

1 MARCH 2004

Operations

OPERATIONS STAN/EVAL (MAJCOM/WING)



NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the AFDPO WWW site at:
<http://www.e-publishing.af.mil>

OPR: XOTT (Maj George R. Farfour)
Supersedes AFSPCCL10-1, 1 June 00.

Certified by: XOT (Col Robert C. Keyser, JR.)
Pages: 8
Distribution: F

This checklist reflects Command requirements for Operations Stan/Eval Programs for AFSPC Space Operators at all levels to prepare for and conduct internal reviews.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This checklist has been revised to update changes made during the revision of AFSPCI36-2202, **Mission Ready Training, Evaluation and Standardization Programs**. This checklist is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed. A asterisk (*) indicates a revision from the previous edition.

1. References have been provided for each critical item. Critical items have been kept to a minimum, and are related to public law, safety, security, fiscal responsibility, and/or mission accomplishment. Critical items identified by a pound sign (#), if present, are those items that if not accomplished in support of primary mission could result in an overall MAJCOM/NAF/Wing assessment rating of less than satisfactory. While compliance with non-critical items is not rated, these items help gauge the effectiveness and efficiency of the function.
2. This publication establishes a baseline checklist. The checklist will also be used by the Command IG during applicable assessments. Use the attached checklist as a guide only. AFSPC Checklists will not be supplemented. Units produce their own standalone checklists as needed to ensure an effective and thorough review of the unit OJT program. Units are encouraged to contact the Command Functional OPR for this Checklist to recommend additions and changes deemed necessary. See Attachment 1.

DOUGLAS M. FRASER, Brig Gen, USAF
Director of Air and Space Operations

ATTACHMENT 1

OPERATIONS STAN/EVAL (MAJCOM/NAF/WING)

Table A1.1. Checklist.

SECTION 1 - HQ AFSPC			
MISSION STATEMENT: Establish policy, basic requirements and provide guidance for standardization and evaluation programs.			
NOTE: All references are from AFSPCI36-2202, <i>Mission Ready Training, Evaluation and Standardization Programs</i> . unless otherwise noted.			
1.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
*1.1.1. Has HQ AFSPC/XO established a MAJCOM office of primary responsibility (OPR) to implement evaluation and standardization programs? (para 1.2.1.2)			
*1.1.2. Are policy, basic requirements and guidance for operations evaluation and standardization programs established and implemented across all command mission areas? (para 1.2.1.3)			
*1.1.3. Does HQ AFSPC/XO determine equipment, manning and facilities required to support operations evaluations? (para 1.2.1.8)			
1.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
1.2.1. Does HQ AFSPC/XOT coordinate supplements, waivers and requests for clarification and guidance? (Instruction introductory para)			
1.2.2. Does HQ AFSPC/XOT oversee management of evaluation and standardization programs? (para 1.2.1.1)			
SECTION 2 - NUMBERED AIR FORCE (NAF)			
MISSION STATEMENT: Serve as point of contact for issues relative to their subordinate units and AFSPCI36-2202.			
2.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
*2.1.1. Does the NAF coordinate guidance issues on AFSPCI36-2202 before providing clarification to the units? (para 1.2.7.10)			
*2.1.2. Does the NAF Stan/Eval conduct visits to assess wing ability to meet mission requirements? (para 1.2.7.2)			

2.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
*2.2.1. Does the NAF define specific roles and responsibilities for wings, groups, squadrons, and detachments to implement the requirements of AFSPCI36-2202? (para 1.2.6.3.)			
*2.2.2. Does the NAF establish requirements for a standardized evaluator training program and ensure wings/groups implement the program? (para 1.2.7.1)			
*2.2.3. Does the NAF process mission ready delinquency date waiver requests that do not exceed 18 months? (para 1.2.7.3)			
*2.2.4. Does the NAF ensure standardization of operations among wings where practical? (para 1.2.7.4)			
*2.2.5. Does the NAF monitor wing or group standardization and evaluation programs? (para 1.2.7.5)			
*2.2.6. Does the NAF provide guidance to subordinate units for error determination when the wing is unable to make a determination? (para 1.2.7.6)			
*2.2.7. Does the NAF establish Individual Qualification Folder (IQF) requirements? (para 1.2.7.7)			
*2.2.8. Does the NAF publish initial, upgrade and recurring evaluation task responsibilities for each type of evaluation for each applicable mission area in the NAF supplement to AFSPCI36-2202? (para 1.2.7.8)			
*2.2.9. Does the NAF publish specific error assessment examples for each applicable mission area in the NAF supplement to AFSPCI36-2202? (para 1.2.7.9)			
*2.2.10. Does the NAF provide assistance on problems affecting compliance with AFSPCI36-2202 when resolution is beyond the scope of subordinate unit resources and request assistance/waivers from HQ AFSPC/XOT if the problem cannot be resolved? (para 1.2.7.10)			
SECTION 3 - WING/GROUP/SQUADRON/DETACHMENT			
MISSION STATEMENT: Implement the AFSPC standardization and evaluation program.			
3.1. GENERAL (CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.1.1. Does the unit Commander or Operations Officer determine corrective action(s) and follow-on training/evaluation requirements when real world crew performance is substandard? (para 1.1.5)			

GENERAL (CRITICAL ITEMS) cont:	YES	NO	N/A
*3.1.2. Does the unit conduct all evaluations required by AFSPCI36-2202? (para 1.2.9.5)			
3.1.3. Are only certified evaluators or evaluator trainees under direct supervision of a certified evaluator used to conduct evaluations? (para 4.1.1.2)			
*3.1.4. Are all required tasks/subtasks evaluated during an evaluation? (Table 4.1)			
3.1.5. Are evaluators restricted when required? (para 4.1.3.4)			
*3.1.6. Are evaluators on CMR restricted status for proficiency reasons prohibited from administering evaluations? (para 4.1.3.4.1.1)			
*3.1.7. Are evaluators on restricted status for medical or PRP reasons limited to conducting simulator evaluations, providing they have maintained currency? (para 4.1.3.4.1.2)			
3.1.8. Are evaluators decertified when they no longer possess the degree of proficiency or professionalism to be an effective evaluator? (para 4.1.3.5.1.2)			
3.1.9. Are scripts designed so they do not create actual conditions that could jeopardize personnel safety or cause damage to equipment? (para 4.1.8.4)			
3.1.10. Do evaluators ensure safety and real world operational requirements take priority over simulated activity? (para 4.1.9.1)			
*3.1.11. Does the unit evaluation office develop programs as described in AFH36-2235, Vol. 11, <i>Information for Designers of Instructional Systems</i> , AFSPCI10-1202, <i>Crew Force Management</i> and AFSPCI36-2202 for non-existent or upgraded space and missile systems? (para 5.1)			
3.2. GENERAL (NON-CRITICAL ITEM):	YES	NO	N/A
*3.2.1. Does OGV ensure development of evaluation materials for BMR and CMR programs? (para 1.2.9.1)			

3.3. EVALUATOR TRAINING (CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.3.1. Are evaluators trained, evaluated and maintaining currency in the tasks they evaluate? (para 4.1.1.3)			
3.3.2. Have all evaluators completed the appropriate training before certification? (para 4.1.3)			
3.4. EVALUATOR TRAINING (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
*3.4.1. Does OGV (unit Stan/Eval at GSUs) administer the initial and recurring evaluator training and certification programs? (para 1.2.9.2)			
3.4.2. Does initial evaluator training include all requirements defined in paragraph 4.1.3.1?			
*3.4.3. Does the Chief of Stan/Eval (or designated representative) observe all certified evaluators conducting an evaluation at least annually? (para 4.1.3.2.2)			
*3.4.4. Does the OG Commander (Squadron Commander for GSUs) certify all evaluators in writing? (para 4.1.3.3)			
3.4.5. Are decertified evaluators recertified by completing tasks as directed by the certifying official? (para 4.1.3.5.3)			
3.4.6. Do evaluators receive quarterly evaluator recurring training? (para 4.1.3.2.1)			
3.5. EVALUATION PROGRAM (CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.5.1. Are upgrade evaluations given to an individual after completion of RQT or UQT for another duty position? (para 4.1.2.2)			
*3.5.2. Has OGV accomplished recurring evaluations by the delinquency date or placed delinquent individuals on restricted status? (para 4.1.6)			
*3.5.3. Does OGV test performance tasks identified in TEPS instructions using evaluation scenarios? (para 4.1.7.1)			
*3.5.4. Are individual training and a special evaluation completed for evaluations rated UQ? (para 4.1.12.6.1.1)			

EVALUATION PROGRAM (CRITICAL ITEMS) cont:	YES	NO	N/A
*3.5.5. Are all tasks/subtasks where major and critical errors were committed (resulting in a UQ rating) evaluated in a subsequent special evaluation? (para 4.1.2.4.3)			
*3.5.6. Do unit evaluators accurately assess critical errors? (para 4.1.12.2.1)			
3.6. EVALUATION PROGRAM (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
*3.6.1. Does the Space Wing/Space Group/Operations Group/Space Operations Group/Operations Support Squadron ensure standardization of operations procedures, training and evaluation programs, wherever feasible, among subordinate groups/units? (para 1.2.8.1)			
*3.6.2. Are all new or changed publications reviewed for impacts on operations procedures and evaluation programs? (para 1.2.8.2)			
*3.6.3. Does OGV conduct visits to operational wing organizations for the purpose of evaluation program and operations standardization? (para 1.2.9.3)			
*3.6.4. Does OGV ensure standardization of evaluation practices among group/squadron CMR evaluators? (para 1.2.9.4)			
*3.6.5. Do units maintain and document IQF information? (para 1.2.8.8)			
*3.6.6. Does the Commander or Operations Officer direct or request recurring or special evaluations to check individual or crew proficiency? (para 1.2.11.3.1)			
3.6.7. Are the proper deficiency codes used to describe why an evaluatee committed a deviation? (para 2.2)			
3.6.8. Do evaluators conduct a pre-brief to ensure that scenario support personnel clearly understand the rules of engagement? (para 2.3.2)			
3.6.9. Are units properly documenting appropriate items on the AFSPC Form 91, Individual's Record of Duties and Qualification ? (para 2.4)			
3.6.10. For units without approved T.O.s, is a stimuli list maintained to document entering arguments for each task/subtask? (para 2.5)			
*3.6.11. For BMR qualifications, is an observation conducted upon completion of qualification training? (para 4.1.2.6.1)			

EVALUATION PROGRAM (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS) cont:	YES	NO	N/A
*3.6.12. Are all evaluations proficiency-based and conducted in a crew environment when practical? (para 4.1.4)			
3.6.13. Does an evaluator only observe one evaluatee when administering an initial or upgrade evaluation? (para 4.1.9.9)			
3.6.14. Do evaluators respond to a real world status change as appropriate during an evaluation in an operational environment? (para 4.1.10)			
3.7. EVALUATION SCRIPTS (CRITICAL ITEM):	YES	NO	N/A
3.7.1. Are scripts designed to prevent unrelated tasks/status from being introduced while a crew is accomplishing critical phases of Level A TEPS/METER performances? (para 4.1.8.9)			
3.8. EVALUATION SCRIPTS (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.8.1. Do scripts include instructions for evaluators, scenario support personnel, simulated inputs and problem cards? (para 4.1.8)			
3.8.2. Do scripts contain valid peacetime and wartime stimuli? (para 4.1.8.1)			
3.8.3. Do problem presentation and equipment response comply with TEPS/METER constraints? (para 4.1.8.2)			
3.8.4. Are scripts written to ensure crews are not driven to perform train-only tasks? (para 4.1.8.6)			
3.8.5. Do scripts create realistic operational environments requiring the evaluatee to prioritize actions? (para 4.1.8.8)			
*3.9 POST-EVALUATION ACTIONS (NON-CRITICAL ITEM):	YES	NO	N/A
*3.9.1. Do evaluators provide written deficiencies to the training section within three duty days of completion of an evaluation phase? (para 4.1.12.6.1.4)			

*3.10. EVALUATION SCENARIO CONDUCT (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.10.1. Are evaluatee pre-briefings properly presented? (para 4.1.9.4)			
3.10.2. Do evaluators ensure responses to evaluatee questions do not give more information than would normally be available, or prompt a response? (para 4.1.9.5.2)			
3.10.3. Do evaluators ensure scenario stimuli are presented as written in the script? (para 4.1.9.5.5)			
3.10.4. Do evaluators ensure evaluatees aren't challenged, corrected, or prompted concerning the evaluatees' actions? (para 4.1.9.5.6)			
3.10.5. Are evaluation questions used correctly? (para 4.1.9.5.7)			
3.10.6. Are evaluations properly terminated? (para 4.1.11)			
3.11. DOCUMENTATION AND REPORTING (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.11.1. Are results debriefed as soon as practical after each phase of the evaluation? (para 4.1.12.6.1)			
3.11.2. Are all errors and deviations documented on a CAW/evaluation report? (para 4.1.13.2)			
3.11.3. Are errors properly credited against the appropriate JPR? (para 4.1.13.2.1)			
3.11.4. Are all tasks/subtasks exposed during an evaluation documented? (para 4.1.13.2.2)			