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

AIR FORCE GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND **INSTRUCTION 13-5301, VOLUME 2**

16 MAY 2011 Incorporating Change 1, 23 SEPTEMBER 2011

Nuclear, Space, Missile, Command and Control

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

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

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

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: A3TV

Supersedes: AFGSCI 36-2202v1, 1 Dec 2009

Certified by: HQ AFGSC/A3T (Col Daniel A. Kosin) Pages: 47

This instruction implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 13-5 Nuclear Operations. This instruction defines roles, responsibilities, and minimum requirements for REACT mission-ready evaluation programs for employment of the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) and applies to 13S personnel assigned to Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC), Twentieth Air Force (20 AF) and AFGSC Missile Wings (MW). This instruction applies to 392nd Training Squadron (392 TRS) as applicable. This instruction does not apply to Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units. This instruction requires collecting and maintaining information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by 10 USC 8013. Privacy Act system notice number F036 AF PC C, Military Personnel Records System, applies.

Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Form 847, Recommendation for Change of Publication; route AF Form 847s from the field through Major Command (MAJCOM) publications/forms managers. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, Management of Records, and disposed of in accordance with Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS) Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at https://www.my.af.mil/afrims/afrims/afrims/rims.cfm. See Attachment 1 for a glossary of references and supporting information.



5

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This interim change implements new guidance that clarifies requirements for REACT crew standardization and evaluation programs. Interim change guidance changes the 20 AF office symbol for responsibilities and clarification, adjusts description of a special check, corrects inherent JPR listings, revises requirement for 20 AF to develop standardized guidelines to support established evaluation program minimum requirements outlined in this instruction, clarifies requirement for ICE course attendance for previously certified evaluators, changes evaluation JPR coverage requirements, clarifies instructions for upgrade evaluations resulting in a Q3 rating, clarifies guidance for ACP/SCP evaluations in the operational environment, adds guidance for evaluation report documentation, adds evaluatee outbriefing guidance as a separate section, adjusts error consummation statement, clarifies guidance for determining training on procedural deviations in the operational environment, revises Attachment 1 to adjust abbreviations and to fix publication formatting errors, revises Attachment 2 to fix publication formatting errors (no change to content). A margin bar (]) indicates newly revised material.

Chapter 1—GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1.	Evaluation Program	5
1.2.	Responsibilities.	5
1.3.	Changes or Clarifications.	7
1.4.	Waivers.	8
1.5.	Supplements.	8
Chapter 2—	EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS	9
2.1.	Evaluation Processes.	9
2.2.	Evaluation Categories.	9
2.3.	Evaluation Types.	9
2.4.	Evaluation Phases.	11
2.5.	No-Notice Evaluations.	12
2.6.	Delinquency Dates.	12
2.7.	Delinquency Date Calculation.	13
Chapter 3—	EVALUATOR TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION	15
3.1.	Training and Certification Program	15
3.2.	Evaluator Training Requirements.	15
3.3.	Evaluator Certification.	16
3.4.	Senior Crew Certification.	16
3.5.	Additional Certification Requirements.	17
3.6.	Recurring Training and Certification Requirements.	17

AFGSCI 13-5301V2 16 May 2011

	3.7.	Evaluator Restricted Status Requirements.	18
	3.8.	Removal From Restricted Status.	18
	3.9.	Decertification and Recertification Requirements.	19
	3.10.	Tailored Evaluator Training Program.	19
Chapt	er 4—E	VALUATION SCENARIOS AND SCRIPTS	20
	4.1.	Evaluation Scenarios.	20
	4.2.	Evaluation Scenario Conduct.	20
	4.3.	Evaluation Scripts.	21
	4.4.	TEPS and Timing Constraints.	23
	4.5.	Status Presentation.	24
	4.6.	Briefings	24
	4.7.	Evaluation Scenario Termination.	25
	4.8.	Operational Evaluations.	26
	4.9.	Outbriefing the Evaluatee.	27
Chapt	er 5—E	VALUATION DOCUMENTATION	28
	5.1.	Error Determination.	28
	5.2.	Error Consummation.	28
	5.3.	Critical Errors.	29
	5.4.	Major Errors	31
	5.5.	Minor Errors.	33
	5.6.	Evaluation Documentation.	33
	5.7.	Evaluation Ratings.	34
Chapt	er 6—M	IISCELLANEOUS	37
	6.1.	Operational Performance.	37
	6.2.	AFGSC Crew Member Excellence (CME) Award.	37
	6.3.	Combat Capability Evaluation (CCE).	38
	6.4.	New or Upgrade System Requirements.	38
	6.5.	DELETED	39
Attack	nment 1-	-GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION	40
Attack	nment 2-	-EVALUATION OVERVIEW CHART	44
Attach	nment 3-	-FORMAL REQUEST FOR ERROR DETERMINATION	45
Attack	nment 4-		46

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. Evaluation Program. Standardization and evaluation across units, missions, and functional areas is done to gain efficiencies in processes, to increase combat capability, and to provide common training products where possible. Unit-level evaluations will challenge an Airman's ability to operate in the heart of the nuclear envelope and validate that they are trained to meet the nuclear needs of the military. Evaluations measure proficiency on existing, new, or revised procedures and equipment, verify procedures are being trained properly to support mission accomplishment and provide feedback on training programs. They also provide squadron leadership feedback on an individual's or crew's demonstrated performance.

1.1.1. Units will design and implement evaluation programs to ensure procedures contained in technical orders, checklists, Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTPs), and operations manuals are standardized, accurate, and effective to fulfill mission accomplishment.

1.1.2. Units will evaluate in accordance with established Training and Evaluation Performance Standards (TEPS).

1.1.2.1. Reference Attachment 2 of AFGSC Instruction (AFGSCI) 13-5301v1, *Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Training*, and AFGSCI 13-5301v4, *REACT Emergency War Order (EWO) Training and Evaluation Procedures*, for the Job Performance Requirement (JPR) List (JPRL).

1.1.2.2. Reference Attachments 3 through 5 of AFGSCI 13-5301v1 and AFGSCI 13-5301v4 for a complete listing of established performance standards and constraints.

1.1.3. Units will use the performance standards to measure crew member proficiency on existing, new, or revised procedures and equipment.

1.2. Responsibilities.

1.2.1. HQ AFGSC Directorate of Operations (A3):

1.2.1.1. Oversees management of Major Command (MAJCOM) standardization and evaluation programs.

1.2.1.2. Establishes a MAJCOM office of primary responsibility (HQ AFGSC/A3T, Training and Standardization/Evaluation Division) to implement the standardization and evaluation programs outlined in this publication.

1.2.1.3. Establishes and implements policy, basic requirements, and guidance for REACT operations standardization and evaluation programs.

1.2.1.4. Develops and provides TEPS to subordinate units.

1.2.1.5. Conducts semi-annual reviews of the TEPS and JPRL for changes or additions.

1.2.1.6. Provides guidance on minimum task requirements for each type of evaluation.

1.2.1.7. Conducts Staff Assistance Visits (SAVs) to assess operations group standardization and evaluation office's ability to meet mission requirements. The requesting wing or group commander will determine the programs and scope of review.

1.2.1.8. Monitors Air Education and Training Command (AETC) standardization and evaluation programs that support the 20 AF missions.

1.2.2. Twentieth Air Force (20 AF):

1.2.2.1. Ensures operational readiness of subordinate missile wings.

1.2.2.2. Recommends policy changes to HQ AFGSC/A3T.

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

1.2.3. 20AF Standardization, Evaluation and Training Office (20AF/A3N):

1.2.3.1. 20 AF, in coordination with the HQ AFGSC/A3 staff, is responsible for interpreting and ensuring compliance with Headquarters Air Force (HAF) instructions and procedures. 20 AF personnel, as the ICBM command evaluators, represent the 20 AF Commander (20AF/CC) and HQ AFGSC in evaluating the command standards.

1.2.3.2. Provides guidance on implementation and use of TEPS.

1.2.3.3. Ensures wings and groups implement standardized evaluator training programs that comply with this instruction.

1.2.3.4. Conducts SAVs to assess operations group standardization and evaluation office's ability to meet mission requirements. The requesting wing or group commander will determine the programs and scope of review.

1.2.3.5. Standardizes operations among wings, where practical.

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

1.2.3.7. Provides a quarterly review of evaluation results to HQ AFGSC/A3TV (Operations Standardization and Evaluation Branch). The report must include the number of full-check evaluations administered, evaluation results and the number of errors assessed broken out by severity.

1.2.3.7.1. Qualification Level 1 (Q1) evaluation results must include the number of evaluations with no errors assessed.

1.2.3.8. Provides guidance to subordinate units for error determination when the wing is unable to make a determination and will supply HQ AFGSC/A3TV a copy of any Guidance and Clarification (G&C) for error determinations issued. If unable to make an error determination, consult with HQ AFGSC/A3TV for guidance and final error determination.

1.2.3.9. Provides assistance on problems affecting compliance with this instruction when resolution is beyond the scope of subordinate unit resources. Requests clarification or waivers from HQ AFGSC/A3T regarding this publication if unable to resolve issue or question.

1.2.3.10. Develops and coordinates a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with AETC/381 Training Group (TRG) outlining responsibilities with regard to initial evaluation requirements following initial skills training (IST).

1.2.4. Missile Wing (MW) and Operations Group (OG):

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

1.2.4.2. Ensures evaluation materials comply with AFMAN 36-2234, *Instructional System Development* (ISD), requirements and higher headquarters (HHQ) directives.

1.2.4.3. Individuals officially appointed as Vice, Deputy, or Operations Officer may act on behalf of principals in accordance with Air Force Standards, unless specifically prohibited by this instruction or their principal.

1.2.5. Operations Group Standardization and Evaluation Office (OGV):

1.2.5.1. Develops or ensures development of evaluation materials for Combat Mission Ready (CMR) programs.

1.2.5.2. Ensures standardization of evaluation practices and ensures evaluator proficiency is maintained among operations group CMR evaluators.

1.2.5.3. Conducts evaluations required by this instruction. OGV is the only wing organization authorized to perform Missile Combat Crew (MCC) evaluations.

1.2.5.4. Ensures standardization of operations procedures and evaluation programs wherever practical among operations group units.

1.2.5.5. Reviews all new or changed publications for impacts on operations procedures, standardization, and evaluation programs.

1.2.5.6. Coordinates on locally developed publications (e.g., operating instructions (OIs), supplements, etc.) and training materials that contain or relate to combat crew weapon system operation.

1.2.5.7. The Chief, Standardization and Evaluation Division (Chief of Stan/Eval) establishes and implements the missile combat crew standardization and evaluation program. The Chief of Stan/Eval is the final unit authority for error determination at the wing.

1.2.5.8. The Chief of Stan/Eval manages the initial and recurring evaluator training and certification programs.

1.2.5.9. The Chief of Stan/Eval recommends certification, decertification, restriction, and removal from restriction for operational evaluators.

1.2.6. Operational Squadron Commander (SQ/CC):

1.2.6.1. The squadron commander or designated representative will determine corrective actions training, or any follow-on evaluation requirements resulting from an evaluation.

1.3. Changes or Clarifications. HQ AFGSC/A3T has overall responsibility for administration of this instruction. Suggestions for improving this instruction or requests for clarification are encouraged.

1.3.1. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR), HQ AFGSC/A3T, 245 Davis Avenue, Barksdale AFB, LA 71110 or AFGSCA3TWorkflow@barksdale.af.mil using the AF Form 847,

Recommendation for Change of Publication. Coordinate and route AF Form 847s through the appropriate functional's chain of command.

1.3.2. Process requests for clarification via memorandum or message to HQ AFGSC/A3T through 20 AF/A3N. Clarification requests will describe the issue with sufficient detail.

1.3.2.1. If a clarification request was initiated by telephone, units will follow up all requests in writing within one working day.

1.3.2.2. HQ AFGSC/A3T will provide clarification to 20 AF for distribution.

1.4. Waivers. HQ AFGSC/A3 is the waiver authority for this instruction unless specifically stated otherwise. Waiver authority may not be delegated. Waivers will be granted on an individual and controlled basis.

1.4.1. Forward all waivers via e-mail through 20 AF to HQ AFGSC/A3T describing the specific requirement creating the problem and explaining why a waiver is needed. If 20 AF concurs with the requested waiver, they will forward their recommendation to HQ AFGSC/A3T, who will in-turn forward their recommendation to HQ AFGSC/A3 for a final determination.

1.4.2. If approved, waivers stay in effect for the life of the publication, unless HQ AFGSC/A3 states a specific period of time, cancels the waiver in writing or issues a change that alters the basis for the waiver.

1.5. Supplements. Individual paragraphs to this instruction may be supplemented by 20 AF in accordance with Air Force Instruction (AFI) 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*. The purpose of the supplement is to document the process by which units implement the requirements of this instruction. Supplements will not be less restrictive than the provisions of this or any other publication. HQ AFGSC is the approving authority for 20 AF supplements.

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1. Evaluation Processes. Units, in coordination with 20 AF, will develop processes to conduct evaluations of missile combat crew members (MCCMs), validate training and provide feedback to the individuals and squadron on a crew members' demonstrated performance in order to fulfill evaluation program requirements outlined in this instruction.

2.2. Evaluation Categories. Evaluations given by units and HHQ inspectors will fall into one of two specific categories.

2.2.1. Full-Check. Full-check evaluations are given to MCCMs following initial training, upgrade training or given on a recurring basis. Full-check evaluations will meet JPR coverage necessary to advance a crew member's delinquency date.

2.2.2. Special-Check. Special-check evaluations are given to MCCMs following individual training or as a no-notice evaluation. Special-check evaluations may not meet evaluation criteria of a Full Check. Delinquency dates will only be advanced following the successful completion of a requalification evaluation.

2.3. Evaluation Types.

2.3.1. Initial Evaluation. Initial evaluations are full-check evaluations given to determine proficiency and capability of crews upon completion of IST and staff officers upon completion of Requalification Training (RQT) as applicable.

2.3.1.1. Initial evaluations administered by the 392 TRS will be scheduled and conducted in accordance with the training calendar.

2.3.1.2. As a minimum, units will ensure the following JPRs are evaluated in an initial evaluation:

2.3.1.2.1. Evaluate A02A, B01A, B04A, B05A, D03A, and at least one subtask from C01, C03 and E08.

2.3.1.2.2. In addition to subtasks listed in paragraph 2.3.1.2.1., evaluate at least one additional task from DXX and EXX, two tasks from FXX (one FXX task must be an execution message), two tasks from GXX, two subtasks from C02, C04, C05, and at least two subtasks anywhere from B06–B09.

2.3.1.2.3. A01A, A01B, A01C, A01E, A01F, A01G, B02A, B02E, B02F, B02G and B04A are inherently accomplished in this Missile Procedures Trainer (MPT) evaluation.

2.3.1.3. All initial evaluation scripts must contain a minimum of three Level A performance events.

2.3.2. Upgrade Evaluation. Upgrade evaluations are full-check evaluations given to an individual who has successfully completed training for an upgrade from Deputy Missile Combat Crew Commander (DMCCC) to Missile Combat Crew Commander (MCCC).

2.3.2.1. Upgrade evaluations will be scheduled and conducted as soon as possible after completion of training.

2.3.2.2. Upgrade evaluations are required to be a two-phase evaluation.

2.3.2.3. As a minimum, units will ensure the following JPRs are evaluated in an upgrade evaluation:

2.3.2.3.1. With the exception of AXX tasks (AXX tasks are optional), evaluate at least two tasks from each area. For example, B07A and B08B represent two BXX tasks, whereas C07A and C07B represent two subtasks of the C07 task.

2.3.2.3.2. FXX JPRs will be evaluated in accordance with AFGSCI 13-5301v4.

2.3.2.3.3. A01A, A01B, A01C, A01E, A01F, A01G, B02A, B02E, B02F, B02G and B04A are inherently accomplished in this MPT evaluation.

2.3.2.4. All upgrade evaluation scripts must contain a minimum of three Level A performance events.

2.3.3. Qualification Evaluation. Qualification evaluations are scheduled or no-notice fullcheck evaluations given to individuals prior to their delinquency date established by an initial, upgrade, full HHQ or previous qualification evaluation. Qualification evaluations are also given to CMR decertified individuals following completion of RQT. A qualification evaluation may also be directed or requested by operations officers and above. These evaluations not only provide a proficiency check, but also provide feedback to the training program.

2.3.3.1. An individual's first qualification evaluation is required to be a two-phase evaluation.

2.3.3.2. As a minimum, units will ensure the following JPRs are evaluated in a qualification evaluation:

2.3.3.2.1. With the exception of AXX tasks (AXX tasks are optional), evaluate at least two tasks from each area. For example, B07A and B08B represent two BXX tasks, whereas C07A and C07B represent two subtasks of the C07 task.

2.3.3.2.2. FXX JPRs will be evaluated in accordance with AFGSCI 13-5301v4.

2.3.3.2.3. A01A, A01B, A01C, A01E, A01F, A01G, B02A, B02E, B02F, B02G and B04A are inherently accomplished in this MPT evaluation.

2.3.3.3. All qualification evaluation scripts must contain a minimum of three Level A performance events.

2.3.4. Full HHQ Evaluation. Full HHQ evaluations are full-check evaluations given by 20 AF evaluators.

2.3.4.1. As a minimum, 20 AF evaluators will ensure the following JPRs are evaluated in a full HHQ evaluation:

2.3.4.1.1. With the exception of AXX tasks (AXX tasks are optional), evaluate at least two tasks from each area. For example, B07A and B08B represent two BXX tasks, whereas C07A and C07B represent two subtasks of the C07 task.

2.3.4.1.2. FXX JPRs will be evaluated in accordance with AFGSCI 13-5301v4.

2.3.4.1.3. A01A, A01B, A01C, A01E, A01F, A01G, B02A, B02E, B02F, B02G and B04A are inherently accomplished in this MPT evaluation.

2.3.4.2. All full HHQ evaluation scripts must contain a minimum of three Level A performance events.

2.3.5. Spot Evaluation. Spot evaluations are special-check evaluations that are given to check proficiency or validate training.

2.3.5.1. Spot evaluations may be directed or requested by squadron commanders and above when a check in proficiency is deemed appropriate, and a qualification evaluation is not appropriate.

2.3.5.2. For each major weapon system modification, a spot evaluation may be directed or requested to verify training and proficiency following supplemental training.

2.3.6. Requalification Evaluation. Requalification evaluations are special-check evaluations that are required upon completion of individual training resulting from an unqualified (Q3) evaluation rating on any full-check, spot evaluation or special HHQ evaluation.

2.3.6.1. If conducting a requalification evaluation resulting from an evaluation where only one member of the crew received a Q3, only the unqualified crew member requires a requalification evaluation. The same crew members should be evaluated together; however, another crew member may take the place of the qualified crew member and will be given credit for a spot evaluation.

2.3.6.1.1. If the evaluation meets the criteria in paragraph 2.3.3.2. and 2.3.3.3., the qualified crew member will be given credit for a qualification evaluation.

2.3.6.2. Evaluate, as a minimum, all subtasks with critical errors and any other requirements that were not fulfilled in the failed evaluation, or as requested by the squadron commander or operations officer.

2.3.6.3. Level B tasks and subtasks may be re-evaluated at the discretion of the certifying official, or designated representative.

2.3.7. Special HHQ Evaluation. Special HHQ evaluations are special-checks given by 20 AF evaluators or Inspector General (IG) inspectors. Special HHQ evaluations do not meet criteria of a full HHQ evaluation and will not advance an individual's delinquency date.

2.3.7.1. Special HHQ evaluations may conducted as no-notice.

2.4. Evaluation Phases. Evaluations administered to MCCMs will consist of either one phase or two phases.

2.4.1. An evaluation conducted in only one environment [off-line in the MPT or operational in the Launch Control Center (LCC)/Launch Control Equipment Building (LCEB)] is a one-phase evaluation.

2.4.1.1. One-phase qualification evaluations will be administered in the MPT.

2.4.1.2. One-phase evaluations conducted in the operational environment are considered spot evaluations.

2.4.2. A two-phase evaluation is conducted in both the MPT and operational environment.

2.4.3. The MPT and operational phases can be administered in any order; however, the second phase must be completed within 30 calendar days following completion of the first phase. The first phase of the evaluation must be re-accomplished if the second phase will not be accomplished within 30 days.

2.4.3.1. The same evaluators should administer both phases of an evaluation.

2.4.3.2. For two-phase evaluations, evaluators will ensure the evaluatee's technical orders have been properly posted following their MPT phase of evaluation, if the MPT phase is first. If the operational phase is first, evaluators will check the technical orders prior to departing for the LCC.

2.4.4. Training between phases of an evaluation is only authorized to remove a crew member from restricted status, provide required supplemental training, or attend normally scheduled recurring training.

2.4.4.1. Individual training conducted between phases will be limited to the training necessary to remove a crew member from restricted status.

2.4.5. Certified MCCMs may perform alert duties between phases of a two-phase evaluation assuming the crew member has not been restricted as a result of a Q3 rating during the first phase and has not reached their delinquency date.

2.5. No-Notice Evaluations. A no-notice evaluation is one where the evaluate is notified of an evaluation, but may not have normal preparation time. To maintain the integrity of the no-notice program, it is imperative that crews will not be told earlier than 18 hours in advance of their pending evaluation.

2.5.1. Units will maintain a no-notice evaluation program.

2.5.1.1. A minimum of 10 percent of all qualification evaluations conducted annually will be given as a no-notice evaluation.

2.5.1.2. No-notice evaluations will be either a spot evaluation or a qualification evaluation.

2.5.1.2.1. Qualification evaluations may be given during local exercises as part of the no-notice evaluation program.

2.5.1.3. No-notice evaluations must be out-of-cycle (at least 3 months before delinquency date) in order to count for no-notice statistics.

2.5.1.4. Units will develop a no-notice review process of individual technical orders to ensure correct posting.

2.6. Delinquency Dates. The delinquency date establishes the maximum time until a CMR individual must receive a qualification evaluation.

2.6.1. All CMR crew members must receive qualification evaluations as a periodic check on proficiency. Failure to receive a qualification evaluation before the individual's delinquency date causes the individual to be placed in restricted status.

2.6.2. If time does not permit a crew member to receive an evaluation prior to a deployment, the operator will be placed in restricted or decertified status at the time restriction or

decertification is required. Refer to AFGSCI 13-5301v1 for removal from restricted or decertified status.

2.7. Delinquency Date Calculation. The delinquency date is calculated from the date of evaluation(s) completion. For two-phase evaluations, the delinquency date will be calculated from the date of completion for the second phase.

2.7.1. Delinquency dates following an initial evaluation upon completion of IST are established by calculating the first day of the 7th month following successful completion of the initial evaluation.

2.7.1.1. If the initial evaluation is rated Q3, establish the delinquency date by calculating the first day of the 7th month following successful completion of the resulting requalification evaluation.

2.7.2. Delinquency dates following an initial evaluation of staff officers upon completion of requalification training are established by calculating the first day of the 13th month following successful completion of the initial evaluation.

2.7.2.1. If the initial evaluation is rated Q3, establish the delinquency date by calculating the first day of the 13th month following successful completion of the resulting requalification evaluation.

2.7.3. Delinquency dates following an upgrade, qualification or full HHQ evaluation are established by calculating the first day of the 13th month following successful completion of an upgrade, qualification or full HHQ evaluation.

2.7.3.1. If the upgrade, qualification or full HHQ evaluation is rated Q3, establish the delinquency date by calculating the first day of the 13th month following successful completion of the resulting requalification evaluation.

2.7.4. Spot and special HHQ evaluations will not advance the delinquency date.

2.7.5. Individuals appointed to a Senior Crew position are required to receive a qualification evaluation prior to certification. The qualification evaluation will be administered by the incumbent Senior Crew and observed by the Chief of Stan/Eval. The evaluation must be accomplished within 90 days prior to certification.

2.7.5.1. 20 AF evaluators will evaluate instructor or evaluator Senior Crew members during scheduled 20 AF Senior Crew evaluation visits. 20 AF may also conduct Senior Crew evaluations in conjunction with unit visits [e.g., Combat Capability Evaluation (CCE)].

2.7.6. If the incumbent instructor or evaluator Senior Crew's delinquency date occurs prior to the 20 AF visit, the delinquency date is automatically extended by 6 months. Delinquency dates beyond 18 months require HQ AFGSC/A3TV approval. Submit waiver request through 20 AF/A3NV.

2.7.7. In the event an instructor or evaluator Senior Crew is removed from Senior Crew duties and the delinquency has expired, an evaluation must be performed before performing unsupervised alert duties.

2.7.7.1. Individuals selected to replace Senior Crew members removed from Senior Crew duties must be evaluated within 45 days of appointment or their delinquency date, whichever is sooner.

2.7.7.2. Individuals must be evaluated by two CMR commander evaluators under the observation of the Chief or Stan/Eval.

Chapter 3

EVALUATOR TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION

3.1. Training and Certification Program. The evaluator training and certification program is designed to instruct and evaluate operations group evaluators on the proper manner by which to correctly assess crew proficiency as part of their role in the ISD process.

3.1.1. 20 AF may establish additional evaluator training program guidance for the requirements listed in paragraph 3.2.1.2.

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

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

3.2.1.1. Observe a minimum of one MPT evaluation and one LCC evaluation conducted by a certified evaluator.

3.2.1.1.1. Observing an evaluation includes participation in pre- and post-evaluation activities and error determination requirements.

3.2.1.1.2. An evaluator trainee may be certified to conduct evaluations in one environment before accomplishing an observation for the second environment.

3.2.1.2. Evaluator trainees must receive instruction on the following items:

3.2.1.2.1. Evaluator responsibilities.

3.2.1.2.2. Evaluation presentation techniques.

3.2.1.2.3. Identifying errors and determining error assessment and evaluation ratings.

3.2.1.2.4. Proper equipment configuration.

3.2.1.2.5. Evaluation material control procedures.

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

3.2.1.2.7. Documentation requirements.

3.2.1.2.8. Evaluation script and scenario construction.

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

3.2.1.2.10. ISD process and procedures.

3.2.1.3. Evaluator trainees must administer an evaluation scenario under the observation of a Senior Crew evaluator or the Chief of Stan/Eval.

3.2.1.4. Evaluator trainees must attend ICBM Center of Excellence (ICE) Operations Evaluator Course (OEC) no later than 3 months after their PCA, unless the individual has previously attended the course due to prior evaluator certification.

3.2.1.4.1. Evaluators will be placed in evaluator restricted status in accordance with paragraph 3.7.1.2. and will not administer evaluations until the OEC has been accomplished.

3.2.1.5. Evaluators responsible for writing scripts must attend the ICE Operations Scriptwriters Course as soon as possible.

3.3. Evaluator Certification. Only certified evaluators or evaluator trainees under direct supervision of the Senior Crew or Chief of Stan/Eval may conduct operations evaluations and document operations evaluations. Evaluators will be trained, observed, recommended and appointed for certification.

3.3.1. Evaluator certification occurs by position only; therefore, evaluators certified while in the DMCCC position are not automatically evaluator certified in the MCCC position.

3.3.1.1. Dual qualified commanders are automatically certified in both positions, but need only be observed and certified in one position.

3.3.2. If the evaluator trainee is not recommended for certification during their certification evaluation in either environment, the Senior Crew observer or the Chief of Stan/Eval will become the evaluator of record.

3.3.2.1. The Senior Crew is designated as the CMR evaluation crew who may observe and recommend certification of other evaluators. Senior Crew will provide recommendations to the Chief of Stan/Eval.

3.3.2.2. There is no limit to the number of observations it might take for an evaluator to become certified. If an evaluator fails to certify while being observed, retraining must be accomplished in the deficient area before the next attempt at certification.

3.3.3. After the evaluator trainee has been trained and observed administering an evaluation, the Chief of Stan/Eval or designated representative recommends evaluator certification to the OG commander.

3.3.4. The OG commander will certify evaluators in writing.

3.3.4.1. Certification paperwork must also include the signature of an approved individual recommending certification.

3.3.5. Evaluator observations and certifications will be documented on the AFGSC Form 91.

3.4. Senior Crew Certification. Senior Crew evaluator positions will be managed as specialized REACT crew positions and filled by selected individuals that are technical experts. Senior Crew evaluators may expect to extend their crew tour to fulfill these duties.

3.4.1. Senior Crew members must be certified in both the MPT and LCC. The Chief of Stan/Eval will observe prospective Senior Crew members observing other evaluators and recommending them for certification in both environments. The Chief of Stan/Eval will recommend Senior Crew certification to the OG commander.

3.4.2. The OG commander will certify evaluators to be a Senior Crew member in writing.

3.4.2.1. Certification paperwork must also include the signature of an approved individual recommending certification.

3.4.3. Senior Crew evaluator observations and certifications will be documented on the AFGSC Form 91.

3.4.4. Senior Crew members should remain in their positions for at least 12 months. When conditions dictate replacement of a Senior Crew in less than 12 months, the OG/CC will request a waiver from 20 AF/A3 explaining the circumstances for the early departure.

3.4.5. If a Senior Crew member is unable to perform their duties for an extended period [e.g., absent for 30 days or more due to illness or temporary duty (TDY)], an interim Senior Crew member may be selected.

3.4.5.1. Interim Senior Crew members must be appointed in writing and documented on the AFGSC Form 91. Interim Senior Crew may perform all required actions of a certified Senior Crew. A certification process is not required.

3.4.6. Individuals appointed to a Senior Crew position are required to receive a qualification evaluation prior to certification. The qualification evaluation will be administered by the incumbent evaluator Senior Crew or other evaluators designated by the Chief of Stan/Eval. The evaluation will be observed by the Chief of Stan/Eval. The evaluation must be accomplished within 3 months prior to certification.

3.5. Additional Certification Requirements. Evaluators must be certified in the position(s) they evaluate.

3.5.1. Unit-level evaluators must be CMR certified in accordance with AFGSCI 13-5301v1.

3.5.2. Unit-level evaluators must be Alternate Command Post/Squadron Command Post (ACP/SCP) certified. If the individual is not ACP/SCP certified prior to their permanent change of assignment (PCA), OGV will ensure certification is completed following their PCA into OGV.

3.5.2.1. Evaluators must be ACP/SCP certified prior to administering evaluations to ACP/SCP crews.

3.6. Recurring Training and Certification Requirements. Evaluators must be trained, observed, and maintain currency.

3.6.1. Evaluators must receive recurring evaluator training to maintain standardization and evaluator proficiency.

3.6.1.1. Recurring evaluator training will be conducted at least quarterly and will ensure all evaluator training tasks listed in paragraph 3.2.1.2. are covered at least annually.

3.6.1.2. The evaluator Senior Crew or Chief of Stan/Eval will administer the evaluator training program.

3.6.2. Evaluator and Senior Crew certifications expire on the first day of the 13th month following certification. Evaluators will be observed annually to maintain certification.

3.6.2.1. The Chief of Stan/Eval is responsible for meeting the annual observation requirements on all certified evaluators.

3.6.2.1.1. If the incumbent evaluator Senior Crew's certification expires prior to a 20 AF visit, the certification date is automatically extended by 6 months. Certification dates beyond 18 months require HQ AFGSC/A3TV approval. Submit waiver request through 20 AF/A3NV.

3.6.2.2. The Chief of Stan/Eval may delegate annual observation requirements to the Senior Crew or designated representative.

3.6.2.2.1. When Senior Crews conduct annual observations, they will brief the Chief of Stan/Eval and document the annual observation on the AFGSC Form 91.

3.6.3. An annual observation is required to maintain evaluator certification. An evaluator supporting another evaluator's initial certification in either the MPT or LCC may be credited with an annual observation.

3.6.3.1. Evaluators observed during an HHQ evaluation by 20 AF/A3N will satisfy an evaluator's annual observation requirement.

3.7. Evaluator Restricted Status Requirements. An individual may be prohibited from performing evaluator duties without being decertified.

3.7.1. Place an individual in evaluator restricted status for the following:

3.7.1.1. The individual is placed in restricted CMR status.

3.7.1.1.1. When an evaluator is placed in CMR restricted status for proficiency reasons, the evaluator may not administer evaluations.

3.7.1.1.2. When placed in restricted status for medical or personnel reliability program (PRP) reasons, the individual may conduct simulator evaluations if they have received all recurring training and maintained currency.

3.7.1.1.3. When an individual is in CMR restricted status for non-performance of alert duties in accordance with AFGSCI 13-5301v1, the individual may conduct simulator evaluations if they have received recurring training and maintained currency.

3.7.1.1.4. Evaluators who are CMR restricted will not perform LCC evaluations.

3.7.1.2. The individual does not receive quarterly recurring evaluator training, training required for certification or fails to receive an annual observation.

3.7.1.3. At the direction of the OG commander, deputy commander or Chief of Stan/Eval.

3.7.2. Individuals who are not CMR, or who are restricted for reasons other than those listed above will not perform evaluations or duties involving operation of the weapon system.

3.8. Removal From Restricted Status. Evaluators may be removed from evaluator restricted status upon completion of corrective actions.

3.8.1. Remove an individual from evaluator restricted status for the following:

3.8.1.1. Individuals who were placed in CMR restricted status must be removed from CMR restricted status.

3.8.1.2. Individuals who missed quarterly evaluator training must complete the applicable training that was missed.

3.8.1.3. Individuals placed in evaluator restricted status at the direction of the OG commander, deputy commander or Chief of Stan/Eval must satisfy requirements established by the certifying official.

3.9. Decertification and Recertification Requirements. The OG commander will decertify and recertify evaluators when needed.

3.9.1. Evaluators will be decertified in writing for the following reasons:

3.9.1.1. Individual is no longer needed as an evaluator.

3.9.1.2. Individual no longer possesses the degree of proficiency or professionalism required.

3.9.1.3. Individual departs unit due to a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) or PCA.

3.9.1.4. Individual is decertified from CMR duties.

3.9.2. Upon decertification, the individual will not perform evaluator duties.

3.9.3. An evaluator may be recertified following corrective actions as directed by the certifying official.

3.10. Tailored Evaluator Training Program. Once an individual has been certified as an evaluator within AFGSC, they will not be required to re-accomplish an entire training program at the new assignment.

Chapter 4

EVALUATION SCENARIOS AND SCRIPTS

4.1. Evaluation Scenarios. A scenario is a specific task or set of tasks presented in a coherent manner to simulate operational conditions for the purpose of evaluating crew members.

4.1.1. Performance tasks identified in the JPRL in Attachment 2 of AFGSCI 13-5301v1, will be evaluated using scenarios.

4.1.2. Evaluation scenario results are based on successfully meeting each task or subtask performance standard.

4.2. Evaluation Scenario Conduct. Evaluators will ensure all scenario stimuli are presented as written in the script and will provide a fair and unbiased evaluation of the crew.

4.2.1. Evaluators will ensure the crew being evaluated will not use any training materials such as study-guides, acronym charts or any personally made status tracking products during an evaluation.

4.2.2. For all evaluations, there will be at least a one-to-one ratio of evaluators to evaluatees. A crew commander will only be evaluated or observed by a commander evaluator. The deputy commander will be evaluated or observed by either a deputy evaluator or dual qualified commander evaluator.

4.2.3. During an evaluation, the evaluators will not challenge, correct, or prompt the evaluatee as to the validity of the actions performed except to provide proper weapon system status.

4.2.3.1. If the crew under evaluation in the MPT passes direction to another LCC or agency, that agency should take the actions directed by the crew regardless if the direction is incorrect. If incorrect direction is passed in the LCC, the evaluators will step in, correct action and assess the error.

4.2.4. Evaluatees are only permitted to ask questions to clarify a stimulus. Evaluators will not give more information than would normally be available or that would prompt a response.

4.2.5. Evaluatees will be given the opportunity to correctly perform the action or to take an incorrect action; however, evaluators must intervene to prevent a safety hazard or damage to any equipment. Errors will be assessed in accordance with Chapter 5 of this publication.

4.2.6. During an evaluation, the evaluator may ask questions to clarify an evaluatee's response to a task. Evaluators will ensure questions will not interfere with crew actions, interrupt crew actions or prompt the evaluatee.

4.2.7. A crew consisting of an ACP/SCP certified commander and deputy commander will be evaluated performing ACP/SCP duties.

4.2.8. Evaluators must always provide status that crew members would normally detect with their senses (e.g., heat, air, smoke, etc.) when it cannot be simulated by the MPT. Status cards will be used to the maximum extent possible. Evaluators will ensure proper configuration is programmed whenever possible or briefed to the crew.

4.3. Evaluation Scripts. Units will design and use scripts to conduct evaluation scenarios. Unit-level evaluations will verify proficiency and validate unit training through robust and challenging evaluation scenarios that adhere to technical orders and all higher-headquarters evaluation standards.

4.3.1. Units will ensure all required ("R") JPRs, as specified in the JPRL, are evaluated at least once every 12 months. JPR coverage for each monthly qualification evaluation will be in accordance with the established Annual Training and Evaluation Plan (ATEP).

4.3.1.1. Units will maintain four monthly qualification evaluation scripts on-line. Units will maintain the current month's script and the three prior month's scripts to be shown during the current calendar month.

4.3.1.2. The rate of exposure for each script during a calendar month will be evenly distributed. To the maximum extent possible, each script should be shown approximately 25% of the time during the current calendar month.

4.3.1.3. To preserve the integrity of the evaluation program, crews will not be informed in advance of the evaluation script selected.

4.3.2. All simulation materials will be marked "For Training Use Only" or "For Evaluation Use Only".

4.3.3. Scripts will contain valid peacetime and wartime stimuli. Stimuli will be identified by JPR, task description, scenario support personnel, initiation and response agencies and notes or expected responses (e.g., TEPS notes, evaluator notes and expected evaluate response).

4.3.3.1. Estimated scenario run times are for scenario presentation only and do not establish a time standard for completing actions. Applicable proficiency time standards must be annotated within the script.

4.3.3.2. Scripts must have a plan for presentation of problem sequences and events that specify instructions for evaluators, MPT operators and scenario support personnel. Scripts will include instructions for simulated inputs, status cards or briefings and will identify proper crew responses.

4.3.4. Problem presentation and equipment response must comply with TEPS and EWO TEPS (ETEPS) constraints.

4.3.4.1. Evaluators should follow the script as written. However, if following the script as it is written causes inaccurate presentation, use evaluator judgment and provide accurate status.

4.3.5. Use status cards or briefings to introduce stimuli that cannot be presented in a more realistic manner. Cards and briefs must not prompt, but must have enough information for the evaluatee to clearly understand the input.

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

4.3.7. Scenarios should be designed so that all actions are accomplished as a crew, except where technical order directs or allows for split crew operations.

4.3.8. Scripts will not be written to evaluate a crew on field evaluatable tasks.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.11. EWO and weapon system portions of the evaluation may be designed to provide a seamless evaluation.

4.3.12. Scripts are normally designed not to exceed the following time standards:

4.3.12.1. Initial evaluations should not be scripted to exceed 4.5 hours.

4.3.12.2. Upgrade and qualification evaluations should not be scripted to exceed 3 hours.

4.3.12.3. Unit special-check evaluations should not be scripted to exceed 2 hours.

4.3.12.4. Full and special HHQ evaluations will be scripted to meet HHQ needs.

4.3.13. Scripts must be fully coordinated prior to being used for documented evaluations. At a minimum, coordination for evaluation scripts must include the Chief of Operations Training, Chief of Stan/Eval, Chief of EWO, and instructor/evaluator Senior Crews.

4.3.13.1. If code related events are evaluated, the codes flight must coordinate.

4.3.13.2. If a weapon system safety rule (WSSR) or missile safety event is evaluated, the wing safety office must coordinate.

4.3.13.3. The Chief of Stan/Eval will be the final approval for all MPT evaluation scripts.

4.3.14. Units must retain evaluation scripts and ancillary items such as dispatches, status cards and script programming in either paper or electronic copy for a period of at least 12 months from the on-line date. This does not require a removable storage element for old revision products. Off-line scripts do not require updates.

4.4. TEPS and Timing Constraints. TEPS detail task performance, standards, timing requirements and constraints for the express purpose of standardizing training and evaluation that support operational mission ready certification requirements.

4.4.1. TEPS/ETEPS are designed for preparing and presenting training and evaluation materials and will be used to prioritize tasks during an evaluation. TEPS/ETEPS will not supplement technical data or instructions.

4.4.2. TEPS/ETEPS are divided into three levels.

4.4.2.1. Level A - Tasks, if not performed correctly, could result in mission failure, endangerment of human life, serious injury or death or require an elevated level of proficiency.

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

4.4.2.1.2. Asterisked Level A performance standards are not subject to judgment, require strict application and adherence. Asterisked Level A's are used where a direct correlation exists between exceeding the time and a tangible undesirable outcome, or requires a higher level of proficiency necessary for mission accomplishment.

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

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

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

4.4.2.1.6. When more than one Level A time standard is running simultaneously, time them concurrently only if specifically written for concurrent timing, otherwise, time separately and sequentially.

4.4.2.1.6.1. The only instance concurrent Level A time standards should occur is when there are multiple Level A time standards associated with a task.

4.4.2.1.7. During a Level A TEPS timing standard event, as long as an evaluatee completes the task within the allotted TEPS time period, the only errors assessed during this period should be attributed to incorrect actions.

4.4.2.2. Level B - Tasks deemed integral to the performance of other tasks and required to sustain acceptable weapon system operation and mission execution.

4.4.2.2.1. Operators must accomplish Level B tasks properly without taking any intervening lower priority actions that would, in the normal sequence of events, adversely affect task performance or outcome.

4.4.2.3. Level C - Rudimentary or simple tasks related to weapons system operations that by themselves have little or no impact on mission execution.

4.4.2.3.1. Level C tasks apply where no specific time standard is identified. The standard is to accomplish the task proficiently in accordance with technical orders and governing directives.

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

4.4.4. Level A, B, and C tasks must be accomplished without outside assistance except as specified by the governing technical order, HHQ instruction or publication.

4.4.5. Outside agency responses will not be used to satisfy accomplishment of TEPS. If the MCC has the technical data to satisfy the required task(s), the outside agency will not provide the data.

4.5. Status Presentation. Crew members must receive proper configuration and status for operational realism.

4.5.1. Status presentation requirements and configuration actions for fire/overheat conditions, nuclear detonation (NUDET) and Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP)/High Altitude Burst (HAB) indications will be provided by 20 AF.

4.5.2. Status cards and briefings will be standardized and presented in accordance with 20 AF direction.

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

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

4.6.2. For evaluation scenarios conducted in the operational environment, evaluators will pre-brief the Flight Security Controller (FSC), Facility Manager (FM) and other topside support personnel as applicable, ensuring they understand their roles and limitations.

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

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

4.6.3.2. During an MPT evaluation, if a crew transitions to a field evaluatable task as defined in the JPRL, the evaluator will brief the task or subtask accomplished when the crew member identifies the requirement to transition.

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

4.6.3.4. If a task is not intended to be evaluated, and is not the result of a crew's incorrect action, evaluators may brief the task accomplished when the crew identifies the requirement to accomplish the task.

4.6.4. DELETED

4.6.4.1. DELETED

4.6.4.1.1. DELETED

4.6.4.2. DELETED

4.7. Evaluation Scenario Termination. Once an evaluation is started, all efforts will be made to complete the evaluation.

4.7.1. Situations may arise in which early evaluation termination would be required. Evaluations terminated early may be re-initiated from the point activity was originally stopped, or the evaluation may be completely re-accomplished.

4.7.2. Before deviating from the approved script and terminating the MPT phase of an evaluation, the evaluators must determine if the minimum JPR coverage and Level A requirements outlined in paragraphs 2.3.1. through 2.3.4. have been met to warrant a valid evaluation.

4.7.3. Do not terminate a two-phase evaluation of a crew member until the completion of all phases of the evaluation unless errors committed in the first phase warrant a Q3 evaluation rating.

4.7.3.1. If an MCCM's commander upgrade is cancelled following a Q3 rating during the first phase of an evaluation, the required requalification evaluations must be taken with a qualified commander.

4.7.3.1.1. Upon successful completion of the requalification evaluation, the MCCM will be credited with a recurring qualification evaluation as a DMCCC unless the evaluation did not meet criteria required of a full-check.

4.7.3.1.2. If the upgrade evaluation was in conjunction with a DMCCC's first qualification evaluation, the DMCCC's requalification evaluation must include the second phase to complete the evaluation.

4.7.3.2. If an MCCM's commander upgrade is not cancelled following a Q3 rating during the first phase of an evaluation, the required requalification evaluation must include the second phase to complete the upgrade evaluation.

4.7.4. If an MCCM is not certified as a commander following the successful completion of an upgrade evaluation, both MCCMs will be credited with completing a recurring qualification evaluation and delinquency dates will be advanced.

4.7.4.1. DELETED.

4.7.4.1.1. DELETED.

4.7.4.2. DELETED.

4.8. Operational Evaluations. The operational phase is conducted in the LCC/LCEB by evaluating tasks based on actual status as it occurs and those tasks directed by technical orders or regulations. When conducting an evaluation on operational equipment, the on-duty crew commander maintains authority during the session.

4.8.1. Prior to an evaluation scenario conducted in the operational environment, units must gauge impact to field operations before dispatching evaluators. Units will use risk management processes to mitigate any adverse operational impact and unnecessary operational risks are avoided.

4.8.2. Evaluators may conduct changeover and assume custody of the alert for the duration of the evaluation.

4.8.3. Safety and operational actions take priority over simulated actions. Evaluators will intervene to prevent a safety hazard, damage to equipment, mission failure or degradation.

4.8.4. Conduct the operational phase of a two phase evaluation for ACP/SCP certified crews in an ACP/SCP configured LCC.

4.8.4.1. ACP/SCP certified crews evaluated in a PLCC will be evaluated as a PLCC crew.

4.8.5. If the evaluatee does not react to situations requiring immediate crew response to prevent personnel injury, damage to equipment, or mission degradation, the evaluators will bring the situation to their attention as follows:

4.8.5.1. If the evaluatee is not in position to note an operational status change, the evaluator will immediately bring it to their attention. Do not assess a deficiency for bringing the status change to the evaluatee's attention.

4.8.5.2. If the evaluatee is in position to note an operational status change, but does not act, the evaluator will immediately bring it to his or her attention. If in the opinion of the evaluator the individual had sufficient time to observe the status change and failed to recognize or take appropriate action, assess and rate the appropriate task deficiency.

4.8.6. If the evaluatee does not react to operational situations not covered by paragraph 4.8.5., the evaluators will bring the situation to their attention as follows:

4.8.6.1. If the evaluatee is in position to note an operational status change, and the response has an associated time standard, bring the status change to their attention after the evaluatee has had reasonable time to note the change. Evaluators will assess the appropriate deficiency.

4.8.6.2. If the evaluatee is in position to note an operational status change, and the response has no associated time standard, bring the status change to their attention after evaluation phase termination and assess the appropriate deficiency.

4.8.7. If potential exists for the crew member in an operational environment to be rated Q3 or placed in restricted status, the evaluator must ensure the evaluatee is supervised by an evaluator certified in the same position until the evaluatee's qualification status is determined or a CMR crew member certified in the same position relieves the evaluatee.

4.9. Outbriefing the Evaluatee. The outbrief provides qualification ratings and feedback to the evaluatee and the evaluation program.

4.9.1. Evaluators will brief results to the squadron commander or designated representative, and the Chief of Stan/Eval as soon as practical after each phase of an evaluation.

4.9.1.1. The outbrief should include discussion of positive performance, strengths, any noted deficiencies, probable causes, and direct/indirect impacts to the mission, personnel, and other organizations.

4.9.1.1.1. The commander or designated representative may direct or request additional training and evaluation regardless of rating.

4.9.1.2. Brief overall evaluation rating upon completion of all phases of an evaluation.

Chapter 5

EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION

5.1. Error Determination. Upon completion of each phase of an evaluation, evaluators will identify, assess and document errors.

5.1.1. Error determination must be based upon the actions or inactions of the evaluatee.

5.1.2. When the evaluatee causes a script deviation and an error results, evaluators will assess the error.

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

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

5.1.4. Use the Deficiency Codes in Attachment 6 of AFGSCI 13-5301v1 to describe why an evaluatee committed an error.

5.1.5. Evaluators will use definitions and/or examples of errors in paragraphs 5.3. through 5.5. of this instruction and examples in AFGSCI 13-5301v4 for error determinations.

5.1.6. If OGV cannot ascertain how to assess an error for an evaluation after querying all required on-base agencies [e.g., EWO Plans Office, Safety, Missile Maintenance Operations Center (MMOC), etc.], call and initiate a formal request for error determination with 20 AF/A3NV.

5.1.6.1. 20 AF/A3NV will analyze the information passed, make a final determination, and respond back to the unit OGV as soon as possible.

5.1.6.2. If 20 AF is unable to make a final determination, a formal request for error determination must be forwarded to HQ AFGSC/A3T. The information will be analyzed and a final determination will be provided to 20 AF.

5.1.6.2.1. Error determination requests for EWO errors must be forwarded to HQ AFGSC/A3T and A3I. The information will be analyzed by HQ AFGSC A3T and A3I and a final determination will be provided to 20 AF.

5.2. Error Consummation. Evaluation errors will be assessed on the actions or inactions of the crew.

5.2.1. Errors are based on decision points and may be consummated at the expiration of Level A TEPS, clock advances or check phase termination.

5.2.1.1. Errors will be assessed on incorrect actions at the point of consummation regardless of the scripted outcome.

5.2.2. If a crew fails to accomplish a required Level B task action prior to the clock advance, but is able to complete the task after the clock advance, the error may be partially or fully recovered depending on the circumstances.

5.2.2.1. If a clock advance removes the crew's ability to accomplish the required action (e.g., reconfigures equipment, removes sortie status, etc.), award the appropriate error for failure to accomplish the task.

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

5.2.3. If a script is written to brief a crew out of actions but the crew has performed an incorrect action that could impact future events, allow the crew to continue their actions through consummation of the error.

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

5.2.4.1. An incorrect report to an outside entity can be corrected to no error if the crew takes corrective actions prior to termination of the report or call.

5.2.4.2. If the MCC directs an incorrect action over phone lines or makes an incorrect report, assess the appropriate level of error upon termination of the phone call or report. An error is consummated upon termination of an incorrect phone call or report; however, if the crew takes corrective actions prior to expiration of any timing standard, recovery to a less severe error is possible.

5.2.4.3. If the MCC transmits an incorrect command, incorrectly accomplishes an internal command or test, trips an incorrect circuit breaker or takes an action that causes degradation to a redundant environmental control system, the error is consummated immediately upon the action taken and recovery is not possible.

5.2.4.4. Momentary mistakes due to status monitoring, inadvertent actions, or miscalculations that are immediately corrected, and do not result in system degradation, or degradation to a redundant system, may be recoverable to a lesser severity of error.

5.3. Critical Errors. Assess a critical error when evaluatee actions result, or would reasonably be expected to result, in operational mission failure, endangerment of human life, serious injury, or death.

5.3.1. A mission-critical error results in the crew member being restricted and unqualified for all positions. The crew member may not perform unsupervised operations duty until successful completion of a requalification evaluation.

5.3.2. Some examples of critical errors are as follows:

5.3.2.1. Failure to comply with warnings or technical order safety precautions that could reasonably be expected to result in endangerment of human life, serious injury, or death.

5.3.2.2. Taking the weapon system off-line when not required or allowing or requesting the weapon system to be taken off-line when not required.

5.3.2.3. Failure to initiate, direct, or coordinate corrective actions to restore a non-operational LCC or ICBM sortie to mission capable status. This includes failure to note or report indications of an LCC or ICBM sortie becoming non-operational.

5.3.2.4. Unnecessary shutdown of an LCC, with or without launch capability.

5.3.2.5. Violation of two person concept or no-lone zone requirements. This includes failure to report violations of two person concept or no-lone zone requirements.

5.3.2.6. Removal of a sortie from Pendulous Integrating Gyroscopic Accelerometer (PIGA) leveling when not authorized by command directives.

5.3.2.7. Failure to ensure sortie is capable of correctly responding to a Preparatory Launch Command (PLC)-A. Sortie must be assigned a PLC-A per command directives.

5.3.2.8. Actions by the MCC that result in transfer of timeslot when not required, unnecessary shutdown of an operational console or LCC, removal of ability to command PLC, enable command (ENC), or execute launch command (ELC), removal of ability to generate target constants, execution plans, or perform remote Data Change (RDC). These critical errors are not recoverable once a crew action is taken that removes these capabilities.

5.3.2.8.1. This includes not exiting the anti-jam mode by status update or check phase termination.

5.3.2.8.1.1. If, by staying in the anti-jam mode, a crew is unable to accomplish RDC, a critical error is warranted.

5.3.2.8.1.2. If a crew delays RDC and subsequently exits anti-jam, or remains in anti-jam, and misses status, or becomes unable to process subsequent scripted events, a major error is warranted.

5.3.2.8.2. This includes any instance where a crew makes an incorrect decision that removes their LCC's capabilities in accordance with paragraph 5.3.2.2. This critical error is not recoverable once a crew action is taken that removes these capabilities.

5.3.2.9. Transferring a case(s) from the Force Direction Message (FDM) Buffer to the Case Library prior to the effective time.

5.3.2.10. Failure to enter the correct Translate Code value or failure to verify Translate Codes at crew changeover when required. Assign error to the crew member entering or verifying the incorrect value. Error severity may be reduced to a minor if corrected before first enable or check phase termination.

5.3.2.11. Requesting or allowing a launch capable sortie to be safed, or remain safed, when not required.

5.3.2.12. Violation of any nuclear weapon system safety rules to include the following:

5.3.2.12.1. Any action or inaction by a crew that allows a sortie to unnecessarily enter radio mode (RAMO), failure to initiate an Airborne Launch Control Center (ALCC) Holdoff command (AHC) before a sortie enters radio mode, failure to initiate an AHC before unsafing a launch facility (LF) reporting RAMO, or failure to initiate an AHC to a sortie that unexpectedly enters RAMO.

5.3.2.12.2. Failure to enter anti-jam mode and initiate first encrypted inhibit within 2 minutes from the requirement to accomplish inhibit commands.

5.3.2.12.3. Failure to command eight inhibits within 8 minutes from requirement to accomplish inhibit commands.

5.3.2.12.4. Failure to request a sortie to be manually safed when required, in accordance with AFI 91-114, *Safety Rules for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile System*.

5.3.2.12.5. Failure to ensure a site is guarded in accordance with applicable security directives.

5.3.2.12.6. Failure to direct security element response to a security situation or failing to relay correct site or location.

5.3.2.12.7. Allowing a team to depart prior to proper site security system reset (no other team on site) when not authorized by applicable security directives.

5.3.2.13. Failure to inspect all Tamper Detection Indicators (TDIs) on a piece of equipment in accordance with *Operating Procedures for Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting Tamper Detection for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Force.*

5.3.3. Reference AFGSCI 13-5301v4 for classified critical errors.

5.4. Major Errors. Assess a major error when evaluatee actions result, or would reasonably be expected to result in, degradation to the operational mission or personnel injury.

5.4.1. Some examples of major errors are as follows:

5.4.1.1. Exceeding an asterisked Level A time standard, unless error is listed under paragraph 5.3.

5.4.1.2. Failure to comply with cautions or technical order (T.O.) safety precautions not covered by paragraph 5.3.2.1.

5.4.1.3. Failure to maintain optimum or established system configuration resulting in a mission degradation or degradation to a redundant system or that delays accomplishment of non-time-critical mission requirements.

5.4.1.4. Failure to verify equipment configuration and/or operability upon return from maintenance or testing. This also includes failure to accomplish daily inspections or verifications.

5.4.1.5. Failure to report a change in system status or correct change in system status, systems capability, or operations capability that has degraded the operational mission.

5.4.1.6. Failure to ensure security measures are accomplished.

5.4.1.6.1. Physical Security. An example includes failing to report indications of improper Sensitive Command Network Test (SCNT) results.

5.4.1.6.2. Communications Security (COMSEC). Examples include losing control of COMSEC materials, compromise or possible compromise of COMSEC materials, and failure to report compromise to a responsible agency.

5.4.1.6.3. Information Security (INFOSEC) and Operations Security (OPSEC). Examples include loss of control of classified and passing classified information over an unsecure line. (EXCEPTION: Reference AFGSCI 13-5301v4)

5.4.1.6.3.1. Failure to pass a Possible Code Compromise (PCC), Possible Compromise of TDI Technology (PCTT), or Secret Procedural Violation (PV) by

secure means, when secure means are available and required.

5.4.1.7. Failure to accomplish an operational report within established time limits or submitting an incorrect operations report.

5.4.1.8. Failure to note or report indications of mission degradation or degradation to a redundant system not listed in paragraph 5.3.2.3. This includes failure to accomplish required corrective actions.

5.4.1.9. Incorrectly configuring any EWO communication equipment. This includes monitoring or directing another LCC to monitor an incorrect satellite, frequency, channel/priority or antenna steering.

5.4.1.9.1. This also includes incorrectly configuring or failure to monitor Ultra High Frequency (UHF) voice EWO frequency when required in accordance with applicable directives.

5.4.1.10. Failure to notify SCP or Controlling LCC (CLCC) of a requirement to reassign PLC/ENABLE assignment or assigning another LCC to configure for incorrect PLC/ENABLE assignment.

5.4.1.11. Improperly configuring or failing to configure a sortie, and the result does not warrant a critical error.

5.4.1.12. Declaration of incorrect security situation number and letter or incorrect security situation and indications.

5.4.1.13. Failure to obtain authentications or a Visitor Control Number (VCN) when required.

5.4.1.14. Requesting improper guarding in accordance with security directives. Error severity may be reduced if corrected.

5.4.1.15. Failure to correctly configure a security system (e.g., failing to place Missile Interior Intrusion Detection System (MIIDS) in secure mode).

5.4.1.16. Failure to report indications of a PCC or PCTT to the codes division or WCP.

5.4.1.17. Entering a sortie into PIGA leveling when not required.

5.4.1.18. Failure to inspect or verify the integrity of a TDI.

5.4.1.18.1. This only applies for failing to inspect one TDI on a piece of equipment. If all TDIs on a single piece of equipment were not inspected, a critical error for violation of WSSRs is warranted.

5.4.1.19. Incorrectly posting pages to technical orders in sections III, IV, or V in accordance with the A-page of the following technical orders, as applicable. Posting refers to the order and sequence of T.O. pages, not annotations or other administrative requirements.

5.4.1.19.1. T.O. 21M-LGM30G-1-22, Minuteman Weapon System Wings III and V

5.4.1.19.2. T.O. 21M-LGM30F-1-23, Communication and Ancillary Equipment (REACT)

5.4.1.19.3. T.O. 21M-LGM30G-1-24, Minuteman Weapon System Wing I

5.4.1.20. Failure to direct MMOC to accomplish an immediate inspection of the launch tube wall when required.

5.4.1.21. Any action that results in damage to equipment which does not meet the criteria of a critical error.

5.5. Minor Errors. Assess a minor error for any procedural error, omission, or deficiency which is not significant enough to meet critical or major error criteria.

5.5.1. Minor errors will be assessed regardless of operational impact.

5.5.2. Evaluators may assess a minor error for lack of knowledge when evaluatees display a lack of knowledge on a procedural task that is not significant enough to meet critical or major error criteria.

5.6. Evaluation Documentation. Evaluation documentation provides a means to identify trends, track individual performance, provides performance feedback to the individual's supervisor and serves as a key feedback and training program tool.

5.6.1. A standardized evaluation report will be used for each evaluated individual to document details of administered evaluations and observations.

5.6.1.1. In addition to evaluator and evaluate information, the following information will be included on the evaluation report:

5.6.1.1.1. All errors will be documented. Errors will be documented against the task or subtask for which the error is attributed.

5.6.1.1.1.1. If a crew member recognizes the status change but fails to perform a required task or subtask, document the error against the task or subtask that should have been performed.

5.6.1.1.1.2. If a crew member recognizes the status change but performs the wrong task or subtask, document the error against the task or subtask that should have been performed. However, give credit to the task or subtask that was performed.

5.6.1.1.1.3. If a crew member does not recognize a status change and a resulting task or subtask requirement, document the error against the required task or subtask that should have been accomplished.

5.6.1.1.1.4. When the task or subtask being performed directs transition to another task or subtask and the evaluatee fails to perform the subsequent task or subtask or fails to identify the requirement to transition, document the error against the task or subtask that directed the transition.

5.6.1.1.1.5. If a crew member performs an unnecessary task or subtask, which causes or results in an error, document the error against the unnecessary task or subtask being performed.

5.6.1.1.1.6. Error descriptions on the evaluation report will be unclassified. Units will maintain a separate log for classified error descriptions.

5.6.1.1.1.7. Following HHQ administered evaluations, HHQ evaluators or inspectors will provide evaluation paperwork and will identify errors in writing to

the unit. OGV will create and coordinate an evaluation report to be maintained for documentation purposes.

5.6.1.1.2. The evaluation report will identify the script presented and evaluators will list all JPRs credited during the conduct of each evaluation phase.

5.6.1.1.2.1. A crewmember will receive credit for a JPR by performing any portion of a task, regardless if a checklist is used or if all actions are contained within another checklist.

5.6.1.1.2.2. Evaluators awarding JPR credit are documenting the crew was exposed to a portion of the task.

5.6.1.1.2.3. Evaluation reports developed by OGV following HHQ evaluations will only list JPRs for which errors are written against.

5.6.1.1.3. Delinquency date information will be listed on the evaluation worksheet even if there is no change.

5.6.1.1.4. A place must be provided for the commander to document decisions about corrective actions, restricted status, and/or subsequent evaluations as a result of the evaluation.

5.6.1.1.5. An evaluation type must be listed for each individual. Evaluation types may be different for each individual on the report. Evaluations must be annotated as a no-notice evaluation as applicable.

5.6.2. Evaluation reports will be maintained in the Individual Qualification Folder (IQF) for each evaluatee.

5.6.2.1. OGV will maintain copies of any evaluation report for trend analysis.

5.6.2.2. When retraining is required, the Operations Support Squadron (OSS) must receive copies of the evaluation report for training purposes.

5.6.2.2.1. Once training is completed, the appropriate agencies will document the accomplishment of training on the evaluation report.

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

5.6.2.4. Individual records must maintain all restriction-related paperwork to include evaluation reports, restriction letters, letters for removal from restricted status, and training documentation.

5.7. Evaluation Ratings. Overall evaluation performances are rated by qualification levels.

5.7.1. Qualification Level 1 (Q1) indicates an evaluatee demonstrated the desired level of performance and knowledge of procedures, equipment and directives within prescribed tolerances.

5.7.1.1. Criteria for a Q1 rating consist of no critical or major errors and three or fewer minor errors.

5.7.2. Qualification Level 2 (Q2) indicates an evaluatee demonstrated the ability to perform duties safely, but may need additional training at the discretion of the squadron commander or operations officer.

5.7.2.1. Criteria for a Q2 rating consist of no critical errors, two or fewer major errors or four or more minor errors.

5.7.2.2. The level of training and other corrective actions for any errors (briefing, formal training or evaluation) and possible restriction for the evaluatee will be determined by the squadron commander or operations officer.

5.7.3. Qualification Level 3 (Q3) indicates an evaluatee is unqualified based on an unacceptable level of safety, performance or knowledge.

5.7.3.1. Criteria for a Q3 rating consist of one or more critical errors, or three or more major errors.

5.7.3.2. The level of training for any errors (briefing or formal training) will be determined by the squadron commander or operations officer.

5.7.3.3. A requalification evaluation including all tasks with major or critical errors is required.

5.7.3.4. The evaluatee is restricted in all positions and may not perform unsupervised operations duty until completion of retraining and successful completion of an evaluation on all tasks where critical and major errors were committed.

5.7.3.4.1. Dual position crew members will always be rated unqualified (Q3) for both positions if rated Q3 in either position.

5.7.4. Exceptionally Qualified (EQ) indicates an evaluatee demonstrated exceptional knowledge and performance above the standard. The goal of the exceptionally qualified rating is to recognize an evaluation performance considered to be among the top 15% of all evaluations.

5.7.4.1. To be eligible for nomination, an evaluatee must complete all phases of a fullcheck evaluation and receive a Q1 rating with zero errors committed.

5.7.4.2. Evaluatees will be nominated to receive the EQ designation on the evaluation report based on the discretion of the evaluators.

5.7.4.2.1. Evaluators will use AFGSC Form 15, *REACT EQ Nomination Worksheet* for eligible evaluatees to determine whether they should be nominated for the EQ designation.

5.7.4.2.2. The AFGSC Form 15 is only required to be completed following evaluations for which an individual(s) are nominated for the EQ designation.

5.7.4.3. OGV Senior Crew will review EQ nomination worksheets and will recommend approval or disapproval to the Chief of Stan/Eval.

5.7.4.4. The Chief of Stan/Eval will review the worksheet and Senior Crew's recommendation for final approval or disapproval.

5.7.4.4.1. An EQ rating may be awarded to one or both members of the evaluated crew.

5.7.4.4.2. EQ ratings are not allowed for special-check evaluations.

5.7.4.5. HHQ inspectors may award an EQ following a full HHQ evaluation.

5.7.4.5.1. Final approval for the EQ rests with 20AF/A3NV and AFGSC IG/IGI as applicable.

Chapter 6

MISCELLANEOUS

6.1. Operational Performance. When a crew is on alert and procedural deviations or errors are observed or found through a review of alert prints, logs, or weapon system indications, the squadron commander or operations officer, Chief of Stan/Eval, or OG/CC, as applicable, shall be notified in writing within 3 working days after discovery.

6.1.1. The TEPS/ETEPS and error definitions in Chapter 5 serve as tools or guides when determining corrective action and the individual's CMR or restricted status.

6.1.2. When a crew's substandard performance would have resulted in a "Q3" rating during an evaluation is either observed or determined, the crew will be restricted and retrained in all tasks in which they were found to be unqualified.

6.1.2.1. The unit commander or operations officer may determine any additional corrective action(s), additional training, evaluation requirements, and any crew force management actions as required.

6.1.3. Substandard operational performance will not be documented as an evaluation or an evaluation error. Therefore, a criticality will not be assigned to the deficiency.

6.1.3.1. Although critical, major and minor error ratings will not be used, appropriate agencies must understand the severity of the deviations.

6.1.4. Deviations meeting the criteria in Chapter 5 and AFGSCI 13-5301v4 as critical, will be documented as restrictable and will result in automatic restricted status. Deviations meeting major or minor criteria will be documented as non-restrictable.

6.1.4.1. Additionally, recommendations for restricting may be made to the OG commander or deputy, or the squadron commander or operations officer, based on deviation severity or deficiency in knowledge, proficiency, or professionalism.

6.1.4.2. The squadron operations officer or higher authority will determine the level of training (briefing or formal training) for restrictable field deviations and will determine any training requirements for non-restrictable field deviations.

6.1.5. Deviations will be documented using a procedural deviation worksheet which and will be coordinated through all appropriate agencies.

6.1.5.1. Procedural deviation worksheets will be maintained in the IQF for the appropriate individual.

6.1.5.2. OGV will maintain copies of all procedural deviation worksheets for trend analysis.

6.2. AFGSC Crew Member Excellence (CME) Award. This award recognizes MCCMs who have sustained an excellent record of evaluation performances and overall performance while a crew member within AFGSC.

6.2.1. To be eligible for the CME Award, an individual must achieve a minimum of five Q1 evaluation ratings out of a maximum of six consecutive evaluations. The only exception is for individuals who have received an EQ rating, at which point the individual must achieve a

minimum of four Q1 evaluation ratings (with at least one EQ) out of a maximum of five consecutive evaluations.

6.2.1.1. Evaluations must be full-check evaluations to count toward CME eligibility.

6.2.1.2. An individual must not have a Q3 rating on a special-check or full-check evaluation. A Q3 will automatically reset the CME eligibility count.

6.2.1.3. At least one of the evaluations must be taken as an MCCC.

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

6.2.2.1. A restrictable field deviation will automatically reset an individual's CME eligibility count.

6.2.3. Approved individuals will receive an *AFGSC Crew Member Excellence* certificate (AFGSC Form 56) recognizing their evaluation performances.

6.3. Combat Capability Evaluation (CCE). 20 AF may conduct CCEs to assess the unit's readiness and ability to conduct its Designed Operational Capability (DOC)-defined mission(s). These visits ensure wing or group training, standardization and evaluation programs meet the requirements of this instruction and AFGSCI 13-5301v1.

6.3.1. 20 AF evaluators have the authority to overrule unit instructors and evaluators and conduct retraining for crew members, instructors and evaluators.

6.3.2. 20 AF evaluators will become the evaluators of record if unit evaluators fail to adhere to, or ensure adherence of technical order safety precautions, or when unit evaluators have displayed an inability to properly determine the pass/fail rating of crew members under evaluation.

6.3.3. 20 AF will coordinate assessments with HQ AFGSC/IG to de-conflict schedules.

6.4. New or Upgrade System Requirements. For new or upgraded missile systems, the unit standardization and evaluation office will develop the evaluation program to meet requirements within this instruction, AFGSCI 13-5301v3, *Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Operations*, AFGSC Instruction (AFGSCI) 36-283, *ICBM Training System Management*, and AFGSCI 10-604, *Global Strike Operational Weapon Systems Management*.

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

6.4.2. The unit commander will appoint a limited number of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in writing. The primary duty of the SME is to develop technical documentation, evaluation materials, and to conduct CMR evaluations.

6.4.2.1. Document SME appointment on the individual's AFGSC Form 91. Forward the SME designation memorandum through the chain of command directly to HQ AFGSC/A3T and 20 AF/A3NV.

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

6.4.3.1. Once evaluations are complete and individual is certified, document certification on the AFGSC Form 91.

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

6.4.5. Where new operational programs will not meet IOC, HQ AFGSC will staff a proposal for that system's evaluation program.

6.5. DELETED.

6.5.1. DELETED.

6.5.2. DELETED.

TIMOTHY M. RAY, Brigadier General, USAF Director of Operations

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION

References AFGSCI 10-604, Global Strike Operational Weapon System Management AFGSCI 13-5301v1, Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Training AFGSCI 13-5301v3, Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting (REACT) Crew Operations AFGSCI 13-5301v4, REACT Emergency War Order (EWO) Training and Evaluation **Procedures** AFGSCI 36-283, ICBM Training System Management (MAJCOM/NAF/Wing) AFI 33-360, Publications and Forms Management AFI 91-114, Safety Rules for the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Systems AFMAN 33-363, Management of Records AFMAN 36-2234, Instructional System Development (ISD) AFPD 13-5, Nuclear Operations T.O. 21M-LGM30G-1-22, Minuteman Weapon System Wings III and V T.O. 21M-LGM30F-1-23, Communication and Ancillary Equipment (REACT) T.O. 21M-LGM30G-1-24, Minuteman Weapon System Wing I Forms Prescribed AFGSC Form 15, REACT EQ Nomination Worksheet AFGSC Form 56, AFGSC Crew Member Excellence Award Certificate Forms Adopted AF Form 847, Recommendation for Change of Publication AFGSC Form 91, Individual's Record of Duties and Qualification AFGSC Form 91A, Record of Signatures **Abbreviations** ACP—Alternate Command Post AETC—Air Education and Training Command **AFB**—Air Force Base AFGSC—Air Force Global Strike Command **AFGSCI**—Air Force Global Strike Instruction

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFRIMS—Air Force Records Information Management System

AHC—ALCC Holdoff Command

ALCC—Airborne Launch Control Center

ATEP—Annual Training and Evaluation Plan

CCE—Combat Capability Evaluation

CLCC—Controlling Launch Control Center

CME—Crew Member Excellence

CMR—Combat Mission Ready

COMSEC—Communication Security

DOC—Designed Operational Capability

DMCCC—Deputy Missile Combat Crew Commander

ELC—Execute Launch Command

EMP—Electromagnetic Pulse

ENC—Enable Command

EQ—Exceptionally Qualified

ETEPS—EWO Training and Evaluation Performance Standards

EWO—Emergency War Orders

FDM—Force Direction Message

FM—Facility Manager

FSC—Flight Security Controller

G&C—Guidance and Clarification

HAB—High Altitude Burst

HAF—Headquarters Air Force

HHQ—Higher Headquarters

HQ—Headquarters

ICBM—Intercontinental Ballistic Missile

ICE—ICBM Center of Excellence

IG—Inspector General

INFOSEC—Information Security

IOC—Initial Operational Capacity

IQF—Individual Qualification Folder

ISD—Instructional System Development

IST—Initial Skills Training

JPR—Job Performance Requirements

JPRL—Job Performance Requirements Listing

LCC—Launch Control Center

LCEB—Launch Control Equipment Building

LF—Launch Facility

MAJCOM-Major Command

MCC—Missile Combat Crew

MCCC-Missile Combat Crew Commander

MCCM—Missile Combat Crew Member

MIIDS—Missile Interior Intrusion Detection System

MMOC—Missile Maintenance Operations Center

MOA—Memorandum of Agreement

MPT-Missile Procedures Trainer

MW—Missile Wing

NAF—Numbered Air Force

NUDET—Nuclear Detonation

OEC—Operations Evaluator Course

OG—Operations Group

OGV—Office of Standardization and Evaluation

OI—Operating Instruction

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility

OPSEC—Operations Security

OSS—Operations Support Squadron

PCA—Permanent Change of Assignment

PCC—Possible Codes Compromise

PCS—Permanent Change of Station

PCTT—Possible Compromise of TDI Technology

PIGA—Pendulous Integrating Gyroscopic Accelerometer

PLC—Preparatory Launch Command

PRP—Personnel Reliability Program

- **PV**—Procedural Violation
- Q1—Qualification Level 1
- **Q2**—Qualification Level 2
- Q3—Qualification Level 3
- RAMO-Radio Mode
- **RDC**—Remote Data Change
- **RDS**—Records Disposition Schedule
- **RQT**—Requalification Training
- SAV—Staff Assistance Visit
- SCNT—Sensitive Command Network Test
- SCP—Squadron Command Post
- SME—Subject Matter Expert
- SQ—Squadron
- TDI—Tamper Detection Indicator
- **TDY**—Temporary duty
- **TEPS**—Training and Evaluation Performance Standards
- T.O.—Technical Order
- TRS—Training Squadron
- TRG—Training Group
- TTP—Techniques, Tactics and Procedures
- **UHF**—Ultra High Frequency
- VCN—Visitor Control Number
- WSSR—Weapon System Safety Rule

EVALUATION OVERVIEW CHART

Table A2.1. Evaluation Overview Chart

Evaluation Category	Evaluation Type	Evaluated By	Evaluation Required	Advances Delinquency Date	New Delinquency Date
	Initial	392 TRS	Following the completion of IST	With a Q1 or Q2 rating	1st day of 7th month
	Initial	Unit-level OGV	Following the completion of RQT	With a Q1 or Q2 rating	1st day of 13th month
Full- Check	Upgrade	Unit-level OGV	Following the completion of UT	With a Q1 or Q2 rating	1st day of 13th month
	Qualification	Unit-level OGV	Prior to an individual's delinquency date	With a Q1 or Q2 rating	1st day of 13th month
	Full HHQ	20AF/A3NV	At the discretion of HHQ evaluators	With a Q1 or Q2 rating	1st day of 13th month
	Spot	Unit-level OGV	At the discretion of unit OGV or SQ/CCs	N/A	N/A
Special- Check	Requalification	Unit-level OGV	Following the completion of IT resulting from a Q3	With a Q1 or Q2 rating	1st day of 13th month
	Special HHQ	20AF/A3NV or AFGSC/IG	At the discretion of HHQ evaluators or inspectors	N/A	N/A

FORMAL REQUEST FOR ERROR DETERMINATION

MEMORANDUM FOR 20 AF/A3NV

FROM: XX OG/OGV Address Address

SUBJECT: Request for Error Determination

1. The following question(s) is (are) presented for your consideration:

a. Scenario: Present scenario here. Be very detailed and precise.

b. Question: Present specific question. Include your answer and the verbiage "Do you concur? If not, please provide rationale."

2. Direct any questions to (POC) at DSN ###-####.

JEFF FINCH, Capt, USAF Chief, Standardization and Evaluation

(End of Example)

ERROR ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET EXAMPLE

Time Slot(s): DEFCON: AFI(s): Posture:

LCC Status/Faults:

LF Status/Faults:

What did the script call for the crew to do (be detailed)?

What did the crew do (be detailed)?

How did the evaluators present the problem?

What level of error does your unit think should be assessed?

Using which paragraph(s) of AFGSCI 13-5301v2

Are there any Clarification Messages applicable for this scenario?

AFGSCI 13-5301V2 16 May 2011

What JPRs were involved?
What constraints are involved?
Was the scenario valid?
Was the presentation valid?
Additional information: