell out and follow with the acronym; e.g., Officer Development System (ODS). Acronyms or abbreviations common throughout the Air Force, such as CGO, NCO, CONUS, TDY, etc., are not required to be spelled out first.

7.3. **Who Will Prepare.** The subjective appraisal process is the primary responsibility of each cadet's rater and additional rater, with the squadron AOC serving as the reviewing official and stratification certifier. Raters and additional raters will evaluate their assigned subordinate's performance in the main performance dimensions (duty performance, professionalism, leadership, and character) via Likert-scale ratings and qualitative comments. Raters are required to provide at least two descriptive bullets justifying their appraisal of the ratee's performance and stratification, preferably in the Action-Impact-Result or Accomplishment-Impact format. In addition to these qualitative appraisals, the cadet supervisor provides a stratification of the cadets versus their peers under their supervision.

7.3.1. Squadron AOCs. Serve as reviewer and certifier for end of semester performance appraisals for all cadets assigned.

7.4. **Administrative Practices.**

7.4.1. Performance Appraisal MPA Rating Scale. The final subjective score is calculated after each AOC assigns their cadets a ranking versus peers in their squadron. Based on these rankings, the cadets in each squadron will be assigned an MPA along a controlled distribution resulting in an average of 84% for the Squadron, 88% for Group Staff, and 91% for Wing Staff. Each semester the top 4 overall squadrons in the Wing OSS rankings are authorized to use a controlled MPA distribution that results in an average of 86% on the unit's end of semester subjective MPA. The top 4 overall squadrons in the Wing OSS annual rankings are authorized to use a controlled MPA distribution that results in an average of 88% on the unit's end of semester subjective MPA.

7.4.1.1. The National Character and Leadership Symposium Cadet-in-Charge (CIC), Assistant CIC/Cadet NCO, and four team leads directly report to the Cadet Wing



Commander. A controlled MPA distribution that results in an average of 91% will be used to calculate their mid-semester and end of semester subjective MPA inputs.

7.4.1.2. The USAFA SPARK is an innovation organization that directly reports to the Cadet Wing Commander. Led by the SPARK Director, two deputies, executive assistant, and 6 capability leads. A controlled MPA distribution of 91% will be applied to the members of USAFA SPARK to their Prog and Final performance appraisals. Unit Innovation Actualizers will be stratified by the SPARK director who is allocated 250 points within the final CW Professional Appraisal to controlled MPA distribution of 86%.

7.4.1.3. The midterm and final semester CW Professional Appraisal are assigned by each AOC by evaluating each cadet's duty performance, professional qualities, leadership and character versus their peers in the squadron, group staff, or wing staff. These scores will be assigned using any distribution between 70% and 100%, centered on a mean. A score below 70 will identify deficient performance and will drive a Squadron Commander Review Board (SCRB). Each cadet's score will then be entered into the LMS, and applied toward the points available for that particular graded event.

7.4.1.4. This process enables alignment between the performance appraisals with the cadet's actual level of effort throughout the course of the semester. This also allows for closer score distribution among cadets performing at similar levels. Maintaining an average is necessary to provide a cap to inflation and ensure one squadron does not have a unique advantage over another unit.

7.4.2. Recommended changes to a squadron's mean subjective MPA must be submitted to the MPARC for consideration. The MPARC will discuss recommendations with the MEs before making a final decision.

7.4.3. End-of-Semester MPA Debrief. Each cadet's final semester MPA is recorded on a Cadet Performance Report. Each cadet rater will be responsible for providing direct face-to-face feedback from the Cadet Performance Report to their assigned subordinates prior to finals week. Feedback will focus on their performance on the four performance dimensions and how that led to their stratification versus their peers. Once complete, raters will sign and ensure subordinate signs the Cadet Performance Report and provides it to the additional rater for review. After additional raters validate feedback was accomplished, they will sign the Cadet Performance Report and deliver it to the squadron AOC. The squadron AOC will review all completed Cadet Performance Reports to certify the final reports and sign them. Squadron AMTs may assist in this certification step as directed by their squadron AOC. Signed reports become part of each cadet's official record.

**7.5. When to Finalize a Cadet Performance Report.** The AFCW 707A will be finalized no later than M39.

**7.6. Preparing and Processing Evaluations.** Completion of the Cadet Performance Report will ensure formal documentation of a ratee's performance relative to their duty performance, professionalism, leadership, and character, as evaluated over the course of the semester.

Recommendations must be based upon the cadet's performance and their potential based upon that performance.

7.6.1. Rater. Focus the evaluation in Sections III and IV on what the ratee did, how well he or she did it, and how they contributed to mission accomplishment. Inputs should be written in concise bullet format. Comments in Sections III and IV may include recommendations for positions within the cadet wing. Provide a copy of the report to the ratee prior to it becoming a matter of record, and provide post-eval feedback to let the ratee know how their performance resulted in their final report and resultant stratification.

7.6.2. Ratee. The ratee's signature is an acknowledgment of receipt of the Cadet Performance Report; it does not indicate concurrence.

7.6.3. AOC. Carefully review the rater's evaluation to ensure it is accurate, unbiased, and uninflated. If an AOC disagrees with the rater, they may ask the rater to review his or her evaluation. Discrepancies should be resolved before assigning a final stratification. Major discrepancies should be resolved prior to assigning an end-of-semester MPA.

7.6.4. General Guidelines.

7.6.4.1. Section I, Ratee Identification Data. Fill in all required information. The name should be in upper case and listed as LAST, FIRST, M. Document their class year and rank (ex: 2017/ C/Lt Col). Enter ratee's Academic Year Squadron designator (ex: USAFA/CW/CS-01).

7.6.4.2. Section II, Job Description. This section is used to document the ratee's critical role in achieving mission success. Document the ratee's official duty title. Select the appropriate semester. Summarize the key duties from AFCWI 36-3501.

7.6.4.3. Section III, Performance Evaluation. Evaluation ratings are used to determine selections for stratification, leadership positions, and special program recommendations. Therefore, evaluators at all levels must use caution to prevent inflation; it is important to distinguish performance among peers and is a disservice to ALL cadets when CPR ratings are inflated.

7.6.4.3.1. Select the appropriate block for ratee's assessed level of performance in each major area (duty performance, professionalism, leadership, and character). **Note:** See [Attachment 4](#) for a full description of each performance dimension and the distinction between the Likert scale components.

7.6.4.3.2. Capture 2-5 bullets regarding the member's duty performance using the Action- Impact-Result or Accomplishment-Impact format.

7.6.4.4. Section IV, Other Undocumented Performance.

7.6.4.4.1. Document additional performance not captured elsewhere in GPA, MPA, or PEA. For example: community involvement or club activity. This section may also be used for additional duty-related inputs if there wasn't room in Section III to adequately document their performance. Include the date of the last Cadet Comprehensive Assessment (mid-term feedback). If a mid-term CCA was not accomplished, document the reason.

7.6.4.5. Section V, Rater Signature. Include the rater's name, grade, and organization. Enter the rater's name in all caps, followed by their rank and service designation. Enter the rater's unit on the second line. Enter the rater's duty title. Include the date the evaluation was completed in day, month, and year format (ex: 20 April 2017). The rater will digitally or manually sign the form once the evaluation is complete.

7.6.4.6. Section VI, Final Rankings.

7.6.4.6.1. Peer Feedback (optional). Completed by the Cadet Flight Commander, Executive Officer, or Squadron Commander. Use, "N/A" for classes that did not capture peer feedback.

7.6.4.6.2. Additional Rankings. At a minimum, this section will include the Cadet Flight Commander and Squadron Commander stratifications. This section may include other stratifications, if known.

7.6.4.6.3. Final Stratification. The AOC will enter the final AOC stratification. Include the ratee's final MPA (can be retrieved from LMS).

7.6.4.7. Section VII, AOC Validation. The AOC will validate all of the information on the form, include their information, and digitally or manually sign the form.

7.6.4.8. Section VIII, Ratee Acknowledgement. The ratee will sign and date the form. Their signature indicates acknowledgment that feedback was accomplished, and receipt and understanding of all the information contained on the Cadet Performance Report. Signature does not indicate agreement.

#### **7.7. Routing and Disposition Responsibilities.**

7.7.1. Once complete, provide the ratee with a copy of the report and place an additional copy in the Cadet Personnel Record (CPR-II).

7.7.2. It is the rater's responsibility to ensure proper disposition.

### **8. AFCW FORM 707B, EXTERNAL CADET PERFORMANCE REPORT PROCESS**

8.1. **Purpose.** This form is the primary means to collect otherwise undocumented performance and is the best method with which to influence a cadet's end-of-semester performance appraisal, for supervisors that do not have direct input into the cadet's MPA. The AFCW Form 707B can be used to give the owning AOC information with which to prepare the cadet's final evaluation and should contain as much detail and accurate information on the ratee's performance as possible. Additionally, raters can request an AFCW Form 707B to collect information from a supervisor, not in the rating chain, that has in-depth knowledge of the ratee's performance outside the squadron.

8.2. **Who Will Prepare.** USAFA faculty and staff members who interact with cadets throughout the semester also have the opportunity to provide feedback on a cadet's performance to their chain of command. Sources for ME feedback include: DF instructors, CW permanent party members who directly interact with the cadet, AD coaches, 306 FTG commanders, coaches, and instructors, and any optional rater that does not already have direct input into MPA. If provided, this ME feedback will be viewable by cadet, cadet's rater, additional rater, and AOC/AMT.

### 8.3. Administrative Practices.

8.3.1. Rater. Focus the evaluation in Sections III and IV on what the ratee did, how well he or she did it, and how they contributed to mission accomplishment. Inputs should be written in concise bullet format. Comments in Sections III and IV may include recommendations for positions within the cadet wing. Provide a copy of the report to the ratee prior to it becoming a matter of record, and provide post-eval feedback to let the ratee know how their performance resulted in their final report and resultant stratification.

8.3.2. Ratee. The ratee's signature is an acknowledgement of receipt of the Cadet Performance Report; it does not indicate concurrence.

8.3.3. AOC. Carefully review the rater's evaluation to ensure it is accurate, unbiased, and uninflated. If an AOC disagrees with the rater, they may ask the rater to review his or her evaluation. Discrepancies should be resolved before assigning a final stratification. Major discrepancies should be resolved prior to assigning an end-of-semester MPA.

### 8.4. General Guidelines.

8.4.1. Section I, Ratee Identification Data. Fill in all required information. The name should be in upper case and listed as LAST, FIRST, M. Document their class year and rank (ex: 2017/ C/Lt Col). Enter ratee's Academic Year Squadron designator (ex: USAFA/CW/CS-01).

8.4.2. Section II, Job Description. This section is used to document the ratee's critical role in achieving mission success. Document the ratee's official duty title. Select the appropriate semester. Summarize the key duties from AFCWI 36-3501. If the ratee's job is not listed in AFCWI 36-3501, provide a thorough description of their key duties and responsibilities. The description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job. It should be specific and include the level of responsibility, number of personnel supervised, dollar value of resources accountable for, projects managed, etc. Be clear and use plain English.

8.4.3. Section III, Performance Evaluation. Evaluation ratings are used to determine selections for stratification, leadership positions, and special program recommendations. Therefore, evaluators at all levels must use caution to prevent inflation; it is important to distinguish performance among peers and is a disservice to ALL cadets when CPR ratings are inflated.

8.4.3.1. Select the appropriate block for ratee's assessed level of performance in each major area (duty performance, professionalism, leadership, and character). **Note:** See [Attachment 4](#) for a full description of each performance dimension and the distinction between the Likert scale components.

8.4.3.2. Capture 2-5 bullets regarding the member's duty performance using the Action-Impact- Result or Accomplishment-Impact format.

8.4.4. Section IV, Leadership and Officer Potential (optional).

8.4.4.1. Provide bullets or a narrative that clearly articulates the rater's assessment of the cadet's leadership and officer potential.

- 8.4.4.2. Include the date of the last Cadet Comprehensive Assessment (midterm feedback). For AFCW Form 707Bs, midterm feedbacks are optional, but highly recommended, especially if commenting on deficient performance.
- 8.4.5. Section VI, Final Rankings.
- 8.4.5.1. Provide a response regarding whether or not the performance was captured in another graded area (GPA or PEA), and whether the cadet's performance was distinguishable from their peers.
- 8.4.5.2. Describe the primary means of assessment. For example: "Ratee's performance was monitored during daily execution of assigned duties;" or, "Ratee was assessed through speech and actions."
- 8.4.5.3. Final Stratification. Answer whether or not the evaluation includes a stratification. Annotate the stratification (if applicable) and define the group the ratee was stratified against. **Note:** AOCs find stratification very useful when compiling external inputs.
- 8.4.6. Section V, Rater Signature. The rater will complete Section IV, then sign the form.
- 8.4.7. Section VII, AOC Validation. The AOC will acknowledge receipt of the evaluation by completing their information in Section VII, then signing the form.
- 8.4.8. Section VIII, Ratee Acknowledgement. The ratee will sign and date the form. Their signature indicates acknowledgement that feedback was accomplished (if applicable), and receipt and understanding of all the information contained on the Cadet Performance Report. Signature does not indicate agreement.

## 8.5. Routing and Disposition Responsibilities.

- 8.5.1. Completed forms will be submitted directly to the owning AOC.
- 8.5.2. Upon receipt, the AOC will validate the form and collect the ratee's signature.
- 8.5.3. The AOC will ensure the ratee receives a copy of the form and an additional copy is placed in the ratee's CPR-II.

## 9. EXCEPTIONAL PROGRAMS

### 9.1. Service and Foreign Academy Exchange Program MPAs.

- 9.1.1. AOCs shall evaluate all Cadets/Midshipmen from U.S. Service academies on semester exchange to USAFA using their respective Academy forms. USAFA/CWTS shall ensure AOCs have appropriate evaluation forms and forward completed copies to the respective service Academy leadership. Service and Foreign Academy Exchange Program Cadets/Midshipmen will not be assigned an MPA.
- 9.1.2. Four-year Foreign Academy Exchange Cadets will be included in the MPA process and will be rated IAW this instruction.
- 9.1.3. USAFA cadets on Foreign Exchange or at another U.S. service Academy for a semester will not receive an MPA nor be eligible for the Commandant's List for the

semester they are absent from USAFA. Instead, they will receive their cumulative MPA. (See USAFAI 36-2001, *Cadet Service Academy Exchange Program*).

9.2. **ROTC MPAs.** AOCs shall evaluate all ROTC Exchange Cadets using their respective evaluation forms. SAFA/CWTS shall ensure AOCs have appropriate evaluation forms and forward completed copies to the respective ROTC program leadership.

9.3. Cadets on Administrative Turn-back, the Commander's Cadet Intermission Program, or other applicable programs, will not receive an MPA during their absence from the Air Force Academy. Cadets re-admitted to USAFA will initially be assigned their cumulative MPA, until they receive an official MPA at the end of their first semester back at USAFA.

9.4. MPAs, Overall Performance Appraisal, and the Graduation Order of Merit calculations are all processes subject to change based on the need to consistently refine the appraisal of cadet performance in line with priorities established for commissioning requirements and needs established by the service. For these reasons MPAs and OPA calculations related to order of merit will not be recalculated for any cadet that has taken administrative turn-back, voluntarily disenrolled, or resigned and subsequently returned to duty or been readmitted as a cadet. However, for an extremely limited number of circumstances involving cadets returning from administrative turn-back, voluntary disenrollment, or resignation where the individuals see their OPA drop in order of merit review by the Vice Commandant of Cadets may occur. This review will be applied only for programs consideration for competitive programs such as graduate school, AFSC matches, Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training, etc. Commanders will apply sound judgement, compare overall performance, individual objective component performance, and relative performance in comparison to their peers when advocating for their cadet. The Vice Commandant will review the cadet's record and determine a ranking that will be applied only for that cadet's specific selection board process. The new ranking will not be applied toward graduation honors.

## 10. DEFICIENCIES AND PROBATION

### 10.1. Deficient Ratings .

10.1.1. An MPA score below 2.00 from the squadron AOC is considered substandard performance. Sustained or repetitive substandard performance may lead to probation or disenrollment. A MPA below 2.00 at the end of the semester will result in the cadet being placed on formal probation. If a cadet receives a MPA below 2.0 at Prog due to substandard performance, a SCRB will be initiated, and formal feedback documented and provided to the cadet by the Sq/CC & AOC. The AOC will reference Cadet Disciplinary System (CDS) to place the cadet on Aptitude Probation or recommend to CWV (Vice-Commandant) the cadet be placed on Aptitude Probation, if a first- class cadet. See AFCWI51-201, *Administration of Cadet Discipline*, for details.

### 10.2. Guidelines for Deficient Semester Rating.

10.2.1. During a cadet's probationary period, the AOC will determine if the deficient cadet has met all probation requirements. Cadets on conduct, aptitude, or honor probation may not receive higher than a 1.90 overall assessment for the respective semester in which the infraction occurred.

10.2.2. An MPA of 0.00 indicates the AOC is recommending the cadet be dis-enrolled from the Air Force Academy.

10.2.3. If the AOC is rating a cadet below 1.90, the AOC must consult with the GAOC before making the appraisal final.

10.3. Probations. Cadets on probation or otherwise not meeting military standards will receive a “Referral Report” for that semester. The squadron AOC will manually flag referral reports within the rank-ordered list of cadets. This will automatically move those cadets to the bottom of the calculated subjective MPA list and the AOC will then assign an MPA of 1.90 or below. Cadets with a semester MPA of 1.90 or below will not be counted as part of the AOC qualitative assessment point distribution process.

## 11. APPEALS AND CORRECTING EVALUATIONS

11.1. **Program Appeals.** MEs and all selected participants with direct input into MPA can appeal the results of their respective inputs, if the provided system is creating unfair results.

11.1.1. All program appeals will be submitted to CW Stan/Eval, who will review and forward the request to the Vice Commandant of Cadets. The final cadet appeal decision authority is the Vice Commandant of Cadets. As the MPA system is continuously at risk of inflation, only significant deviations from a fair outcome will be considered.

11.1.2. At a minimum, appeals should include a detailed explanation of the circumstances warranting review. Provide a breakdown of each cadet in the selected population, their cumulative average, the scores being awarded for that specific semester, and explanation regarding why the results are unfair.

11.1.3. If a program is forced to appeal for two consecutive semesters due to same root cause, the MPARC will consider amending this instruction to create a more lasting correction.

11.2. **Individual Appeals.** Throughout the MPA cycle, the review process ensures numerous safeguards to support the accuracy and fairness of the cadet ratings. Objective scores should be resolved immediately. If the cadet does not agree with an “objective” score, the cadet has 5 duty days to notify CW Stan/Eval through their chain of command. If a cadet has basis for why his/her “subjective” evaluation is unwarranted, the cadet has 5 duty days following their primary rater’s debrief to compile the necessary paperwork for review.

11.2.1. Minimum Requirements. The following are the minimum requirements for review:

11.2.1.1. A letter indicating the rating that is in question with documentation regarding specifically where the error occurred.

11.2.1.2. A summary report of all inspections, if the appeal is about this component of the objective rating.

11.2.1.3. The cadet’s Commissioning Education grade as recorded by the CW Curriculum Division, if the appeal is about this component of the objective rating.

11.2.1.4. The cadet will provide letters of recommendation from instructors, coaches or classmates, if the appeal is about this component of the subjective rating.

11.2.2. AOC Response. The AOC will respond to the package and meet with the cadet within 5 duty days of package receipt. If the cadet's issues are not resolved in meeting with the AOC, they may appeal to the GAOC. The GAOC is the final authority on the appeal. The Group AOC may address an appeal by: (a) making no change to the subjective MPA or (b) making a manual change to the cadet's subjective MPA only. GAOCs are advised to use extreme caution in addressing an appeal via a manual override, as this inherently skews the established averages in each squadron and could affect Commandant's List placement and other systems that use the MPA (i.e., OPA, Graduation Order of Merit). In addition, such changes will impact other cadets' MPAs within units. If changes are made, GAOCs will contact CW Stan/Eval to ensure the MPA score is amended properly and all cadet electronic records are appropriately updated.

## 12. PROGRAM OVERSIGHT AND ASSESSMENT

12.1. **MPA Review Committee.** The MPA Review Committee (MPARC) is chaired by the Vice Commandant of Cadets, and it will meet a minimum of once per semester to discuss the process, the system, data, trends, and other related topics for program sustainment and improvement. This committee will also review all recommended changes to the MPA program and its recommendations will be forwarded to the Commandant for final decision. This committee is tied to the USAFA corporate process.

12.1.1. Composition. Members will include, but are not limited to: two of the four Group AOCs, two AOCs (mix of one 1st-year and one 2nd-year AOC; not already MPA Working Group members), an Athletic Department (AD) Rep, a Dean of Faculty (DF) Rep, a 306 Flying Training Group (FTG) rep, CW Stan/Eval, a Center for Character and Leadership Development (CCLD) rep, a LMS representative, and CAMIS or SIS PMO. MPARC members are expected to inform CW Stan/Eval if they can no longer serve on the committee. CW Stan/Eval is responsible for establishing the meeting dates, agenda, and for maintaining a current list of committee members.

12.1.2. Meeting Schedule. The MPARC will meet once per academic semester, prior to or shortly after PROG.

12.1.3. Meeting Deliverables. A minimum of one week before the meeting, CW Stan/Eval will forward the upcoming agenda along with any associated reports, MPA change recommendations, and assessment data to each of the board members. CW Stan/Eval will record the meeting and generate minutes within three duty days following the meeting. Additionally, the MPARC will review any appeal requests and decide upon individual appeals, and forward its program adjustment recommendations to the Commandant for a final decision. CW Stan/Eval, with Vice Commandant of Cadets oversight, will prepare board recommendations and decisions for Commandant review and final decision.

12.1.4. Mission Element Representation. The MPARC members will be the primary interface between their represented group (to include MEs), and CW with regards to the MPA system. This will ensure two-way communication flow, both to CW in terms of ME questions, concerns and recommendations, and from CW in terms of updates, concerns, requests, and recommendations. This aspect of the MPARC is vital to program sustainment.



**12.2. MPA Working Group.** The MPA Working Group (MWG), chaired by CW Stan/Eval, will address systemic issues as they arise and gather input from the cadet wing (cadets and permanent party).

12.2.1. Composition. Members will include four AOCs (two 1st-year; two 2nd-year), four Academy Military Trainers (AMTs) (one per group), one C1C from each Group (nominated by GAOCs), and CW Stan/Eval as the chairperson. The Behavioral Sciences and Leadership Department (DFBL) will serve as an advisor to the team, as needed. HQ USAFA/CCLD will serve as an advisor to the team, in an institutional integrator role and program assessment role as needed. MWG Team membership covers the academic year.

12.2.2. Meeting Schedule. The MPA Working Group will meet a minimum of twice per academic semester. During the academic semester, the MWG will meet once to review the Prog results, primarily to ensure score validity and prevent inflation. The MWG will meet again at the end of the semester to ensure score validity, prevent inflation, and correct any major errors prior to the scores becoming finalized.

12.2.3. Meeting Deliverables. A minimum of one week before the meeting CW Stan/Eval will forward the upcoming agenda along with any associated reports, MPA change recommendations, and assessment data to each of the board members. CW Stan/Eval will record the meeting and generate minutes within three duty days following the meeting. CW Stan/Eval will prepare board recommendations and decisions for MPARC review and recommendation.

12.2.4. MPA Working Group Recommendations. Working Group recommendations will be reviewed and discussed by the MPARC prior to being submitted to the Commandant for final decision.

**12.3. Program Assessment.** Routine program assessment is an essential aspect of the system's validity, health, and sustainment. Program assessment will be conducted at every level and the responses will be aggregated in the MWG for review and further assessment by the MPARC. At a minimum, program assessment will be collected and documented twice per academic year. The results from the assessment cycle will be compiled into a report. Once the report has been reviewed by the MWG, MPARC, and validated by the Commandant, it will be forwarded to CW Stan/Eval for inclusion within the MPA historical records.

12.3.1. Prog Review. The main purpose of the Prog review is to review the mid-semester results to prevent inflation and ensure score validity. The MWG is responsible for compiling the results, addressing any issues that require immediate attention, and including the results in the End-of-Semester Review.

12.3.2. End of Semester Review. The primary purpose of the end-of-semester review is to ensure score validity, prevent inflation, and correct any major errors prior to the scores becoming finalized. Once the scores are finalized, the results will be combined with the mid-semester review in the form of an end-of-semester report. This report will be compiled by the MWG and provided to the MPARC for final review and then to the Commandant for validation. Once validated, the end-of-semester report will be forwarded to CW Stan/Eval for inclusion within the MPA historical records.

12.3.3. Routine Reports. At a minimum the MWG will pull the following reports for review and inclusion the end-of-semester review: 1.) an average of all objective scores by squadron (includes group and wing staff); 2.) a performance appraisal average by squadron (includes group and wing staff); 3.) a performance appraisal average from each ME, broken down by program and/or instructor, as appropriate; 4.) a report of missing scores with associated program and/or instructor identified; 5.) a report of the overall MPA average on the 4.0 scale (to monitor possible inflation); and, 6.) a report of grades without rubric inputs (for external performance appraisals). Irregularities (such as inflated grades) must be identified and the point of input (specific program and/or instructor) should be provided with an opportunity to justify or correct the irregularity. CW Stan/Eval is the primary OPR for addressing grading errors and irregularities.

12.3.4. Non-standard Reports. Non-standard reports should be run for all instances of possible invalid and/or unfair results within the MPA system. CW Stan/Eval, with the assistance of the CAMIS PMO and LMS PMO, is the primary OPR for running non-standard reports.

12.4. **Routine Assessment.** Routine assessment will be conducted by CCLD/ASR. ASR is encouraged to collect, aggregate, and report upon data that will provide relevant insight into MPA. At a minimum, the following success criteria will be utilized and refined throughout the assessment cycle:

12.4.1. Was cadet performance adequately captured through the feedback and evaluation system?

12.4.2. What areas were not adequately captured and how can we improve the assessment?

12.4.3. Did the feedback and evaluation system encourage and enforce the behaviors we desire from our cadets (compare to responses from cadet and external surveys)?

12.4.4. Are the selected proxies effectively measuring leadership competencies?

12.4.5. Does the feedback and evaluation system align cadet decisions with institutional objectives?

12.4.6. Are the evaluation processes aligned with the stated objectives?

12.4.7. Are institutional objectives clearly communicated through the feedback and evaluation system?

12.4.8. Are cadets being provided with adequate feedback on their progress toward these objectives?

12.4.9. Does the current system encourage participation by non-CW personnel?

12.4.10. Do other personnel feel their inputs were used and accurately reflected in the system?

12.5. **Program Changes.** All guidance in this instruction is empirical. To change any and/or all components of MPA, to include the attachments will require an update to this instruction in advance of the change. This requirement is intended to stabilize the score by slowing the rate of change and prevent unintended consequences of well-intended input, through a deliberate and thoroughly vetted review process.

12.5.1. To change this instruction, the requestor must first petition CW Stan/Eval with a change request. This can be accomplished with an MFR. CW Stan/Eval will refer to the historical documentation and provide the petitioner with additional information regarding the rationale behind the current construct. If the petitioner is not satisfied with the response, or there is insufficient rationale, the petitioner will submit a change request, via an AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*.

12.5.2. Changes to this instruction will be submitted via an AF Form 847. The AF Form 847 and all supporting documentation will be reviewed and commented on by the MWG. The MWG's recommendations will be presented to the next scheduled MPARC. The MPARC will make a recommendation to adopt, modify or deny the change request. The outcome of the MPARC's recommendation will be validated by the Commandant. Once the Commandant has made a decision, CW Stan/Eval will include the results in the MPA historical records, then inform the petitioner of the results.

12.5.3. Once a change request is approved, CW Stan/Eval will update this instruction. Minor changes can be documented as an interim change via a Guidance Memo (Change 1, Change 2, etc.). Wholesale changes, major revisions, and accumulated minor changes will result in a republication. None of the changes, minor or major, will take effect until the changed publication is updated, signed, and published.

12.6. **Historical Documentation.** MPA has undergone numerous substantive changes, and receives criticism for seemingly being in a constant state of change. Many of the aspects of the current system were part of a past system, then brought back after careful study (**ex:** Summer MPA, and direct ME input into MPA). Historical documentation is vital to create stability and maintain a healthy program. CW Stan/Eval maintains historical documentation for the MPA system. Before a program change is voted on, the MPARC will review all historical references to the component in question. Wholesale changes are discouraged unless they are determined to be essential to effective evaluation of cadet performance. Any changes to this instruction and the MPA system must be documented and included in CW's legacy documentation. Although not all-inclusive, at a minimum the following will be included in the MPA historical records:

12.6.1. The baseline history report, dated 1 July 2017.

12.6.2. All end-of-semester reports.

12.6.3. All assessment reports, provided by CCLD/ASR.

12.6.4. All change requests and their documented outcome.

12.6.5. All previous versions of USAFAI 36-2401, *Military Performance Appraisal*.

RICHARD M. CLARK  
Lieutenant General, USAFA Superintendent

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

AFHandbook 1, *The Airman Handbook*, 1 October 2017

AFDD 1-1, *Leadership and Force Development*

AFH 33-337, *The Tongue and Quill*, 26 May 2015

AFI 36-2014, *Pre-Commissioning Program*, 14 July 2019

AFI 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluations Systems*, 13 November 2019

AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, 22 March 2020

USAFAI 36-2001, *Cadet Service Academy Exchange Program*, 13 January 2015

USAFAI 36-3510, *USAF Academy Cadet Program Recognizing Cadet Achievement*, 17 October 2018

USAFAI 36-3523, *Review and Disposition of Deficient Cadets*, 5 December 2018

USAFAPAM 36-3527, *Officer Development System*, 23 September 2013

***Adopted Forms***

AFCW Form 10, *Report of Conduct*

AFCW 300, *AMI Checklist*

AFCW 301, *SAMI Checklist*

AFCW 304, *PAI Checklist*

AFCW Form 707A, *Cadet Performance Report Process*

AFCW Form 707B, *External Performance Report Process*

AFCW Form 724, *Cadet Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet*.

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

***Abbreviations and Acronyms***

**AF**—Air Force

**AFRIMS**—Air Force Records Information Management System

**AD**—Athletic Department

**ADCON**—Administrative Control

**AFCWI**—Air Force Cadet Wing Instruction

**AFMAN**—Air Force Manual

**AFPD**—Air Force Policy Directive

**AMT**—Academy Military Trainer

**ANG**—Air National Guard  
**AOC**—Air Officer Commanding  
**AFRC**—Air Force Reserve Command  
**CAMIS**—Cadet Administrative Management Information System  
**CCA**—Cadet Comprehensive Assessment  
**CCLD**—Center for Character and Leadership Development  
**CoC**—Chain of Command  
**CE**—Commissioning Education  
**CoCI**—Commandant of Cadet Instruction  
**CMTS**—Cadet Military Training Schedule  
**CQ**—Charge of Quarters  
**CW**—Cadet Wing  
**CWC**—Cadet Wing Curriculum  
**CWTS**—Cadet Wing Training Scheduling Division  
**CWV**—Vice Commandant  
**CWVV**—Chief, Standards & Evaluations  
**C1C**—Cadet 1st Class  
**C2C**—Cadet 2nd Class  
**C3C**—Cadet 3rd Class  
**C4C**—Cadet 4th Class  
**DF**—Dean of Faculty  
**DFBL**—Behavioral Sciences Department  
**FTG**—Flying Training Group  
**GAOC**—Group Air Officer Commanding  
**GPA**—Grade Point Average  
**IAW**—In Accordance With  
**LGM**—Leadership Growth Model  
**MC**—Mission Club  
**MP**—Mission Partner  
**MPA**—Military Performance Appraisal  
**MAE**—Major Assessment Event  
**NCO**—Non-Commissioned Officer

**ODS**—Officer Development System

**OIC**—Officer in Charge

**OPA**—Overall Performance Average

**OPR**—Office of Primary Responsibility

**OPORD**—Operation Order

**PFW**—Performance Feedback Worksheet

**PITO**—Personal, Interpersonal, Teams, and Organizational

**PMO**—Program Management Office

**RDS**—Records Distribution Schedule

**USAFA**—United States Air Force Academy

**USAFAPAM**—USAFA Pamphlet

### *Terms*

**Additional MPA Rater**—Any rater other than the immediate supervisor with the authority to evaluate a cadet’s officership performance. In almost all cases, the additional MPA rater will be the immediate supervisor’s rater; however, for cadet commanders and cadets whose immediate supervisor is a cadet commander, the additional MPA rater will be a USAFA/CW permanent party member who has direct knowledge of the cadet’s performance in relation to their assigned leadership position. For example, a Squadron AOC will serve as the additional rater for their Cadet Squadron Commander, while the Cadet Group Commander serves as the primary rater.

**Aptitude for Commissioned Service**—The personality, capacity, and inclination to adapt to military relationships, customs, and responsibilities which are necessary in military service; and the strength of character and willingness to accept those limitations on freedom of individual action which the structure and legal status of military service imposes upon its members.

**Immediate Supervisor**—The first cadet in the chain of command. The immediate supervisor will be responsible to provide the initial feedback, mid-semester and end-of-semester/program evaluation. For the cadet wing commander, the Commandant is the immediate supervisor.

**Leadership Growth Model (LGM)**—The model which defines the key relationships among leaders, followers, and the situation in terms of a four-stage, continuous process using expectations and inspiration, instruction and feedback, and reflection.

**Military Probation**—The status of a cadet who has demonstrated ongoing or multiple serious deficiencies in aptitude for commissioned service or a cadet whose conduct has raised serious doubt concerning qualification to remain a cadet, as determined by the cadet’s chain of command. (Replaces Conduct and Aptitude Probation).

**Military Review Committee**—This is a standing committee of the Academy Board. The committee evaluates cadets who are deficient in military performance and/or aptitude for commissioned service.

**Objective Appraisal**—That portion of an MPA which is based on total accumulated points for inspections, test scores, and development of the assigned teams (i.e. element, flight, and squadron).

**Optional Rater**—USAFA Permanent Party members (to include Mission Club OICs) that provide evaluations over cadets within their purview.

**Personal, Interpersonal, Teams, and Organizational Model (PITO)**—Development model used to build progressive competencies evolving all MEs at USAFA and encompass every dimension of a cadet’s life—intellectual, professional, physical, ethical, spiritual and social—while contribution to character development.

**Subjective Evaluation**—A numeric or written evaluation of a cadet’s military performance relative.

**Attachment 2 MPA TIMELINE—Table A2.1. MPA Timeline**

<b>Academic Day</b>	<b>Fall and Spring Semester Milestones*</b>	<b>Due</b>
M1-2	*Milestones identified in this chart are for a generic semester and are to be used as a guideline; some days may be adjusted based on mission changes or USAFA related events that may conflict.	M1- 2
M1-2	<b>IT NCOs loads organizational staffing positions in Student</b>	M5
M2	<b>Initial feedback period commences (Use AFCW 724, Cadet Comprehensive Assessments)</b>	T5
T4	<b>AOCs/AMTs validate Cadet rosters in operating SIS (currently</b>	M7
T5	<b>IT NCOs validate cadet job assignments in SIS</b>	T5
M16	<b>Mid-semester feedback period commences (Use AFCW 724, Cadet Comprehensive Assessments)</b>	T18
T28	<b>Element leaders stratify subordinates by class year. Stratification provided to FLT/CC</b>	M30
T28	<b>Cadet club feedbacks due to AOC from OIC/NCOIC (Use AFCW 707B, Cadet Performance Report External Eval)</b>	M31
T29	<b>FLT/CCs &amp; SQ/DO (also WG/CV, WG/DO, GRP/CD, and GRP/DO) stratify subordinates by class year. Stratification provided to SQ/CC, GRP/CC, and WG/CC</b>	M32
M32	<b>Cadet commanders stratify subordinates by class year</b>	T34
M34	<b>Dean of Faculty, Athletic Department (IC Sports) &amp; Airfield EC Inputs</b>	T34
T34	<b>AOC/AMT Reviews Evals, Validates probations &amp; Assigns Final Strat’s</b>	M37
M33	<b>Commissioning Education Test scores completed (All scores finalized</b>	T34
T36	<b>AOC/AMT Completes (Use AFCW FORM 707A) Feedback Period; provide face-to- face feedback to subordinates, obtain signatures on</b>	M39
T36	MPA Process Owner ensures all objective scores have been entered in	T37
T37	<b>All Subjective scores must be submitted</b>	T37
T37	CWVVV Calculate MPAs; loads in SIS	M38

T38	<b>Subjective MPA appeals (Stratifications)</b>	T40 +3
T40	MPA closed; CWVVV loads MPAs in operating SIS	T40 +5
<b>Note:</b> Plain text denotes CWVVV duty, bold, indicates duties which belong to raters and ratee's.		



Attachment 3

MPA POINT DISTRIBUTION AND 4.0 CONVERSION SCALE

Table A3.1. MPA Point Distribution

Professional Excellence Point Distribution									
CW, DF and AD/AF Inputs		Firstie		2 deg		3 deg		4 deg	
		Proposed		Proposed		Proposed		Proposed	
		Points	Weight	Points	Weight	Points	Weight	Points	Weight
CW's Input	CW Professional Appraisal (Prog)	300	20	250	17	230	15	200	13
	CW Professional Appraisal (Final)	600	40	550	37	470	31	400	27
	CW Professional Appraisal (Total)	900	60	800	53	700	47	600	40
	Major Assessment Events	100	7	75	5	50	3	50	3
	PAI	100	7	125	8	150	10	200	13
	SAMI	50	3	100	7	150	10	150	10
	AMI	50	3	100	7	150	10	200	13
	Commissioning Education	300	20	300	20	300	20	300	20
MPA Totals:		1500	100	1500	100	1500	100	1500	100
External	DF Professional Appraisal	250	12.5	250	12.5	250	12.5	250	12.5
	AD/Airfield/SPARK Professional Appraisal	250	12.5	250	12.5	250	12.5	250	12.5
Professional Excellence Totals:		2000		2000		2000		2000	

  

CW and DF-Only Inputs									
CW and DF-Only Inputs		Firstie		2 deg		3 deg		4 deg	
		Proposed		Proposed		Proposed		Proposed	
		Points	Weight	Points	Weight	Points	Weight	Points	Weight
CW's Input	CW Professional Appraisal (Prog)	300	17	250	14	230	13	200	11
	CW Professional Appraisal (Final)	850	49	800	46	720	41	650	37
	CW Professional Appraisal	1150	66	1050	60	950	54	850	49
	Major Assessment Events	100	6	75	4	50	3	50	3
	PAI	100	6	125	7	150	9	200	11
	SAMI	50	3	100	6	150	9	150	9
	AMI	50	3	100	6	150	9	200	11
	Commissioning Education	300	17	300	17	300	17	300	17
MPA Totals:		1750	100	1750	100	1750	100	1750	100
External	DF Professional Appraisal	250	12.5	250	12.5	250	12.5	250	12.5
	AD/Airfield/SPARK Professional Appraisal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Professional Excellence Totals:		2000		2000		2000		2000	

Table A3.2. 4.0 Scale Conversion

Letter Grade	Stand Score	2000 Point Scale	MPA Range
A+	97-100	1,901-2,000	3.751-4.000
A	93-96	1,801-1,900	3.501-3.750
A-	90-92	1,701-1,800	3.251-3.500
B+	87-89	1,601-1,700	3.001-3.250
B	83-86	1,501-1,600	2.751-3.000
B-	80-82	1,401-1,500	2.501-2.750
C+	77-89	1,301-1,400	2.251-2.500

C	73-76	1,201-1,300	2.001-2.250
C-	70-72	1,101-1,200	2.000
D, F	0-69	0-1,100	1.900

**Attachment 4**

**EXPANDED MPA RUBRIC AND PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS**

**A4.1. Performance Dimensions.** A performance dimension focuses on the actions that need to be taken by anyone doing that job to get the work done. Performance dimensions are groupings of behaviors and actions and are defined based upon the requirements and expectations of the job. Dimensions, which focus on the job, are useful for performance management and review.

A4.1.1. The requirements outlined in the expanded rubric are tied to Air Force Commissioning Outcomes, USAFA Outcomes, and key principles as described in AF Handbook 1. All of the requirements have a direct link to the Air Force's Enlisted and Officer Performance Feedback and Appraisal system. The descriptions and behaviors of the key dimensions were extracted from these documents.

A4.1.2. The questions were written to help identify the behaviors in any given environment.

**A4.2. Competencies.** A competency is a cluster of knowledge, skills and abilities that describes a general trait that an individual has or should have to perform a job. Competencies relate to the individual. Competencies, which focus on cadet's traits are useful for development and screening for leadership positions.

**A4.3. The Likert-Scale for Rating Performance.**

A4.3.1. Always Met Standards (Exceeds Standards). Consistently met performance standards with little-to-no prompting. Self-motivated, engaged and an example to others. A unique performer.

A4.3.2. Routinely Met Standards (Consistently Met Standards). Meets established standards and expectations with minimal prompting. Failed to self-correct and/or required prompting on rare occasions. When corrected, takes appropriate action.

A4.3.3. Occasionally Met Standards (Developing). Performs within established standards and expectations, but required significant prompting. Failed to self-correct, but showed improvement when confronted. Performance was below standards but not to level that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below standards or expectations.

A4.3.4. Rarely Met Standards (Does not Meet Standards). Performs below established standards and expectations, requires improvement. Routine and/or significant unacceptable performance, actions that are incompatible with, and/or Airmen who have failed to adhere to established standards and expectations. Performs routinely or significantly at an unacceptable level. Routinely (a repeated inability to meet standards that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below standards or expectations) and/or significantly (a single instance where failure to meet standards is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts the overall aggregated performance assessment).

**Table A4.1. Expanded Performance Dimensions Rubric.**

Performance Dimensions	Requiremen	Description	Behaviors	Relevant Questions
------------------------	------------	-------------	-----------	--------------------

<p><b>1. Duty Performance</b></p> <p>The observable behaviors and actions which explain how a job is done. Includes the results expected from satisfactory performance.</p>	<p>AFH1, 1 Oct 2017 AFI 36-2014, 14 Jul 2019 AFI 36-2406, 13 Nov 2019</p>	<p>Consider the quality, quantity, results and impact of the Airman's job performance .</p> <p>Describes the degree of willingness to execute duties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fulfills on the expectations of their assigned role</li> <li>- Follows the policies associated with the assigned role</li> <li>- Decision-making and results orientation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How would you rate the quality of their work?</li> <li>- How well-prepared were they for class/practice/flight /assigned duties?</li> <li>- Did they consistently follow the established policies?</li> </ul> <p><i>Was their work</i></p>
<p><b>2. Professional Qualities</b></p> <p>Professionalism is the skill, good judgment and polite behavior that is expected of a person who is trained to do a job well. A professional is defined as a person who displays the characteristics of a professional <b>a.</b></p> <p><b><i>Intrinsically Motivated</i></b></p> <p>The undertaking of an activity without external incentive. Personal satisfaction derived through self-initiated achievement. <b>a.</b></p> <p><b><i>Intrinsically Motivated</i></b></p> <p>The undertaking of an activity without external incentive. Personal satisfaction derived through self-initiated achievement. Engages in one of the learned professions and</p>	<p>AFH1, 01 Oct 2017 AFI 36-2406, 13 Nov 2019</p>	<p>Describes the Airman's ownership of, and adherence to, professional standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Makes being on time (punctuality) a priority</li> <li>- Demonstrates a positive attitude <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is helpful to others</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Demonstrates respect for others</li> <li>- Displays respect for human dignity</li> <li>- Takes ownership of errors; respectful when confronted</li> <li>- Communicates effectively (verbal, non-verbal, reading,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did they always show up on time and/or ahead of schedule?</li> <li>- Did they consistently demonstrate a positive attitude, even when faced with adversity?</li> <li>- Were they respectful and courteous to authority?</li> <li>- Were they respectful and courteous to their peers, even when encountering opposing views?</li> <li>- Did they demonstrate respect for human dignity in all situations?</li> </ul>

<p><b>a. Intrinsically Motivated</b> The undertaking of an activity without external incentive. Personal satisfaction derived</p>	<p>AFI 36-2406, 13 Nov 2019</p>	<p>Describes the degree to which the Airman is self-motivated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Takes initiative</li> <li>- Applies effort regardless of circumstance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did they consistently apply themselves regardless of circumstance?</li> </ul>
<p><b>b. Teamwork</b> The cooperative or coordinated effort on the part of a group of persons acting together as a team in the interest of a common cause.</p>	<p>USAF A Outcomes AFH1, 01 Oct 2017 AFI 36-2014, 14 Jul 2019, AFI 36-2406, 13 Nov 2019</p>	<p>Rate how well the Airman selflessly considers others, values diversity, and sets the stage for an environment of dignity and respect; to include promoting a healthy organizational climate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Builds alliances to solve problems/achieve objectives</li> <li>- Works cooperatively and respectfully</li> <li>- Uses diplomacy and tact when interacting</li> <li>- Helps manage conflict</li> <li>- Collaborates</li> <li>- Fosters collegial and cooperative attitudes</li> <li>- Relates well to all personnel regardless of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did they work with others?</li> <li>- Were they cooperative and respectful with all personnel?</li> <li>- Did they work with others to solve problems or did they ignore issues and/or work in isolation?</li> <li>- Did they seek the help of others when needed?</li> <li>- To what degree did they foster a collegial and cooperative environment?</li> <li>- Did they use diplomacy and tact when interacting with others? Were they ever</li> </ul>

<p><b>3. Character</b> The sum of characteristics of one's personality, and the habits of action. To be of good character refers to the degree to the degree to which a person is rightful, upright, correct, moral and honest. The Air Force's means of operationalizing</p>	<p>Air Force Instruction 1-1, Air Force Standards, 6 Aug 2012 AFH1, 01 Oct 2017 AFI 36-2014, 14</p>	<p>Consider how well the Airman adopts, internalizes, and demonstrates our Air Force Core Values.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can be counted on to act morally in all situations -</li> <li>Makes consistent moral choices, regardless of environment -</li> <li>Exhibits a warrior ethos/hardiness of spirit; resilient</li> <li>- Displays poise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How well can you count on this individual to act morally, regardless of circumstance? - Did they appear to demonstrate resilience and hardiness of spirit, even when challenged or faced with the</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--	---

<p><b>a. Integrity</b></p> <p>The willingness to do the right thing, whether or not someone is watching. The foundation upon which trust is built. Includes the values of honesty, courage, and accountability.</p>	<p>AFH1, 01 Oct 2017 AFI 36-2014, 14 Jul 2019, AFI 36-2406, 13 Nov 2019</p>	<p>Consider their willingness to do the right thing, even when it is unpopular and/or</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can be trusted in all situations</li> <li>- Is good to their word</li> <li>- Never offers excuses for personal failures</li> <li>- Does what is explicitly expected of them</li> <li>- Does what is implicitly expected of them</li> <li>- Seeks honest and constructive feedback</li> <li>- Is accountable for their actions and inaction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what degree was the individual good to word (they did what they said they would do)?</li> <li>- Can they be counted upon to do what is explicitly expected of them?</li> <li>- Can they be counted upon to do even what is implicitly expected of them?</li> <li>- To what degree did they seek honest and constructive feedback?</li> <li>- Are they accountable for their actions and/or inaction?</li> <li>- To what degree did they take ownership of their actions and decisions?</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--	---

<p><b>b. Service Before Self</b> Professional duties take precedence over personal desires. The heart and mindset of service allows personnel to embrace expectations and requirements not levied upon the public or other professions. The virtues that demonstrate service include: duty, loyalty and respect.</p>	<p>AFH1, 01 Oct 2017 AFI 36-2014, 14 Jul 2019, AFI 36-2406, 13 Nov 2019</p>	<p>Consider the degree to which the member elevates the needs of the organization above their own personal desires</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selflessly dedicated to duty</li> <li>- Considers service a privilege and puts duty first</li> <li>- Needs of the unit and team placed above their desires</li> <li>- Exhibits faith in the system                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not complain</li> </ul> </li> <li>- The highest loyalty is to the Nation first, the Air Force second and then to those</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did they place assigned duties above their own personal needs and desires?</li> <li>- Did they demonstrate faith in the system and those that led them?</li> <li>- Were there ever any instances where they complained about circumstances or the organization?</li> <li>- Did they have an outwardly observable dedication to the nation?</li> <li>- Did they have an outwardly observable dedication to the Air Force?</li> </ul>
<p><b>c. Excellence</b> This value directs the continuous advancement of the craft and knowledge as Airmen. It involves a passion for continuous improvement and innovation.</p>	<p>AFH1, 01 Oct 2017 AFI 36-2014, 14 Jul 2019, AFI 36-2406, 13 Nov 2019</p>	<p>Developed a sustained passion for improvement and innovation in themselves and others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exceeds the standard</li> <li>- Approaches duties with a sense of stewardship</li> <li>- Demonstrates initiative</li> <li>- Continuously improves of processes</li> <li>- Takes care of resources</li> <li>- Demonstrates pride</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what degree did they exceed expectations?</li> <li>- Did they demonstrate stewardship of their assigned duties and/or resources?</li> <li>- To what degree did they demonstrate initiative?</li> <li>- Did they appear to be proud of their team/organization?</li> <li>- To what degree did they demonstrate self-discipline and personal restraint?</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Anticipates and embraces change</li><li>- Demonstrates self- discipline and restraint</li><li>- Maintains a dedicated work ethic</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- How would you describe their work ethic?</li><li>- Did they go above- and- beyond, or merely meet minimum standards/expectations?</li><li>- Did you get a sense they were bought in, or there because they were obligated?</li><li>- To what degree did they "leave it better than they found it"?</li></ul>
--	--	--	--	--



**Attachment 5**

**MPA MISSION ELEMENT RUBRICS**

**A5.1.** MEs, with MPARC approval, will publish rubrics applicable for their disciplines.

## Attachment 6

### STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM AND LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

#### A6.1. Roles and Responsibilities

A6.1.1. CAMIS or SIS PMO. Respective PMO is responsible for administering cadet information, as determined by USAFA/A6.

A6.1.2. LMS. HQ USAFA is responsible for providing technical support for LMS operation by the MEs.

A6.1.3. CWVV (Stan/Eval). CW Stan/Eval administers CW's use of LMS (currently Blackboard) for MPA purposes.

Attachment 7

**TABLE A7.1. MAJOR ASSESSMENT EVENT. 110 PTS MAX; 1PT SEPARATION BETWEEN EACH SQUADRON**

<b>MAE Squadron Rating</b>	<b>MPA Point Score</b>
1 <sup>st</sup> Place	100
2 <sup>nd</sup> Place	99
3 <sup>rd</sup> Place	98
Outstanding	97-90
Excellent	89-80
Satisfactory	79-70
Marginal	69-61
Unsatisfactory (Deemed by the MAE lead)	60 & below

*\*Note: [Table A7.1](#) Example is based off of CIC MAE points\**

## Attachment 8 SUMMER MPA

**A8.1.** Purpose. The purpose of summer MPA is to provide continuous developmental and evaluative feedback to the upper three classes throughout their summer programs.

**A8.2.** First and second class cadets in leadership programs and select broadening programs will receive an MPA for each period during the summer. CWT, when required, will determine and publish a list of programs receiving an MPA prior to the beginning of the first summer period. Additionally, all rising third class cadets participating in ESET and Commissioning Education will not receive an MPA that will count as their summer MPA.

**A8.3.** Summer Group AOCs, with CWT coordination, are responsible for determining the methods of evaluation used in their respective groups, and the Commandant of Cadet is responsible for determining the method of evaluation for the wing level. All evaluations, however, will be conducted in or entered into the LMS for calculation prior to entry into the SIS. Group AOCs will ensure that all cadets receiving MPAs in their respective programs are briefed on the components no later than the first day of the summer period during which they are participating.

A8.3.1. The 4.0 rating system gives consistency to the summer MPA. A rating of 4.0 is the maximum, and a rating of 0.0 is the minimum. Grading criteria set by MPA behavioral anchors as identified by Officer Development System competencies in AFCWI 36-2401. Qualitative assessments are provided by each cadet's Chain of Command. For any subjective ratings, criteria will be set according to the Expanded Performance Dimensions Rubric A.1.

A8.3.2. If a cadet's performance is assessed as "deficient" for a rating period, the AOC will ensure CWVV flags the cadet as having a "referral report." By definition, a "referral report" is for a cadet whose performance is substandard (an MPA of 1.90 or below). In these cases, conduct and/or aptitude probation should be considered.

**A8.4.** Cadets will receive a separate evaluation for each summer period in which they participate in an identified program. All evaluation data will be entered into the LMS no later than two days prior to the final day of the summer period at COB.

**A8.5.** During each summer period, each cadet supervisor shall provide at least one developmental initial feedback and one final evaluation to each cadet they directly supervise in the unit of assignment. Due to the relatively short grading period, the requirement for Midterm feedback has been deleted. The supervisor will base their feedback and assessment on expectations and actions consistent with the criteria.

**A8.6.** Summer MPAs are to be composed only of Subjective & Objective components. Subjective (Strat rubric), Objective (Test/Quiz/SOP/Course eval).

- 750pts SUB + 250pts OBJ = 1000 Total Points.
- Programs that are exempt from the 250 OBJ testing are scored out of 750 pts.

**A8.7.** MPA scores are entered into Blackboard under Cadet Performance Appraisal by AOCs/AMTs, program leads/instructors along with other Permanent Party (PP) course graders NLT 2 business days prior to the end of each period.

**A8.8.** Stratifications within the unit level are managed at the Squadron, Group or Wing level, similar to Academic Year (AY) standard (SQ 84%, GRP 88%, WG 91%). Groups with a staff smaller than cadets total, to include cadet cadre officers and NCOs, will coordinate with CWVVV the integration of a select number of cadets from the squadron level into the group level stratification process.

**A8.9.** MPA ratings are calculated based on the AOC's/AMT's final ranking of each cadet versus a group of their peers in their respective program.

**A8.10.** Student cadets will not receive MPAs; Upper two (Firsties/2 Degr) will receive MPAs.

**A8.11.** Summer MPAs are weighted as 20% of a Cadet's annual MPA input. Fall and Spring Semester are weighted at 40%, respectively; making a 40/40/20 split of CUM MPAs.

**A8.12.** Cadets placed on probation during the summer semester are able to earn an MPA of 2.0 & above during each of the summer period(s) however, they will receive the deficient MPA of 1.9 in the Fall semester.

**A8.13.** Cadets will have more voice and say in evaluating other cadets. Cadet supervisors are empowered with the rating system more aligned with active duty. Individual development balanced with cadet comparisons to peers in their units. Program managers/PP/Cadets shall strive to allocate time to accomplish ratings.

**A8.14.** Cadets will receive Initial and Final feedback. This official document is completed, reviewed, and signed by the direct supervisor; to then be reviewed and signed by the subordinate. Subordinate also may submit bullets to attach to the document. Each individual will receive a stratification against their peers within their squadron. Final Performance Feedbacks are documented and maintained electronically; Cadets will maintain a signed hard copy and shall turn this copy into their owning AY AOC/AMT. No blanket MPAs are granted over an entire summer program.

**A8.15.** No MPA; individual evaluations are based on a program Pass/Fail assessment. If a student fails a summer program, the student is required to redo the specific program in lieu of Cadet Break the following summer.

**A8.16.** Cadet Chain of Command owns the feedback process and stratification. PP will manage the MPA timelines, ensure the stratifications are fair & equitable, and ensure the timely execution of evaluations. AOCs/AMTs are in a "reviewer" role for Performance Feedbacks. AOCs/AMTs will manage the Stratification process similar to the AY. PP will utilize the scoring rubric provided by CWVV.

**A8.17.** A rating of 4.0 is the maximum and a rating of 2.0 is the minimum MPA that can be garnered during the Summer semester. If a cadet's performance is assessed as "deficient" for a summer rating period, the AOC will flag the cadet as having a "referral report." By definition, a "referral report" is for a cadet whose performance is substandard (an MPA of 1.90 or below). The referral report is sent to the owning AOCs/AMTs as a recommendation for a 1.9 MPA during the Fall semester.

**A8.18.** Each summer period will have a separate ranking for the cadets serving in the identified programs. Programs will have to anatomy to adjust their stratification pool, and process MPAs are input into Blackboard by the assigned AOC/AMT no later than COB on Wednesday before the final day of the summer period.

**A8.19.** If a cadet serves in multiple positions during the summer that earn an MPA, those MPAs are averaged to determine the overall summer MPA for cumulative MPA calculations. If a cadet only works one program that earns an MPA, that MPA is the overall summer MPA.

**A8.20.** If a cadet does not work a summer program that receives an MPA, the previous MPA (semester or cumulative, whichever is higher) is assigned for the summer unless extraordinary circumstances warrant assigning a different MPA. Any "referral report" will result in an overall Fall MPA of 1.90 or below.

**A8.21.** Appeals are conducted in the same manner as the AY process outlined in the AFCWI 36-2401, *Military Performance Appraisal*, however, due to the abbreviated timeline of a summer period, cadets must submit all appeal paperwork through their Program AOC or Officer equivalent to CWVV by COB on the Monday following the end of the period.

A8.21.1. All scoring appeal requests must be immediately communicated to the Cadet's direct chain of command to include the Squadron/Group/Wing Commander, and AOC/AMT. All disputes unable to be resolved at the AOC/AMT and/or GAOC level are elevated to CW/DO and CWVV for final resolution.

**A8.22.** All cadets need to review their records in Blackboard during the summer period transitions to ensure all grades are accounted for and accurate. Once the Monday following the end of the period has passed, no grades are changed. The only grades uploaded outside the prescribed timeline are for cadets that were on an approved SCA, emergency leave, or other extenuating circumstances approved by the AOC/AMT.