



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, DC

AFI36-2406_AFGM2019-01
10 May 2019

***Corrective Action(s) applied on:
4 June 2019***

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION C
MAJCOMs/FOAs/DRUs

FROM: SAF/MR

SUBJECT: Air Force Guidance Memorandum (AFGM) to AFI 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems*

By Order of the Secretary of the Air Force, this Air Force Guidance Memorandum immediately changes AFI 36-2406. Compliance with this Memorandum is mandatory with an effective date of this AFGM. To the extent its directions are inconsistent with other Air Force publications, the information herein prevails, in accordance with AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*.

The AF Guidance Memorandum updates evaluations and feedback process guidance.

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 Forms 847 from the field through appropriate functional chain of command. The OPR for this publication is the Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC)/DP3SP, 550 C Street West Suite 10, Randolph AFB, TX 78140-4712 (email to: afpc.dp3sp.workflow@us.af.mil). Ensure all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with Air Force Manual 33-363, Management of Records, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule located in the Air Force Records Information Management System.

This memorandum becomes void after one-year has elapsed from the date of this memorandum, or upon publication of an Interim Change or rewrite of the affected publication, whichever is earlier.

SHON J. MANASCO
Assistant Secretary
(Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

Attachment:
Guidance Changes

GUIDANCE CHANGES

(Replace) 1.12.3.1. Duty History or Performance Outside the Current Reporting Period. Do not comment on duty history or performance outside the current reporting period, except as permitted by paragraphs 1.12.3.4. and 1.12.4.1.

(Replace) 3.16.2.5.5.4. Stratification in optional Deployed LOEs: Stratification, assignment, command, and DE push statements in deployed letters of evaluation are authorized. Deployed stratifications and push statements may be quoted in future OPRs as long as stratification is not previously documented in the permanent record.

(Replaced) 3.16.2.6. When stratifying officers on OPRs, evaluators will not consider completion/non-completion of non-resident DE if the officer is on the school select list (because they will attend in-residence), or Select/Candidate status. Relative ranking among officers rated by the rating chain should be based on overall performance. This paragraph does not preclude raters from making appropriate assignment and developmental education recommendations on OPRs and RRFs, see paragraph 3.17.4.

(Replace) 3.17.4.3. In addition to assignment recommendations, evaluators may also make recommendations for the appropriate level of in-residence DE on OPRs and LOEs (DE pushes are not authorized on TRs).

(Replace) 3.17.4.6.1. Comments on OPRs or PRFs regarding completion of, or enrollment in DE and AAD are prohibited. Performance and special recognition comments on officers attending in-residence education and/or training will be documented appropriately on the AF Form 475, Training Report (see Chapter 6). **For OPRs only:** Evaluators may comment on an officer's competitive assignment selection to programs that fall outside of the Developmental Education Designation Board (DEDB), to include but not limited to Olmstead, Fulbright, Rhodes, School of Advance Air and Space Studies (SAASS), School of Advanced Warfighting Studies (SAWS). Additionally, evaluators will not comment on an officer's status on the schools list, selection for DE, and/or specific schools (i.e. ACSC, AWC, Joint, etc.) but will limit their remarks to "PDE, IDE, or SDE" only. NOTE: An assignment recommendation for AFIT MS/Masters or PhD program is authorized.

(Add) 8.1.3.1.1. For officers being considered for O-6 and below, promotion recommendation comments are limited to a maximum of two lines in bullet format. In these comments, the senior rater should provide a performance-based differentiation and/or characterization of the eligible officer's potential to serve in the next higher grade. Endorsements for promotion are based upon an officer's demonstrated character and competence as detailed in the Secretary of the Air Force's Memorandum of Instruction for promotion boards. This is an opportunity for the senior rater to tell the Central Selection Board why they should (or should not) promote this officer. This should not be a summary of information already contained in the record of performance. Comments or pushes for items that are decided through other processes or means (e.g. developmental education, jobs, assignments) are not authorized.

(Replace) 8.1.3.2. Promotion Recommendation Form Stratification Guidance. Officer stratification is defined as a quantitative comparison of an individual's standing within an authorized peer group and within a specific evaluator's scope of rating authority. On the Promotion Recommendation Form, officer stratification statements provide a current performance-based differentiation of officers against their peers to assist Central Selection Boards. Senior raters may provide up to two stratifications as part of their promotion recommendation comments. If used, the primary stratification must be among promotion eligible officers by zone and the optional secondary stratification must be among an authorized peer group. If a senior rater does not stratify an officer among eligible officers by promotion zone, they may not provide any other stratification. (Exception: For Narrative-Only PRFs, senior raters will not stratify among eligible officers by promotion zone, but may provide one peer group stratification statement)

(Add) 8.1.3.2.1. Stratification Types.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.1.1. Primary - Eligible by Zone. Senior raters may stratify among eligible officers by promotion zone (e.g. I/APZ and BPZ) from the Master Eligibility List (MEL) for a specific promotion board (Example: #3/10 I/APZ eligible, #1/17 BPZ eligible).

(Add) 8.1.3.2.1.2. Secondary – Peer Group Stratification. If a senior rater stratifies an officer among eligible officers by promotion zone, they may also provide a second stratification in accordance with the following guiding principles.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.2. Authorized Peer Groups. For the purposes of stratification, authorized peer groups are limited to the following categories:

(Add) 8.1.3.2.2.1. Grade. Air Force officers in the same grade (e.g. Captains, Majors, Lieutenant Colonels, Colonels). EXCEPTION: If the officer is permanently assigned to a position on a Joint Manning Document, that officer may be stratified against officers of the same grade, regardless of service affiliation, within the senior rater's scope of rating authority as described below.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.2.2. Command Position. This refers officers filling command positions (e.g. detachment, squadron, group, or wing commanders and materiel leaders). This does not include section commanders or flight commanders. Command position stratification statements for individuals below the grade of Colonel (O-6) **may also include their grade** with the stratification statement (i.e. #2/6 **Maj** Sq/CCs).

(Add) 8.1.3.2.2.3. Duty Position. This refers to the officer's duty position type, level and scope of responsibility (e.g. section chiefs, flight commanders, operations officers, branch chiefs, action officers, analysts, instructors, combat systems officers, pilots, etc.). Officers may be stratified against civilian personnel in equivalent duty positions.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.3. Exception. For Narrative-Only PRFs, senior raters will not stratify among eligible officers by promotion zone, but may provide one peer group stratification statement.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.4. Scope of Rating Authority. Senior raters can only stratify officers within the confines of their direct rating chain and knowledge. Senior rater stratification statements may not extend beyond the confines of their respective senior rater ID (SRID) or overall purview.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.5. Authorized Usage.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.5.1. When used, all stratification statements must stay within an authorized peer group and the evaluator's scope of rating authority.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.5.2. Stratification statements must be written in quantitative terms. Examples:

(Add) 8.1.3.2.5.2.1. By AF Grade. “#3/30 Capts”; “#1/1 Majs”; “#2/12 Lt Cols”

(Add) 8.1.3.2.5.2.2. By Command Position. “#1/9 Grp/CCs”, “#1/7 Maj Sq/CCs”; “#3/20 Lt Col Det/CCs”

(Add) 8.1.3.2.5.2.3. By Duty Position. “#1/6 Flt/CCs”; “#1/40 Analysts”; “#2/12 Branch Chiefs”

(Add) 8.1.3.2.6. Prohibited Usage.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.6.1. Company Grade Officers (CGOs) and/or Field Grade Officers (FGOs) are not an authorized peer group for stratification purposes.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.6.2. Officers may not be stratified based on additional duty positions and may not be stratified against enlisted personnel.

(Add) 8.1.3.2.6.3. Awards are recognition based on a given set of criteria. Accordingly, stratification statements based on awards are not authorized (e.g. #1/50 as Sq CGO of the Quarter).

(Add) 8.1.3.2.6.4. The use of stratification statements from anyone other than the senior rater are prohibited. A senior rater may not quote stratification from another evaluator or source.

(Replace) 8.1.3.3. If promotion opportunity is 100%, regular PRFs are not required. This includes individuals competing for I/APZ; any officers competing for BPZ will still require a completed PRF. EXCEPTIONS: Senior raters will prepare PRFs on all officers who receive "DNP" recommendations and on all officers who receive a “P” recommendation but have derogatory information (Article 15, courts-martial, referral evaluation, LOR, etc.) filed in their OSR.

(Replace) 8.1.3.4. For LAF Capt PRFs: MLRs are prohibited (except for AF Level Students); “Definitely Promote” recommendation PRFs are not authorized any comments; “Promote/Do Not Promote” recommendations are limited to a maximum of two lines or as directed by HAF. Each SR with one eligible officer (regardless of zone) will receive one allocated “DP”. Any additional “DPs” will be awarded based on the allocation rate which is announced approximately 60 days prior to the CSB.

(Delete) 8.1.3.4.1

(Delete) 8.1.3.4.2

(Replace) 8.1.3.5. Statements that refer or imply to the stratification of an officer's standing at an MLR, such as: "#1 of 22 DPs awarded at the MLR," or "If the MLR had one more DP, he/she would get it," are prohibited. This means the head of the ML or MLR President may not use the denominator of the MLs eligibles when stratifying their respective officers, who may have or have not competed at the MLR.

(Delete) 8.1.3.5.1

(Delete) 8.1.3.5.2

(Delete) 8.1.3.5.2.1

(Delete) 8.1.3.5.2.2

(Delete) 8.1.3.5.2.3

(Delete) 8.1.3.5.2.4

(Delete) 8.1.3.5.2.5

(Add) 8.1.3.6. Promotion statements, reserved for the senior rater, will only be made on the PRF.

(Add) 8.1.3.6.1. As a general rule, prohibited promotion statements are any comments, direct or implied, that refer to a higher grade. For example, any comments that state the individual is performing above his/her grade, occupying a position requiring a more senior grade, comparing an individual to officers of higher grade, or alluding to a higher ranking position are all prohibited.

(Add) 8.1.3.6.2. While it is impossible to provide an all-inclusive list of prohibited statements; some examples are:

(Add) 8.1.3.6.2.1. "Maj Burgess is senior officer material." (The term "Senior" is a euphemism for colonel and above, therefore not authorized).

(Add) 8.1.3.6.2.2. "Capt DeSantis has excelled in a major's billet." (Refers to a grade higher than the one the individual currently holds).

(Add) 8.1.3.6.2.3. "Major Moody should be a group commander now." (Recommends the individual for a position two grades higher than the ratee—not normal progression).

(Add) 8.1.3.6.2.4. "Capt Korte is ready for our toughest field grade jobs." (Compares a company

grade officer with higher ranking (Field Grade) officers).

(Add) 8.1.3.6.2.5. “Already performing above her current position.” (Refers to higher grade).

(Replace) Table 8.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Form.

LINE	A B		C
	To Complete		Instructions (See Note 1 and Note 4)
	Sec	Item	
1	I	Ratee Identification Data	See PRF notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the CSS/HR Specialist and MPS for computer correction for ADL officers. For RASL officers, notify the MPS (unit assigned) or HQ ARPC/DPTSE to correct any erroneous data.
2		Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial and Jr., Sr., etc. If the officer has no middle initial, the use of “NMI” is not mandatory. The name will be in all upper case.
3		SSN	Enter SSN. Suffix is optional.
4		Grade	Enter grade.
5		DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC to include prefix and suffix as of the date the PRF notice is generated. See Note 2; See Note 3 for R-O PRFs.
6		Organization	Enter organization, command, and location of assignment (with attachment if applicable). For IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. See Note 3 for R-O PRFs.
7		PAS Code	Enter PAS code as reflected on PRF notice. If PAS code is incorrect, advise the CSS/HR Specialist and MPS (ADL officers) or MPS (unit) or HQ RIO (IMAs). For IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. See Note 3 for R-O PRFs.
8	II	Unit Mission Description	Provides a description of primary unit responsibilities (e.g., what it is and does, and to whom it is responsible), and is the same for all members of a unit. Limit to four lines. This is normally for the organization listed on the PRF. However, in very large organizations, it may be necessary to use the mission description for a lower level, such as the division level if it more accurately portrays the activity in which the officer performs duty. NOTE: For R-O PRFs, leave blank.
9	III	Job Description	Complete as you would on an AF Form 707.

10		Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title as reflected in the Personnel Data System. Pending or projected duty titles will not be used (EXAMPLE: Officer departs to new duty location, losing SR may not use new duty title). See the PSD Handbook for further guidance on duty title construction. For students, enter the student duty title (see Note 2). For AGR student R-O PRFs, enter “Student, type of school” (i.e., Student, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, etc.). For AFR PV, see Note 10. For those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment billet enter deployed title.
11		Key Duties	This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee’s job and not be standardized. Be specific—include level to which responsible, number of people supervised, dollar value of resources accountable for/projects managed, etc. Make it clear; avoid jargon, acronyms and topical references as they obscure rather than clarify meaning. You may mention significant additional duties only if directly related to mission accomplishment, and previous jobs held during the period of the evaluation that impact on the evaluation. For accessions receiving an evaluation while awaiting the start of formal training, the first line of the description will read “Officer is awaiting training.” This may mirror the job description. See Notes 4 and 5. For R-O PRFs, leave blank.
12	IV	Promotion Recommendation	Explain why the officer should or should not be promoted. Limit comments to the next higher grade, see Notes 4 and 5. For N-O PRFs and RASL officers, comments on all PRFs are mandatory. Comments are mandatory for IPZ, one time deferred (passed over) APZ eligible officers and for ANGUS colonels meeting an ANG FRB. Comments are optional for BPZ eligible officers; and two or more times deferred (passed over) APZ eligible officers; and for promotion to the grade of brigadier general when the overall recommendation is “Promote.” When comments are optional, the final decision authority for including comments remains with the SR. Comments are required on all PRFs with a “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendation, regardless of zone. For ADL R-O PRFs, this section is blank. See Note 6 for expanded guidance on PRFs for ADL colonels being considered for brigadier general selection. For officers being considered for O-6 and below, promotion recommendation comments are limited to a maximum of two lines in bullet format.

13	V	Promotion Zone	Place an “X” in the BPZ block for ADL BPZ officers. For ADL I/APZ officers, place an “X” in the I/APZ block. See PRF notice for promotion zone. Type or hand-write entries. No entry is required on PRFs for ADL colonels being considered for brigadier general selection. For ResAF officers, leave blank. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter “N/A.” For N-O PRFs, leave blank.
14	VI	Group Size	For ADL officers, see Table 8.2. Type or hand-write the entry. For N-O PRFs, leave blank. See Note 6 for instructions pertaining to colonels being considered for brigadier general selection. For ResAF, (I/APZ) rank order all officers awarded a “DP” recommendation, within each competitive category, i.e., 2/5/10; the officer is ranked number 2 of 5 officers awarded a “DP” out of 10 officers in that competitive category meeting the CSB. PV: rank order all officers nominated for PV within each competitive category, i.e., 2/5; the officer is ranked number 2 of 5 officers. (The SR has 5 officers in that competitive category meeting the PV CSB). The Deputy RE ranks AGR student R-O PRFs according to the competitive category within the student population. These PRFs are not included with the PRFs under the SRID that applies to the Chief of Air Force Reserve. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter “N/A.”
15	VII	Board ID	Enter the CSB for which the senior rater prepared the PRF (EXAMPLE: P0408A indicates the CY08 major board, and A0409A indicates the FY09 ANG major board). The PRF notice includes the board ID. For N-O PRFs, enter the date signed in this section. For RASL N-O PRFs, leave blank. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter “N/A.”
16	VIII	SRID	The five-character code used to identify the position of the SR. Enter this code as shown on the PRF notice. For IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. For N-O PRFs, and PRFs on colonels being considered for brigadier general, leave blank. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter “N/A.”
17	IX	Overall Recommendation	The SR marks one of three recommendations, as appropriate. Electronically “X” or hand-write this entry in dark blue or black ink. See Note 7 for additional information on N-O PRFs, Non-Line and aggregate PRFs. For RASL, do not mark a recommendation for Position Vacancy or N-O PRFs. Nominees for ANG colonel are exempt. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter “Definitely Promote”.

18	X	SR Data	See instructions at Note 8 for lieutenant colonels and below, Note 9 for ADL colonels and Note 11 for ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general.
----	---	---------	---

Notes:

1. SRs complete PRFs no earlier than 60 days before the CSB (the PRF cutoff date). For AFR, complete the PRFs in time to arrive at HQ ARPC not later than 45 days before the board convening date. SRs award one of three overall recommendations: "Definitely Promote," "Promote," or "Do Not Promote This Board." Excluding AFR and AGR officers, there is a limit on "DP" recommendations to ensure they convey the intended message. Except for PRFs written on promotion-eligible colonels (see also Note 6), there is a limit on "DP" recommendations to ensure they convey the intended message. There is no limit on "P" and "DNP" recommendations.

2. If changes to DAFSC or duty title are approved after the MLR, but before the CSB, see paragraph 8.5 for correction procedures. Once the PRF is a matter of record, a formal application for correction must be submitted in accordance with Chapter 10 of this instruction. For RASL officers, contact HQ ARPC/DPS if data is incorrect. For AGR students, enter "Student of (type of school)," (i.e. PDE, IDE, SDE, etc).

3. For R-O PRFs.

a. Enter in Item 4, student DAFSC; for Item 5, the organizational designation, MAJCOM, and location of the ratee's assigned school; and for Item 6, student PAS code.

b. For AGR students only. Enter in Item 4, student DAFSC; for Item 5, Office of Air Force Reserve (HAF), Washington DC; and for Item 6, student PAS code.

4. Some general guidelines:

a. For officers being considered for O-6 and below, promotion recommendation comments are limited to a maximum of two lines in bullet format. In these comments, the senior rater should provide a performance-based differentiation and/or characterization of the eligible officer's potential to serve in the next higher grade.

b. Endorsements for promotion are based upon an officer's demonstrated character and competence as detailed in the Secretary of the Air Force's Memorandum of Instruction for promotion boards. This is an opportunity for the senior rater to tell the Central Selection Board why they should (or should not) promote this officer. This should not be a summary of information already contained in the record of performance. Comments or pushes for items that are decided through other processes or means (e.g. command, developmental education, jobs, assignments) are not authorized.

c. PRFs may include recommendations for promotion (limit comments to the next higher grade).

d. For promotion-eligible colonels and brigadier generals; SRs may consider information in an officer's SOUIF. Reliable source information does not need to be quoted or attributed.

e. Do not discuss classified information.

f. Do consider including comments related to Article 15 action, or letters of reprimand,

admonishment or counseling. It is strongly recommended that Control Roster action be recorded. It is mandatory to record courts-martial results unless actions resulted in acquittal.

g. Do not make recommendations for selective continuation since Selective Continuation Boards do not see PRFs. On CSBs where promotion and selective continuation are involved, PRFs are removed from the selection records before the start of the selective continuation process.

h. Refer to paragraph 1.12. for guidance on inappropriate evaluator considerations and comments on PRFs.

i. Duty information must be within the SR's jurisdiction as of the PRF accounting date.

j. May not comment on an officer's prior enlisted time.

5. Comments are mandatory when an officer receives a "DP" or "DNP" recommendation, and must substantiate, amplify, or explain the recommendation. Comments for "P" recommendations are optional for BPZ ADL officers.

6. On PRFs prepared on promotion-eligible colonels, entries in Section VI may be handwritten (in dark blue or black ink) but on all "DP" PRF entries must be "Handwritten" (must be typed for ANG FRB). Rank officers by competitive category. Focus on potential to serve at the GO level. Use ratee's accomplishments as a colonel to demonstrate potential and to explain why an officer uniquely qualifies for promotion more so than others. Use comparative terms and gauge difficulty of job challenge, but do not repeat content of OPRs. Highlight factors that demonstrate desired GO traits (breadth, depth, versatility, adaptability, generalist qualities, leadership, management intellect, presence, image, communication skills, experience, functional expertise, appreciation for future vision, etc.). Use personal terms and be clear and concise. Identify true contenders and place heavy emphasis on future use as a GO. The head of the ML (or designated representative) may solicit advice and information from the ratee's supervisors and commanders, both current and past. If rendering a "DP" recommendation, indicate the officer's rank order among the total number of promotion-eligible officers in the ML and competitive category.

EXAMPLE: An officer receiving a "DP" recommendation who is second in an ML of 150 total eligibles would have the entry "2/150" in Section VI. If the officer does not receive a "DP" recommendation, leave this section blank or enter "N/A." MLs are not limited in the number of "DP" recommendations they award to their eligibles.

7. For narrative-only PRFs, do not mark any of the three blocks and type "No Overall Recommendation" in the top of this section. For Non-Line of the AF officers: MC and DC promotion to major and lieutenant colonel; LAF, NC, MSC, BSC, and HC promotion to captain, only "P" or "DNP" recommendations are used on the PRF (when the promotion opportunity is 100 percent). Do not prepare a PRF for Judge Advocate promotion to captain. For officers submitted in aggregate or carry-over to an evaluation board, leave this section blank.

8. SR (lieutenant colonels and below):

a. Enter name, grade, branch of service (military officers and DAF civilians only), organization, command of assignment, and location. Grade must be that in which the SR is serving, **EXCEPTION:** Enter "Brig Gen (S)" for brigadier general selectees confirmed by the U.S. Senate and designated as SR by the ML. Enter "Major Gen (S)" for major general selectees confirmed by the U.S. Senate. Retired grade is not authorized. If an officer has been "frocked," enter his or her actual grade unless the officer is serving in a funded billet and the ratee is a lieutenant colonel or above.

- b. Enter only the last four digits of the SSN if the evaluator is a USAF officer (suffix not entered). The SSN is optional, though encouraged, if the evaluator is a civilian or a member of another U.S. military service.
 - c. Do not include command level, unless it is an integral part of the duty title, with the official duty title.
 - d. Do not enter any classified information.
 - e. For ADL officers, enter current data as of the date of PRF completion. Do not complete the PRF before the PRF cut-off date.
 - f. For ADL R-O PRFs, the President of the Air Force MLR acts as the SR. Enter the following information: name; grade; branch of service; for organization, enter "HQ USAF Student MLR;" for location, enter the location of the review; SSN; and for duty title, enter "President, HQ USAF Student MLR."
9. For ADL colonels, the head of the ML must complete this section if the recommendation is a "DP." For other recommendations, the head of the ML may designate one or more representatives, senior in grade to the ratees, to complete this section.
10. For PV nomination, place the position number to the far right in this block. All PV nominations must have a valid funded position number with an authorized grade higher than the officer's current grade when it arrives at HQ ARPC/PB. PRFs with missing/invalid position numbers or those for nominees not the incumbent (an UMD overage) in the position for which nominated, may be returned. Questions should be directed to HQ ARPC/PB.
11. For ANGUS colonels, their PRF must be signed by the Adjutant General of their state affiliation.
-

**BY ORDER OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE**

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 36-2406

8 NOVEMBER 2016



Personnel

**OFFICER AND ENLISTED
EVALUATION SYSTEMS**

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: AFPC/DP3SP

Certified by: SAF/MR
(Mr. Daniel R. Sitterly)

Supersedes: AFI 36-2406, 2 January 2013

Pages: 317

This publication implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 36-24, *Military Evaluations*. It provides guidance and procedures for implementing Air Force (AF) Evaluation Systems policy for the Officer Evaluation System (OES) and Enlisted Evaluation System (EES). It describes how to prepare, submit, and manage Air Force Forms (AF Forms) prescribed by this Air Force Instruction (AFI). Waivers to this instruction are authorized and shall be processed IAW AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*. Waiver requests will be submitted using the AF Form 679, *Air Force Publication Compliance Item Waiver Request/Approval*, or via e-mail or memorandum if the form is unavailable. For unit-level compliance items, waivers must be approved by AFPC/DP3SP. AFPC/DP3SP is the waiver approving authority for non-tiered requirements in this publication.

This publication applies to all major commands (MAJCOM), field operating agencies (FOA), direct reporting units (DRU), and other Air Force activities, as well as Regular Air Force, Air National Guard (ANG), Active Guard/Reserve (AGR), and Air Force Reserve (AFR) activities, officers, and enlisted. While the philosophy and intent of the OES/EES pertain to the ANG and AFR, modifications are necessary. This instruction also provides procedures governing evaluation of brigadier and major generals.

This publication is affected by the Privacy Act (PA) of 1974 (DoDD 5400.11, DOD Privacy Program), and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (DoD Regulation 5400.7-R_AFMAN 33-302, *DoD Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program*). Title 10, United States Code, Section 8013 and Executive Order 9397, as amended, authorize the Air Force to collect and maintain the

records in this instruction. System of Records Notice (SORN) F036 AF PC A, Effectiveness/Performance Reporting Systems, and F036 AFPC T, Officer Performance Report (OPR)/Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) Appeal Case Files is available at <http://dpclo.defense.gov/Privacy/SORNs.aspx>. Evaluators (except civilian and foreign-service evaluators) must provide the last four numbers of social security number (SSN). Use the SSN to verify the identity of the evaluator for research and accountability. Any requests for records or documents contained in this System of Records Notice will be processed under the Freedom of Information Act guidelines outlined IAW AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*, **Chapter 4**, Giving Access to Privacy Act Records and **Chapter 12**, Disclosing Records to Third Parties.

Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained IAW Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) in the Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS).

Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*; route AF Form 847 to AFPC Publishing Office, 550 C Street West Suite 48, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph Texas 78150-4750, or email afpc.publications@us.af.mil.

Field agencies will not publish supplements that change basic policies/procedures or merely duplicate the text of these instructions. Supplements initiated at MAJCOM-level or below require HQ USAF/A1PPP and HQ AFPC/DP3SP approval before publication. Send published copies of approved supplements to HQ USAF/A1PPP, HQ AFPC/DP3SP, and HQ ARPC/PB. Field agencies must get HQ AFPC/DP3SP and AFDPO/PPP approval before using locally created versions of the AF Forms prescribed by this instruction.

The authorities to waive wing/unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier ("T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3") number following the compliance statement. See AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate Tier waiver approval authority, or alternately, to the Publication OPR for non-tiered compliance items.

Vigilance must be taken to protect Personally Identifiable Information (PII) when submitting or sending nominations, applications or other documents to Department of Defense (DoD) agencies through government Internet, software applications, systems, e-mail, postal, faxing or scanning.

See Attachment 1 for glossary of references and supporting information used in this publication. Attachment 2, Appeal Guidance for Applicants, is a guide to be used when appealing evaluations in accordance with Chapter 10. We recommend you review the attachments before reading this document.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This instruction has been extensively reformatted and should be read in its entirety. The new structure provides ease of references by separating the Officer Performance Report and Enlisted

Performance Report chapters eliminating redundancy in the instruction. These changes incorporate and implement new guidance on the Enlisted Evaluation System, including clarification on: mandatory comments, prohibited comments, future roles, Professional Military Education (PME) completion, retirement Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) options, clarification for forced distributors regarding discussions with lower level leadership, and adjustments to Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel (EFDP) splits and record review. In addition, the reference and utilization instructions for the SecAF Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) for use in officer evaluation programs were added. **Chapter 5**, Contingency and Wartime Provisions has been eliminated and the guidance was merged into the applicable officer and enlisted chapters. Updates were made to office symbols throughout the instruction. These changes were made in collaboration with the Chief of Air Force Reserve (HQ AF/RE) and the Director of the Air National Guard (NGB/CF), Headquarters Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel, and Services (HQ USAF/A1) develops personnel policy for enlisted promotion and demotion programs.

Chapter 1— GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS	10
1.1. Purpose.....	10
1.2. Forms Used--Purpose and Their Use.....	10
1.3. General Guidelines.	11
1.4. Preparing and Processing Evaluations.....	14
1.5. Evaluator Requirements.....	20
1.6. Responsibilities.....	23
1.7. Rating Chain Deviations and Evaluator Changes.....	31
1.8. Evaluator's Mandatory Considerations.....	34
1.9. Disagreements.....	40
1.10. Referral Evaluations.	41
1.11. Mandatory Comments.....	48
1.12. General Prohibited Evaluator Considerations and Comments.....	49
1.13. Policy Deviations and Waiver Requests.	53
1.14. Missing, Late and Removed Performance Evaluations.	53
1.15. National Emergency or Wartime Provisions.	54
Figure 1.1. Example Referral Memorandum.....	56
Table 1.1. Mailing Addresses for Correspondence.....	58
Table 1.2. Missing and Late Evaluations.....	61

Chapter 2—	AIRMAN COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT	62
2.1.	Purpose.....	62
2.2.	Responsibilities.....	62
2.3.	Who Requires an ACA.	63
2.4.	Guidance for Conducting ACA Sessions.....	64
2.5.	When to Hold Documented ACA Sessions.	64
2.6.	The ACA Notice.	64
2.7.	Which ACA Form to Use.	64
2.8.	Preparing the ACA Worksheet.	64
2.9.	Disposition and Access.....	65
2.10.	Failure of Rater to Conduct or Document an ACA Session.	65
2.11.	Tracking ACA Sessions.....	65
Table 2.1.	Airman Comprehensive Assessment Requirements.	66
Table 2.2.	Preparing AF Form 931 (AB thru TSgt), Airman Comprehensive Assessment....	67
Table 2.3.	Preparing AF Form 932 (MSgt - CMSgt) Airman Comprehensive Assessment...	71
Table 2.4.	Preparing AF Form 724 (Lt thru Col) Airman Comprehensive Assessment.....	75
Chapter 3—	OFFICER PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	77
3.1.	General Guidelines.	77
3.2.	Purpose of the AF Form 707.....	77
3.3.	Who Requires an OPR.	77
3.4.	Who Does Not Require an OPR.	77
3.5.	When to Submit an OPR.....	79
3.6.	Annual Reports.	79
3.7.	Change of Reporting Official (CRO) Reports (including events of emergency or no-notice departures).	79
3.8.	Directed by HQ USAF, NGB, or Commander (MAJCOM, wing, group, or squadron, as appropriate).....	79
3.9.	365-day Extended Deployment Officer Performance Reports (OPRs).	80
3.10.	“FROM” Dates.	85

	3.11.	“THRU” Dates.....	85
	3.12.	Non-Rated Periods.....	85
	3.13.	Number of Days Supervision.....	88
	3.14.	ACA/Performance Feedback.	88
	3.15.	Reviewer.....	88
	3.16.	Prohibited Evaluator Considerations and Comments.	89
	3.17.	Inappropriate Recommendations Referring to Aviator Continuation Pay, Separation/Retirement, Civilian Employment, Assignments, DE/Professional Military Education (PME) and Advanced Academic Degrees (AAD).....	92
	3.18.	Extensions of Close-Out Dates.	94
	3.19.	Ratee’s Acknowledgement.	95
Table	3.1.	Instructions for Preparing AF Form 707, Officer Performance Report.....	97
Table	3.2.	When to Prepare OPRs for RegAF and ANG Officers (Lieutenant thru Colonel).	109
Table	3.3.	When to Prepare OPRs on AFR Officers (Lieutenant thru Colonel).....	111
Chapter 4—		ENLISTED PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS	113
	4.1.	General Guidelines.	113
	4.2.	EPR Forms.....	113
	4.3.	Who Requires EPRs.....	113
	4.4.	Evaluations not Authorized.....	114
	4.5.	When to Submit an Enlisted Performance Report (EPR).	115
	4.6.	“FROM” Dates.	115
	4.7.	“THRU” Dates.....	115
	4.8.	Non-Rated Periods.....	117
	4.9.	Number of Days Supervision.....	120
	4.10.	Completing Evaluations.....	120
	4.11.	Promotion Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Time-In-Service (TIS) Eligibility (AF Form 910 only).....	121
	4.12.	Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Senior Rater Stratification/Endorsement Eligibility (AF Form 911 only).	121
	4.13.	Final Evaluator’s Position and Single Evaluators.....	123

	4.14.	ACA/Performance Feedback.	125
	4.15.	Forced Distributor, (Section IX, AF Form 910) Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer, (Section VIII, AF Form 911).....	126
	4.16.	Evaluator Considerations and Comments.....	126
	4.17.	Inappropriate Comments Referring to Separation/Retirement, Civilian Employment, and Professional Military Education (PME).	128
	4.18.	Ratee's Acknowledgement.	129
	4.19.	Forced Distribution (AF Form 910 Only).....	130
Table	4.1.	EFDP Scale.....	141
	4.20.	Additional EFDP Guidance.	141
	4.21.	EFDP Report.....	141
Table	4.2.	Instructions for Preparing AF Forms 910, Enlisted Performance Reports.	143
Table	4.3.	When to Submit EPRs on RegAF and ARC AGR/Stat Tours.....	153
Table	4.4.	When to Submit EPRs on ARC Airmen (Non-AGR).....	155
Table	4.5.	Time-in-Grade (TIG) Senior Rater Eligibility Chart.....	157
Table	4.6.	Instructions for Preparing AF Form 912, CMSgt Enlisted Performance Reports...	159
Table	4.7.	Static Close-out Date (SCOD) Enlisted Chart for RegAF, ARC AGR, and Stat Tour.....	167
Table	4.8.	Static Close-out Date (SCOD) Enlisted Chart for AFR and for ANG Non AGR. .	167
Table	4.9.	Instructions for Preparing AF Forms 911, Enlisted Performance Reports (MSgt Select, MSgt, SMSgt Select, SMSgt).....	168
Table	4.10.	Forced Distribution Allocation Table (SrA).	179
Table	4.11.	Forced Distribution Allocation Table (SSgt and TSgt).	180
Table	4.12.	Accounting Dates for Static Close-out Date Evaluations.	181
Chapter 5— AF FORM 77, LETTER OF EVALUATION			182
	5.1.	Purpose.....	182
	5.2.	Types of Letters of Evaluation (LOE).	182
	5.3.	Who Will Prepare.	187
	5.4.	Administrative Practices.	188
	5.5.	Completing AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation.....	188

5.6.	Routing, Updating and Disposition Responsibilities	188
5.7.	CSS/HR Specialist/MPS/PERSCO Responsibilities.	189
Table 5.1.	Instructions for Completing the AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation.	199
Table 5.2.	When to Submit a Letter of Evaluation.	199
Chapter 6— AF FORM 475, EDUCATION/TRAINING REPORT		201
6.1.	When to Use Training Reports (TR).....	201
6.2.	Who Prepares Training Reports.....	203
6.3.	Referral Training Reports.	203
6.4.	Routing and Responsibilities.	203
Table 6.1.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 475, Training Report (Officers Only).	205
Table 6.2.	When to Prepare AF Form 475, Training Report.	209
Table 6.3.	Updating Officer Training Reports.....	212
Chapter 7— GENERAL OFFICER EVALUATIONS		213
7.1.	Overview.....	213
7.2.	Forms Used.	213
7.3.	Reasons for Reports.	213
7.4.	General Instructions.....	214
7.5.	Processing General Officer Evaluations.	216
Table 7.1.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 78, Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation.	217
Table 7.2.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 77 for General Officers.	220
Chapter 8— PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION AND MANAGEMENT LEVEL REVIEW PROCESS		222
8.1.	AF Form 709 (for Active Duty List [ADL] officers).....	222
8.2.	AF Form 709 (for Reserve Active Status List officers).....	230
8.3.	MLRs (ADL Lieutenant Colonel and Below).....	233
8.4.	Special Provisions (applies to ADL officers only).	246
8.5.	Correction of Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRF) (ADL Officers) (Stop File process).....	250
8.6.	Promotion Recommendations for Colonels.	251

8.7.	Supplemental Management Level Reviews (SMLRs) for Recommendation Upgrade (POST-CSB), (For ADL Only).	253
Figure 8.1.	Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB) or ResAF CSB.	255
Table 8.1.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Form. ...	256
Table 8.2.	What to Enter in (Group Size) on the PRF (ADL Lt Col and below only).....	263
Table 8.3.	Senior Rater "Definitely Promote" Allocation Rate Table - ADL Officers,	264
Chapter 9— AF FORM 3538, RETENTION RECOMMENDATION FORM		266
9.1.	When to Use the AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).....	266
9.2.	Responsibilities.....	266
9.3.	RRF Submission.	267
9.4.	Air Force Advisor Examination.....	267
9.5.	Correction of Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).....	267
Figure 9.1.	Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB).	268
Table 9.1.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).	269
Chapter 10— CORRECTING OFFICER AND ENLISTED EVALUATIONS		271
10.1.	Purpose.....	271
10.2.	Program Elements.....	271
10.3.	Correcting Evaluations.	274
10.4.	Responsibilities.....	275
10.5.	Meeting Time Limits and Expedited Requests.....	278
10.6.	Using Classified, Privacy Act, and Restricted Release Information:.....	279
10.7.	Requesting Special Selection Board (SSB) or Supplemental Promotion Consideration:	279
10.8.	Resubmitting an Appeal:	280
Table 10.1.	How to Submit Requests for Correction.....	281
Table 10.2.	Correcting Minor Errors on Evaluations.....	282
Table 10.3.	Minor Corrections – Offices Authorized to Make Corrections and Disposition. ...	284
Table 10.4.	Board Directed Corrections - Correcting and Disposition of Documents.	285

Table 10.5.	Correcting AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Forms.	287
Table 10.6.	Instructions For Completing AF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports	288
Figure 10.1.	Sample, AF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports.	290
Attachment 1— GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION		291
Attachment 2— APPEAL GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (LOCAL REPRODUCTION AUTHORIZED)		308
Attachment 3— NON-RATED PERIOD MEMORANDUM		317

Chapter 1

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1. Purpose. The Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems have varied purposes. The first is to establish performance standards and expectations for ratees, meaningful feedback on how well the ratee is meeting those expectations, and direction on how to better meet those established standards and expectations. The second is to provide a reliable, long-term, cumulative record of performance and promotion potential based on that performance. The third is to provide officer Central Selection Boards (CSBs), SNCO evaluation boards, the Weighted Airman Promotion System (WAPS), and other personnel managers' with sound information to assist in identifying the best qualified officers and enlisted personnel for promotion, as well as other personnel management decisions.

1.1.1. To accomplish these purposes, the evaluation system focuses on performance. How well the individual does his or her job, and the qualities the individual brings to the job, are of paramount importance to the Air Force. It is also important for development of skills and leadership abilities and in determining who will be selected for advancement through assignments, promotions, and other personnel actions. The evaluation system emphasizes the importance of performance in several ways--using periodic performance feedback, as the basis for formal evaluations and through performance-based promotion recommendations.

1.1.2. Effective evaluators must have an adequate understanding of Officer Evaluation System (OES), Enlisted Evaluation System (EES), or both, depending on who they supervise. Additionally, Air Force members are encouraged to receive annual recurring OES/EES training. How and when this training is conducted is at the discretion of the unit commander. To assist commanders, OES/EES Training Guides are located on the myPers website.

1.1.3. Unless stated otherwise, the general guidelines outlined in this chapter apply to all evaluations, (OPRs, EPRs, TRs, PRFs, LOEs, ERRFs and RRFs).

1.2. Forms Used--Purpose and Their Use.

1.2.1. AF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation* (LOE), is a multipurpose evaluation form (see Chapter 5 for details).

1.2.2. AF Form 78, *Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation* (PRF), used to document performance and promotion recommendations for certain general officers (see Chapter 7 for details).

1.2.3. AF Form 475, *Education/Training Report* (TR), used to document periods when Airmen are in education or formal training.

1.2.4. AF Form 707, *Officer Performance Report* (OPR) (Lt thru Col); AF Form 910, *Enlisted Performance Report* (AB thru TSgt); AF Form 911, *Enlisted Performance Report* (MSgt thru SMSgt), or AF Form 912, *Enlisted Performance Report* (CMSgt), are used to document potential and performance as well as provide information for making a promotion recommendation, selection, or propriety action; selective continuation; involuntary separation; selective early retirement; assignment; school nomination and selection; and other management decisions (see Chapter 3 [officers]). For enlisted only, use ratee's grade or

projected grade on the Static Close-Out Date (SCOD) to determine which form to use (see Chapter 4 [enlisted]).

1.2.5. AF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation Form* (PRF), used to assess an officer's performance-based potential and to recommend promotion from a Senior Rater (SR) (or in case of colonel ratees, from the head of the Management Level (ML) or designated representative) to Central Selection Boards (CSBs). PRFs are removed from the Officer Selection Record (OSR) following the promotion board which they were accomplished for, and are stored electronically. AF Forms 709 will be used for historical, legal, and appeal purposes only (see Chapter 8 for details).

1.2.6. AF Form 724, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (Lt thru Col)*, AF Form 931, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (AB thru TSgt)*, and AF Form 932, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (MSgt thru CMSgt)*. These forms are used to document formal communication regarding an assessment of an Airman's responsibilities, accountability, Air Force culture, critical role in support of the mission, individual readiness and performance between raters and ratees (see Chapter 2 for details).

1.2.7. AF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation Form* (RRF), and AF Form 3538E, *Enlisted Retention Recommendation Form* (ERRF) are used in conjunction with this AFI and HQ AFPC Retirements and Separations office, to document performance-based differentiation and retention recommendations, to assist in involuntary separation and/or retirement boards (AF Form 3538 - Force Shaping, Reduction in Force (RIF), or Selective Early Retirement (SERB) boards; AF Form 3538E - Force Shaping, Enlisted Retention Board (ERB), Quality Force Review Board [QFRB]). These forms are only used at the discretion of the Secretary of the Air Force. RRFs/ERRFs are removed from the OSR/enlisted board file following the board which they were accomplished for, and are stored electronically. These RRFs/ERRFs will be used for historical, legal, and appeal purposes only. See Chapter 9 and AFI 36-3203, *Service Retirements*, for details.

1.2.8. AF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports*, is used by RegAF, and Reserve personnel to substitute, correct or remove an evaluation when the applicant does not have access to the Virtual Military Personnel Flight (vMPF)/Virtual Personnel Center (vPC) application process (see Chapter 10 for details). Only used when access to the vMPF/vPC or a HR specialist is unavailable, see paragraph 10.4.4.1.2.

1.3. General Guidelines.

1.3.1. Access to Evaluations. Evaluations are For Official Use Only (FOUO) and are subject to the Privacy Act. They are exempt from public disclosure under DoD Regulation 5400.7-R_AFMAN 33-302, *DoD Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program*, and AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*. Only persons within the agency who have a proper need to know may have access to the evaluations. The office with custodial responsibility is responsible for determining if a person's official duties require access. See Chapter 2 for access to the ACA Worksheets.

1.3.2. Classified Information and Security Classification. Do not enter classified information in any section of the evaluation; this includes any type of evaluation forms, attachments to evaluations, referral documents, or endorsements to referral documents. If an entry would result in the release of classified information, use the word "Data Masked" in place of that

entry. The Personnel Accounting Symbol (PAS) code alone is unclassified, however it will only be entered on the ratee. In the Forced Distributor Identification (FDID) block enter nine asterisks, (*****) and in the Senior Rater Identification (SRID) block enter five asterisks, (*****). In those cases where the evaluator is with a classified organization or location, enter "Data Masked" for organization nomenclature and nothing more.

1.3.3. Bullet Format. Bullet format is mandatory. Use bullet format as specified in the appropriate table for the evaluation being accomplished. Bullets are limited to a maximum of two lines per bullet and white space is authorized. Main bullets begin at the left margin and will have one space after the "-".

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

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

1.3.6. Type and Font.

1.3.6.1. Type all evaluations using the electronic version of the form from the AF Publications website. **EXCEPTION:** Use of automated evaluation systems are authorized (e.g. vPC applications).

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

1.3.6.3. Forms will be typed using 12-pitch font. You must use computerized versions with proportional spacing, provided a 12-pitch font is used. **(T-0)**.

1.3.6.4. Handwritten Evaluations.

1.3.6.4.1. Evaluations may be handwritten, only when authorized by HQ AFPC/DP3SP or ARPC/DPT, as appropriate (**EXCEPTION:** POTUS/VPOTUS may handwrite evaluations).

1.3.6.4.2. When authorized, print or legibly write entries.

1.3.6.4.3. Use only dark blue or black reproducible ink.

1.3.6.4.4. HQ AFPC/DP3SP or HQ ARPC/DPT will not approve requests if a computerized form, typewriter, or word processor is available.

1.3.7. Nicknames and Acronyms.

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

1.3.7.2. Acronyms.

1.3.7.2.1. Uncommon acronyms must be spelled out; however, if space is limited, define the acronyms in the proper section of the applicable form. **NOTE:** The AF evaluation forms allow the evaluators to explain uncommon acronyms in the Remarks section of the forms (creating a continuation sheet solely to record acronyms is not

authorized). When acronyms are used, the acronyms must be listed alphabetically and separated by a semicolon (;).

1.3.7.2.2. When used, first spell out and follow with the acronym; e.g. Personnel Support for Contingency Operations (PERSCO).

1.3.7.2.3. Acronyms or abbreviations common throughout the Air Force, such as CGO, NCO, CONUS, TDY, etc., are not required to be spelled out.

1.3.8. Waivers and Recommended Changes. Send requests for deviations or waivers through the wing commander or the comparative level to HQ AFPC/DP3SP who in turn will forward the request to appropriate office of primary responsibility listed in Table 1.1.

1.3.8.1. Waiver Authority. AFPC/DP3SP with guidance from AF/A1P, is the waiver authority for this instruction. All waivers will be submitted to AFPC/DP3SP for consideration.

1.3.8.1.1. Waiver authority for Tier 0: Non-AF authority (e.g. Congress, White House etc.).

1.3.8.1.2. Waiver authority for Tier 1: MAJCOM/CC (delegable no lower than MAJCOM/A1.

1.3.8.1.3. Waiver authority for Tier 2: MAJCOM/CC (delegable no lower than MAJCOM/A1K.

1.3.8.1.4. Waiver authority for Tier 3: Wing/CC (delegable no lower than FSS/CC or equivalent).

1.3.8.1.5. Waiver authority for Non-tiered compliance items targeted for functions above the wing or equivalent is AFPC/DP3SP.

1.3.8.2. Waiver Process.

1.3.8.2.1. Process waiver requests IAW AFI 33-360.

1.3.8.2.2. If deemed necessary, submit additional data to substantiate the waiver request.

1.3.8.2.3. Tier 0 waiver: Following a MAJCOM/CC (delegable no lower than MAJCOM Director) request, the appropriate MAJCOM functional OPR will submit the package to AFPC/DP2SPE. AFPC/DP2SPE will submit the package to the publication OPR (i.e. external agency/Non-AF authority) for concurrence/approval. Package results will be provided to the appropriate MAJCOM functional OPR.

1.3.8.2.4. Tier 1 waiver: Following a MAJCOM/CC (delegable no lower than MAJCOM Director) request, the appropriate MAJCOM functional OPR will submit the package to Office Symbol AFPC/DP3SP. AFPC/DP3SP will process/submit the package to AF/A1P and/or AF/A1 for concurrence. Package results will be provided to the appropriate MAJCOM functional OPR.

1.3.8.2.5. Tier 2 waiver: Staff waiver requests in accordance with MAJCOM guidance.

1.3.8.2.6. Tier 3 waiver: Staff waiver requests in accordance with Wing guidance.

1.3.8.3. Waiver Period. Tier 1, 2, and 3 waivers may be approved for a period not to exceed the requested waiver period or 30 calendar days after the approving commander's tour length, whichever is shorter. Because waivers are the expression of a specific commander accepting risk, Tier 1, 2, and 3 waivers automatically expire 30 days after a change of command unless the new commander renews the waiver.

1.3.8.4. Filing Process. A copy of approved waivers are required to become part of the approver's and requestor's official records.

1.3.8.5. Waivers and the Managers Internal Control Toolset (MICT). The requesting commander/director will ensure appropriate waiver information is entered in the MICT within 7 days of waiver approval notification.

1.4. Preparing and Processing Evaluations.

1.4.1. Career Briefs. Evaluators are permitted to review a career brief when writing an evaluation. For officers, the brief will be used only to aid evaluators in making recommendations for command, assignments, and Developmental Education (DE). For enlisted, the brief may be used as an aid in determining SNCO stratification/endorsement level eligibility or junior enlisted forced distribution promotion recommendation. **NOTE:** Enlisted only. Education (such as Community College of the Air Force (CCAF)) and professional military education (applicable level Distance Learning (DL) or in-residence course) may only be considered for overall SR stratification/forced distribution eligibility and as leading indicators of overall performance based on completion during the required window of eligibility.

1.4.2. Suspenses.

1.4.2.1. The servicing Military Personnel Section (MPS) will monitor the evaluation system to ensure prompt performance evaluation submittal.

1.4.2.2. Do not suspense or require raters to submit a completed evaluation with their signature (digital, "wet" or otherwise) on it to the next evaluator in the rating chain any earlier than five duty days after the close-out date. If the rater is not available, extend the suspense. The suspense can be extended to a date that will still allow the evaluation to meet the suspense into the official record 60 days after the close-out date. **NOTE:** This does not preclude a draft copy being routed earlier.

1.4.2.3. Officer Performance Reports (OPR)/Enlisted Performance Reports (EPR) are:

1.4.2.3.1. Due to the MPS no later than 30 days after close-out.

1.4.2.3.2. Due to AFPC/ARPC or office of record no later than 45 days after close-out, so that it can be placed in the records NLT 60 days after the close-out date. **NOTE:** This suspense is to allow for any corrections at the lower level.

1.4.2.3.3. Filed in the Automated Records Management System (ARMS) no later than 60 days after the close-out.

1.4.2.4. OPRs/EPRs directed by HQ USAF or NGB are due to HQ AFPC/DP1SSP, HQ ARPC/DPTSE, HQ AF/DPE, HQ AF/DPO, HQ AF/DPG respectively by the suspense date established in the directing letter or message (i.e. Personnel Service Delivery Memorandum [PSDM]).

1.4.2.5. Complete referral evaluations IAW paragraph 1.10. and file in the appropriate record and/or place into ARMS NLT 60 days for RegAF personnel and 90 days for non-Extended Active Duty (non-EAD) personnel, after the close-out date of the evaluation.

1.4.3. When an Evaluation Becomes a Matter of Record.

1.4.3.1. All signed evaluations (digitally or “wet” signed) are considered a matter of record once they are uploaded into ARMS. All evaluations are considered “working copies” until they are made a matter of record.

1.4.3.2. Once transmitted to HQ AFPC or HQ ARPC, an evaluation can no longer be accessed for correction, unless the evaluation is returned to the unit for corrections. Any corrections, once transmitted to HQ AFPC or HQ ARPC for processing into the official record, must be submitted through the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB) IAW Chapter 10. See paragraph 10.3. (T-0).

1.4.4. Attachments to Evaluations. Only those documents authorized by this AFI will be accepted for file and attached to the applicable evaluation. **EXAMPLE:** Referral memorandums, materials and attachments; rebuttals to referrals; endorsement memorandums; and AF Forms 77.

1.4.5. Reproducing, Copying and Printing Evaluations.

1.4.5.1. Printing/Reproducing. When printed, all evaluation forms will be printed in the head-to-foot format. Both sides of the forms will be printed whether used or not. The form will not be altered, (i.e., reduce or enlarged), other than from authorized administrative corrections, (i.e., white out on a date change for “wet” signed evaluations). The quality of the form will be as close to the original form as possible; sharp, free of excessive smudges, and suitable for scanning.

1.4.5.1.1. Do not reproduce copies for purposes other than those noted below without the approval of HQ AFPC/DP3SP or HQ ARPC/DPT. Do not reproduce and or print evaluations except:

1.4.5.1.2. For official actions such as courts-martial; awards and decoration recommendations; promotion processing, demotion, elimination, release, appeal actions, and senior rater stratification/forced distribution procedures; and appropriate assignment actions by AFPC/ARPC/AFRC/RIO or AF/DPO/DPG/DPE/RE assignment personnel. Copies will be provided only to authorized personnel.

1.4.5.1.3. On written authority of AF/DPG for general officers (NGB-GO for ANGUS general officers); AF/DPO for officers on Extended Active Duty (EAD) in the grade of colonel; HQ AFPC/DP3SP for officers on EAD in the grades of lieutenant colonel and below; or the HQ ARPC/DPTSE for ANG officers in the grades of colonel and below, AFR officers not on EAD, and AGR or Voluntary Limited Period of Active Duty (VLPAD) officers.

1.4.5.1.4. As authorized by AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program* when requested by the ratee or his or her designated legal representative.

1.4.5.1.5. As required provide copies for file in ARMS, the OSR/NSR, the Officer Command Selection Record (OCSR), or Adjutant General (AG) or NGB/HR record file.

1.4.5.1.6. To replace missing or lost documents in the Master Personnel Records Group (MPerRGp). Ensure copies are the same size as the printed document. Additionally, if the form is not a digitally signed form it must be certified as a true copy (see paragraph 1.14. and Table 1.2.).

1.4.5.2. Corrected Copies. A Corrected Copy may be either a copy or an original document which contains changes from the original document. Corrections authorized by the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) or Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB) on “wet signature” evaluations may require a corrected copy annotation. In these cases, the following statement will be entered on the reverse bottom margin: “Corrected Copy, HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or HQ ARPC/DPT, XX XXX XX, certifying official’s typed signature block and signature.” (Annotation components: corrected copy, office/name/rank of official doing correction, date correction made, and signature of the person making the correction.)

1.4.5.3. Quality and Legibility. The MPS returns copies that are difficult to read or do not comply with paragraph 1.4.5.

1.4.5.4. Showing and/or providing copies to the ratee. Unless the evaluation is a referral evaluation, evaluators are not required to show or provide a copy of the evaluation to the ratee, until specified in the applicable chapter; Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheets Chapter 2; OPRs Chapter 3; EPRs Chapter 4; Letters of Evaluation Chapter 5; Training Reports Chapter 6; Promotion Recommendation Forms Chapter 8; Retention Recommendation Forms Chapter 9 and/or the current program guidance.

1.4.6. Evaluation identification data review. If any data is incorrect, notify the Commander’s Support Staff (CSS)/Military Personnel Section (MPS) to ensure corrective action is taken.

1.4.7. Organization. Enter ratee’s organizational information as of the close-out date or, for those enlisted airman with a Permanent Change of Station (PCS) or Permanent Change of Assignment (PCA) after the established accounting date, use the organizational information as of the established accounting date for the specific enlisted grade. **NOTE:** Deactivated organizations. If the unit deactivates after the accounting date for SCOD EPRs, the deactivated unit will accomplish the EPRs to include all forced distribution and senior rater endorsement processes. If the unit deactivated prior to the accounting date, the gaining unit (the unit as of the accounting date) will accomplish all evaluations related matters. All affected units will coordinate with AFPC/DP2SPE on all actions associated with deactivating units.

1.4.7.1. Enter the organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable) and location. For RegAF and ARC on EAD, do not enter the component. If classified, refer to paragraph 1.3.2.

1.4.7.2. If the command of assignment is an integral part of the organization name, such as “HQ AMC/A1,” it is not necessary to repeat the command (AMC) within parentheses.

1.4.7.3. On EAD (RegAF and ARC), enter organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable) and location as of the close-out date or for those enlisted Airman PCSing/PCAing to a new PAS code after the established accounting date, use the organizational information as of the established accounting date for the specific enlisted grade.

1.4.7.4. On EAD (RegAF and ARC) and performed duty in an organization other than his or her assigned PAS code, enter the assigned information, followed by “with duty at . . .” to indicate the organization where the ratee actually performed duty. This includes personnel on 365-day extended deployment billets. **EXAMPLE:** 341st Security Forces Squadron (AFGSC), Malmstrom AFB MT, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq. **NOTE:** Do not use this section to enter a second organization if the ratee is filling a dual-hatted role. Mention it in the job description or elsewhere in the evaluation.

1.4.8. Duty Air Force Specialty Code (DAFSC). The DAFSC is based on the Unit Manpower Document (UMD) authorization.

1.4.8.1. Officers: Use the DAFSC the officer is approved for by HQ AFPC and assigned against as of the close-out (“THRU”) date of the evaluation, as reflected on the evaluation notice. This is not to be confused with an officer’s awarded Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSCs) (PAFSC, 2AFSC, etc.). If the DAFSC listed on the evaluation notice is incorrect, initiate corrective action immediately, annotate the correct DAFSC on the notice, and attach a copy of the documentation reflecting the requested change to the evaluation notice. MPS personnel must confirm the requested change was approved and that the effective date of the change was on or before the close-out date of the evaluation before forwarding the evaluation to HQ AFPC/HQ ARPC. If the requested change has not been approved by the date the evaluation is ready to send to HQ AFPC/HQ ARPC, the DAFSC on the evaluation will be changed to match the DAFSC approved in the Personnel Data System (PDS).

1.4.8.2. Enlisted: Use the DAFSC as of the established Static Close-out Date (SCOD); if the Airman has a PCS or PCA, use the DAFSC as of the established accounting date. This is not to be confused with the PAFSC, CAFSC, or 2AFSC, etc. If the DAFSC listed on the evaluation is incorrect, initiate corrective action immediately. CSS/MPS personnel must ensure the correct information is reflected and/or updated in the PDS.

1.4.8.3. An authorized 365-day extended deployment billet: Use the DAFSC assigned to the position and/or billet that the ratee is officially filling in the deployed location.

1.4.9. Rank Data. For officer ranks, the rank must be the rank that the ratee actually holds as of the close-out date of the evaluation. Even if an officer has been “frocked,” you must enter his or her actual rank, regardless of the billet being filled. For enlisted ranks, the rank must be the rank the ratee actually holds as of the SCOD of the evaluation or the projected rank the ratee holds as of the SCOD date (i.e., TSgt-select).

1.4.10. Fitness Data.

1.4.10.1. When completing the evaluation the ratee’s fitness status during the entire reporting period, as well as of the close-out date, will be considered when completing the evaluation. However, a current passing fitness test as of the SCOD is required for promotion eligibility and SR stratification/forced distribution consideration. See AFI 36-2905, *Fitness Program*, for MANDATORY and OPTIONAL command actions upon fitness failure.

1.4.10.1.1. Comments regarding unit fitness achievements are authorized for Airmen who have a key role in the success of unit PT programs. See paragraph 1.4.10.3.1.

1.4.10.1.2. (**Officers only**) Unit commanders may request close-out date extensions of up to 59 days for officers to ensure resolution of any administrative, or other significant issues. See paragraph 3.18. for details.

1.4.10.2. When considering adherence to standards, fitness is one of many standards to be evaluated. Accordingly, Airmen exhibiting unacceptable performance, actions incompatible with AF standards and expectations, and/or Airmen who have ***routinely*** (a repeated inability to meet standards that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below AF standards and expectations) and/or ***significantly*** (a single instance where failure to meet standards is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts overall aggregated performance assessment) failed to adhere to established AF standards and expectations will be considered as not meeting standards.

1.4.10.2.1. Enlisted evaluations with a "Met Some But Not All Expectations" will be referred as an AF standard was not met.

1.4.10.2.2. Officer evaluations with a "Does Not Meet Standards" will be referred as an AF standard has not been met.

1.4.10.3. Fitness Comments.

1.4.10.3.1. Comments may include performance by PTLs, UFPs, First Sergeants, Superintendents, Section Commanders, Flight Chiefs, Commanders, and other members deemed integral to a particular organization's successful Fitness Program. **EXAMPLE:** "Implemented rigorous squadron PT program; drove unit pass rate from 75% to 100%" or "Ensured accountability--98% readiness rate, zero overdue/expired tests."

1.4.10.3.2. It is prohibited to put an individual's fitness score or fitness category on an evaluation, unless the "Does Not Meet Standards" or "Met Some But Not All Expectations" block is marked and the evaluation is being referred due to fitness failure. This does not prevent an evaluator from documenting referral comments in other areas outside of the fitness area when an Airman displays a negative attitude or has not demonstrated fitness improvement. In those cases, the referral comments may address the reasons or behavior and will not document the score. **(T-0)**.

1.4.10.3.3. Do not comment on an exemption or the reason for exemption.

1.4.11. Signatures, Signature Elements and Dates.

1.4.11.1. General Signature and Date Guidelines.

1.4.11.1.1. Do not sign or date before the close-out (thru date). Sign on or after the close-out date.

1.4.11.1.2. Do not sign blank forms or forms not containing ratings.

1.4.11.1.3. Do not use "auto-signature" pens or delegated "CAC" signatures.

1.4.11.1.4. Do not delay signing an evaluation due to pending personnel changes, promotions, or approval of a more prestigious duty title.

1.4.11.1.5. Do not “back date” the signature. **EXCEPTION:** If, after referring an evaluation to the ratee, the evaluation is reprinted for the purpose of including all evaluator comments or for making minor administrative corrections that do not require an additional referral to the ratee, all signature dates, up to and including the referring official(s), should reflect the date it was originally signed. This is necessary to show the dates each referral action actually occurred to ensure the evaluation was properly processed. All evaluators, subsequent to the (last) referring official will use either original signature dates or current signature dates.

1.4.11.1.6. If an evaluator is both the Functional/Acquisition Examiner and the Air Force Advisor, then both positions will be identified. **EXAMPLE:** On the OPR/EPR, you would place an “X” in both the examiner and the advisor blocks.

1.4.11.1.7. Do not sign as “Select” unless authorized by paragraph 1.4.11.4.

1.4.11.2. Digital Signatures and Dates.

1.4.11.2.1. Forms must be digitally signed.

1.4.11.2.2. Digital signatures must be used by all evaluators and reviewers, unless one or more of the following scenarios apply. In the few instances where a DoD authorized digital signature is not available; or when at least one evaluator does not have access to a DoD authorized digital signature capability. If one evaluator or reviewer is unable to access digital signature, all evaluators and reviewers must “wet” sign and date the evaluation. **NOTE:** If wet signed, the AF Form 707, 910, 911, and 912 will be printed head to foot and dates will be handwritten, stamped, or typed.

1.4.11.2.3. The form is enabled with digital signature and auto date capability. Forms will be auto-dated only when digital signature is applied.

1.4.11.2.3.1. Evaluators cannot sign before the previous evaluator due to the security features associated with the digital signature capability. **EXAMPLE:** Additional rater cannot sign before the rater. **EXCEPTION:** Unless evaluators are separated by the International Date Line.

1.4.11.2.3.2. Each evaluator’s digital signature will lock their comments and ratings; additionally it will unlock the digital signature feature for the next evaluator. **EXAMPLE:** Rater’s digital signature will unlock the digital signature feature in the additional rater’s block.

1.4.11.2.3.3. The AF advisor/functional examiner and Forced Distributor (FD) or unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer digital signature capabilities are not locked and are independent of other evaluator signatures.

1.4.11.3. Handwritten “Wet” Signatures and Dates. Dates will be handwritten, stamped or typed. Must be payroll signature. Must be in reproducible blue or black ink.

1.4.11.4. General Officer (GO) Signature Blocks. The CSAF approved a standardized signature block for GOs. This signature block will not impact the signing of legal documents for disciplinary (UCMJ) or pay purposes. In these instances, the member’s signature will reflect their rank commensurate with their pay grade. Base legal office should be contacted where clarification is required.

1.4.11.4.1. For Brig/Maj Gen (RegAF and ARC):

1.4.11.4.1.1. Selects: Upon Senate confirmation, selects may sign all evaluations as “Brig Gen (Sel)” or “Maj Gen (Sel)”, if serving in a SR/reviewer position or assigned to an authorized brig/maj gen officer position. If not in a SR/reviewer position or assigned to an authorized brig/maj gen officer position, sign as “Col” or “Brig Gen” respectively.

1.4.11.4.1.2. Frocked: For all evaluations sign as “Brig Gen” or “Maj Gen”.

1.4.11.4.1.3. Upon Senate confirmation of selection to brigadier general of a colonel who is already the designated SR for the lieutenants through majors in an organization, the Management Level (ML) must realign their Senior Rater Identifications (SRIDs) and re-designate the selectee as the SR for the colonels and lieutenant colonels of the organization.

1.4.11.4.2. Only one general officer or equivalent will sign an evaluation as an evaluator/reviewer. **EXCEPTION:** See paragraph 1.7.1.7.

1.4.11.4.3. Senior Executive Services (SES)/GO Equivalents. SES positions are typically GO equivalent and for some, SR positions. On evaluations, if an SES is a SR then a GO cannot sign the report. However, if an SES is not a SR and falls under a GO who is a SR, based on their position, then both the SES and GO signatures are authorized on the evaluation. There can be two SES signatures on an evaluation report as long as only one of them is designated by the ML as a SR and a GO who is not a SR is not signing the report. SES is only required to use the term “SES” and the level is optional in the signature element. Bottom line: There can only be one SR on a report, see paragraph 1.7.1.7. for exceptions.

1.5. Evaluator Requirements.

1.5.1. Number of Evaluators.

1.5.1.1. OPRs will have three evaluators, unless the rater or additional rater is also the reviewer/SR.

1.5.1.2. EPRs will have at least two evaluators, unless the rater qualifies as a single evaluator.

1.5.1.2.1. For CMSgt, no more than two evaluators (the rater and SR) will evaluate the ratee’s performance.

1.5.1.2.2. For MSgt selects thru SMSgt, no more than four evaluators (the rater, additional rater, unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer and final evaluator) will evaluate the ratee’s performance.

1.5.1.2.3. For AB thru TSgt, no more than three evaluators (rater, additional rater and FD) will evaluate the ratee’s performance.

1.5.1.3. AF Form 78 and AF Form 3538 forms require two evaluators (N/A for ANG GOs).

1.5.1.4. PRFs and TRs only require one evaluator. **EXCEPTION:** The preceding requirements must be strictly adhered to, unless: commander disagrees with the ratings (paragraph 1.9); the evaluation is referred and the commander is not the evaluator named in the referral document, Referral Reviewer, (paragraph 1.10); or the reviewer is senior to the commander and refers the evaluation.

1.5.2. Evaluators and Minimum Grade Requirements.

1.5.2.1. Rater. The official in the rating chain designated by management to provide periodic ACA and initiate performance evaluations. Typically the ratee's immediate supervisor.

1.5.2.1.1. Military Raters.

1.5.2.1.1.1. For officers. The rater must be an officer of the United States or a foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee.

1.5.2.1.1.2. For enlisted. The rater must be an officer or an E-4 or higher, who has completed ALS (or equivalent), of the United States or a foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee.

1.5.2.1.2. Civilian Raters.

1.5.2.1.2.1. For officers. Raters must be a civilian serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee.

1.5.2.1.2.2. For enlisted. A civilian rater must be at least a GS-5 or a comparable grade or higher and must be in a position higher than the ratee in the rating chain. For MSgt thru CMSgt, a civilian rater must be at least a GS-11 or above.

1.5.2.1.3. For Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs). The rater will not normally be another IMA. However, if circumstances require that an IMA must directly supervise another IMA, the rater will be the official appointed by the respective commander/director of that unit in coordination with the IMA's detachment commander. IMAs (or Traditional Reservists) may write an evaluation on RegAF personnel only if the IMA (or Traditional Reservist) was on consecutive active duty Military Personnel Appropriation (MPA) orders for a minimum of 120 days and supervised/rated the RegAF member for the required number of days needed to render the report. AGR members or members on statutory tours may supervise RegAF members under their command.

1.5.2.1.4. A rater of the United States or a foreign military service serving in the same grade as the ratee without regard to date of rank (DOR) may be appointed.

1.5.2.2. Additional Rater (Rater's Rater).

1.5.2.2.1. The official designated to provide periodic ACA and initiate a performance evaluation on a rater and will be no higher in organization than the reviewer/SR.

1.5.2.2.2. The second evaluator in the rating chain, after the rater, to endorse a performance evaluation. The second evaluator in the rating chain must be the rater's rater unless paragraph 1.7. or one of the exceptions listed in the definition of rating chain in Attachment 1 applies.

1.5.2.2.3. Military Additional Raters.

1.5.2.2.3.1. For officers. The additional rater must be an officer of the United States or a foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the rater, and in a grade higher than the ratee. **EXCEPTION:** An O-6 of the United States or a foreign military service may be the additional rater for an O-6.

1.5.2.2.3.2. For enlisted. When the rater's rater does not meet the grade requirements below, the additional rater will be the next evaluator in the rating (supervisory) chain that meets the requirements.

1.5.2.2.3.2.1. For AB thru TSgt (AF Form 910). The additional rater must be an officer, SNCO (E-7 or above) of the United States or a foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the rater.

1.5.2.2.3.2.2. For MSgt select, MSgt, SMSgt select, and SMSgt (AF Form 911). The additional rater must be equal or higher in grade than the ratee and a SNCO (E-7) or above; or an officer of the United States or a foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the rater.

1.5.2.2.4. Civilian Additional Raters.

1.5.2.2.4.1. For officers. The additional rater must be an officer of the United States or a foreign military service serving in a civilian grade equivalent equal to or higher than the rater, and in a grade higher than the ratee. Additional raters must be at least a GS-9 or equivalent for company grade officers and GS-11 or equivalent for field grade officers.

1.5.2.2.4.2. For enlisted. A civilian additional rater must be serving in a civilian grade equivalent, equal to or higher than the rater.

1.5.2.2.4.2.1. For TSgt and below. A civilian additional rater must be at least a GS-7 (or equivalent) or above.

1.5.2.2.4.2.2. For MSgt and SMSgt. A civilian additional rater must be at least a GS-12 (or equivalent) or above.

1.5.2.2.5. For EAD officers and all IMAs. The additional rater is defined in the paragraphs above and must be in the RegAF rating chain.

1.5.2.3. Reviewer/SR/Final Evaluator. All SRs must be the person holding the senior rater position designated by the ML for the ratee's assigned organizational Personnel Accounting Symbol (PAS) code.

1.5.2.3.1. SRs/Reviewer/Final Evaluator. **NOTE:** The Head of a ML (normally MAJCOM/CC) must designate all SR positions. Appointment of command (G-Series) orders do not authorize Senior Rater status.

1.5.2.3.1.1. For officers. The reviewer must be the ratee's SR and will be the final evaluator on the OPR. **EXCEPTION:** When the rater or additional rater is also the SR, the OPR will close-out at this level (see Table 3.1). Also, when a SR refers the evaluation, the officer named in the referral memorandum becomes the final evaluator, unless he/she refers the evaluation again (see paragraphs 1.10. and Table 3.1.). See definitions of Reviewer, Senior Rater, Final Evaluator and Rating Chain

in Attachment 1 for additional information.

1.5.2.3.1.1.1. For lieutenant colonels and colonels (except ANG). The reviewer must be the first general officer (includes a brigadier general select confirmed by the senate), or equivalent, in the rating chain who has been designated as a SR by the ML.

1.5.2.3.1.1.2. For lieutenants through majors (except ANG). The reviewer must be the first colonel (or equivalent) in a wing commander (or equivalent) position who has been designated as a SR, as determined by the ML.

1.5.2.3.1.1.3. For ANG colonels, the first GO in the rating chain will review the OPR.

1.5.2.3.1.1.4. For ANG officers, lieutenant colonel and below, the reviewer will be the wing or group commander. For a member assigned to a unit where there is no parent wing or group headquarters in-state, the state AG will establish an equivalent command-level review authority.

1.5.2.3.1.1.5. HQ AFRC may deviate and assign SR levels as appropriate for AFR unit assigned majors and below.

1.5.2.3.1.1.6. Civilian SR/Reviewer/Final Evaluator.

1.5.2.3.1.1.6.1. For officers.

1.5.2.3.1.1.6.1.1. For majors and below. A civilian SR/Reviewer/Final Evaluator must be serving as a wing commander or equivalent in a SR position designated by the ML and at least a GS-15.

1.5.2.3.1.1.6.1.2. For lieutenant colonels and colonels. A civilian SR must be the first SES or equivalent in the rating chain in a SR position designated by the ML.

1.6. Responsibilities.

1.6.1. Commander. The commander of a unit must review the records of all personnel, regardless of grade, assigned to and/or transferred into his or her command to ensure knowledge of and familiarization with the Airman's history of sex-related offenses resulting in conviction by courts-martial, non-judicial punishment, or other punitive administrative action in order to reduce the likelihood of repeat offenses will escape the notice of current, subsequent, or higher level commanders. This responsibility will be conducted by the immediate commander of the Airman at the lowest unit level. Sex-related offenses include violations of the UCMJ Article 120, Article 125, Article 120a (stalking), Article 120b (rape and sexual assault of a child), Article 120c (other sexual misconduct, which includes indecent viewing/recording/ broadcasting, forcible pandering, and indecent exposure) or attempts to commit any of those offenses. These responsibilities will not be delegated.

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

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

1.6.2.2. Evaluations contain accurate information (particularly in the ratee identification and job description sections).

1.6.2.3. Spelling accuracy and proper bullet structure.

1.6.2.4. Evaluations do not contain inappropriate comments or recommendations.

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

1.6.2.6. Evaluations are properly referred, when necessary.

1.6.2.7. Evaluations are accomplished IAW this AFI.

1.6.3. Rater.

1.6.3.1. For officer evaluations, there must be a minimum number of days supervision; see the applicable Table for the type of evaluation being prepared. For enlisted evaluations, there must be a minimum of one day supervision to prepare an evaluation.

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

1.6.3.3. Must provide an ACA IAW Chapter 2. Official documented ACA does not preclude a rater from performing day-to-day verbal assessments. Additionally, raters are required to perform an assessment at the time the evaluation is presented to the ratee. This assessment at the time the evaluation is presented, may be, but is not required to be officially documented on the ACA worksheet. If geographically separated, assessments can be performed electronically or telephonically.

1.6.3.4. Must consider the contents of any Unfavorable Information File (UIF) and/or Personal Information File (PIF), if applicable, before preparing the performance evaluation.

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

1.6.3.6. Receives meaningful information from the ratee and as many sources as possible (i.e. LOEs from those who previously supervised the ratee during the reporting period, the First Sergeant, etc.), especially when the rater cannot observe the ratee personally. The ratee is encouraged to provide the rater with inputs on specific accomplishments however, the ratee will not be directed to write or draft any portion of his or her own performance report. For ARC members, they should provide information to the supervisor to assist in the preparation of the evaluation. This may include end-of-tour evaluations.

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

1.6.3.8. Differentiates between ratees with similar performance records; especially when making promotion, stratification, assignment, DE and retention recommendations when not prohibited by this AFI or other special program specific guidance.

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

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

1.6.4. Additional Rater.

1.6.4.1. There is no minimum number of days supervision required.

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

1.6.4.3. Completes Section V of the OPR, Section VIII of the AF Form 910, and Section VII of the AF Form 911 by concurring or non-concurring with the rater and making comments.

1.6.4.4. Assumes the responsibilities of the rater when paragraph 1.7. applies. **NOTE:** This does not include PCS, PCA, Separation or Retirement of the rater.

1.6.4.5. If the additional rater changes after the close-out date, see paragraph 1.7.

1.6.5. Reviewer/SR/Final Evaluator.

1.6.5.1. There is no minimum number of days supervision required.

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

1.6.5.3. Obtains additional information, if necessary, from competent sources such as the ratee's second and third line supervisor, etc.

1.6.5.4. When appropriate, nonconcur with previous evaluators and makes comments.

1.6.5.5. SR approves the unit mission descriptions for the PRF.

1.6.5.6. Directs the additional rater to assume rater's responsibilities when paragraph 1.7. applies.

1.6.5.7. Completes performance evaluations as required. See applicable chapters and/or references/documents cited in paragraph 1.2.

1.6.6. First Sergeant, Additional Duty First Sergeant or Designated SNCO.

1.6.6.1. Will not assume rater/additional rater responsibilities. **EXCEPTION:** There is absolutely no other evaluator available.

1.6.6.2. Will be aware of the contents of the UIF and/or PIF if applicable, on all enlisted evaluations and returns the evaluation to the rater for reconsideration, if appropriate, to ensure an accurate, unbiased, and an uninflated evaluation.

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

1.6.6.4. SNCOs may only be designated for organizations for which no 8F000/First Sergeant authorization exists. Additional duty first sergeants will not complete evaluation reviews in-lieu of an organization's 8F000/First Sergeant. **EXCEPTION:** Interim first sergeants, additional duty first sergeants, or designated SNCOs may complete evaluation reviews when the organization's 8F000/First Sergeant is unavailable due to extended absence (e.g., deployment, lengthy training, or lengthy convalescent leave).

1.6.7. Forced Distributor (FD) or Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer designated in writing.

1.6.7.1. Conducts the commander's review on EPRs.

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

1.6.7.3. The review is performed by a military service member designated as the director of, or in command of, a unit (PAS code[s]). In the commander or director's extended absence, an individual on G-Series orders or a senior official within the unit commander's jurisdiction designated in writing by the unit commander or director, may complete the review, provided in both cases, the designated individual is the next most senior ranking officer or civilian within the organization (e.g., deputy commander, operations officer, deputy director). Individuals designated in writing to complete the review, in absence of the unit commander or director, may not use the title "commander" or "director" and are to use their assigned duty title on the EPR. A civilian equivalent, assigned to the position of director, or unit director, responsible for the unit (PAS code[s]), may also complete the review. The Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer's review will be accomplished by the home station commander for all individuals assigned to 365-day extended deployment, regardless of the grade of the deployed rater and additional rater. See Attachment 1 for definitions.

1.6.7.4. Flight commanders do not qualify. See paragraph 1.7.1.2.

1.6.7.5. Commandants for SNCOA/NCOA designated in writing by the commander may perform the Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer's review on AF Form 911 only.

1.6.7.6. Manages the performance evaluation program for the organization.

1.6.7.7. Ensures all evaluations accurately describe performance and make realistic recommendations for advancement.

1.6.7.8. Prepares and maintains the unit mission description for the PRF.

1.6.7.9. Determines the rating chain for assigned personnel based on Air Force and ML policy.

1.6.7.9.1. The ratee's parent ML must approve rating chains that involve evaluators from other MLs.

1.6.7.9.2. For rating chain deviations see paragraph 1.7.

1.6.7.10. Encourages first-time supervisors to obtain training within 60 days of being assigned supervisory duties and encourages all unit members receive general OES/EES training on an annual basis as needed.

1.6.7.11. Ensures that no member in the rating chain is his or her spouse or other relative.

1.6.7.12. Ensures the first sergeant (or additional duty first sergeant/designated SNCO) conducts a quality force review on all EPRs before conducting the commander's review.

1.6.8. Functional Examiner, Acquisition Examiner and Air Force Advisor.

1.6.8.1. Functional/Acquisition Examiner/Air Force Advisor Block.

1.6.8.1.1. For evaluations that do not include an examiner/advisor block, an AF Form 77 will be completed.

1.6.8.1.1.1. Functional/Acquisition Examiners or Air Force Advisors who desire to make comments may attach an AF Form 77.

1.6.8.1.1.2. Comments are not mandatory. However, if used, the intent of these comments are to provide clarification and ensure the evaluation is written in accordance with Air Force policy and standards in a joint environment or to clarify functional or acquisition-related considerations; not to list additional accomplishments or voice disagreement with an evaluator's assessment. Comments are limited to five lines.

1.6.8.1.1.3. The AF Form 77 will be prepared and electronically forwarded along with the electronic evaluation.

1.6.8.1.2. Functional/Acquisition Examiners or Air Force Advisors will not change any statement or rating on the performance evaluation.

1.6.8.1.3. If the Functional/Acquisition Examiner and the Air Force Advisor are both the same person, both positions will be indicated; both the Functional Examiner and Air Force Advisor blocks will be marked on the OPR/EPR. For evaluations that do not include the Examiner/Advisor block, i.e. TRs, the Examiner/Advisor will indicate both positions on the AF Form 77.

1.6.8.1.4. When the Examiner and Advisor are two different people on an OPR/EPR, the person who receives the evaluation first will complete the Functional Examiner/Air Force Advisor block on the OPR/EPR and the next person will complete an AF Form 77. For evaluations that do not include the Examiner/Advisor block, (i.e. TRs), an AF Form 77 will be prepared for each.

1.6.8.2. Air Force Advisor Program.

1.6.8.2.1. When the final evaluator on an OPR, EPR or TR is not an Air Force military member or civilian employee, an Air Force Advisor will be designated to advise raters on matters pertaining to Air Force performance evaluations.

1.6.8.2.1.1. Normally, a senior Air Force military member on duty with the activity or agency assumes this position. However, the ML may designate any Air Force member or Department of the Air Force (DAF) official meeting the grade requirement with the activity or agency to serve as advisor.

1.6.8.2.1.1.1. For officers, the advisor will be serving in the grade of colonel or above.

1.6.8.2.1.1.2. For SNCOs, the advisor will be serving in the grade of major or above.

1.6.8.2.1.1.3. For TSgts and below, the advisor will be serving in the grade of MSgt or above.

1.6.8.2.1.1.4. For IMAs and Participating Individual Ready Reserve (PIRR) members, the advisor is the person appointed by the ML for the active force.

1.6.8.2.1.2. When an agency (i.e., DoD departments, non-Air Force schools or units, etc.) has only one Air Force member assigned, the ML for that activity appoints an advisor.

1.6.8.2.1.3. If the commander or other senior official designated in writing by the commander who completes the "commander's review" on an EPR is senior/equal to the last evaluator on the evaluation, (or is also the designated advisor for the unit), and is an Air Force officer or DAF official who meets Air Force Advisor grade requirements, the commander does not need to complete an advisor statement.

1.6.8.2.2. The advisor will sign prior to the final evaluator regardless of rank.

1.6.8.2.3. An Air Force Advisor will have, or be able to obtain, knowledge of the ratee, be higher in grade than the ratee, and, when feasible, be equal to or higher in grade than the SR (officers) or final evaluator (enlisted). Additionally, an O-6 cannot sign on another O-6.

1.6.8.3. Functional Examiner. Designated to ensure functional oversight is provided for individuals in specific career fields. The examiner accomplishes the examination after the entire rating chain has completed the performance evaluation. If an Air Force Advisor review is also required, the examiner forwards the evaluation to the advisor. Otherwise, the examiner forwards the evaluation to the rater to finalize the evaluation. **NOTE:** The examiner will not change any statement or rating on an evaluation nor will any comments be used for accolades, recommendations, etc. If comments are used the examiner is limited to five lines placed on AF Form 77.

1.6.8.4. Acquisition Examiner.

1.6.8.4.1. In accordance with Title 10 U.S.C. Section 1722 (g), an opportunity is provided for review and inclusion of comments on any performance evaluation of a person serving in an acquisition position by a person serving in an acquisition position in the same acquisition career field. In most instances, this opportunity is inherent in the completion of the performance evaluation by acquisition officers in the rating chain. However, in the event neither the rater, additional rater, nor reviewer are on acquisition-coded positions in the same acquisition position category, the ratee may request that the performance evaluation be examined by a qualified acquisition officer from outside the rating chain (i.e., an acquisition examiner).

1.6.8.4.2. Review by an acquisition examiner is completed only when the ratee requests a review, and is filling an acquisition-coded position and neither the rater, additional rater nor reviewer are on a coded position in the same acquisition position category.

1.6.8.4.3. Acquisition positions are identified on the unit manpower document and are also identified on the evaluation notice generated when an evaluation is required.

1.6.8.4.4. The acquisition examiner must be a person in an acquisition-coded position within the same acquisition position category as the ratee. If the ML does not have anyone who meets the criteria herein, the ML can forward the evaluation to the Air Staff functional or SAF/AQX to identify an acquisition examiner. The minimum grade of the examiner will be:

1.6.8.4.4.1. O-6 or civilian equivalent on a critical acquisition position (for officers).

1.6.8.4.4.2. O-4 or civilian equivalent (for enlisted).

1.6.8.4.5. The acquisition examiner accomplishes the acquisition examination after the entire rating chain has completed the performance evaluation.

1.6.8.4.6. Comments are not mandatory, but if desired for clarification about acquisition-related considerations, the examiner prepares an AF Form 77 according to Table 5.1. for attachment to the performance evaluation. The examiner will not change any statement or rating on the evaluation, nor will an AF Form 77 be used simply to include additional comments, accolades, recommendations, etc. If used, comments are limited to five lines.

1.6.9. Ratee.

1.6.9.1. The ratee is equally responsible for ensuring they know their rating chain and that they received an ACA IAW Chapter 2.

1.6.9.2. For OPR/EPR responsibilities see Chapter 3 and 4.

1.6.9.3. For PRF responsibilities see Chapter 8.

1.6.9.4. For appeals see Chapter 10.

1.6.9.5. Ratee Review. Evaluations must be reviewed by the ratee prior to becoming a matter of record. This is the time to review for typos, spelling, and inaccurate data and bring it to the attention of the rater. If the data is administratively accurate and it is just a matter of the ratee disagreeing with the content, the rater is not required to change their assessment. When the ratee signs the evaluation, he or she is not concurring with the content, but rather acknowledging receipt and that the ratee has reviewed the evaluation for administrative errors. If the ratee disagrees with the content, (comments and/or ratings) the ratee may file an appeal IAW Chapter 10 after the evaluation becomes a matter of record. **NOTE:** An ACA worksheet is not required upon completion of the OPR/EPR. The OPR/EPR serves as official documentation of the feedback provided to the ratee.

1.6.10. Military Personnel Section.

1.6.10.1. The MPS will administer the base OES/EES for units and Geographically Separated Units (GSUs) under their control. This includes reviewing all evaluations for administrative accuracy and policy compliance IAW this instruction prior to forwarding the evaluation to AFPC/ARPC. The MPS must also ensure they assist SRs which the MPS services to ensure this AFI is complied with.

1.6.10.2. Provide technical assistance to the commander and evaluators.

1.6.10.3. When applicable, update data into the appropriate system according to the PSD Guide and this instruction.

1.6.10.4. Evaluations will be routed within the evaluations system for digitally signed evaluations. Wet signature evaluations will be scanned and loaded into the vPC for transmittal to AFPC or ARPC. **(T-0)**.

1.6.10.5. Coordinates referral reports with appropriate work centers in the MPS to ensure Military Personnel Data System (MilPDS) updates are accomplished.

1.6.10.6. MPSs will return evaluations to be re-accomplished when they do not conform to the requirements of this instruction.

1.6.11. Major Commands (MAJCOM). The Management Level (ML) and their servicing personnel activity.

1.6.11.1. Designate SR positions and determine civilian equivalency for SR designations. **NOTE:** If CV is assuming CC responsibilities and the ML wants them to have SR responsibilities, the ML must appoint the CV SR responsibilities in writing.

1.6.11.2. Manage the performance evaluation program for their activity, and at their option, quality review PRFs and return them for correction, when necessary.

1.6.11.3. Print copies of digitally signed evaluations from the ARMS.

1.6.11.4. Approve evaluators to be from a different ML than that of the ratee IAW ML policy.

1.6.11.5. Appoint Air Force Advisors in writing and ensure these individuals are current on evaluation policies and procedures.

1.6.11.6. Appoint Acquisition Examiners and establish OPR routing procedures when the examination cannot be accomplished within the existing rating chain.

1.6.12. Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower, Personnel and Services (AF/A1). Establishes and approves policy regarding the Air Force OES/EES. Establishes a triannual evaluation system program review to determine if changes or adjustments are needed.

1.6.13. Headquarters Air Force Personnel Center Evaluation Programs (HQ AFPC/DP3SP).

1.6.13.1. Manages the Air Force OES/EES program Air Force-wide.

1.6.13.2. AFPC/DP1SSP receives all RegAF EPRs/OPRs evaluations via vPC.

1.6.13.3. AFPC/DP1SSP reviews all referral evaluations on officers (lieutenant through lieutenant colonel), SNCOs, TSgts, and a random sampling (no less than 20%) of all other evaluations for compliance with policy directives and this instruction; returns them for correction when necessary.

1.6.13.4. AFPC/DP1SSP forwards all RegAF evaluations to ARMS.

1.6.14. Headquarters Air Reserve Personnel Center (HQ ARPC).

1.6.14.1. Receives all evaluations for ARC members via vPC.

1.6.14.2. Reviews all referral evaluations and a random sampling (no less than 20%) of all other evaluations for compliance with policy directives and this instruction; returns them for correction when necessary.

1.6.14.3. Forwards all ARC evaluations to ARMS.

1.7. Rating Chain Deviations and Evaluator Changes. This paragraph does not apply to rater changes due to PCS, PCA, separation, or retirement of the rater. Raters who are about to, or have PCS'd/PCA'd to a new organization, separate(d), or retire(d) will still accomplish the evaluations they are/were responsible for.

1.7.1. Rating Chain Deviations.

1.7.1.1. The commander determines the rating chain for assigned personnel based on Air Force and Management Level (ML) policy. Commanders may deviate from the normal (supervisory) rating chain only when necessary to meet grade requirements or to accommodate unique organizational structures and situations where personnel are temporarily loaned or matrixed to other activities outside the ratee's assigned PAS.

1.7.1.1.1. The ratee's parent ML must approve rating chains that involve evaluators from other MLs; however, both MLs (the parent and the temporary ML) must formally agree to the rating chain deviation.

1.7.1.1.2. A rating chain deviation **MUST** be in effect for at least 12 months or longer, for the temporary ML to be able to sign reports. If there is a rating chain deviation for less than 12 months, then the parent ML **MUST** sign all reports.

1.7.1.1.3. Upon rating chain deviation approval, the temporary ML will be responsible for writing the member's OPR, PRF, LOE, decoration, etc. until the member is matrixed back under their parent ML. **EXAMPLE:** A major is on loan to the Numbered Air Force (NAF) commander to fill an executive officer position for 12 months. Through agreement with the parent ML and temporary ML, the parent ML can approve a rating chain deviation. Once approved, the NAF commander will sign the officer's OPR, PRF, LOE, decoration, etc.

1.7.1.1.4. It is prohibited to make rating chain deviations (such as skipping an evaluator) solely for reasons of convenience. **EXAMPLE:** Do not skip a rater's rater who is temporarily unavailable (on leave, TDY, etc.). Do not skip a rater's rater for the sole purpose of affording another official in the supervisory chain (i.e., the rater's rater's rater or the SR) the opportunity to endorse or comment in an evaluation.

1.7.1.1.5. Associate Unit: A unit which integrates members or units of one component of the Air Force with members or units of another component of the Air Force to accomplish the USAF mission (e.g., Air Force Reserve (AFR)/Air National Guard (ANG) with the Regular Force). In these cases, evaluation rating chains may involve different AF components and shall normally be written by the member's day-to-day supervisor with additional rater IAW affected ML direction. However, evaluations **MUST** be returned to the member's ADCON commander/reviewer/SR to finalize the evaluation/endorsement. This allows for maximum operational integration and reporting accuracy while still meeting administrative (PAS code driven) requirements.

1.7.1.2. Flight Commander/Flight Chief Rating Chains. For flight commander and flight chief rating chains, when an officer heads a flight, the position is flight commander and is rated by the squadron commander. When an enlisted person or civilian heads a flight, the position is a flight chief. Applicable to both the operational and the functional communities.

1.7.1.3. Personnel assigned to 25th Air Force: The OPRs of the National Security Agency (NSA) field site directors at NSA/CSS/HR Specialist/HR Specialist Texas, Misawa Cryptologic Group, and Menwith Hill Station will have Director of NSA (DIRNSA) as the additional rater. The OPR reviewer for these evaluations will be 25 AF/CC. This will result in the OPR reviewer being lower in rank than the additional rater. In this case, enter the applicable mandatory statement "Reviewer's rank is lower than the Previous Rater" in the remarks section of the evaluation.

1.7.1.4. 25th Air Force Groups in USAFE, PACAF and ACC. Rating Chains/Signature Authorities for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) Groups, the 480 IW/CC will rate the ISR group commanders. The supported NAF commander will be the additional rater and SR/reviewer. ML will be the respective supported MAJCOM commander. 25 AF/CC will endorse each officer's report in the Functional Examiner/Air Force Advisor block. This policy will apply to current and future 25 AF Groups and 480 IW with the same configuration. This exception to policy applies only to 25 AF Group Commanders. All other 25 AF personnel will follow their normal rating chains IAW this instruction.

1.7.1.5. Senior Defense Official/Defense Attaché (SDO/DATT) Program.

1.7.1.5.1. SDO/DATT personnel will be rated by Director, Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA).

1.7.1.5.2. SDO/DATT personnel will be additionally rated by COCOM.

1.7.1.5.3. For individuals owned by COCOM, normal processing procedures apply. Reviewer statement will read "THE RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER" and/or "THE ADDITIONAL RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER". PRFs in these cases, will be accomplished by COCOM.

1.7.1.5.4. For individuals owned by DIA, reviewer statement will read "THE RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER" and/or "THE ADDITIONAL RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER" and comments will still be allowed in the additional rater block by COCOM.

1.7.1.5.5. Enter the required statement "Two GOs auth IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.7." on all evaluations.

1.7.1.6. If the grade of the home station SR is lower than the deployed rater, (i.e. deployed rater is an O-7 and the home station senior rater is an O-6), enter the required statement "REVIEWER'S rank is lower than the Previous Rater".

1.7.1.7. Currently paragraph 1.4.11.4.2. prohibits multiple GOs from serving as evaluators on performance evaluations. However, for those personnel filling an authorized 365-day deployment billet, multiple GOs are authorized. When applicable, enter "Two GOs auth IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.7."

1.7.1.7.1. Enlisted personnel at home station only (AF Form 911). Multiple flag officer endorsements are only authorized when the rater is a flag officer, but has not been designated as a SR, and the ratee has been selected for SR stratification/endorsement. In such cases the rater will complete AF Form 911, Sections III through VII; however, performance comments/bullets are only authorized in Sections III through IV. Section VII will only include the mandatory statement “THE RATER IS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL RATER”, and must include the applicable rater’s signature element and signature. The SR [second flag officer] will complete Sections IX, Final Evaluator’s Comments [senior rater], to include the applicable SR stratification drop-down. The officer designated as the unit commander will complete Section VIII.

1.7.1.8. In cases where the rater is a GO (single evaluator) on an evaluation written on an individual filling an authorized 365-day deployment billet, enter the required statement “THE RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER” and/or “THE ADDITIONAL RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER”.

1.7.1.9. GOs signing referral reports. If the SR is a GO, and is the evaluator who refers the evaluation, the referral document will be the SR’s rater regardless of rank. Enter the required statement “Two GOs auth IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.7.”

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

1.7.2.1. If it is determined that removal from evaluator responsibilities are necessary, the removing evaluator must provide written notification of the action to the evaluator being removed, with information copies to the removed evaluator’s immediate subordinate(s) and any other evaluators in the rating chain, through and including the SR. This action must be accomplished, and the evaluator being removed must acknowledge receipt within 30 days from the date, or the date of discovery, of the incident that lead to the removal from evaluator responsibilities.

1.7.2.2. If the rater has died, is missing in action, captured or detained in captive status, incapacitated, or when directed by the reviewer/SR (officers) or commander (enlisted) because the rater is formally relieved from duties as an evaluator or relieved from duty for cause, the additional rater assumes the responsibilities and acquires the number of days supervision (for AF Form 707 only)/ACA dates of the original rater. When this occurs, a statement explaining why the rater did not prepare the evaluation must be included in the remarks section of the evaluation.

1.7.2.2.1. Evaluations already prepared by a rater under these circumstances are working copies and may be re-accomplished unless they have become a matter of record.

- 1.7.2.2.2. There is no minimum number of days supervision required for the additional rater. However, if the additional rater has insufficient knowledge to prepare the evaluation for the required period of supervision, he or she must gather knowledge of the ratee's duty performance from all available, reliable sources (First Sergeant, former supervisors, etc.).
- 1.7.2.3. In some instances (**EXAMPLE:** When the additional rater is physically/geographically separated from the ratee), it may be more practical or desirable for another individual who has current personal knowledge of the ratee to assume the rater's responsibilities. In this case, the unit commander submits the request, through the CSS/MPS/HR Specialist to the SR for approval.
- 1.7.2.4. If unusual circumstances dictate sufficient knowledge cannot be obtained, HQ AFPC/DP3SP, AF/DPO, AF/DPE, AF/DPG, the ARPC/DPTSE, NGB/A1P, NGB/HR or NGB-GO (for ANG general officers) authorizes filing an AF Form 77 in the ratee's records stating why an evaluation could not be prepared for the period.
- 1.7.2.5. The next evaluator in the rating chain (the additional rater's rater) assumes the responsibilities of the additional rater, when the additional rater is unable to perform evaluator duties, see paragraph 1.7.1 and paragraph 1.7.2 for applicable reasons. When the additional rater's rater is also the reviewer/final evaluator, he or she completes the Additional Rater's Comments section and Reviewer/Final Evaluator's Comments of the applicable form and closes the evaluation.

1.8. Evaluator's Mandatory Considerations.

- 1.8.1. Reporting Convictions. To assist raters in preparing evaluations, all commissioned officers and enlisted members who are in the RegAF or in an active status in a Reserve Component, shall report (in writing) to their rater within 72 hours, any conviction for a violation of a criminal law of the United States or violations of a criminal law of any other country whether or not the member is on active duty or in an active status at the time of the conduct that provides the basis for the conviction to the member's rater (first-line military supervisor) or summary courts-martial convening authority. In the case of a member of the standby reserve or ANG, all commissioned officers and enlisted members shall report (in writing) to their wing commander (or equivalent), in accordance with the requirements below within 30 days. Or in the case of a member of the individual ready reserve, all commissioned officers and enlisted members shall report (in writing) to the Air Reserve Personnel Center, in accordance with the requirements below within 30 days. (Ref: National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2006, Public Law 109-163, §554, 119 Stat. 3136, 3264-65).
- 1.8.1.1. When to Document. In deciding whether to document adverse information on the performance evaluation, evaluators must consider the vast majority of Airmen serve their entire career with honor and distinction; therefore, failure to document misconduct which reflects departure from the core values of the Air Force is a disservice to all Airmen. Additionally, evaluators must consider items listed below when assessing performance and potential, and specifically mention them in evaluations when appropriate.
- 1.8.1.2. Impact of the misconduct on the Air Force mission (Did the mission suffer in any way? Was unit morale affected?).

1.8.1.2.1. For purposes of this policy, the term “conviction” includes a plea or finding of guilty, a plea of nolo contendere (no contest), and all other actions tantamount to a finding of guilty, including adjudication withheld, deferred prosecution, entry into adult or juvenile pretrial intervention programs, and any similar disposition of charges.

1.8.1.2.2. For purposes of this policy, a criminal law of the United States includes any military or other Federal criminal law; any State, district, commonwealth, or territorial or equivalent criminal law or ordinance; and any criminal law or ordinance of any county, parish, municipality, or local subdivision of any such authority, other than motor vehicle violations that do not involve a court appearance.

1.8.1.2.3. RegAF members shall submit reports under this policy within 72 hours of the date the conviction is announced, even if sentence has not been imposed or the member intends to appeal the conviction. Reserve Component members not on active duty but in an active status shall submit reports under this policy at the first drill period after the date the conviction is announced, or within 30 days of the date the conviction is announced, whichever is earlier, even if sentence has not been imposed or the member intends to appeal the conviction. All members who must submit evidence of their conviction, must maintain evidence of compliance with this requirement.

1.8.1.2.4. In the event a commander or military law-enforcement official receives information that a covered member of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of another military department has become subject to a conviction for which a report is required by this section, the commander or military law-enforcement official receiving such information shall forward it to the member’s immediate commander. If the member’s immediate commander cannot be readily identified, the commander or military law-enforcement official receiving the information shall forward it to the office designated by the member’s military department identified as required below.

1.8.1.2.5. Each Service shall institute procedures to ensure that the members covered by the law comply with its requirements and the policy set forth in this instruction. These procedures shall include points of contact for other military departments to comply with the notification requirements above. Each Service shall also establish points of contact to which Reserve Component members in the individual ready reserve or standby reserve who may not know the identity or address of their first line military supervisor or summary courts-martial convening authority may provide information of a conviction covered under this policy.

1.8.1.3. Impact of the misconduct on the Air Force as an institution (Did it bring discredit on the Air Force?).

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

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

1.8.1.6. Grade, assignment and experience of the ratee (Is the ratee in a “sensitive” job? Did the ratee “know better”?).

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

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

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

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

1.8.2. What to report. Adverse Actions: For the purpose of this policy, “adverse action” includes:

1.8.2.1. Reportable Civilian Offenses. A conviction of a Federal criminal law; any State, district, commonwealth, or territorial or equivalent criminal law or ordinance; or any criminal law or ordinance of any county, parish, municipality, city, township, or local subdivision of any such authority, and convictions of any foreign criminal law; other than convictions for motor vehicle violations that do not require a court appearance. Specifically, convictions required to be reported include the following: 1) any finding of guilt; 2) any plea of guilty; 3) any plea of no contest or nolo contendere; 4) any plea of guilty in exchange for a deferred prosecution or diversion program, and/or; 5) any other similar disposition of civilian criminal charges.

1.8.2.1.1. Any citation or violation of a motor vehicle offense which ultimately results in a conviction of a lesser included offense (resulting from the original citation) is not reportable if the lesser included offense would not have required a court appearance. For example, a member who is charged with reckless driving (an offense requiring a court appearance), but is found guilty of speeding (an offense not requiring a court appearance) has not been convicted of an offense requiring reporting. Commanders and/or supervisors who have questions regarding whether a particular conviction triggers the mandated comment should consult with their Staff Judge Advocate (SJA).

1.8.2.1.2. Procedures shall be instituted to ensure members covered by the law comply with its requirements and the policy as stated in this instruction. These procedures shall include points of contact for other military departments to comply with the notification requirements above. Points of contact shall also be established with the Reserve Component members in the individual ready reserve or standby reserve who may not know the identity or address of their first line military supervisor or summary courts-martial convening authority may provide information of a conviction covered under this policy.

1.8.2.2. Substantiated sex-related offenses must be documented in the permanent record. This includes any substantiated allegation of a sex-related offense against an Airman, regardless of grade, that results in conviction by courts-martial, non-judicial punishment, or other punitive administrative action. For the purpose of documenting sex-related offenses, a punitive administrative action is defined as a Letter of Reprimand (LOR). Sex-related offenses include violations of Article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (rape, sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, and abusive sexual contact), Article 125 (forcible sodomy, which is forced oral or anal sex, and bestiality), Article 120a

(stalking), Article 120b (rape and sexual assault of a child), Article 120c (other sexual misconduct, which includes indecent viewing/recording/broadcasting, forcible pandering, and indecent exposure) or attempts to commit any of the above offenses. **NOTE:** Documenting sex-related offenses in the evaluation will not limit or prohibit the capacity of the Airman to challenge or appeal the placement of a notation or location of placement of a notation in the Airman's personnel service record. The effective date of the requirement for notation is 26 Dec 13.

1.8.2.3. If a member has been convicted by a courts-martial or if the SR decides to file any adverse information in an Airman's Officer Selection Record (OSR) or Senior Non-Commissioned Officer Selection Record (NSR), comments relating to the ratee's behavior are mandatory on the ratee's next OPR, EPR or TR, and PRF (if not already documented on an evaluation or courts-martial in the OSR or NSR). The evaluation becomes a referral for the OPR, EPR, and TR. Comments are also required on Airmen who have been convicted of a "reportable civilian offense" that: 1) is a sexual offense that is the same as, or closely related to, UCMJ, Articles 120, 120a, 120b, 120c, 125, or attempts to commit any of those offenses; 2) carries a possible sentence of confinement for more than one year, or death; or 3) resulted in a sentence that included unsuspended confinement. For guidance on interpreting this paragraph and sub-paragraphs, supervisors and commanders should consult the servicing SJA.

1.8.2.3.1. A rater is not required to comment on the conviction in a current report if, during a previous rating period, the rater already commented on the underlying misconduct that ultimately resulted in the conviction. For example: In a case where a member is arrested and charged with DUI by off-base officials who decline to waive jurisdiction, the member's commander issues the member an LOR based on the evidence, and then comments on the DUI LOR in the ratee's next evaluation. Then, the downtown prosecution results in a conviction during a future reporting period. In such a case, the rater is not required to comment on the DUI conviction because the underlying misconduct that led to the conviction was already addressed in a previous evaluation.

1.8.3. Waiver Requests. In extraordinary cases, raters may request a waiver of the mandatory requirement to document civilian convictions for good cause. The waiver request will route from the rater, through any required additional rater and the ratee's commander, to the ratee's SR. The SR may either deny the waiver request or endorse the request and forward to the MAJCOM/CC (or in the case of reports within AFDW, USAFA, or any DRU or FOA reporting to an activity on the Air Staff, to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or in the case of the ANG, to the Director, Air National Guard [DANG]). The DANG may delegate this authority to the respective state's Adjutant General, or equivalent for Territories and the District of Columbia, who will make determinations after consultation with the DANG, or the Deputy Director, Air National Guard (DDANG). Both the nature and the outcome of the offense for each approved waiver will remain on file with the DANG. No further delegation is authorized.

1.8.3.1. If the SR denies the waiver request, the decision regarding the waiver request is final and may not be appealed or considered further. This does not prevent an individual from challenging any completed report in any other appropriate forums, e.g., ERAB, AFBCMR.

1.8.3.1.1. When the SR endorses the waiver request and forwards it to the final approval authority (MAJCOM/CC, Vice Chief of Staff, or DANG), the final approval authority can either approve the exception, allowing the exclusion of any comments in the EPR, OPR, TR, and PRF, or deny the request, resulting in the mandatory inclusion of comments regarding the ratee's criminal behavior.

1.8.3.1.2. The final approval authority is delegable to the MAJCOM/CV or, in the case of the AF/CV, to the AF/CVA; no further delegation beyond a TAG, or equivalent, is authorized for the ANG. The decision of the approval authority is the final decision for such waiver requests and may not be appealed or considered further. This does not prevent an individual from challenging any completed report in any other appropriate forums, e.g., ERAB, AFBCMR.

1.8.3.1.3. In order to approve any waiver requests, the approval authority must issue a written finding that the mandatory comments for the specific criminal conviction are not in the best interests of the Air Force and that the inclusion of any such comments would unduly harm the ratee. Upon final decision, the final approval authority will forward the waiver documentation to AFPC/DP2SPE via email and AFPC/DP1ORM. Written waiver approvals will be filed in the member's Master Personnel Records Group (MPerRGp) for the sole purpose of documenting the final approval (ARMS, Section H).

1.8.4. Specificity of Comments. In all cases, when comments are included in performance evaluations, they must be specific, outlining the event and any corrective action taken. Comments such as "conduct unbecoming..." or "an error in judgment led to an off-duty incident..." are too vague. Examples of valid comments are "MSgt Smith drove while intoxicated, for which he received an Article 15" and "Capt Jones made improper sexually suggestive and harassing comments to a squadron member, for which he received a letter of reprimand."

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

1.8.5.1. All NCO and officer evaluators will assess their ratee(s) on what the member did to ensure a healthy organizational climate.

1.8.5.2. Commanders at every level have an even greater responsibility to create a healthy climate in their command. Additionally, they are responsible for ensuring adherence to Sexual Assault Prevention (SAPR) Program directives. Command climate, just like organizational climate, is the perception of a unit's environment by its members.

Commanders are ultimately responsible for the good order and discipline in their unit and have unique responsibility and authority to ensure good order and discipline. Therefore, evaluators must take this special responsibility and authority into consideration when evaluating a commander's effectiveness in ensuring a healthy command climate.

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

1.8.7. Fitness Testing and Education and Intervention Programs. All personnel must meet established standards IAW AFI 36-2905. It is the commander's discretion to annotate a non-current/failing Fitness Assessment (FA) within the reporting period on the evaluation. Additionally, it is the commander's discretion to document the evaluation as a referral for a non-current/failing FA at the evaluation close-out date or EPR SCOD. Additionally, failure to progress satisfactorily in the Education and Intervention Programs reflects poorly on the Air Force and the Airman. Unsatisfactory progress in the Fitness Improvement Program (FIP) program should be considered, and if documented on any evaluation provide specific comments on the behavior that led to the unsatisfactory progress and/or failure, with compatible ratings.

1.8.8. Management Control. All personnel must manage resources and ensure funds, property, and other government assets are protected against waste, loss, unauthorized use, or misappropriation. Comments about failures in inherent or assigned internal control responsibilities, or noteworthy accomplishments in improving internal controls, are mandatory. AFI 65-201, *Managers' Internal Control Program Procedures*, provides specifics of the Management Control Program.

1.8.9. Productivity. While related to internal management control, productivity gains are often a result of improved efficiency rather than establishing or administering policies. Productivity gains can have measurable monetary or manpower savings and are of significance to the Air Force and Air Reserve components. Give consideration to the ratee's achievements in implementing Defense Management Report principles and recommendations, taking into account the ratee's opportunity, or lack of opportunity, for such achievements. Many suggestions approved under the Airmen Powered by Innovation (API) Program fall in this category.

1.8.10. Occupational Safety and Health. Consider how commanders, managers, and supervisors discharge their responsibilities under the Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health (AFOSH) Program.

1.8.11. Security of Classified Information. Consider how well ratees who handle or have access to classified information discharge security responsibilities. When appropriate, comment on any action, behavior, or condition that is reportable under security regulations.

1.8.12. Award of Contracts. Awarding Contracts to Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Minority Institutions (Section 806, Public Law 100- 180). If you rate an officer who holds a warrant as a contracting officer and who has the opportunity to increase the award of contracts to small disadvantaged business concerns, HBCUs, and minority institutions, you must consider the ratee's ability to increase awards.

1.8.13. General Accounting Office (GAO), Office of the Inspector General, and Air Force Audit Agency (AFAA) Audit Resolution. Prompt, responsive and constructive action by managers is an integral part of good management. When applicable, comment on the degree of effectiveness in resolving disputed audit findings and recommendations.

1.8.14. Acquisition and Management of Inventory Items (Section 323, Public Law 101-510). For people assigned to Inventory Control Points, consider their efforts to eliminate wasteful practices and achieve cost savings as prescribed in the DoD Inventory Reduction Plan.

1.8.15. General and Specific NCO Responsibilities. Consider the ratee's compliance with mandatory requirements prescribed in AFI 36-2618, *The Enlisted Force Structure*.

1.9. Disagreements.

1.9.1. Explain any significant disagreement with a previous evaluator on a performance evaluation. Digitally signed forms will not allow an evaluator to initial in a different rating block, so the evaluator who disagrees must specifically state the performance factor in disagreement, the reason for the disagreement and what their rating is, in their comments. On evaluations with multiple evaluators, a significant disagreement is a change of any rating or any statement that indicates obvious disagreement with previous evaluator(s).

1.9.2. Comments to support disagreements are required. **EXAMPLE:** Disagree with rater's assessment of Job Knowledge—TSgt Smith was unable to provide correct operating procedures during monthly evaluation; or Capt Rogers was unable to answer critical questions concerning the operation of his flight leading to an ORI rating of "Unsatisfactory" for his squadron.

1.9.3. Evaluators should discuss disagreements when preparing evaluations. Preceding evaluators are first given an opportunity to change the evaluation; however, they will not change their evaluation just to satisfy the evaluator who disagrees. If, after discussion, the disagreement remains, the disagreeing evaluator marks the "non-concur" block, and must provide specific comments in their block to explain each item in disagreement prior to commenting on any performance. In these cases, the evaluator is forfeiting space normally used to document performance to explain the disagreement. The evaluator who non-concurs with the evaluation will only attach an AF Form 77 if more space is required to explain the disagreement. The AF Form 77 will not be used to add additional performance information.

1.9.4. On "Wet Signature" evaluations, when the additional rater marks the non-concur block and shows disagreement with a "Performance Assessment Factor" by initialing a different block, or disagrees with the rater's overall narrative assessment, the additional rater must provide specific comments to explain the disagreement.

1.9.5. Updating the Personnel Data System (PDS). When an evaluation contains two different ratings due to an unresolved disagreement, the final evaluator's rating will be updated in the military data system. For example: On an enlisted evaluation (AF Form 910) the rater gives the ratee an overall "Exceeded most, if not all expectations" performance assessment, but the additional rater disagrees and changes the performance assessment to an overall "Exceeded some, but not all expectations" performance assessment, the overall "Exceeded some, but not all expectations" performance assessment will be updated in the military PDS, provided the FD concurs with the additional rater's performance assessment. Likewise, if the rater gives the ratee an overall "Exceeded some, but not all expectations" performance assessment and the additional rater agrees, but the FD disagrees and changes the performance assessment to an overall "Exceeded most, if not all expectations" performance assessment, the overall "Exceeded most, if not all expectations" performance assessment is updated in the military PDS. **NOTE:** Two different evaluators can observe the same performance, but assess it differently. However, the mandatory comments should clearly state the reason for the difference in the overall rating performance. Unless the evaluation is a referral, limit comments to the space provided within each applicable section of the evaluation.

1.9.6. If the FD/Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer is junior in grade to the Rater/Additional Rater/Reviewer/Final Evaluator, they must discuss any non-concurrence with the Rater/Additional Rater/Reviewer/Final Evaluator prior to signing the evaluation.

1.10. Referral Evaluations.

1.10.1. Purpose. Referral procedures are established to allow the ratee due process by giving the ratee an opportunity to respond and/or rebut any negative ratings or comments before it becomes a matter of record. Additionally, it allows evaluators to consider all the facts, some they may not have been aware of, prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record.

1.10.2. General Information.

1.10.2.1. Vague Comments. Do not make non-specific and/or vague comments about the individual's behavior or performance. **EXAMPLE:** "Due to a recent off-duty incident, Lt Jackson's potential is limited." Vague comments do not fully explain the incident or behavior, nor do they justify how and why potential is limited (see paragraph 1.12.4. for examples of acceptable statements). When doubt arises as to whether a comment is a referral comment or not, refer the evaluation. **NOTE:** If the comment was on your evaluation, would you want the opportunity to respond to that comment; if yes, refer the evaluation. It is better to afford the ratee the due process now while all evaluators are available, than to try and refer it later if directed by the ERAB or AFBCMR.

1.10.2.2. Any evaluator whose ratings or comments causes an evaluation to become a referral evaluation, must give the ratee the opportunity to comment on the evaluation.

1.10.2.3. A referral evaluation could be detrimental to an Airman's career, therefore face-to-face interaction is required between the rater and ratee.

1.10.2.4. If a subsequent evaluator's comments initially cause an evaluation to become a referral, the evaluation will not be processed electronically, but will be re-accomplished, printed and contain "wet" (handwritten) signatures only. Dates will be handwritten, stamped or typed.

1.10.2.5. An evaluation will be referred more than once when a subsequent evaluator gives additional referral ratings or comments. **NOTE:** Comments regarding the same incident or behavior will not require the evaluation to be referred more than once.

1.10.2.6. If, after the evaluation has been referred to the ratee, there are any corrections made to the evaluation which add information or changes the content and/or the meaning of the evaluation, (this does not include administrative corrections such as correcting the SSN, spelling, punctuation, etc.), the ratee must again be given an opportunity to respond to the new information presented on the current version of the evaluation. Refer the evaluation again and allow 3 duty days for a response (30 calendar days for non-EAD). Care should be taken to ensure the date of the new referral document is on or after the date the new “version” of the evaluation is signed. If the ratee previously submitted a rebuttal and wishes that original rebuttal to be considered as his or her response to the current version, he or she may simply hand-write a statement to that effect on the new referral letter when receipt is acknowledged and attach the original rebuttal; or submit a new rebuttal.

1.10.2.7. Although an evaluation may be referred several times during processing, any one evaluator will not normally refer the evaluation more than once. However, this does not include evaluations referred again IAW paragraph 1.10.4.4. and paragraph 1.10.4.5.

1.10.2.8. Ensure the name of the next evaluator is included in the space provided in Section XI of the OPR, Section VIII of the AF Form 912, Section VIII of the AF Form 77 (LOE), or in the Referral Memorandum (Figure 1.1) when referral procedures are not included on the form itself.

1.10.2.9. The evaluator who refers the evaluation and any subsequent evaluators may continue comments on the AF Form 77 (each evaluator uses a separate form). Comments are limited to the space on the front of the form (Section IV) and each evaluator will use one AF Form 77. The purpose of the AF Form 77 is to allow additional space to explain non-concurrence or the detailed behavior that led to the referral evaluation; it is not to be used to provide additional accomplishments. **(T-0)**.

1.10.2.10. All original documents will remain attached to the original evaluation. **EXAMPLE:** The referral memorandum when applicable, any AF Forms 77, the rebuttal document and any attachments, etc.

1.10.2.11. In organizations where the rating chains cross MAJCOM lines (for instance, when you have a “dual-hatted” senior rater), the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) is next official in the chain of command from the MAJCOM that controls the ratee’s organization of assignment, even if the senior rater’s rater belongs to the other MAJCOM.

1.10.2.12. Airmen whose most recent performance report (OPR/EPR) or final PCS performance report is or will be a referral report are ineligible for PCS IAW AFI 36-2110, *Assignments*.

1.10.3. When to Refer a Performance Evaluation. Performance evaluations must be referred when:

1.10.3.1. Comments in any OPR, EPR, LOE or TR, regardless of the ratings if applicable, or the attachments to that evaluation, that are derogatory in nature, imply or refer to

behavior incompatible with, or not meeting minimum acceptable standards of personal or professional conduct, character, judgment or integrity, and/or refer to disciplinary actions. When considering the Airman's ability to meet standards, consider unacceptable performance as actions that are incompatible with, and/or Airmen who have ***routinely*** (a repeated inability to meet standards that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below AF standards and expectations) and/or ***significantly*** (a single instance where failure to meet standards is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts overall aggregated performance assessment) failed to adhere to established AF standards and expectations. This includes, but is not limited to, comments regarding omissions or misrepresentation of facts in official statements or documents, financial irresponsibility, mismanagement of personal or government affairs, confirmed incidents of discrimination or mistreatment, illegal use or possession of drugs, AWOL, Article 15 action, and conviction by courts-martial. **(T-0)**.

1.10.3.2. An officer fails to meet standards in any one of the listed performance factors, in Section III or Section IX of the OPR, the overall evaluation will be a "Does Not Meet Standards" evaluation and the evaluation must be referred. **NOTE:** If the evaluation is marked "Does Not Meet Standards," there must be a comment pertaining to the behavior in the referring evaluator's assessment block. Comments in the referral memorandum do not meet this requirement. **(T-0)**.

1.10.3.3. An evaluator marks "Does Not Meet Standards" in Section III of the AF Form 707, "Met some but not all expectations" in any Section of the AF Form 910/911, or a "Do Not Retain" in Section IV of the AF Form 912. **(T-0)**.

1.10.4. Who Refers a Performance Evaluation.

1.10.4.1. Any evaluator whose ratings or comments causes the evaluation to be referral will refer the evaluation to the ratee.

1.10.4.2. If an evaluator did not refer the evaluation and a subsequent evaluator determines the evaluation should be referred, the evaluation must be returned to the evaluator who made the referral comments to refer the evaluation to the ratee.

1.10.4.3. If there is a disagreement as to whether or not the evaluation should be referred, then the additional evaluator may refer the evaluation on behalf of the previous evaluator.

1.10.4.4. In cases where the referring evaluator is a MAJCOM or unified commander (e.g. USTRANSCOM/CC), the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) will be the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force who will sign on an AF Form 77. However, in situations where the rater is a senior rater who has caused the evaluation to be referred and there is an existing evaluator within the rater's organizational chain (to include MAJCOM), the evaluation should be forwarded to that evaluator for appropriate action, see paragraph 1.7.

1.10.4.5. On EPRs, when the additional rater refers the evaluation, the FD or unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer, is the individual named in the referral document and will review the ratee's comments. FDs or unit commanders/military or civilian directors/other authorized reviewers complete their review and may place additional comments, that exceed the one-line provided in the FDs

or Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer's Comments, section on an AF Form 77.

1.10.4.5.1. When the FD or unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer refers the evaluation, the FD or unit commander/military or civilian/other authorized reviewer's rater is the individual named in the referral document.

1.10.5. Responsibilities.

1.10.5.1. The Referring Evaluator Responsibilities.

1.10.5.1.1. Prepares the referral document IAW Figure 1.1., Table 4.2, Table 4.6 and Table 4.9. (Enlisted), Table 3.1. (Officers), paragraph 1.10.6.4. (Training Reports) or Table 5.1. (Letter of Evaluations), whichever is applicable. **NOTE:** The date the rater signs the evaluation and the date of the referral memorandum should be the same date.

1.10.5.1.2. On or after the close-out date of the evaluation, hand-deliver the referral document to the ratee; obtain the ratee's signature and the date acknowledging receipt of the referral document. After the ratee signs the referral document acknowledging receipt, provide a copy of the signed referral document to the ratee, and forward the original referral document to the evaluator named in the referral document, (Referral Reviewer). Do not include subsequent evaluator comments on the referral OPR/EPR until after the rebuttal is received or rebuttal period has past.

1.10.5.1.3. If the ratee is geographically separated (including those who have passed their date of separation [DOS]), send a copy of the referral document to the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) and mail the original referral document to the ratee by "return receipt requested" mail.

1.10.5.1.4. Upon receipt of completed evaluation and prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record, provide feedback to the ratee and obtain the ratee's acknowledgement of the completed evaluation. Then forward the evaluation to the ratee's servicing MPS.

1.10.5.2. Ratee Responsibilities.

1.10.5.2.1. The ratee acknowledges receipt of the referral document by signing and dating it. The signature only acknowledges and verifies receipt of the referral document on the date indicated; it does not signify concurrence with the evaluation or indicate whether or not the ratee will provide rebuttal remarks.

1.10.5.2.2. If the ratee is geographically separated, he or she will sign the referral document to acknowledge receipt, then forward the original to the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer). The ratee is encouraged to keep a copy of the referral document.

1.10.5.2.3. The ratee will provide rebuttal comments to the referral reviewer within 3 duty days, (30 calendar days for non-EAD members) from the date of receipt (if mailed from the date of delivery), regardless if the ratee is still on active duty. The ratee will hand-deliver the referral documents with all attachments or use certified or registered mail, if geographically separated. The ratee may request more time from the evaluator

named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) not to exceed 45 calendar days from acknowledgement. Additionally, the ratee:

1.10.5.2.3.1. May ask the Area Defense Counsel (ADC) or local personnel advisor to provide guidance/assistance in preparing rebuttal comments.

1.10.5.2.3.2. Must limit comments, including any pertinent attachments, to a total of 10-single side pages (5 pages front and back). These will not reflect on the character, conduct, integrity, or motives of an evaluator unless fully substantiated and documented. All pertinent attachments become part of the evaluation filed in the personnel record; however, items which are already part of the permanent record, such as copies of previous evaluations, etc., will be removed from the referral package prior to filing.

1.10.5.2.3.3. May have another individual prepare comments on his or her behalf (such as an attorney). However when this is done, the ratee must include a statement confirming the document is to be considered as the ratee's response. This statement will appear somewhere on the rebuttal document or be attached as a separate statement. **NOTE:** If the ratee's statement is provided as a separate attachment, it will be considered part of the 10-page restriction. **(EXAMPLE:** If the attorney submits 5 pages, the ratee can submit 5; if the attorney submits 9 pages, then the ratee can only submit 1 page and vice versa).

1.10.5.2.4. May choose not to comment on the referral evaluation. Once the time limit has elapsed, the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) completes the evaluation and continues normal processing (see paragraph 1.10.5.3.). Failure to provide comments does not prevent the ratee from later appealing the evaluation IAW the procedures in Chapter 10 once the evaluation becomes a matter of record.

1.10.5.3. The Referral Reviewer. (The Evaluator Named in the Referral Document.)

1.10.5.3.1. Must allow the ratee 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD members) to submit a rebuttal. If the ratee needs additional time, i.e., due to the non-availability of an ADC or the referral reviewer has returned the rebuttal because it is more than 10 pages, the referral reviewer may grant an extension as needed. However, the referral reviewer will not review the evaluation until the 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD members) have passed, even if the ratee has indicated that he/she will not submit comments.

1.10.5.3.2. After 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD members) have passed, the referral reviewer will:

1.10.5.3.2.1. Review and consider the ratee's comments, if provided.

1.10.5.3.2.2. Place the applicable mandatory statement in the evaluators comment block of the appropriate evaluation:

1.10.5.3.2.2.1. If the ratee provided comments, prepare an endorsement to the evaluation and enter the statement: "I have carefully considered (ratee's name) comments to the referral document of (date)." Subsequent evaluators do not enter this statement.

1.10.5.3.2.2.2. If the ratee does not forward comments within 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD) (plus mailing time and any approved extensions), prepare an endorsement to the evaluation and include the statement: "Comments from the ratee were requested but were not received within the required period." Then send the evaluation on for normal processing.

1.10.5.3.3. Ensure the date referenced (paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.2.1.) is the date of the referral document (either the memorandum on the form or the separate memorandum) and not the evaluation close-out date or the date of the ratee's rebuttal.

1.10.5.3.4. Forward the evaluation with all attachments to the next evaluator. If the referral reviewer is the final evaluator, forward the evaluation to the rater so the rater can provide feedback and obtain the ratee's acknowledgement of the completed evaluation.

1.10.5.4. Additional/Subsequent Evaluators.

1.10.5.4.1. Send the evaluation to the next evaluator in the rating chain for additional endorsement when an endorser is senior to the commander or when a commander who is senior to the endorser, refers the evaluation, see paragraphs 1.10.4.4. and 1.10.4.5.

1.10.5.4.2. Prepare the endorsement on AF Form 77.

1.10.5.4.3. Check the "supplemental sheet" block on AF Form 77, Section IIA and enter appropriate comments in Section IV.

1.10.5.4.4. If the evaluator on the AF Form 77 is not an Air Force officer, Air Force NCO, or DAF civilian, obtain an Air Force Advisor review.

1.10.5.4.5. An additional rater or final evaluator/reviewer who decides to refer an evaluation due to a performance assessment rating or comment made by a previous evaluator, refers it to the ratee before completing his or her portion of the evaluation. The referral document will instruct the ratee to direct and return any rebuttal comments back to him or her. Upon receipt of the ratee's rebuttal, or when 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD) have elapsed, the evaluator completes his or her portion of the evaluation.

1.10.5.4.6. If, after referral, a subsequent evaluator upgrades the ratings and/or invalidates the referral comments so the conditions defined in paragraph 1.10.3. *no longer apply*, the non-concur block is marked and comments are made in support of the disagreement in the ratings or comments. The evaluation is no longer considered referral; however, retain all original referral documents and/or correspondence with the evaluation.

1.10.5.4.7. If, after referral, a subsequent evaluator upgrades ratings or comments but the conditions defined in paragraph 1.10.3. still exist, the non-concur block is marked and comments are made in support of the disagreement in the ratings or comments; the evaluation remains a referral. Retain original referral correspondence with the evaluation.

1.10.5.4.8. When the last evaluator on the evaluation has caused the evaluation to be referred, the next evaluator in the rating chain (as named in the referral document) will, upon receipt of the ratee's comments, prepare an endorsement to the evaluation on an

AF Form 77 if no comment area exists on the applicable evaluation form. If the evaluator named in the referral document (the Referral Reviewer) does not concur with the comments or ratings of the previous evaluator, their endorsement will, in addition to the mandatory referral comments, describe the disagreement (on the first line in the comments area on the applicable evaluation or may continue comments on an AF Form 77).

1.10.5.5. Deployed Evaluators. If the referring evaluator is deployed and is referring a home station evaluation, the referring evaluator will sign the referral memorandum and OPR/EPR and forward the evaluation and referral documents to the next evaluator in the rating chain. The next evaluator in the chain (the referral reviewer) will act on behalf of the referring evaluator who is deployed and issue the evaluation and referral documents to the ratee. Upon receipt of the ratee's comments, or at the expiration of the ratee's 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD) window to respond, the referral reviewer processes the evaluation and all referral documents IAW paragraph 1.10.5.3.

1.10.6. Referral Procedures.

1.10.6.1. Referral OPRs. The front and reverse side of the AF Form 707 will be completed for referral OPRs. The referring evaluator can fill in the specifics in the blank lines provided. When typing information into the form, you will have to end typing at the end of each line and manually place the cursor on the next line to continue typing. The text does not wrap around automatically. If the specific details are too long for the space allotted the referring evaluator can attach a separate AF Form 77 (see paragraph 1.10.2.9.) and annotate "See Attachment" in the lines provided in this block. Refer to Table 3.1. for procedures on preparing the AF Form 707.

1.10.6.2. Referral EPRs. Prepare a Referral Memorandum (AF Form 910/911 only) IAW Figure 1.1.

1.10.6.3. Referral Letter of Evaluations (LOEs). The referral process is accomplished on the form itself.

1.10.6.3.1. Deployed Commander LOEs. Complete the AF Form 77 IAW Table 5.1. and paragraph 5.2.1.2.1. for Deployed CC LOE procedures.

1.10.6.3.2. All Other LOEs.

1.10.6.3.2.1. Designated Rater (*Officer Only*). If an LOE prepared by the officially designated rater contained referral comments, the rater prepares an OPR IAW paragraph 1.10.6.1. The reason for the evaluation will be "Directed by HQ USAF." 60 calendar days of supervision are required, unless the waiver authority extends the requirement, see paragraph 1.13.

1.10.6.3.2.2. Other than Designated Rater. Complete Sections I, II, IV, V and VII only IAW Table 5.1. The referral process itself is not accomplished on the AF Form 77. **EXCEPTION:** Deployed Commander LOEs. If someone other than the officially designated rater prepares an LOE with referral comments, the LOE, along with any rebuttal comments the ratee may want to add, if any, is forwarded to his or her officially designated rater. The rater will review the LOE and if the rater considers the referral comments serious enough to warrant permanent recording,

the rater prepares a performance evaluation (OPR/EPR) using the procedures in applicable paragraph 1.10.6.1. (officers) or paragraph 1.10.6.2. (enlisted); and the LOE becomes a referral document attached to the OPR/EPR. If the rater believes an evaluation is inappropriate, he or she returns the LOE and any rebuttal comments to the ratee. **NOTE:** When the rater determines the comments are not serious enough to warrant permanent recording at that time, they may consider commenting on the derogatory information in the proceeding evaluation. Evaluators should carefully consider, whether the negative incident(s) from the referenced LOE involved the character, conduct, or integrity of the ratee, and whether it has continued to influence the performance or utilization of the ratee during the remainder of the reporting period. In such case, the information included in the evaluation may make the EPR a referral; and the LOE will not be attached to the referral evaluation.

1.10.6.4. Referral TR (AF Forms 475). Refer the TR to the ratee using the same procedures as you would when referring an OPR/EPR, paragraph 1.10.6.1. and paragraph 1.10.6.2. Name the commander of the Air Force school or unit of assignment as the next evaluator, (determined by which organization is preparing the Training Report). The evaluator reviews the ratee's comments, if provided, add the applicable mandatory comments IAW paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.2.1. or paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.2.2., and endorses the TR on an AF Form 77, using the first evaluators block.

1.11. Mandatory Comments. Specific comments or entries mandated by this AFI are identified by the instruction to "enter" or "include the statement," followed by the specific comment placed within quotation marks and should be entered on the evaluation exactly as shown.

1.11.1. Referral Reviewer. For a referral LOE, OPR/EPR, or TR, the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) must comment as required by paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.2.

1.11.2. If the rater died, became incapacitated, or was relieved from duties as an evaluator, state the reason in the feedback sections of the AF Forms 707 (see paragraph 1.7.2.2) or in the remarks section of AF Form 910/911/912. **(T-0)**.

1.11.3. If a member has been convicted by a courts-martial, comments relating to the ratee's behavior are mandatory on the ratee's next OPR, EPR, TR or PRF. Additionally, comments on individuals who have been found guilty, pled guilty or nolo contendere (no contest), of a reportable civilian offense are mandatory, (see paragraph 1.8.2.1.).

1.11.4. If performance feedback was not accomplished, state the reason why it was not accomplished. Rationale must be placed in the Performance Feedback Certification block for AF Form 707, and the Remarks Section XI, AF Form 910/911, and Section VII AF Form 912 and it must be honest, plausible and specific, such as "Midterm ACA not conducted due to only 58 days supervision between initial ACA and the evaluation close-out date," or "Rater was unable to conduct ACA (state specific reason)." Non-receipt of a feedback notice, and "administrative oversight," etc., are not acceptable reasons.

1.11.5. If a member has been assigned to serve as a voting assistance officer, a comment relating to how well the member performed these duties is required in the members next performance report (Title 10, Section 1566[f][1]).

1.12. General Prohibited Evaluator Considerations and Comments. Certain items are prohibited for consideration in the performance evaluation process and will not be commented upon on any OES/EES form. Except as authorized in this instruction, do not consider, refer to, or include comments regarding:

1.12.1. Sensitive Information.

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

1.12.1.2. Confidential Statements. Confidential statements, testimony, or data obtained by, or presented to, boards under AFI 91-204, *Safety Investigations and Reports*.

1.12.1.3. Appeal Agencies Outside Rating Chain. Actions taken by an individual outside the normal chain of command that represent guaranteed rights of appeal. **EXAMPLE:** Inspector General, Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records, EOT/MEO complaints, Congressional Inquiries, etc.

1.12.1.4. Drug or Alcohol Abuse Rehabilitation Programs. Focus on the behavior, conduct, or performance resulting from alcohol or drug use versus the actual consumption of alcohol or drugs or participation in a rehabilitation program. Only competent medical authorities can diagnose alcoholism or drug addiction, and the diagnosis is prohibited on evaluations.

1.12.1.5. Temporary or Permanent Disqualification under AFMAN 13-501, *Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Program (PRP)*. You may reference the behavior of the ratee that resulted in the action; however, you may not mention the ratee was disqualified.

1.12.1.6. Fitness Scores/Categories. It is prohibited to put an individual's fitness score or fitness category on an OPR or EPR unless the member does not meet standards.

1.12.1.7. Medical Information. Only authorized medical officials are in a position to make comments on medical conditions. Evaluators must focus evaluation comments on the *behavior* and *duty performance* of the individual. Comments pertaining to the medical condition, treatment, or diagnosis are prohibited.

1.12.2. Potential Discriminatory Factors and/or Information.

1.12.2.1. Race, Ethnic Origin, Gender, Age, Religion, Sexual Orientation or Political Affiliation of the Ratee. Do not refer to these items in such a way that others could interpret the comments as reflecting favorably or unfavorably on the person. This is not meant to prohibit evaluators from commenting on involvement in cultural or church activities, but cautions against the use of specific religious denominations, etc. **EXAMPLE:** "Capt Doe is the first *female* pilot ever selected for training in the F-16", is an inappropriate reference to gender. You may use pronouns reflecting gender (e.g., he, she, him, her, his, and hers). "Wing POC for African American Heritage Committee" or "Arranged a blood drive at the Baptist Memorial Hospital" are acceptable comments.

1.12.2.2. Family Activities or Marital Status. Do not consider or include information (either positive or negative) regarding the member's marital status or the employment, education, or volunteer service activities (on or off the military installation) of the member's family.

1.12.2.3. Officer/Enlisted Club Membership. Comments regarding a ratee's club membership is prohibited.

1.12.2.4. Courts-Martial Panel Membership. Do not consider performance as a member of a courts-martial panel, or render a less than favorable evaluation because of the zeal in which the ratee served as a defense or respondent's counsel (see Article 37, UCMJ). This is not intended to inhibit an accurate portrayal of a counsel's competence in the representation of clients.

1.12.3. Performance Outside the Reporting Period.

1.12.3.1. Duty History or Performance Outside the Current Reporting Period. Do not comment on duty history or performance outside the current reporting period, except as permitted by paragraphs 1.12.3.4. and 1.12.4.1. However, since performance in past jobs is relevant in the preparation of PRFs, raters may include it on PRFs.

1.12.3.2. Previous Evaluations or Ratings. Comments from previous evaluations or ratings are prohibited (i.e., do not include comments from an AF Form 475 on an AF Form 707), except in conjunction with ACA sessions and as outlined in Chapter 8 for promotion recommendation forms. **NOTE:** Evaluators may review previous evaluations to prevent repeating prior accomplishments and making inappropriate recommendations.

1.12.3.3. **(Officer Only)** Events That Occur After the Close-Out Date. If an incident or event occurs, that reflects a departure from standards and are derogatory in nature, between the time an annual or initial evaluation closes-out and the time it becomes a matter of record that is of such serious significance that inclusion in that evaluation is warranted, an extension of the close-out date may be requested by the unit commander IAW paragraph 3.18. This includes completion of an investigation begun prior to the close-out date or confirmation of behavior that was only alleged as of the close-out date. For fitness, an extension may be requested to authorize an Airman to test again to meet the standard if justification is warranted. An extension to document a failure for fitness is not authorized.

1.12.3.4. Prior Events. Do not include comments regarding events which occurred in a previous reporting period, unless the events add significantly to the evaluation, were not known to and considered by the previous evaluators, and were not previously reflected in an evaluation which is a part of the permanent record (this includes EPRs, OPRs, LOEs and TRs). **EXAMPLE:** An event (positive or negative) which came to light *after* an evaluation became a matter of record, but which occurred *during* the period of that evaluation, could be mentioned in the ratee's *next* evaluation because the incident was not previously reported. In rare cases, serious offenses (such as those punishable by courts-martial) may not come to light or be substantiated for several years. In those cases, inclusion of that information may be appropriate even though the incident/behavior occurred prior to the last reporting period. Additionally, negative incidents from previous reporting periods involving the character, conduct, or integrity of the ratee that continue to influence the performance or utilization of the ratee may be commented upon *in that context only*. Commanders and SRs make the determination of what constitutes a significant addition. If a commander has considered and made a decision not to comment on a known adverse action, an incumbent commander may not overturn a previous commander's decision by requesting the adverse action be added after the evaluation has been made a matter of record, nor may the incumbent commander include it in the next

evaluation. However, if the behavior has continued into the next rating period, an evaluator may comment on the specific behavior for that rating period.

1.12.4. Derogatory Information and Disciplinary Actions.

1.12.4.1. Conduct Based on Unreliable Information.

1.12.4.1.1. Raters must ensure that information relied upon to document performance, especially derogatory information relating to unsatisfactory behavior or misconduct is reliable and supported by preponderance of the evidence.

1.12.4.1.2. The rater should consult with the servicing SJA whenever any question exists whether this standard has been met.

1.12.4.1.3. Raters should be particularly cautious about referring to charges preferred, investigations, or boards of inquiry (such as accident investigation boards), or using information obtained from those sources, or any similar actions related to a member, that are not complete as of the close-out date of the evaluation.

1.12.4.1.4. When it is determined that such conduct is appropriate for comment, refer to the underlying performance, behavior or misconduct itself and not merely to the fact that the conduct may have resulted in a punitive or administrative action taken against the member, such as a letter of reprimand, Article 15, courts-martial conviction, etc. **EXAMPLE:** An evaluator should say: “SSgt Johnson engaged in drunk and disorderly conduct and drove while intoxicated,” rather than “SSgt Johnson got an Article 15 for violations of Article 92 and 134.”

1.12.4.1.5. **(Officers only)** If an extension to the close-out date might be warranted to determine if reliable information of unsatisfactory performance or misconduct has been established, refer to paragraph 3.18.

1.12.4.2. Acquittals or Similar Results.

1.12.4.2.1. Any action against an individual that resulted in acquittal or a failure to successfully implement an intended personnel action is prohibited. For example, an evaluator cannot say: “SSgt Johnson was *acquitted* of assault charges,” or “SrA Smith’s involuntary separation action was unsuccessful.”

1.12.4.2.2. This does not mean, however, that evaluators cannot mention the underlying conduct that formed the basis for the action.

1.12.4.2.3. A determination as to the appropriateness of doing so should be made only after consultation with the servicing SJA.

1.12.4.2.4. The decision to include such information should be made only when evaluators can establish that the information is reliable and supported by preponderance of evidence.

1.12.4.2.5. In any case, do not reference any punitive or administrative action taken against the individual in response to the conduct for which the member was acquitted or where the action was not actually taken.

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

1.12.4.3.1. Acceptable statements: “Drove while intoxicated, received an Article 15” and “Failed to report to duty, received an LOR,” etc.

1.12.4.3.2. Prohibited statements: “Sentenced to 6 months confinement,” “Reduced to the grade of,” “Forfeiture of pay,” “5 days extra duty,” etc.

1.12.4.4. Disciplinary Actions.

1.12.4.4.1. Must be reasonably specific, clearly outlining the event and/or behavior. Comments such as “conduct unbecoming” or “an error in judgment led to an off-duty incident” are too vague and open the door for appeals. Also see paragraph 1.10.2.1. on vague comments.

1.12.4.4.2. The ratee must be advised specifically why he or she is considered substandard in order to respond appropriately.

1.12.4.4.3. An evaluation should not simply contain the comment that “MSgt Smith received an Article 15 during this period.” Instead, the underlying conduct should be specifically cited with the resulting action included, such as: “During this reporting period, Lieutenant Jones sexually harassed a female subordinate for which he received an Article 15,” or “MSgt Jones drove while under the influence, for which he received an Article 15.”

1.12.4.4.4. In any case, the focus of the comment should be on the conduct or behavior. Evaluators should consult the servicing SJA or local personnel advisors for questions regarding the appropriateness of including comments about misconduct and/or the resulting actions on a performance evaluation.

1.12.5. Profanity. Use of profanity in evaluations is prohibited.

1.12.6. Other Prohibited Comments.

1.12.6.1. A Recommendation for Decoration. You may include only those decorations actually approved or presented during the reporting period. The term “decorations,” as used here, applies to those for which a medal is awarded and worn on the Air Force uniform, such as an Air Force Achievement Medal. You may mention other awards, or nominations, for honors and awards such as “Outstanding Maintenance Officer” or “Twelve Outstanding Airmen of the Year.”

1.12.6.2. Meeting Goals for/Results of the Combined Federal Campaign (CFC). Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 950, Solicitation of Federal Civilian and Uniformed Service Personnel for Contributions to Private Voluntary Organizations, Section 108 Preventing coercive activity, subparagraphs (a through g). Comments pertaining to met/exceeded goals, collected dollar amount, or meeting/exceeding goal or collecting a particular dollar amount. (**EXAMPLE:** 100% contact, \$15K raised, 500 contacted, etc.) are prohibited.

1.12.6.3. WAPS Data. Score data on the WAPS score notice or SNCO promotion score notice, board scores, test scores, relative standings among peers etc. are prohibited.

1.12.6.4. Airman Comprehensive Assessment (ACA). Evaluators do not refer to ACA sessions in any area of the performance evaluation except in the Performance Feedback Certification Block or the remarks section of AF Forms 910/911/912.

1.12.6.5. Matrices, fact sheets, background sheets or other documents unless specifically authorized in this instruction. Additionally, do not establish panels or boards to review and collectively score, rate, rank, or tally records and/or generate a priority list for determining promotion recommendations, level of endorsement or stratification, except as authorized in paragraphs 4.19.12. and 4.19.13. (see paragraph 8.2.3.1.2 for PRFs).

1.13. Policy Deviations and Waiver Requests. See Table 1.1. for mailing addresses for the Offices of Primary Responsibilities/Point of Contacts (POC).

1.13.1. Policy Deviations and Waiver Requests.

1.13.1.1. Send requests for deviations or waivers through the wing commander or the comparative level to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE (or appropriate ANG/AFR) who in turn will forward the request to appropriate office of primary responsibility listed in Table 1.1.

1.13.1.2. Requests will be in memorandum format with all the appropriate endorsements and detail the reason for the request with full justification. If the request is applicable to a specific organization or individual, the request must include the name of the unit or the name of the individual, grade and SSN.

1.13.1.3. All deviation requests pertaining to SRID issues require coordination through the respective ML and must be signed by the head of the ML.

1.13.1.4. Signed requests will be mailed to the HQ AFPC/DP2SPE (or appropriate ANG/AFR office stated in Table 1.1.), or may be sent email.

1.14. Missing, Late and Removed Performance Evaluations. When an evaluation is missing, all attempts to locate it should be exhausted. If all attempts to locate the missing report are unsuccessful, consider re-accomplishing the report; however, before doing so, evaluators should consider such things as: How long it has been since the report closed out; are all the evaluators readily available; is there a draft of the original still available; does the ratee or any of the evaluators happen to have a copy of the original report; can the evaluators now give a fair and accurate report based on the timeframe; etc. (See Table 1.2.)

1.14.1. Missing Evaluations on RegAF Officers and SNCOs. The CSS/MPS/AFPC/ARPC initiates action to try and locate the missing report.

1.14.1.1. If the report is located or is able to be re-accomplished (must be the original evaluators at the time of the close-out), place the original evaluation in the permanent record or send the original to AF/DPO for colonels and colonel selects, AF/DPE for CMSgts and CMSgt selects, and forwards a copy to HQ AFPC/DP1ORM for file into ARMS. If required, update the system following this AFI and supplementary program guidance published on myPers and in the latest Personnel Services Delivery (PSD) Guide.

1.14.1.2. If the report is not located, or cannot be re-accomplished, the HR specialist (CSS/MPS/AFPC/ARPC agency) who identified the discrepancy will prepare an AF Form 77 according to Table 5.1., and insert the original into the OSR/NSR, or send the original to AF/DPO for colonel and colonel selects, AF/DPE for CMSgts and CMSgt selects, and

forward a copy to HQ AFPC/DP1ORM for file in ARMS. Make sure to update the system in accordance with PSD Guide.

1.14.2. Missing Evaluations on RegAF Enlisted TSgts and Below. The MPS, initiates action to try and locate the missing report.

1.14.2.1. If the report is located, forward the original evaluation to HQ AFPC/DP1SSP or ARPC for file in official record (ARMS) and if required, update the system in accordance with PSD Guide.

1.14.2.2. If a report is not located or cannot be re-accomplished, the MPS prepares an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 5.1., and forwards AF Form 77 to HQ AFPC/DP1ORM for file in ARMS. Make sure to update the system in accordance with PSD Guide.

1.14.3. Missing Evaluations for AFR. The OSR custodian, the HQ ARPC commander, or offices as prescribed by the commander concerned, initiates action to try and locate the missing report.

1.14.3.1. If the report is located, place the original evaluation in the OSR and forward a copy to ARPC/DPTS for filing in ARMS.

1.14.3.2. If the report is not located or cannot be re-accomplished, the MPS prepares an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 5.1., and forwards AF Form 77 to HQ ARPC/DPTS for filing in ARMS. Make sure to update the system in accordance with PSD Guide.

1.14.4. Missing Evaluations for ANG only. The CSS, FSS, or HR Specialist will initiate action to locate missing reports for AGR or DSG personnel, and NGB/HR for Statutory Tour personnel. If the report is located, forward the original evaluation to HQ ARPC/DPTAR for file in ARMS and if required, update the system in accordance with PSD Guide.

1.14.4.1. If the report is not located or is unable to be re-accomplished, the CSS, FSS, or HR Specialist will prepare AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 5.1. and forwards AF Form 77 to HQ ARPC/DPTAR for file in ARMS. HQ ARPC/DPTAR will update the system in accordance with PSD Guide.

1.14.5. Evaluations Removed From Records Under Chapter 10 or under AFI 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records*. Prepare an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 5.1., and if required, update the system in accordance with the PSD Guide.

1.15. National Emergency or Wartime Provisions. (Used only when directed by the appropriate authority).

1.15.1. During times of war or national emergency, authorities may change certain evaluation policies and procedures to reduce the workload on field commanders and supervisors while ensuring they still document important performance information. The following changes apply to emergencies, and only when HQ AFPC/DP3SP, HQ AFPC/PRC, HQ USAF/A1, USAF/PRC direct, or when one of these agencies specifically delegates this authority to the MAJCOMs. MAJCOMs may implement these procedures totally or in part depending on the nature and scope of the situation. In implementing wartime provisions, the MAJCOM must provide specific instructions (with information to the implementing authority) to its respective MPSs regarding completing evaluations, routing evaluations once completed, and any other appropriate actions.

1.15.2. In implementing wartime provisions, HQ AFPC/DP3SP, in coordination with USAF/REP and NGB/A1P will provide specific instructions regarding completion of evaluations, routing evaluations once completed, and any other appropriate actions. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or HQ ARPC/PB will announce officer promotion recommendation form (PRF) procedures (see [Chapter 8](#)). HQ USAF/A1PPP and HQ AFPC/DP3SP will determine whether to restrict provisions for the performance evaluations to certain theaters or organizations and whether to implement them in part, totally, or incrementally. They may make performance feedback optional. Commands must implement the provisions outlined below or as HQ AFPC/DP3SP directs.

1.15.3. When to Submit Performance Evaluations. (when implemented, supersedes the requirements of Chapter 3 and 4).

1.15.3.1. Evaluations due prior to deployment:

1.15.3.2. Deployment does not change the requirement to prepare annual/biennial evaluations.

Figure 1.1. Example Referral Memorandum.

DATE

MEMORANDUM FOR SRA JOHN SMITH (Ratee's Rank & Name)
123 SFS/SFOL-C (Ratees Functional Address Symbol (FAS))

FROM: 123 SFS/SFOL
1122 Main Street
Any base AFB ST 77777-7777
(FAS and complete address of referring evaluator)

SUBJECT: Referral Enlisted Performance Report
(Indicate Enlisted Performance Report or Education/Training Report)

1. I am referring the attached (indicate Enlisted Performance Report or Education/Training Report) to you according to AFI 36-2406, para 1.10. It contains comments(s)/ratings(s) that make(s) the evaluation a referral as defined by AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.10. Specifically, (state why the evaluation is being referred, i.e., "Specifically, my rating of met some, but not all expectations in section (indicate which section) and my comments, pertaining to your failure to meet and enforce dress and appearance standard in yourself and your subordinates, cause this evaluation to be referred."). In addition, if you are Time-In-Grade / Time-In-Service eligible, my rating (s) or comment (s) may result in a promotion recommendation of "Not Ready Now" or "Do Not Promote".

2. Acknowledge receipt of this correspondence by signing and dating in reproducible ink. Your signature on this memo merely acknowledges that a referral evaluation has been rendered; it does not imply acceptance of or agreement with the ratings or comments on the evaluation. Once this memo is signed, you are entitled to copy. You may submit comments to rebut the evaluation and address any concerns pertaining to the promotion recommendation. Send your comments to (name and address of next evaluator) no later than 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD members) from the date you receive this memorandum. If you need additional time, you may request an extension from the individual named above. You may submit attachments limited to a total of 10 pages (5 pages front and back); but they must directly relate to the reason the evaluation was referred. Pertinent attachments not maintained elsewhere in the official record will remain attached to the evaluation for filing in your official personnel record. Copies of previous evaluations, etc. submitted as attachments, will be removed from your rebuttal package prior to filing the referral evaluation since these documents are already filed in your official records. Your rebuttal comments and any attachments may not contain any reflection on the character, conduct, integrity, or motives of the evaluator unless you fully substantiate and document them. Contact your MPS/CSS/HR Specialist if you require any assistance in preparing your reply to the referral evaluation.

3. It is important for you to be aware that receiving a referral evaluation may affect your eligibility for other personnel related actions, (i.e., assignments, promotion, etc.). Recommend you consult your first sergeant, commander or MPS if you desire more information on this subject. If you believe this evaluation is inaccurate, unjust, or unfairly prejudicial to your

career, you may apply for a review of the evaluation under Chapter 10, Correction of Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Reports, once the evaluation becomes a matter of record as defined in paragraph 1.4.3.

(Signature of referring evaluator)
JAMES JONES, TSgt, USAF
NCOIC, C Flight

Attachment:

AF Form 910, 31 Mar 15 (AF Form 910, 911 or 475, as appropriate, close-out date)

Cc: 123 SFS/SFO (Name of next evaluator)

1st Ind, SrA John Smith (Ratee's Grade/Name)

MEMORANDUM FOR 123 SFS/SFO (Maj Brown) (FAS and Name of next evaluator)

Receipt acknowledged at _____(time) on _____(date).

(Signature of ratee)
JOHN SMITH, SrA, USAF (ratee)

Table 1.1. Mailing Addresses for Correspondence.

R U L E	A	B
	Address	Office of Primary Responsibility
1	HQ AFPC/DP3SP 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio- Randolph TX 78150 (NOTE: All processing of E/OPRs are completed by AFPC/DP1SSP via vPC).	Administrator Evaluation Programs. Manages/Overseas the OES/EES and Evaluation Appeals for all RegAF airman basic through lieutenant colonel following direction provided by USAF/A1P.
2	HQ AFPC/DP2SPE 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio- Randolph TX 78150	Manages the student Management Level Review (MLR) and all PRF actions.
3	HQ AFPC/DP2SPE 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio Randolph TX 78150	Evaluation Appeals. Administers the ERAB.
4	AF/DPG 1040 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1040	Air Force General Matters Office. Manages OES for, and maintains all evaluations on, GOs and brigadier general selects on EAD. NOTE: All wet signature evaluations (ONLY when digital is not available) on AD GOs are sent to this address. See Note 2.
5	USAF/REG 1150 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1150	Air Force Reserve General Officer Matters Office. Manages OES for Reserve GOs (and Brig Gen selects). NOTE: All wet signature evaluations on Reserve GOs are sent to this office, see Note 2.
6	AF/DPO 1040 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1040	Air Force Colonel Matters Office. Manages OES for, and maintains all evaluations on, colonels (except brigadier general selects) and colonel selects on the Active Duty List (ADL). NOTE: All wet signature evaluations on RegAF Colonels are sent to this address, see Note 1.

7	AF/DPE 1040 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1040	Air Force Chief Matters Office. Maintains all evaluations on RegAF CMSgts and CMSgt selects. NOTE: All wet signature evaluations on RegAF CMSgts are sent to this address, see Note 1.
8	HQ ARPC/DPTS 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave Bldg 390 MS 68 Buckley AFB CO 80011	Records and Board Support Division. Manages the OES for ARC officers not on the active duty list and the EES for ARC enlisted personnel following policy provided by HQ USAF/RE and NGB/A1PP. NOTE: All wet signature evaluations on ARC personnel are sent to this office, except general officers.
9	HQ AFPC/DP1ORM 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150	(RegAF ARMS) Maintains the ARMS on all RegAF personnel.
10	HQ ARPC/DPTS 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave Bldg 390 MS 68 Buckley AFB CO 80011	(Reserve/Guard ARMS) Maintains the ARMS on all ARC personnel. See Note 2.
11	AF/RE 1150 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1150	Provides AFR OES/EES policy with collaboration with AF/A1P and AFPC/DP3SP.
12	HQ AFPC/DP2N 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4727	Medical Service Officer Management. Provides advice on reporting policy for officers within the health professions, in conjunction with AF/SG1, Medical Force Development Directorate, Office of the Surgeon General, AF/SG.
13	AFRC/A1 155 Richard Bay Blvd Robins AFB GA 31098-5000	Responsible for effective management and operation of all AFRC Manpower, Personnel and Services programs, plans, policies and procedures. NOTE: AFRC/A1 is approval authority for evaluation close-out date extensions for all AFR members.

14	AFRC/A1K 155 Richard Bay Blvd Robins AFB GA 31098-5000	Promotions, Retention and Customer Service Branch. Provides AF OES/EES policy and guidance following policy provided by AF/A1PPP or AF/RE. A1KK also processes close-out date extensions to A1 for approval/disapproval for Lt thru Lt Col.
15	AFRC/A1L 155 Richard Bay Blvd Robins AFB GA 31098-5000	Senior Leader (colonel) Management Division for AFRC.
16	NGB-GOMO Bldg 2 111 South George Mason Drive Arlington VA 22204	National Guard General Officer Management Office. Responsible for promotions and evaluations for all National Guard officers in the grade of O-7 and above.
17	NGB/A1P 3500 Fetchet Ave. Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762	Force Management Division. A1PO - Responsible for Officer Programs and Policy. (for officers in the grade of O-6 and below) A1PP - Responsible for enlisted evaluations and enlisted promotions with collaboration with AF/A1P and AFPC/DP3SP.
18	AF/JAX 1420 Air Force Pentagon, Suite 5B269 Washington DC 20330-1420	The Judge Advocate General Corps Professional Development Directorate. Provides advice on reporting policy for judge advocates.
Notes: 1. All digitally signed evaluations (O-6 and below) must be pushed through the virtual Personnel Center (vPC). (T-0) . 2. All digitally signed GO evaluations must be pushed through Right Now Technology (RNT).		

Table 1.2. Missing and Late Evaluations (See Notes 1 and 2).

R U L E	A	B	C
	The report was located or successfully re-accomplishment:	and the system contains the overall rating and close-out	Then:
	1 No	Yes	When authorized by AFPC/ARPC the CSS/MPS/HR Specialist or The Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/HR who discovers the discrepancy prepares AF Form 77, see Table 5.1.
	2	No	When authorized by AFPC/ARPC the CSS/MPS/HR Specialist prepares AF Form 77, see Table 5.1.
3	Yes		File the evaluation according to and update the system, if appropriate.

Notes:

1. The gaining CSS/MPS/HR Specialist, The Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/HR tracks missing or late evaluations. The losing CSS/MPS/HR Specialist, HQ ARPC/DPTSE, the Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/HR gives the gaining CSS/MPS/HR Specialist, HQ ARPC/DPTSE, The Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/HR a copy of AF Form 330, *Records Transmittal/Request*, when appropriate. Do not redo evaluations more than 18 months past the close-out date. AF Forms 77 are prepared by the CSS/MPS/HR Specialist.

2. When all attempts to find the missing evaluation fail, the HR Specialist sends an inquiry to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or ARPC/DPTSE (officers/SNCOs), requesting that HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or HQ ARPC/DPTS search the history files for the EPR rating. Include in the request:

- All known information that may assist in identifying the missing evaluation.
- An account of all actions taken to find the missing EPR. For personnel with prior service, do not send a request to HQ AFPC/DP2SP or ARPC/DPTSE for missing evaluations earlier than 120 calendar days after the date the ratee reentered to duty. The CSS/MPS/HR Specialist provides this information when requesting a search for missing APRs or EPRs on personnel with prior service: Name, Grade, SSN, Grade at separation, Date of separation, Whether an AF Form 1613, *Statement of Service*, might exist.

NOTE: If HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or HQ ARPC/DPTS finds the rating in the history files, complete an AF Form 77 according to Table 5.1. When more than one evaluation is involved, the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist may prepare one AF Form 77 according to Table 5.1, if no gaps exist in the period of the missing evaluations. However, if the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist later receives one or more of the missing evaluations, the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist prepares one or more AF Forms 77, as required, so that periods of time in the performance record remain consecutive. If the rating is not available, comply with Table 5.1.

Chapter 2

AIRMAN COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT

2.1. Purpose. Airman Comprehensive Assessment (ACA) is formal communication between a rater and ratee to communicate responsibility, accountability, Air Force culture, an Airman's critical role in support of the mission, individual readiness, and performance feedback on expectations regarding duty performance and how well the ratee is meeting those expectations to include information to assist the ratee in achieving success. It is intended to increase Airmen interaction and support at all levels. If done correctly, mentorship will create and sustain a culture of belonging. The ACA is also intended to provide Airmen an opportunity to discuss their personal and professional goals. Raters document the session on the ACA worksheet and use the Performance Feedback section to assess or discuss the objectives, standards, behavior, and performance with the ratee. Providing this information helps an individual contribute to positive communication, improve performance, and grow professionally. The following information applies to all military personnel.

2.2. Responsibilities.

2.2.1. The ratee will:

2.2.1.1. Know when ACA sessions are due.

2.2.1.2. Request a "Ratee Requested" feedback session from the rater, if desired. If a ratee requests a feedback session, the rater will provide one within 30 days of receipt of the request, provided 60 days have passed, since the last feedback session.

2.2.1.3. Notify the rater and, if necessary, the rater's rater, when required or requested ACA did not take place.

2.2.1.4. Complete Section III on their own and review Section VII (AF Form 724), Section IX (AF Form 931), or VIII (AF Form 932) in preparation for the ACA session.

2.2.1.5. Sign the ACA indicating the date the supervisor conducted the ACA session.

2.2.2. The rater will:

2.2.2.1. Conduct ACA sessions as required by this instruction.

2.2.2.2. Prepare for, schedule, and conduct ACA sessions according to Table 2.1., Table 2.2., Table 2.3., and Table 2.4.

2.2.2.3. Understand Air Force standards and expectations and consider them when providing ACA to personnel.

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

2.2.2.5. Provide the original completed and signed ACA worksheet to the ratee.

2.2.2.6. Retain a copy of the signed and dated ACA worksheet. The midterm ACA is a required, mandatory supporting document to be routed with the performance evaluation (OPR/EPR), however, will not be made a matter of the official record (see para 2.9.3 for individuals authorized to view the ACA). In addition, the rater will retain a copy of the

initial and midterm ACA as this may be needed for any future appeals (See paragraph 2.9.). **EXCEPTION:** Extremely rare circumstances may exist where a midterm ACA is not available to be routed with the evaluation (i.e. the rater has been removed from supervisory/rater duties).

2.2.2.7. The ACA is a communication tool and is not to be used to discover or document behavior which may result in administrative or judicial action. **NOTE:** It is important that behavior representing a significant deviation from expected standards is recorded in other administrative forms (i.e. LOR, LOC, LOA, Memorandum for Record [MFR]).

2.2.2.8. Provide the ratee the most current AF Benefits Fact Sheet (available on AF Portal).

2.2.3. The rater's rater will:

2.2.3.1. Monitor personnel to ensure raters properly conduct ACA sessions.

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

2.2.4. The unit commander will:

2.2.4.1. Administer the ACA program.

2.2.4.2. Monitor raters and ratees to ensure ACA sessions are conducted properly and as required in Table 2.1. The unit commander can consider disciplining and removing from supervisory positions those raters who fail to conduct documented ACA sessions.

2.2.5. The Military Personnel Section (MPS) will:

2.2.5.1. Provide guidance on ACAs to their servicing population.

2.2.5.2. Not be required to maintain a repository for ACAs for personnel assigned.

2.2.6. The unit will:

2.2.6.1. At the unit commander's request, develop a local tracking mechanism to ensure ACAs are conducted. It is the responsibility of individual raters to maintain copies of all completed ACAs on their assigned ratees (RegAF only).

2.3. Who Requires an ACA. ACAs are mandatory for all RegAF and ARC Airmen, airman basic through colonel. If an individual requests an ACA session, the rater will provide one within 30 days of receipt of the request, provided 60 days have passed since the last ACA session. Do not prepare an ACA when a ratee is a captive, patient, prisoner, absent without leave (AWOL), etc. For student officers receiving an AF Form 475, *Education/Training Report*, and for student enlisted personnel, in approved initial skills training or advanced skills training courses an ACA is not required, but may be given at the discretion of the commander of the school. For those performance evaluations completed on non-rated initial skills training or advanced skills training course students, academic progress reports, such as the AETC Form 156, *Student Training Report*, captured in the Technical Training Management System (TTMS) or an equivalent document utilized by non-AETC institutions of instruction, will serve in-lieu of the mandatory mid-term ACA.

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

2.5. When to Hold Documented ACA Sessions. See Table 2.1.

2.6. The ACA Notice.

2.6.1. The rater should receive a computer-generated notice 30 days after supervision begins (identifying initial or follow-up ACA sessions as required) and again halfway between the time supervision began and the projected performance report close-out date (identifying mid-term ACA session requirement). This notice serves to remind raters that an ACA session is due; however, failure to receive a notice does not justify failing to hold a required session.

2.6.2. For officers assigned to ANG, the MPS will send the ACA notice to the rater concurrently with the OPR notice or upon initial assignment of the ratee. If the reason for the OPR is a Change of Reporting Official (CRO), the new rater will receive the ACA notice within 5 working days after the effective date of the change in rater. Hold the ACA session no later than 60 days after the OPR close-out date, initial assignment date, or effective date of change in rater.

2.6.3. Since the ratee shares the responsibility to ensure ACA sessions are conducted, an ACA notice is also sent to the ratee, through his or her unit, 30 days after sending the notice to the rater (for officers) or concurrently with the notice sent to the rater (for enlisted).

2.6.4. For Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMA), the ACA notice is sent to the supervisor's RegAF MPS for forwarding to the supervisor.

2.6.5. ANG does not currently have standardized automated process to create ACA notices for raters and ratees. ANG MPSs may not be able to provide raters and ratees a computer generated ACA notice. If computer generated notices are not available, MPSs should use alternate forms of communication to notify ratees and raters of ACA notices. Mass communication from MPS to wing personnel is acceptable. Signed notices are not required for ANG personnel.

2.7. Which ACA Form to Use.

2.7.1. For lieutenant through colonel, use AF Form 724.

2.7.2. For MSgt (and MSgt selects) thru CMSgt, use AF Form 932.

2.7.3. For TSgt and below, use AF Form 931.

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

2.8.1. The ACA worksheet may be handwritten or typed by the rater providing the assessment.

2.8.2. For instructions on filling out the ACA see Table 2.2. for the AF Form 931, Table 2.3. for the AF Form 932, and Table 2.4. for the AF Form 724.

2.9. Disposition and Access.

2.9.1. The ACA worksheet **will not** be made an official part of **any** personnel record (including PIFs) nor used in any personnel action with the exception of paragraph 2.9.3. **NOTE:** At a minimum the rater will maintain a copy of the ACA worksheet until the evaluation becomes a matter of record.

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

2.9.3. The ACA worksheet may not be reviewed by anyone other than the rater, ratee and authorized personnel as outlined in the following paragraphs, specifically for the purposes of completing performance evaluations. It may not be introduced in any other personnel action unless the ratee first introduces it, or alleges, either he or she did not receive required ACA or that the sessions were inadequate.

2.9.3.1. For enlisted, the additional rater, rater's rater (when the additional rater is not also the rater's rater), first sergeant, squadron superintendent or equivalent, squadron commander (administrative unit commander on G-Series orders), Forced Distributor, Military/Civilian Director, group superintendent or equivalent, group commander or equivalent, command chief, wing commander or equivalent/final evaluator, and functional examiner/Air Force advisor (when applicable) are authorized access to the ACA worksheet specifically for the purpose of completing performance evaluations.

2.9.3.2. For officers, the additional rater, squadron commander, group commander, wing commander, reviewer, and functional examiner/Air Force advisor (when applicable), are authorized access to the ACA worksheet specifically for the purpose of completing performance evaluations.

2.9.4. Temporary Duty (TDY) supervisors may conduct assessments and complete ACA worksheets; however, the ACA worksheet will not be sent to the home station rater. A memo will be sent to the home station rater if there are any issues the temporary supervisor may wish to address. **EXCEPTION:** If the TDY rater has been officially designated as the ratee's reporting official, an ACA is required.

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

2.11. Tracking ACA Sessions. Unit commanders may establish procedures beyond those provided in this chapter to check ACA completion compliance provided those procedures do not violate the privacy of ACA worksheet communications as specified in paragraph 2.9.3.

Table 2.1. Airman Comprehensive Assessment Requirements.

R U L E	A	B
	If the ratee is	then the ratee requires the following feedback
1	a CMSgt or a colonel	Initial (See Note 1 & Note 4)
2	a MSgt or SMSgt, major or lieutenant colonel	Initial (See Note 1 & Note 4) Midterm (See Note 2 & Note 4)
3	an AB, Amn or A1C (who has already received an EPR), a SrA through TSgt, a lieutenant through captain (see Notes 6 and 7)	Initial (See Note 1 & Note 4) Midterm (See Note 2 & Note 4) End-of-reporting period (See Note 3)
4	an AB, Amn or A1C (with less than 20 months TAFMS or less than 20 months DIEUS for ARC)	Initial (See Note 1) Midterm (See Note 5)
5	an AB through colonel	Requested by Ratee (See Note 8)
6	an AB through colonel	When determined necessary by the rater
Notes: 1. The rater must conduct the initial feedback session within the first 60 days he or she initially begins supervision. This will be the ratee's only initial feedback until they have a change of reporting official. For CMSgts and colonels, this is the only feedback required. 2. The rater must conduct the midterm feedback session midway between the date supervision begins and the projected close-out date of the next OPR/EPR. 3. The rater conducts an End-of Reporting Period feedback session when an evaluation has been accomplished. This session must be conducted within 60 days of the close-out of the evaluation and serves two distinct purposes. The first purpose is to review and discuss with the ratee the previous reporting period and resulting OPR/EPR. The second purpose is to establish expectations for the new reporting period. This feedback may be accomplished using evaluation that just closed or a new AF Form 931/724. NOTE: (Officers only) If the evaluation is due to a CRO, the new rater will be required to do an initial feedback in addition to the feedback performed by the previous rater during the presentation of the evaluation. 4. ARC personnel are not required an ACA if member is pending action IAW AFI 36-3209, <i>Separation and Retirement Procedures for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Members</i> . 5. After the initial feedback session is conducted, conduct a (midterm) feedback session every 180 days until the rater writes an EPR or a CRO occurs. 6. If the ratee is due an annual evaluation and the period of supervision is less than 150 days, the rater conducts the feedback session approximately 60 days before the projected evaluation close-out date. 7. (Officers only) If the ratee is getting a CRO evaluation and time permits, the rater will hold a feedback session within 60 days of the close-out date, but not later than 30 days prior. 8. When a ratee requests a feedback session, the rater must conduct a session within 30 days of the ratee's request if at least 60 days have passed (at the rater's discretion) since the last feedback session.		

Table 2.2. Preparing AF Form 931 (AB thru TSgt), Airman Comprehensive Assessment.

SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA (to be completed by rater)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and any suffix (i.e. JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of "NMI" is optional. Name will be in all upper case.
2	Rank	Self-explanatory
3	Unit	Enter information as of ACA completion date. The goal is an accurate description of what unit the ratee belongs. For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. Information will be in all upper/lower case.
SECTION II. TYPE OF ASSESSMENT (to be completed by rater)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
4	Type of Assessment	Indicate whether the assessment is initial, midterm, follow-up, ratee requested, or rater directed. Sections VI, VII and VIII will not be completed during initial feedback sessions. Once Section II is completed the rater forwards the ACA to the ratee who will assess themselves. The information captured during the self-assessment will assist the rater when accomplishing the remaining areas of the overall assessment.
SECTION III. SELF-ASSESSMENT (to be completed by ratee)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
5	Responsibility, Accountability, Air Force Culture, and Self	Ratee will place a "Y" in the block indicating they understand the importance of the self-assessment area, or a "N" to indicate they need more information from the rater in order to make a self-assessment in that area. After the ratee completes the self-assessment they will return the ACA to the rater.

	SECTION IV. AIRMAN'S CRITICAL ROLE IN SUPPORT OF THE MISSION (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
	6 Airman's Critical Role in Support of the Mission	Completed by the rater to identify the ratee's critical role in achieving mission success.
	SECTION V. INDIVIDUAL READINESS INDEX (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
	7 Individual Readiness Index	Rater consults Unit Deployment Manager to identify ratee's current deployment status and AEF Indicator. Rater will place an "R" in the first box indicating the ratee's readiness status as currently not deployable or "G" if the ratee's current readiness status is deployable.
	8 AEF Indicator	Rater will identify the AEF Indicator in the second box.
	SECTION VI. PERFORMANCE: LEADERSHIP/PRIMARY DUTIES/FOLLOWERSHIP/TRAINING (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
	9 Task Knowledge/Proficiency	Consider the quality, quantity, results, and impact of the Airman's knowledge and ability to accomplish tasks. See Note.
	10 Initiative/Motivation	Describes the degree of willingness to execute duties, motivate team members, and develop innovative new processes. See Note.
	11 Skill Level Upgrade Training	Consider skill level awarding course, CDC timeliness and/or completion, course exam results, and completion of core task training. Mark "N/A" for Airmen that possess required skill level/training. See Note.
	12 Duty Position Requirements, qualifications, and certifications	Consider duty position qualifications, career field certifications (if applicable), and readiness requirements. Mark "N/A" for Airmen that possess training commensurate with grade prior to reporting period. See Note.

13	Training of others	Consider the Airman's effort and impact made by training others. Mark "N/A" for Airmen with no valid opportunity to train. See Note.
14	Comments	Provide specific comments tailored to those areas assessed in Section VI.
SECTION VII. FOLLOWERSHIP/LEADERSHIP (to be completed by rater)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
15	Resource utilization (e.g. time management, equipment, manpower and budget)	Consider how effectively the Airman utilizes resources to accomplish the mission. See Note.
16	Comply with/enforce standards	Consider personal adherence and enforcement of fitness standards, dress and personal appearance, customs and courtesies, and professional conduct. See Note.
17	Communication skills	Describes how well the Airman receives and relays information, thoughts, and ideas up and down the chain of command (includes listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills); fosters an environment for open dialogue. See Note.
18	Caring, respectful and dignified environment (teamwork)	Rate how well the Airman selflessly considers others, values diversity, and sets the stage for an environment of dignity and respect, to include promoting a healthy organizational climate. See Note.
19	Comments	Provide specific comments tailored to those areas assessed in Section VII.
SECTION VIII. WHOLE AIRMAN CONCEPT (to be completed by rater)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
20	Air Force Core Values	Consider how well the Airman adopts, internalizes and demonstrates our Air Force Core Values of Integrity First, Service Before Self, and Excellence in All We Do. See Note.
21	Personal and Professional development	Consider the amount of effort the Airman devoted to improve themselves and their work center/unit through education and involvement. See Note.

22	Esprit de corps and community relations	Consider how well Airman promotes camaraderie, embraces esprit de corps, and acts as an Air Force ambassador. See Note.
23	Comments	Provide specific comments tailored to those areas assessed in Section VIII.
SECTION IX. KNOWING YOUR AIRMAN (to be completed during formal feedback between rater and ratee)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
24	Questions 1-7	Completed during ACA session discussion. Provides questions designed to facilitate open communication between the ratee/rater and may trigger areas and/or specific items which need to be probed in more depth. These questions are not intended to be all encompassing. The purpose is to help start the conversation on the particular item, not make it an interrogation. Items 6 and 7 are designed to receive feedback from the ratee and to set specific expectations for the ratee's growth.
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
25	Ratee/Rater Signature and Date	In the instance where digital signatures are not used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite or date stamp the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the ACA completion date (only on the date of completion). The forms have digital capability; the use of digital signatures is optional.
Note: Use the appropriate word picture/rating assigned to each area on the performance assessment when filling out the ACA.		

Table 2.3. Preparing AF Form 932 (MSgt - CMSgt) Airman Comprehensive Assessment.

	SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and any suffix (i.e. JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of "NMI" is optional. Name will be in all upper case.
2	Rank	Self-explanatory
3	Unit	Enter information as of ACA completion date. The goal is an accurate description of what unit the ratee belongs. For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. Information will be in all upper/lower case.
	SECTION II. TYPE OF ASSESSMENT (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
4	Type of Assessment	Indicate whether the assessment is initial, mid-term, ratee requested, or rater directed (Sections VI and VII will not be completed during initial feedback sessions). Once Section II is completed the rater forwards the ACA to the ratee who will assess themselves. The information captured during the self-assessment will assist the rater when accomplishing the remaining areas of the overall assessment.
	SECTION III. SELF ASSESSMENT (to be completed by ratee)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
5	Responsibility, Accountability, Air Force Culture, and Self	Ratee will place a "Y" in the block indicating they understand the importance of the self-assessment area, or a "N" to indicate they need more information from the rater in order to make a self-assessment in that area. After the ratee completes the self- assessment they will return the ACA to the rater.

	SECTION IV. AIRMAN'S CRITICAL ROLE IN SUPPORT OF THE MISSION (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
6	Airman's Critical Role in Support of the Mission	Completed by the rater to identify the ratee's critical role in achieving mission success.
	SECTION V. INDIVIDUAL READINESS INDEX (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
7	Individual Readiness Index	Rater consults Unit Deployment Manager to identify ratee's current deployment status and AEF Indicator. Rater will place an "R" in the first box indicating the ratee's readiness status as currently non-deployable or "G" if the ratee's current readiness status is deployable.
8	AEF Indicator	Rater will identify the AEF Indicator in the second box.
	SECTION VI. PERFORMANCE: LEADERSHIP/PRIMARY DUTIES/ FOLLOWERSHIP/TRAINING (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
9	Mission Accomplishment	Consider the Airman's ability to lead and produce timely, high quality/quantity, mission-oriented results. See Note.
10	Resource Utilization (e.g. time management, equipment, manpower and budget)	Consider how effectively the Airman leads their team to utilize their resources to accomplish the mission. See Note.
11	Team Building	Consider the amount of innovation, initiative and motivation displayed by the Airman and their subordinates (collaboration). See Note.
12	Mentorship	Consider how well Airman knows their subordinates, accepts personal responsibility for them, and is accountable for their professional development. See Note.

13	Communication Skills	Describes how well the Airman communicates (includes listening, reading, speaking and writing skills) in various mediums, translates superiors' direction into specific tasks and responsibilities, fosters an environment for open dialogue and enhances communication skills of subordinates. See Note.
14	Complies with/enforces standards	Consider personal adherence and how the Airman fosters an environment where everyone enforces fitness standards, dress and personal appearance, customs and courtesies, and professional conduct. See Note.
15	Duty Environments	Rate how well the Airman establishes and maintains caring, respectful, and dignified environments while valuing diversity, to include promoting a healthy organizational climate. See Note.
16	Training	Describes how well the Airman and their team complies with upgrade, duty position, and certification requirements. See Note.
17	Comments	Provide specific comments tailored to those areas assessed in Section VI.
SECTION VII. WHOLE AIRMAN CONCEPT (to be completed by rater)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
	18	Air Force Core Values Consider how well the Airman adopts, internalizes, demonstrates and insists on adherence of our Air Force Core Values of Integrity First, Service Before Self and Excellence in All We Do. See Note.
19	Personal and Professional Development	Consider effort the Airman devoted to improve their subordinates, their work center/unit and themselves. See Note.
20	Esprit de corps and community relations	Consider how well Airman promotes camaraderie, enhances esprit de corps, and develops Air Force ambassadors. See Note.
21	Comments	Provide specific comments tailored to those areas assessed in Section VII.
SECTION VIII. KNOWING YOUR AIRMAN (to be completed during formal feedback)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions

22	Questions 1-7	Completed during ACA session discussion. Provides questions designed to facilitate open communication between the ratee/rater and may trigger areas and/or specific items which need to be probed in more depth. These questions are not intended to be all encompassing. The purpose is to help start the conversation on the particular item, not make it an interrogation. Items 6 and 7 are designed to receive feedback from the ratee and to set specific expectations for the ratee's growth.
23	Ratee/Rater Signature and Date	In the instance where digital signatures are not used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite or date stamp the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the ACA completion date (only on the date of completion). The forms have digital capability; the use of digital signatures is optional.
Note: Use the appropriate word picture/rating assigned to each area on the performance assessment when filling out the ACA.		

Table 2.4. Preparing AF Form 724 (Lt thru Col) Airman Comprehensive Assessment.

	SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and any suffix (i.e. JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of "NMI" is optional. Name will be in all upper case.
2	Rank	Self-explanatory
3	Unit	Enter information as of ACA completion date. The goal is an accurate description of what unit the ratee belongs. For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment.
	SECTION II. TYPE OF ASSESSMENT (to be completed by rater)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
4	Type of Assessment	<p>Indicate whether the assessment is initial, mid-term, follow-up, ratee requested, or rater directed (Section VI and will not be completed during initial feedback sessions).</p> <p>Once Section II is complete the rater forwards the ACA to the ratee who will assess themselves. The information captured during the self-assessment will assist the rater when accomplishing the remaining areas of the overall assessment.</p>
	SECTION III. SELF ASSESSMENT (to be completed by ratee)	
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
5	Responsibility, Accountability, Air Force Culture, and Self	<p>Ratee will place a "Y" in the block indicating they understand the importance of the self-assessment area, or a "N" to indicate they need more information from the rater in order to make a self-assessment in that area.</p> <p>After the ratee completes the self- assessment they will return the ACA to the rater.</p>
	SECTION IV. AIRMAN'S CRITICAL ROLE IN SUPPORT OF THE MISSION (to be completed by rater)	

I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
6	Airman's Critical Role in Support of the Mission	Completed by the rater to identify the ratee's critical role in achieving mission success.
SECTION V. INDIVIDUAL READINESS INDEX (to be completed by rater)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
7	Individual Readiness Index	Rater consults Unit Deployment Manager to identify ratee's current deployment status and AEF Indicator. Rater will place an "R" in the first box indicating the ratee's readiness status as currently non-deployable or "G" if the ratee's current readiness status is deployable.
8	AEF Indicator	Rater will identify the AEF Indicator in the second box.
SECTION VI. PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK (to be completed by rater): Self-explanatory		
SECTION VII. KNOWING YOUR AIRMAN (to be completed during formal feedback between rater and ratee)		
I T E M	A	B
	Heading	Instructions
9	Questions 1 – 7	Completed during ACA session discussion. Provides questions designed to facilitate open communication between the ratee/rater and may trigger areas and/or specific items which need to be probed in more depth. These questions are not intended to be all encompassing. The purpose is to help start the conversation on the particular item, not make it an interrogation. Items 6 and 7 are designed to receive feedback from the ratee and to set specific expectations for the ratee's growth.
10	Ratee/Rater Signature and Date	In the instance where digital signatures are not used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite or date stamp the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the ACA completion date (only on the date of completion). The forms have digital capability; the use of digital signatures is optional.
Note: Use the appropriate word picture/rating assigned to each area on the performance assessment when filling out the ACA.		

Chapter 3

OFFICER PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

3.1. General Guidelines.

3.1.1. See Chapter 1 for general processing guidance applicable to all evaluations.

3.1.1.1. Do **NOT** deduct any periods of leave, TDY, absences or periods loaned out to other organizations. **EXCEPTION:** deduct non-rated periods IAW paragraph 3.12.

3.1.2. Evaluation ratings are used to document performance and potential as well as provide information for making promotion recommendation, selection, or propriety action; selective continuation; involuntary separation; selective early retirement; assignment; school nomination and selection; and other management decisions. Therefore, evaluators at all levels must use caution to prevent inflation; it is important to distinguish performance among peers and is a disservice to **ALL** officers when OPR ratings are inflated.

3.1.3. Marking Ratings. “*Wet Signature Evaluations Only.*” When electronic ratings (Xs) are not used, do not enter hand-marked ratings until signing the evaluation to prevent erroneous entry of ratings by other personnel. When hand marking, use only reproducible dark blue or black ink.

3.2. Purpose of the AF Form 707. Used to document potential and performance as well as provide information for making a promotion recommendation, selection, or propriety action; selective continuation; involuntary separation; selective early retirement; assignment; school nomination and selection; and other management decisions.

3.3. Who Requires an OPR.

3.3.1. All officers in the grade of colonel and below (except brigadier general selects), not being evaluated using AF Form 475 (see paragraph 6.1.), or as specified in paragraph 3.4. See Table 3.2. and Table 3.3.

3.3.2. Any individual being released from RegAF to the ARC (participating or non-participating) regardless of the days of supervision prior to separating.

3.3.3. Officers filling an authorized 365 day extended deployment billet who have at least 120 days of supervision, prior to departing TDY. See paragraph 3.9.

3.3.4. Officer placed in prisoner status, appellate leave, or who are AWOL.

3.3.5. Officers whose separation/retirement is withdrawn. An evaluation is due if the officer's separation/retirement is withdrawn or cancelled. If the original projected close-out date has not passed, then it will remain the same. If the original projected close-out date has passed, the close-out date will be the date of the official withdrawal, cancellation, or as soon as the rater has 120 days of supervision whichever occurs first. The reason for the evaluation is “annual/biennial”.

3.4. Who Does Not Require an OPR.

3.4.1. Deployed commanders being evaluated using the AF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation (LOE)*, see paragraph 5.2.1.2.1.

3.4.2. RegAF and ARC. Brigadier general selects, see Chapter 7.

3.4.3. State adjutants general (ANG only), see Chapter 7.

3.4.4. AFR officers in a non-pay status (PAS S7XXXXX).

3.4.5. Officers who are in full-time student (functional category: L) or patient status. **EXCEPTION:** Officers in the AF Gold Bar program. The period of supervision must be at least 60 days.

3.4.6. Officers in the Wounded Warrior Program, or officers in the Career Intermission Program (CIP).

3.4.7. Individuals who died on active duty. However, if the death occurred on or after the close-out date of an evaluation that was already being processed, it becomes an optional evaluation.

3.4.8. When the criteria under paragraphs 3.4.8. (retirement) or 3.4.9. (separation) are met, an annual evaluation becomes optional. The rater may opt to write an evaluation and the ratee may request an evaluation be written. If the rater chooses to submit an optional evaluation, the evaluation is written (regardless of whether the ratee wants the evaluation to be written or not). Should the rater choose to submit an evaluation requested by the ratee, the SR decides whether an evaluation will be written. If the rater does not wish to submit an evaluation, the SR may direct an evaluation be written.

3.4.9. Officers with an approved retirement date, provided all the following criteria below are met:

3.4.9.1. The approved retirement date is within 1 year of the projected annual/biennial close-out date of the evaluation. **EXAMPLE:** If the approved retirement date is 1 Jun 16 and if the close-out date is 1 Jun 15 or later, no evaluation is required. However, if the close-out date is 31 May 15 or earlier, then an evaluation is required.

3.4.9.2. The retirement application was approved prior to the projected annual/biennial close-out date. **EXAMPLE:** If the close-out date is 1 Jun 15, and the retirement application was approved on 1 Jun 15 or earlier, no evaluation is required. However, if the retirement application was not approved until 2 Jun 15 or later, then an evaluation is required.

3.4.9.3. The officer will not be considered for promotion, selective continuation, or selective early retirement by a HQ USAF central selection board or a ResAF selection board before retirement.

3.4.10. Officers with an approved separation date, provided the following criteria below are met:

3.4.10.1. The officer voluntarily resigns his or her commission, has fulfilled his or her military service obligation, and is not requesting or accepting a ResAF commission (RegAF officers) or retaining a ResAF commission (Reserve officers) or transferring to another service. Reminder—evaluations are mandatory for anyone being released from RegAF to the ANG or Reserves under the Palace Chase or Palace Front Programs.

3.4.10.2. The officer is RegAF and voluntarily resigns his or her commission, or is a Reserve officer, and is granted release from RegAF in lieu of action under AFI 36-

3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers*, or courts-martial. (NOTE: The evaluation is mandatory following courts-martial conviction.)

3.4.10.3. The officer is involuntarily discharged or released from RegAF under AFI36-3206 and AFI36-3207, *Separating Commissioned Officers*; unless transferring to the ANG/AFR, i.e., Force Management.

3.5. When to Submit an OPR.

3.5.1. AF Form 707 for RegAF and Air National Guard (ANG) officers, see Table 3.2.

3.5.2. AF Form 707 for USAF Reserve (AFR) officers, see Table 3.3.

3.5.3. AF Form 78, see Chapter 7.

3.6. Annual Reports. RegAF and ARC officers' reports will close-out one year from the close-out date of the last evaluation. The first evaluation will close-out one year, minus one day (365 days) from the Entered Active Duty (EAD) date. For example, the officer's EAD date is 15 Jun 08 then the close-out date would be 14 Jun 09.

3.7. Change of Reporting Official (CRO) Reports (including events of emergency or no-notice departures).

3.7.1. Use the day before the effective date of the change for the close-out date.

3.7.2. If either the rater or ratee is pending separation, retirement, or PCS, then the close-out date will be 30 calendar days before the projected departure date, unless:

3.7.2.1. The 30-day rule will cause a ratee to be ineligible for an evaluation due to a lack of supervision. Then the close-out date must be adjusted to the date on which the rater achieves the required number of day's supervision, but no later than one day before the departure date. If the rater does not have the required supervision by the day before the departure date, a report is not required.

3.7.2.2. Approved by the commander, to record significant events. Then adjust the close-out date accordingly. Significant events are things such as AF-level awards or derogatory information resulting in a referral evaluation, not simply additional daily achievements. However, the adjusted close-out date must be before the projected departure date and this *only* applies to CRO reports.

3.7.2.3. If the ratee is ResAF officer, adjust the close-out date within the 30-day window to the date the ratee completes the minimum 16-point, and 120 days of supervision requirement.

3.7.3. CRO evaluations resulting from a ratee's or rater's deployment to a contingency or war zone are waived provided the ratee has received an evaluation within 180 calendar days of the deployment date and provided the ratee's performance is not of a referral nature.

3.8. Directed by HQ USAF, NGB, or Commander (MAJCOM, wing, group, or squadron, as appropriate).

3.8.1. Message Directed. Use the date specified in the message directing the evaluation.

3.8.2. Missing-in-Action (MIA)/Captured/Detained. Use the date the ratee was placed in MIA, captured, or detained in captive status.

3.8.3. Control Roster Placement. Use one day before being placed on the control roster if the evaluation is directed as a result of placement on the control roster.

3.8.4. Control Roster Removal. Use one day before expiration and/or removal from control roster if directed as a result of being removed or upon completion of the control roster observation period.

3.8.5. Otherwise Directed. Use the date as otherwise directed by the commander, see Table 3.2. and Table 3.3.

3.9. 365-day Extended Deployment Officer Performance Reports (OPRs). NOTE: These instructions apply only to those individuals who are actually selected to fill an official Extended Deployment requirement. Do not use these instructions for individuals filling other requirements, even though they may be extended to, or beyond 365-days.

3.9.1. Home Station Rating Chain Responsibilities:

3.9.1.1. Prior To Departure:

3.9.1.1.1. If there has been at least 120 days supervision, the home station CSS/HR Specialist will generate a CRO evaluation.

3.9.1.1.2. If there has been less than 120 days supervision, an informal LOE is required and home station CSS/HR Specialist will send the LOE to the deployed PERSCO when the member's annual evaluation becomes due. The deployed rater may or may not use the information when preparing the annual evaluation.

3.9.1.1.3. If there has been less than 120 days supervision, but it has been more than 1 year since the member's last evaluation, only 60 days supervision is required and an annual evaluation will be accomplished.

3.9.1.1.4. If the deployed rater is known prior to departure, the CSS/HR Specialist will update the deployed rater. In most cases, however, the deployed rater will not be known until the member arrives to the deployed location. In that case, use the home station commander as a temporary rater. This will facilitate home station and deployed commander's direct line of communication to ensure the rating chain is established and updated in a timely matter. **EXAMPLE:** If the data is not updated immediately, a feedback notification rip will produce within 30 days and that alone should act as a reminder to the commander that the deployed data needs to be updated.

3.9.1.2. Upon Arrival in the AOR: The home station CSS/HR Specialist will coordinate with the deployed PERSCO team and update MilPDS to reflect member's deployed duty title and DAFSC effective the date the member arrives in the AOR. They will also update the deployed rater if rater was unknown prior to departure. All updates should be completed as soon as possible but no later than 30 days after member arrives in the AOR.

3.9.1.2.1. Duty Title format: All Extended Deployment personnel duty titles will be standardized to reflect the Extended Deployment "duty title/country" assigned. If space allows include the unit assigned. **EXAMPLE:** "Commander, 442 ECS/Iraq" or "Comm Mentor, GSU/Afghanistan."

3.9.1.2.2. When determining deployed rating chain, the rater should typically be the person who directly supervises the individual's day to day activities. The unit that

owns the Unit Line Number (ULN) will determine the rating chain (and will typically have TACON). Raters may be in any United States or foreign military service or a civilian in a supervisory position and must be in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee. In joint environments, an Air Force unit will be designated to have ADCON responsibilities. ADCON responsibilities, per AFDD-2, include personnel management. With regard to evaluations, this involves managing the evaluation program, ensuring evaluations are accomplished on individuals on extended deployments, formal LOEs are accomplished on deployed commanders, and decorations and informal LOEs are processed per local and AFCENT direction. ADCON responsibility does not necessarily extend to writing the evaluations on those attached to the Air Force unit for ADCON purposes.

3.9.1.3. Upon Return from the AOR:

3.9.1.3.1. The home station CSS/HR Specialist will change the member's rater, DAFSC, and duty title in MilPDS to reflect home station (post-deployment) information.

3.9.1.3.2. The home station senior rater/commander will continue to complete the commander's review/reviewer's (senior rater) portion of all evaluations, including those completed by the deployed rating chain.

3.9.1.4. Senior Rater Responsibilities: The senior rater matched to the ratee's home station PAS code must perform senior rater duties. Home station senior raters will prepare a PRF for promotion-eligible officers (officers will be on the home station senior rater's Master Eligibility List (MEL) and will meet respective Management Level Review[MLR]).

3.9.1.5. Interrogators TR: Officers who attend the Interrogator training program will receive a TR upon graduation from the course. The 314 TRS/CC will sign all TRs. These TRs (officer and enlisted) will be updated in MilPDS. The start date will be based off of the previous evaluation close-out date and the end date will be based upon the graduation date. See Table 6.3., for update procedures.

3.9.1.6. Annual evaluations that become due while in the AOR.

3.9.1.6.1. Extended (365-day) Deployments: If an annual evaluation becomes due while deployed and the deployed rater has had at least 120 days supervision, the evaluation will be prepared by the deployed rater. If the deployed rater has not had 120 days supervision, the close-out will be extended out to where there will be 120 days supervision. If an annual evaluation was accomplished earlier in the deployment, and there has been at least 60 days but less than 120 days supervision by the time the member departs, an informal LOE will be prepared.

3.9.1.6.2. All others. The evaluation will be prepared by the home station rater. If there was not at least 120 days supervision before the departure, the close-out date will be extended until the member returns and the number of days supervision is 120 days. Home station and deployed raters are encourage to work together in preparing the evaluation. The deployed rater may have some significant inputs for the rating period.

3.9.1.7. Home station and deployed commander will ensure a direct line of communication to the deployed rating chain is established to preclude evaluations not being completed at

the deployed location. This is very important, as a majority of individuals on extended deployments may have individuals from other services in their rating chain. The commander's direct involvement in this area is critical and will preclude any problems.

3.9.2. PERSCO Team Responsibilities: The owning PERSCO team will be responsible for tracking the evaluations on all deployed personnel filling extended deployment billets.

3.9.3. Deployed Rating Chain Responsibilities.

3.9.3.1. Updates: Ensure the home station has updated MilPDS to reflect member's DAFSC, duty title and deployed rater.

3.9.3.2. Feedback: Perform initial and mid-term feedback IAW Chapter 2.

3.9.3.3. Evaluations: The deployed rater (and additional rater[s]) will render an evaluation on an officer (OPR, AF Form 707), under the following circumstances:

3.9.3.3.1. The individual is assigned to a legitimate 365-day extended deployment requirement.

3.9.3.3.2. There has been at least 120 days of supervision.

3.9.3.3.3. Upon completion of the extended deployment.

3.9.3.3.4. If the individual is an officer filling a commander's billet. An OPR versus the formal Deployed CC LOE will be required.

3.9.3.3.5. If the deployed rater changes after 120 days of supervision, a CRO evaluation must be completed. **NOTE:** Multiple evaluations may result and are authorized under these circumstances.

3.9.3.3.6. If ratee is returned early or the deployed rater changes prior to completing 120 days supervision, an informal LOE is required. 60 days minimum supervision is required.

3.9.3.4. Evaluation Form: For instructions on completing the AF Form 707, see Table 3.1. (OPRs).

3.9.3.4.1. The deployed rating chain completes the evaluation through the additional rater's comments/signature.

3.9.3.4.1.1. AF Form 707: Sections I through V.

3.9.3.4.2. Provide recommended comments for the reviewer (senior rater) when applicable.

3.9.3.4.3. Forward the evaluation to the home station rating chain for completion.

3.9.3.4.3.1. AF Form 707: Sections VI through VIII.

3.9.3.5. Two GOs in rating chain: Currently paragraph 1.4.11.4.2. prohibits multiple GOs from serving as evaluators on performance evaluations. **EXCEPTIONS:** see paragraph 1.7.17.

3.9.3.5.1. Deployed GO Raters: Evaluation will qualify as a single evaluator and no additional rater will be required. Complete rater block and forward evaluation to the home station senior rater.

3.9.3.5.2. Deployed GO Additional Raters:

3.9.3.5.2.1. Provide recommended comments for the reviewer (senior rater) when applicable.

3.9.3.5.2.2. Complete the additional rater block and forward to the home station senior rater/unit commander.

3.9.3.5.3. Home station Rating Chain: If one of the following situations apply, enter the applicable mandatory statement in the feedback comment section of the evaluation:

3.9.3.5.3.1. Evaluations signed by a deployed GO and the home station senior rater is a GO, see paragraph 1.7.1.7.

3.9.3.5.3.2. Evaluations Signed by a deployed officer who out ranks the home station senior rater, see paragraph 1.7.1.6.

3.9.4. Evaluations required during deployments:

3.9.4.1. Raters will submit annual evaluations when one year has passed (for AFR, biennial if two years has passed) since the close-out date of the last evaluation and the period of supervision has been at least 120 calendar days, see Table 3.2., and Table 3.3.

3.9.4.2. ANG and AFR officers ordered to EAD under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 12304 (200K call up), or 12302 continue to receive OPRs according to Table 3.1. and Table 3.2. Officers ordered to EAD under Title 10, U.S.C, Section 12301 (war or national emergency) receive evaluations under the RegAF list provisions in this instruction.

3.9.5. Evaluations rendered in the combat zone or at noncombat ports and MPSs. All provisions of this instruction remain in effect, except:

3.9.5.1. Authorities waive CRO evaluations resulting from the deployment to the combat zone, provided the ratee has received an evaluation within 180 calendar days of the deployment date and the ratee's performance meets minimum standards. For ratees not meeting minimum standards, prepare a referral evaluation and process it according to paragraph 1.10.

3.9.5.2. IMAs or those who are members of AFR mobilized units receive OPRs as required for other Airmen in the RegAF according to Table 3.2.

3.9.6. Evaluator Requirements and Procedures for OPRs.

3.9.6.1. Minimum grade requirements for senior raters and reviewers remain unchanged. See paragraph 1.5.

3.9.6.2. Rater, additional rater and final evaluator requirements remain unchanged. See paragraph 1.5. The rater cannot be substituted for any reason other than those outlined in paragraph 1.7.

3.9.6.3. If the OPR rater is also the reviewer, leave Section V, Additional Rater's Overall Assessment, blank and include the following statement in Section VI, Reviewer's comments block: "THE RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER." The rater digitally signs the rater, additional rater, and reviewer blocks (signature elements are optional). If the OPR additional rater is also the reviewer, enter the additional rater's comments in Section V, Additional Rater Overall Assessment, and include the following statement in Section

VI, Reviewer's comments block: "THE ADDITIONAL RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER." The additional rater signs both the additional rater and the reviewer block.

3.9.6.4. "In-place" Additional Rater. Commander's may authorize the next evaluator in the rating chain (the additional rater's rater) or "in-place" additional rater to assume the responsibilities of the additional rater, when the additional rater is unable to perform evaluator duties due to deployment. When this occurs, Section V must include a statement explaining why the original additional rater did not prepare the evaluation (ex: additional rater deployed as of close-out date). **NOTE:** "In-place" additional rater is defined as the person responsible for the original additional raters normal day to day duties. To endorse the evaluation, this individual must still meet additional rater grade requirements as defined in paragraph 1.5.2.2.

3.9.6.4.1. When the squadron or group commander is deployed and is the additional rater or completes the commander review, the "acting" commander on "G" series orders, may be substituted as the additional rater or commander's review. An officer cannot serve as an "acting commander" and/or be identified or described as an "acting commander" on an evaluation. Either the officer is a commander on G-Series orders or they are not a commander (whether by title or description). In order to document an officer filling the position in the commander's absence, use examples such as "served as commander for 3 separate weeks" or "assumed commander duties for 6 months" or "filled in as CC 5 separate weeks" etc.

3.9.6.5. For deployed senior raters. Vice wing commanders may assume the responsibilities of the senior rater/wing commander for OES forms only when placed on "G" series orders and designated by the Management Level (ML) as the senior rater.

3.9.6.6. Comments are mandatory when there is significant disagreement with the previous evaluator. Evaluators must make specific comments to justify referral ratings.

3.9.7. Referral Evaluation Procedures. Use referral procedures in paragraph 1.10. with the following exception: ratee comments on the referral evaluation must reach the next evaluator no later than 30 calendar days after receipt of the referral letter when the ratee is deployed in support of contingency operations. Type, legibly hand-write, or print referral correspondence in dark blue or black ink using paragraph 1.10. as a guide.

3.9.8. Routing Evaluations.

3.9.8.1. Performance evaluations are due to the servicing MPS or personnel activity 30 days after close-out, and to the office of record 60 days after close-out.

3.9.8.2. Forward evaluations directed under Table 3.2. or Table 3.3. for CSB use, to arrive at HQ AFPC or HQ ARPC (as appropriate) by the suspense date provided in the directing letter.

3.9.8.3. Forward evaluations in a sealed envelope clearly marked, OPR DATA--TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY.

3.9.8.4. Alternate routing procedures. Some crisis conditions may result in temporary changes to routing procedures. If this occurs, units will receive specific instructions.

3.9.9. Quality Control Review. Quality control of the appearance of performance evaluations may relax, but the content and data contained must be accurate. Evaluations prepared under wartime provisions may be handwritten.

3.9.10. Interruption or Loss of Automated Data Processing (ADP) Support. See the PSD Handbook.

3.10. “FROM” Dates. Use the “FROM” date on the OPR notice, but if different or incorrect, use the information below to establish the “FROM” date. If the officer is:

3.10.1. On EAD, and it is the first OPR, use the EAD date; or the day following the close-out date of a TR from a school that is 20 weeks or more.

3.10.2. An ANG officer not on EAD and it is an initial evaluation, use the effective date of federal recognition in ANG or the day following the close-out of a TR from a school of 20 weeks or more. **NOTE:** Use AF Form 77 to cover any gap from the officer’s entry into non-EAD status to the “FROM” date of the first evaluation received in non-EAD status in IAW paragraph 1.14 and AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*.

3.10.3. An ANG officer not on EAD, and was assigned to an ANG unit from ARPC (ISLRS, NARS, ORS, or RRPS), use the date of latest federal recognition (Complete an AF Form 77 to cover a gap caused by insufficient supervision IAW paragraph 1.14 and AFI 36-2608).

3.10.4. An ANG officer not on EAD and was assigned to an ANG unit from another state, use the date of latest federal recognition (the losing state will complete an AF Form 77 to cover a gap caused by insufficient supervision IAW paragraph 1.14 and AFI 36-2608).

3.10.5. An AFR officer not on EAD and it is an initial evaluation or the officer has been reassigned from the IRR, use the date of assignment.

3.10.6. An AFR officer not on EAD, but previously on EAD and concurrently assigned to training category A, B, or E on release from AD, use the day following the close-out of the last evaluation received while on EAD. (Applies only to the first non-EAD-status evaluation.)

3.10.7. An AFR officer not on EAD but previously on AD as RegAF and did not accept an AFR commission concurrently with release from AD, use the effective date of appointment in non-EAD status. Applies only to the first non-EAD status evaluation. Use AF Form 77 to cover any gap from the officer’s entry into non-EAD status to the “FROM” date of the first evaluation received in non-EAD status IAW paragraph 1.14. and AFI 36-2608.

3.11. “THRU” Dates. Never close-out an evaluation on or after the actual departure, retirement, or separation date of the rater or ratee. If a departure, separation, or retirement date changes after establishment of the “THRU” date of an evaluation, it is not necessary to adjust the close-out date if it is no more than 30 days before the actual departure date. Evaluations prepared and made a matter of record under the CRO rule remain valid even if the condition is later canceled.

3.12. Non-Rated Periods. In particular circumstances, non-rated periods may be authorized. The documentation and/or approval authority required will vary depending on the nature of the circumstances (i.e., for medical conditions, non-rated period is initiated by the Airman’s medical provider). Those Airmen in or having been in military or civilian confinement, may lack to a degree, performance in their primary AFSC (dependent on the duration of confinement). Non-rated periods due to medical circumstances may include some degree of decreased duty performance and/or behavioral effects resulting from these circumstances. An Airman’s medical

circumstances for non-rated periods must be considered *individually* as each Airman's circumstance is unique. For example, there is no defined 'timeline' when a sexual assault victim becomes a survivor; every victim's recovery process is dependent on many variables, and therefore, time needed for recovery will vary. Airmen may present a variety of symptoms after a trauma that may impact duty performance. Some of these primary symptoms include effects on sleep and concentration. Responses to a trauma will vary among Airmen because the nature and intensity of a current trauma occurs in the context of an Airman's past history. As a result, commanders, senior leaders, and supervisors must be aware of potential duty performance changes. Likewise with post-traumatic stress, for Wounded Warriors, and Airmen requiring a recovery period as a result of surgery, invasive treatment (such as radiation or chemotherapy), counseling, and/or other rehabilitative treatments and services, the length of recovery period is dependent on many variables (severity of diagnosis, prognosis, type and duration of treatment, reoccurring/multiple conditions/trauma, Airman's support system, individual resiliency, dynamics in the duty section, family history, etc.). Being TDY or deployed is NOT an example of a period that is non-rated.

3.12.1. Medical (physical, physiological, and/or psychological conditions; hospitalization, maternity, and/or convalescence in excess of 80 days, including, but not limited to, Airmen in Patient Status) Documentation: The Airman's provider will initiate the recommendation for a non-rated period to the Airman's unit commander using AF Form 469, *Duty Limiting Condition Report*.

3.12.1.1. Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director (or equivalent) Duties/Considerations. The presumption will be in favor of the Airman requesting the non-rated period. Counsel the Airman, directly, to ensure he or she is fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable career impacts (re-accomplish counseling prior to 60-day extensions). Make every reasonable effort to minimize disruption to their normal career progression.

3.12.1.2. Approval Authority. The unit commander/military or civilian director is the approval authority and if they recommend disapproval of the request for a non-rated period, justification must be provided and request will be forwarded to the member's wing commander/equivalent (may be delegated no further than vice commander/equivalent) for final approval/disapproval. This may be accomplished on an additional memo or under a separate attachment.

3.12.2. Sexual Assault (Unrestricted Report) Documentation: The Airmen will submit the request, using memorandum format (see example in Attachment 3) to their unit commander/military or civilian director for approval. The initial non-rated period, if approved, is 80 calendar days; additional periods (60-day increments) may be requested for the Airman's recovery, and will be requested in the same manner. It is prohibited to include comments on any correspondence (evaluation, evaluation notice, etc.) relating to or regarding the member's filing of an Unrestricted Report of sexual assault, receiving support services, and/or participating in the investigative process and/or judicial proceedings.

3.12.2.1. Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director (or equivalent) Duties/Considerations. See paragraph 3.12.1.1.

3.12.2.2. Approval Authority. See paragraph 3.12.1.2.

3.12.3. Military or Civilian Confinement: Non-rated periods of supervision, regardless of the number of days served, may be considered for Airmen in military or civilian confinement (prisoner status), having served in military or civilian confinement during the reporting period, or those continuing to serve a term of confinement in a military or civilian confinement facility not managed by the Air Force Security Forces Center (AFSFC). The ratee's unit commander/military or civilian director will subtract periods of non-rated supervision as a result of confinement using the total days documented on Airman's AF Form 2098, *Duty Status Change*, from the total number days of supervision, for all evaluations, with the exception of Directed by Commander (DBC) reports. DBC evaluations, accomplished to capture the egregious event(s) that resulted in confinement and will not subtract days of confinement (non-rated days) from the total number of days supervision.

3.12.3.1. The losing unit commander/military or civilian director for those courts-martialed Airmen, transferred to a long term confinement facility managed by the AFSFC, are required to complete a DBC report (even when a DBC report has already been accomplished), to close out the day the courts-martial is adjudged, encompassing the courts-martial results, and capturing the egregious event(s) that resulted in the courts-martial ruling of long term confinement (if the egregious event(s) are not already captured in a previous DBC or annual evaluation).

3.12.3.2. Airmen in prisoner or confinement status as a result of courts-martial conviction, who have PCS'd, and are gained to a long-term confinement facility managed by the AFSFC, do not require annual evaluations. **NOTE:** Airman awaiting publication of a Courts-Martial Order (CMO) will remain the administrative responsibility of the losing unit commander/military or civilian director until such time as the CMO is published and the member is officially transferred to an AFSFC managed correctional facility; these Airmen will still require annual evaluations (as applicable), completed by the losing commander/director.

3.12.3.3. Airmen undergoing appellate review leave and awaiting an appeals court decision are not required an annual evaluation, as they are still permanently assigned to a AFSFC managed confinement facility for reporting purposes.

3.12.3.4. AFPC will complete an AF Form 77 for those Airmen who choose to remain in the Air Force following overturn of a CMO by a subsequent appeals court. The inclusive dates for AF Form 77s will be the day after the ratee's last evaluation's close-out date, through the day they were transferred back to present for duty status (the date the courts-martial is overturned). The unit to which the Airman transfers following the return to present for duty status will take over performance evaluation responsibilities, beginning the day following AF Form 77 completion through to the next applicable annual or CRO close-out date.

3.12.4. Notification. Once the non-rated period is approved, the Airman's evaluation notice will be annotated accordingly and forwarded to the Airman's rater. If additional non-rated periods are deemed necessary, notification will follow in the same manner.

3.12.5. Reporting. The rater will not consider, nor comment on, the Airman's performance during a non-rated period, except as required IAW paragraph 3.12.3. **EXCEPTION:** The rater may comment on significant accomplishments (completion of ACSC correspondence) if requested by the ratee. If the non-rated period covers the entire reporting period, enter the

statement: "Airman is not rated for this period: (date) through (date). No comments authorized IAW AFI 36-2406" in Sections IV, V, and VI of the AF Form 707.

3.13. Number of Days Supervision.

3.13.1. Enter the number of days the rater supervised the ratee during the reporting period. To compute, use the "supervision began date" through the "close-out date" to determine the number of day supervision.

3.13.2. Do NOT deduct any periods of leave, TDY, absences or periods loaned out to other organizations. **EXCEPTION:** non-rated periods authorized IAW paragraph 3.12.

3.13.3. On EAD an OPR is being written by the rater's rater per paragraph 1.7., then enter number of days for which the evaluator had personal or written knowledge of the ratee's duty performance during the reporting period.

3.13.4. A Non-EAD ANG officer's OPR is being written by another rater per paragraph 1.7, then enter number of days the evaluator had personal or written knowledge of the ratee's duty performance during the reporting period. The number of days of supervision for a ratee assigned to a rater for a calendar year is 365, not the sum of unit training assembly and field training days.

3.13.5. A Non-EAD AFR officer, then enter the number of days of supervision under the rater during the reporting period. Deduct from the period of supervision tours of AD under other than the designated rater for which there is an LOE. **EXAMPLE:** If preparing an OPR to cover the period from 1 July to 31 December, and the rater was first so designated on 1 September and served in this capacity without a break to 31 December, and the ratee reported for training and duty for a total of 27 days between 1 September and 31 December, then the period of supervision is 122 days, not 27 days. The rater is responsible for the accuracy of the number of days of supervision entry.

3.14. ACA/Performance Feedback.

3.14.1. ACA/Performance Feedback will be accomplished IAW Chapter 2.

3.14.2. In Section III, Rater certifies ACA in this area by entering the date the ACA was provided during the rating period, this includes midterm ACA or any subsequent ACA sessions requested by the ratee. If ACA was not accomplished, an explanation must be provided.

3.15. Reviewer.

3.15.1. The reviewer is the highest level endorser in the ratee's rating chain. The senior rater must be in the grade of at least a colonel or civilian equivalent (GS-15), or higher, serving as a wing commander or equivalent and designated by the ML.

3.15.2. The reviewer will place an "X" in the concur or non-concur block. Do not enter any comments in the reviewers block. See paragraph 1.9. for disagreements.

3.15.3. The reviewer may comment only under the following circumstances:

3.15.3.1. If the reviewer disagrees with the evaluation. The rater and additional rater are first given an opportunity to change the evaluation; however, they will not change their evaluation just to satisfy the reviewer. If the evaluation remains unchanged and the reviewer still disagrees, the reviewer marks the non-concur block and specifically states

why he or she disagrees in the space provided. An AF Form 77 can be added if additional space is required. See paragraph 1.9.

3.15.3.2. The evaluation is a referral, and the reviewer is the evaluator named in Section XI of the OPR, or the reviewer refers the evaluation. See paragraph 1.10.

3.15.3.3. The ratee is colonel or colonel select. When the reviewer is not also the rater or additional rater, he or she may make, if desired and appropriate, command and/or assignment recommendations in Section VI, reviewer's comments block, without non-concurring with the evaluation. Promotion recommendations and other comments are not allowed.

3.15.3.4. If the reviewer is also the rater or additional rater, see paragraph 3.9.6.3., mandatory comments.

3.15.4. Single Evaluator only. An evaluator must be an O-6 or a GS-15 (or equivalent). If the rater is a SR, the evaluation must close-out at this level unless it is a referral evaluation. The evaluator must meet both grade requirements and the evaluator requirements for each section of the applicable evaluation form.

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

3.16.1. Inappropriate Stratification and Broad Statements.

3.16.1.1. Stratification statements, when authorized, are not mandatory. The omission of stratification does not constitute an error or injustice. **NOTE:** An evaluator may remove or change a stratification at any point during the drafting process of an evaluation.

3.16.1.2. Stratification Quotes. The use of stratification statements as quotes from anyone other than the evaluator endorsing the report are prohibited unless authorized in this instruction.

3.16.2. Statements Outside the Scope of Responsibility. Stratification and broad statements outside the scope of the evaluator's responsibility or knowledge are prohibited. Evaluators can only stratify personnel within the confines of their direct rating chain and/or scope of responsibility (i.e.: within SRID). A broad statement is one which implies knowledge of Air Force members not assigned within the evaluator's realm of knowledge. **EXAMPLES:**

3.16.2.1. The communications squadron commander, as the communications functional on a base, cannot compare Information Management (IM) officers assigned to other units on the base.

3.16.2.2. Functional communities at higher headquarters cannot compare their staff officers with members outside their immediate staff or across the Air Force.

3.16.2.3. A MAJCOM/A1 cannot compare someone on their staff to all personnel officers in the command.

3.16.2.3.1. "The best civil engineer in the business" (outside their scope of responsibility, because they do not have knowledge of all civil engineers).

3.16.2.3.2. Similarly, the phrase “top 5% officer” is inappropriate because the evaluator does not have first-hand knowledge of all Air Force officers.

3.16.2.3.3. **(AFR Only)** Stratifications on evaluation reports regarding placement on Key Personnel Lists and other Development Team vectors are strictly prohibited.

3.16.2.4. An evaluator cannot use the stratification of a higher level evaluator or quote a higher level evaluator. **EXCEPTION:** use of a senior rater stratification may be quoted if the senior rater is a signatory on the officer evaluation and does not have the opportunity to provide comments. For instance a squadron level commander cannot stratify an individual at the group level. Some examples of prohibited squadron commander statements are below; however, these examples are applicable at all levels:

3.16.2.4.1. “#2 of 72 Majors in the group” (out of squadron/cc’s scope of responsibility).

3.16.2.4.2. “Group/CC says he/she is #2 of 72 Cpts” (quotes are prohibited).

3.16.2.5. An evaluator (must be a signatory) may stratify at a level below, as long as it is within his/her scope of responsibility. For instance:

3.16.2.5.1. A group commander can state: “2/50 Maj in the CE squadron,” “#1/4 Lts in the Ops Sq,” or “1/10 CGOs in the FSS.”

3.16.2.5.2. The MSG commander can state: “#2 of 6 MSG Cpts,” or “1/4 Lts in FSS;” however, he/she could not comment on the officers in an Ops Sq because that would fall under the scope of the OG commander.

3.16.2.5.3. A squadron commander can only stratify within the squadron, or down (flight); not up (group or wing). **EXCEPTION:** The use of a senior rater stratification may be quoted if the senior rater is a signatory on the officer evaluation.

3.16.2.5.4. Stratification for promotion selectees and frocked officers. Evaluators for promotion selectees and frocked officers are authorized to stratify these officers with their pinned on peers. In addition, the verbiage must specify the stratification is amongst the affected grade; i.e., “O-6/O-6 selects”, and if SRs choose to stratify with the pinned/frocked peers and use them in a denominator, SR may not include these officers in another denominator. For example, if a SR has six pinned on O-6s, two O-6-selects, and four O-5s ... SR may say “#1/8 O-6/O-6 sels!” AND also may say “#1/4 O-5s”; this would be acceptable. However, stating “#1/8 O-6/O-6 sels!” AND “#1/6 O-5s” would be prohibited. This applies to officers selected for promotion to all grades of major through colonel.

3.16.2.5.5. Stratification statements must be written in quantitative terms based on the following:

3.16.2.5.5.1. Stratification based on peer comparisons: Peers (#1/10 Majors or #1/5 Captains); Peer Group (#1/10 FGOs or #1/10 CGOs); Duty Positions (#1/7 Action Officers, #1/7 Sq/CCs); Aggregate Groups (#1/50 officers in my Group; #1 of my 50 officers; #1 of 50 majors in my 20 years of service); Additional Qualifiers (#1/4 Force Support CGOs; Best Major in my 32 years); Recognition Level (Wing CGO/yr, #1/200). **NOTE:** Stratifications that are vague or lack a qualified peer reference group are prohibited (Example, although not all inclusive, would be:

“#1/5”; “#1 of 30 officers”; “#1/50 officers” or “#1/200 personnel” as these do not identify a specific peer group).

3.16.2.5.5.2. Stratification within a rater’s authority: Senior raters may only stratify within their rating chain (MAJCOM/CC may state “#1 of 500 Majors in the command”). **NOTE:** Stratification outside the scope of the rater’s chain of command, despite functional authority or responsibility, will remain prohibited (i.e. MAJCOM/A1 may not stratify an officer as “#1/75 38F FGOs in this MAJCOM.”). **EXCEPTION:** Although outside the scope of the rater, quoting authorized stratification from deployed LOEs are authorized.

3.16.2.5.5.3. Stratification quotes from senior leaders: May quote stratification by senior leaders in the chain of command provided the senior leader is a signatory on the evaluation and does not provide comment (Sq/CC or Gp/CC could say “Wg/CC’s #1 of 50 Majors”). **NOTE:** Stratification quotes from the ratee’s chain of command who are not a signatory will remain prohibited (MSG/CC may not state “OG/CC lauds as #1 LRO in my Group.”) **EXCEPTION:** If a Gp/CC is not a signatory on the OPR, a Gp/CC stratification is not authorized (unless supported by an award, “Ops Grp CGO Qtr”).

3.16.2.5.5.4. Stratification in optional Deployed LOEs: Stratification, assignment, command, and DE push statements in deployed letters of evaluation are authorized. Deployed stratifications and push statements may be quoted in future OPRs and PRFs as long as stratification is not previously documented in the permanent record.

3.16.2.6. When stratifying officers on OPRs and PRFs, evaluators will not consider completion/non-completion of non-resident DE if the officer is on the school select list (because they will attend in-residence), or Select/Candidate status. Relative ranking among officers rated by the rating chain should be based on overall performance. This paragraph does not preclude raters from making appropriate assignment and developmental education recommendations on OPRs/PRFs/RRFs, see paragraph 3.17.4.

3.16.3. Inappropriate Promotion Statements or Reference to Grades/Positions Higher than the Ratee Holds.

3.16.3.1. Promotion statements that are pushes to the next higher grade are prohibited. **EXCEPTION:** Statements of fact (i.e. “filled a Lt Col billet”) are authorized. Additionally, while promotion statements are prohibited, an evaluator may make recommendations to select officers for a particular assignment, DE, Augmentation, Continuation, or Conditional Reserve Status.

3.16.3.2. The term “Senior” on officer evaluations is prohibited. This term is commonly understood as a euphemism for colonels and above, or to refer to members holding a higher grade than the ratee. **EXCEPTION:** On PRFs for lieutenant colonels being promoted to colonel, the term “Senior” may be used.

3.16.3.2.1. When used in conjunction with words such as “officer,” “position,” or “leadership,” the term “Senior” constitutes an implied promotion statement and is therefore prohibited in officer evaluations.

- 3.16.3.2.2. Referring to a major as the “Senior Chaplain” is authorized; however, referring to a major as “Performing senior leadership duties” is prohibited.
- 3.16.3.3. Statements acknowledging an officer’s selection for promotion during the reporting period are acceptable. **EXAMPLE:** Maj Korte’s recent BPZ selection to Lt Col is right on target.

3.17. Inappropriate Recommendations Referring to Aviator Continuation Pay, Separation/Retirement, Civilian Employment, Assignments, DE/Professional Military Education (PME) and Advanced Academic Degrees (AAD).

3.17.1. Aviator Continuation Pay. Comments on an officer's decision to accept or decline aviator continuation pay is prohibited.

3.17.2. Separation or retirement status. Comments referring to separation, retirement, or transfer to reserve status are prohibited. However, comments may be warranted when an officer displays a reluctance to accept responsibility, a negative attitude toward the job, and/or exhibits a decrease in performance that can be reasonably attributed to a pending separation or retirement. Comments are limited to the behavior and not the fact the Airman is separating, retiring or transferring to a reserve status. **NOTE:** Although comments are mandatory, an evaluator may use the minimum bullets required IAW Table 3.1.

3.17.3. Civilian Employment. Comments about civil service jobs or other civilian occupations are prohibited unless it directly relates to the military position and their military performance. Recommendations for civilian employment are prohibited.

3.17.4. Assignment and DE Recommendations. Assignment and DE recommendations on officer evaluations that are inconsistent with an officer’s current grade are prohibited. The intent and philosophy of OES is to recommend an officer for assignments/positions and resident level of DE that reflect his or her potential.

3.17.4.1. Evaluators may make one or more assignment recommendations in an officer’s evaluation provided the recommendations are both appropriate and realistically achievable for the officer’s current grade or current grade plus one. The assignment recommendation may involve current grade plus one if the officer has completed or is currently completing the last reasonable career development step for the current grade. **EXAMPLE:** “Highly recommend for AFIT—then Joint Duty.” **NOTE:** AFIT can be used for an assignment push, however, it cannot be used as a DE push.

3.17.4.2. The intent is to focus on what job or DE assignment the officer should be doing immediately after his or her current assignment. Anything beyond the next assignment would be mapping out a career or making an implied promotion statement—both instances are contrary to the spirit and intent of OES.

3.17.4.3. In addition to assignment recommendations, evaluators may also make recommendations for the appropriate level of in-residence DE on OPRs, PRF and LOEs (DE pushes are not authorized on TRs).

3.17.4.3.1. Evaluators determine the appropriate level recommendation by considering the highest level in-residence DE the officer has already completed along with the eligibility criteria for each level of in-residence DE. (For the purposes of Primary Developmental Education (PDE) SOS is the method of completion).

3.17.4.3.1.1. For lieutenant through captain, a PDE recommendation is appropriate until the officer has completed PDE in-residence.

3.17.4.3.1.2. For a captain, once they complete PDE in-residence, an Intermediate Developmental Education (IDE) recommendation is appropriate.

3.17.4.3.1.3. For a major, if as of the close-out date of the OPR, he or she has not already completed IDE in-residence and is still eligible for consideration, an IDE recommendation is appropriate. However, once the major completes IDE in-residence or when he or she is no longer eligible for consideration, then a Senior Developmental Education (SDE) recommendation is appropriate.

3.17.4.4. Raters cannot recommend officers for specific schools, including “joint DE;” only the terms PDE, IDE, SDE are authorized. The appropriate venue for a specific school recommendation is through the annual DE process on the *PME/AFT/RTFB/Officer Worksheet*.

3.17.4.5. There is a fine line between an assignment recommendation and an overt, implied or veiled promotion statement. When making an assignment recommendation on an OPR, there will be no reference to a higher grade, and it must be consistent with the officer’s appropriate progression of their professional development.

3.17.4.5.1. Acceptable **EXAMPLES:**

3.17.4.5.1.1. “Make Capt Cousins an MPS Chief.” (Appropriate next level of progression).

3.17.4.5.1.2. “Send Major Smith to IDE.” (Appropriate DE progression).

3.17.4.5.1.3. On a Lt Col OPR, “Make him an Ops Group Commander.” (Appropriate next level of progression).

3.17.4.5.1.4. “After SDE, assign to Air Staff.” (Appropriate DE with follow-on assignment).

3.17.4.5.1.5. For a major who has completed ACSC in-residence, or who is out of the eligibility window, recommendations for SDE would be appropriate, “Send to SDE.”

3.17.4.5.1.6. For a captain who has completed PDE in-residence, or who is beyond the window of eligibility, an appropriate recommendation would be “In-resident IDE a Must.”

3.17.4.5.2. Prohibited **EXAMPLES:**

3.17.4.5.2.1. “Make Lt Triska an FSS Commander.” (Inappropriate next level of progression).

3.17.4.5.2.2. “Send Capt Brown to IDE after selection to major.” (Reference to IDE is appropriate, but the comment “after selection to major” is an implied promotion statement).

3.17.4.5.2.3. “SDE in 2008, Group Commander in 2012, and Wing Commander in 2015.” (Goes beyond the scope of the next assignment).

3.17.4.5.2.4. “Capt Phelps is ready to be a flying Sq/CC” and “Make Maj Knisley a group commander.” (In both cases, the recommendations are clearly beyond the officer’s next assignment and are viewed as veiled promotion statements).

3.17.4.6. DE (in residence or non-residence) and Advanced Academic Degree (AAD) education for officers.

3.17.4.6.1. Comments on OPRs or PRFs regarding completion of or enrollment in DE and AAD are prohibited. Performance and special recognition comments on officers attending in-residence education and/or training will be documented appropriately on the AF Form 475, *Training Report* (see [Chapter 6](#)) and may be attributed when writing PRFs. Evaluators may comment on an officer’s competitive assignment selection to programs that fall outside of the Developmental Education Designation Board (DEDB), to include but not limited to Olmstead, Fulbright, Rhodes, School of Advance Air and Space Studies (SAASS), School of Advanced Warfighting Studies (SAWS), etc.. Evaluators will not, however, comment on an officer’s status on the schools list, selection for DE, and/or specific schools (i.e. ACSC, AWC, Joint, etc.) but limit their remarks to “PDE, IDE, or SDE” only. **NOTE:** An assignment recommendation for AFIT MS/Masters or PhD program is authorized.

3.18. Extensions of Close-Out Dates.

3.18.1. The authority to extend the close-out date is retained by HQ AFPC/DP2SPE for RegAF and HQ AFRC/A1 for AFR (may be delegated to ARPC). The authority to extend the close-out date for ANG personnel is TAG in the state/territory to which they are assigned or NGB/HR for Statutory Tour personnel. (This waiver authority will not be delegated, there are no exceptions). AF/DPG (for EAD general officers) and NGB-GO (for ANG general officers) retains similar authority on AF Form 78. AF/DPO retains authority on OPRs for colonels.

3.18.2. Events that occur after the close-out date. Extensions are only granted to allow evaluators to document negative behavior (i.e. courts-martial actions, investigations, etc.). Extensions are not granted to document awards, achievements or completion/non-completion of any training. Extensions on DBH and CRO evaluations are not authorized. Extensions must be requested prior to, but no later than 30 days after the close-out date of the evaluation.

3.18.2.1. Pending Administrative Actions. If an incident or event occurs that reflect a departure from standards or derogatory in nature between the time an annual or initial evaluation closes out and the time it becomes a matter of record that is of such serious significance that inclusion in that evaluation is warranted, an extension of the close-out date may be requested by the unit commander. This includes completion of an investigation begun prior to the close-out date or confirmation of behavior that was only alleged as of the close-out date. Commanders may request OPR close-out date extensions to ensure resolution of any pending administrative actions or other significant issues. Extensions will be granted to cover only the time necessary to complete actions, not to exceed 59 days.

3.18.3. Send requests for extension to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE (or appropriate ANG/AFR office) via the servicing personnel office, who in turn will forward the request to appropriate office of primary responsibility listed in Table 1.1. This must be done in a timely manner, and a commander initiated email is acceptable. The request must include the following information:

Name, Grade and SSN of ratee, evaluation “FROM” and “THRU” dates, desired close-out date (not to exceed 59 days), and a complete rationale as to why the extension is needed. Include all applicable pertinent information including dates of investigations during the reporting period and/or deployment dates (if applicable). Incomplete requests will be returned without action.

3.18.4. Approved extensions must be documented by placing the following statement in the feedback section of the AF Form 707: “Close-out date was extended IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 3.18.”. **(T-0)**

3.18.5. When the approving authority grants an extension, only one extension, not to exceed 59 days will be granted. If the actions cannot be finalized by, or event occurs after, the extended close-out date, the evaluation will be completed using the original close-out date. If desired, the commander can then direct another evaluation be rendered at the 120-day point (60-day point for referral evaluations) to capture the incident. See Table 3.3. for AFR.

3.18.5.1. Use the date approved by the appropriate waiver authority per a request for an extension of the close-out date.

3.18.6. For AFR, if needed, adjust the close-out date on which the rater achieves the required number of days of supervision and points.

3.19. Ratee’s Acknowledgement.

3.19.1. The rater is required to conduct face-to-face (End-of-Reporting Period) feedback in conjunction with presenting the evaluation to the ratee IAW Table 2.1. The OPR serves as the feedback form. An ACA form is not required. Electronic routing of the form does not excuse the rater from providing face-to-face feedback. Only in situations where face-to-face feedback is not feasible, will feedback be conducted either by telephone or electronically. The rater should first attempt to call the ratee and conduct the feedback via telephone. If that option is not available, the rater may provide clear, detailed feedback to the ratee via email, using a read receipt to verify the feedback was received and read.

3.19.2. The ratee’s signature in the acknowledgment block does not constitute concurrence or non-concurrence of the content and/or rating of the evaluation. The signature is to acknowledge receipt only.

3.19.3. The ratee’s signature will be obtained after the reviewer has signed. In cases where an Air Force Advisor or Acquisition/Functional Examiner signature is required, ratee acknowledgment will occur after the advisor or examiner review.

3.19.4. The ratee must acknowledge receipt of the evaluation prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record unless the ratee refuses or is unable to sign. The ratee will review and verify all dates, markings and comments on the form. Significant discrepancies and administrative errors can be addressed at this time, and corrected if agreed by all parties, before the evaluation becomes a matter of record. This is not to be interpreted to mean the ratee can refuse to sign if they disagree. This is an acknowledgement of the evaluation **not concurrence**. If evaluators do not agree to change the evaluation and the ratee wishes to dispute it, they should pursue the established appeal/correction avenues available to them as outlined in [Chapter 10](#), once the evaluation is a matter of record.

3.19.5. The rater will suspend the ratee three (3) duty days (30 calendar days for ARC) to sign the evaluation.

3.19.6. In cases where the ratee refuses or is unable to sign, any evaluator signing the evaluation is authorized to select “Member declined to sign” or “Member unable to sign” from the drop down menu in the ratee’s acknowledgment and sign the evaluation in the ratee’s acknowledgement block.

3.19.7. For the purpose of signing evaluations, the term “Member unable to sign” indicates that the member does not have access to a CAC-enabled computer (i.e. convalescent leave, TDY to a contractor facility without government computer access, deployed to a location without computer access, in AWOL or deserter status, etc.).

3.19.8. “Wet Signature Evaluations Only.” Evaluators can type, handwrite or use the drop down option to annotate the evaluation when the ratee is unable or declines to sign.

Table 3.1. Instructions for Preparing AF Form 707, Officer Performance Report.

I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial and any suffix (i.e. JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of “NMI” is optional. Name will be in all upper case.	DOE, JOHN E. JR.
2	SSN	Enter full SSN. Do not use suffix.	123-45-6789
3	Grade	Enter appropriate grade. See paragraph 1.4.9.	2LT, 1LT, CAPT, MAJ, LT COL, COL
4	DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC held as of the “THRU” date of the evaluation, including prefix and suffix, if applicable. 365-day extended deployments will use the TDY DAFSC. See paragraph 1.4.8.	K11R3A
5	Reason for Report	Enter reason for report from OPR notice and as determined by Tables 3.2. or 3.3.	Annual, CRO, Directed by HQ USAF, Directed by CC
6	PAS Code	Enter PAS code of ratee’s unit of assignment as of the close-out date. Those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment billet, use the home station PAS code. For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, use unit of attachment’s PAS code.	TE1CFYRZ
7	Organization, Command, Location, (Component ANG/AFR Only)	Enter information as of close-out date. Nomenclature does not necessarily duplicate what is on OPR notice. The goal is an accurate description of where and to whom the ratee belongs. Command (and Component, ANG/AFR only) will be listed inside parentheses. The Component will be listed at the end of the statement for AFR and ANG only. 365-day extended deployments will use the home station unit, “with duty at . . .” For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. See paragraph 1.4.7	964th Airborne Air Control Squadron (ACC), Tinker AFB OK 124th Airborne Air Control Squadron (ACC), Tinker AFB OK 341st Security Forces Group (AFSPC), Malmstrom AFB MT, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq

SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
8	Period of Report	FROM Date: Enter the day following the last evaluation's close-out date. See paragraph 3.10. THRU Date: Use the date on the OPR notice or see paragraph 3.11. to determine the close-out date.	12 Jan 2015 thru 11 Jan 2016
9	Number Days Supervision and Number of Days Non-Rated	Enter number of days ratee was supervised by rater during the reporting period. See paragraph 3.13. Enter number of days Non-Rated (if applicable) IAW paragraph 3.12.	365 120
10	SRID	Enter the SRID for the ratee's unit of assignment as of the close-out date. For IMAs, PIRR Cat E, SRID is that of unit of attachment. 365-day extended deployments will use the home station SRID.	1S341 See paragraph 1.3.2. for classified locations
11	Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title as of the close-out date in upper/lower case. If the duty title on the notice is abbreviated and entries are not clear, spell them out. If wrong, enter the correct duty title and take appropriate actions to update the personnel data system. Corrective actions should be initiated upon receipt of the OPR notice. Ensure the duty title is commensurate with the ratee's grade, AFSC, and responsibility. 365-day extended deployments will use the deployed duty title.	Flight Commander
SECTION II. JOB DESCRIPTION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

12	Job Description	<p>Comments in bullet format are mandatory. Limit text to four lines. Enter information about the position the ratee held in the unit and the nature or level of job responsibilities. The rater develops the information for this section. This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job. Be specific--include level of responsibility, number of people supervised, dollar value of resources accountable for/projects managed, etc. Make it clear; use plain English. Avoid jargon, acronyms, and topical references-- they obscure rather than clarify meaning. You may mention previous jobs held during the reporting period only if it impacts the evaluation. 365-day extended deployments will use the TDY job description. For deployments that do not warrant an evaluation, reserve the final bullet for significant additional duties.</p> <p>Commander's job description will include the total force (RegAF, ANG, and AFR) assigned. A short one-line description of the unit's mission may be included in the job description if it is necessary to better explain the ratee's duties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commands, directs and leads 50 AWACS aircrew members - Responsible for ... - Supervises 9 NCOs ... - 89 RegAF, 65 Air National Guard and 55 AFR
13	Job Knowledge, Leadership Skills, Professional Qualities (includes adherence to standards), Organizational Skills, Judgment & Decisions, and Communication Skills	<p>Enter an "X" in the appropriate box.</p> <p>All six performance factors are consolidated in this block. Specific performance factors are listed on the reverse side of the form.</p>	
SECTION III. PERFORMANCE FACTORS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

14	Meets/Does Not Meet	Enter an “X” in the appropriate box. One of the two blocks must be marked.	
SECTION IV. RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
15	Rater Overall Assessment	Comments mandatory; must use bullet format and include at least one bullet. This section allows evaluators to comment on the ratee’s overall performance and performance-based potential as compared to others in the same grade known by the evaluators. If “THE RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER” comment is required in Section VI, the rater will digitally sign the rater, additional rater, and reviewer signature blocks; leave Section V comments area blank. For AFR colonels in GO billets, include a mandatory statement that the officer “continues in” or “leave” the general officer position. See paragraph 1.9. for Disagreements. See paragraph 1.10. for Referrals. (T-0) .	- Capt Smith..... - Performed..... - Led.....
16	Last Performance Feedback Date	Raters certify performance feedback in this area by entering the date the most recent feedback was provided. Enter date as DD MMM YYYY. If feedback was not accomplished, state reason why. There is no excuse for not completing this requirement. If feedback was not required, enter “N/A.” Do not use the date feedback was provided in conjunction with completion of the evaluation. See Chapter 2.	15 Jan 2015 Or Feedback was not accomplished due to.....
SECTION IV. RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT Continued			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

17	Rater's Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter Rater's signature block as of the close-out date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	SUE J. DOE, Col, USAF 20th Dental Squadron (ACC) Shaw AFB SC JOE C. BUSCH, GS-09, DAF 50th Space Wing (AFSPC) Schriever AFB CO
18	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case letters as of the close-out date of the OPR.	Commander
19	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). Rater assessment and feedback block will be locked and additional rater signature capability unlocked with rater digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
SECTION V. ADDITIONAL RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
20	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
21	Concur/ Non-Concur	Place an "X" in the appropriate box indicating concurrence/non-concurrence of the rater's assessment. If non-concurring, comments are required. See paragraph 1.9. for disagreements.	

22	Additional Rater Overall Assessment	<p>Comments are mandatory. Must contain at least 1 bullet, a maximum of 4 lines. Must be in bullet format.</p> <p>Use this section to support rating decision and allow evaluators to comment on the ratee's overall performance and performance-based potential as compared to others in the same grade known by the evaluators.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.12. for inappropriate comments.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.9. for disagreements.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.10. for referrals. (T-0).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capt Smith..... - Better than others..... - Led.....
SECTION V. ADDITIONAL RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT Continued			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
23	Additional Rater Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	<p>Enter the additional rater's information. Additional raters assigned on or prior to close-out date, enter information as of the close-out date; additional raters assigned after the close-out date, enter the information as of the date signed.</p> <p>Multiple general officers serving as evaluators are prohibited, see paragraph 1.7.1.7. for exceptions. (T-0).</p>	<p>BILL R. REED, JR., Col, USAF 20th Operations Group (ACC) Shaw AFB SC</p> <p>JAYMES E. JONES, GS-12, DAF 35th Fighter Wing (PACAF) Misawa AB, Japan</p>
24	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case letters as of the close-out date of the OPR.	Commander

25	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite the date. DO NOT: sign blank forms that do not contain ratings, sign before the close-out date (only on or after), or date before the date the rater signed it or earlier than the date of the ratee's endorsement to a referral letter. Additional rater assessment block will be locked and reviewer signature capability unlocked with the additional rater's digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11. (T-0).	
26	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
27	Concur/ Non-Concur	The reviewer will place an "X" in the appropriate box indicating concurrence or non-concurrence of the additional rater's assessment. See paragraph 1.9. for disagreements.	
28	Reviewer Comments	<p>The reviewer is the primary quality control level and guards against inaccuracy and exaggeration.</p> <p>See paragraph 3.15. for circumstances where the reviewer may add comments.</p> <p>When mandatory comments are used, the last rating official will digitally sign in the signature block.</p>	<p>"THE ADDITIONAL RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER"</p> <p>"I have carefully considered (ratee's name) comments to the referral memorandum of (date)"</p> <p>"Comments from the ratee were requested but were not received within the required period"</p>

29	Reviewer's Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter reviewer's signature block. Reviewers assigned on or prior to close-out date, enter information as of the close-out date; if assigned after the close-out date, enter the information as of the date signed. Multiple GOs as evaluators are prohibited see paragraph 1.7.1.7. for exceptions. (T-0) .	JOHN H. BROWN, Col, USAF 20th Fighter Wing (ACC) Shaw AFB SC
SECTION VI. REVIEWER Continued			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
30	Duty Title	Enter the duty title in upper/lower case letters as of the close-out date of the OPR.	Commander
31	Date & Signature	<p>The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite the date.</p> <p>DO NOT: sign blank forms that do not contain ratings, sign before the close-out date (only on or after), or date before the date the rater signed it or earlier than the date of the ratee's endorsement to a referral letter.</p> <p>Reviewer's assessment block will be locked with reviewer digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.</p>	
32	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	2345
33	Functional Examiner or AF Advisor	When applicable, place an "X" in the appropriate box. See paragraph 1.6.8.	
34	Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization & Location	Enter advisor/examiner's information as of the close-out date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JACK C. JONES, Col, USAF 20th Fighter Wing (ACC) Shaw AFB SC

SECTION VII. FUNCTIONAL EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
35	Date & Signature	Digital signatures will auto date. Non-digital: Handwrite the date. DO NOT: sign blank forms that do not contain ratings, sign before the close-out date (only on or after), or date before the date the rater signed it or earlier than the date of the ratee's endorsement to a referral letter. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
36	Duty Title	Enter advisor/examiner's duty title.	Command Financial Manager
37	SSN	Enter advisor/examiner's last four. See paragraph 1.4.11.	1122
SECTION VIII. RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
38	Ratee Acknowledgement. I understand my signature does not constitute agreement or disagreement. I have verified my personal information in Section I and II.	After reviewing evaluation, the ratee will read the acknowledgement statement and digitally sign in Section VII. (T-0) .	

39	Date & Signature	<p>The ratee must acknowledge receipt prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record by signing in this block. Signing the evaluation does not imply concurrence, but acknowledgement. If ratee non-concurs with the evaluation, they may submit an appeal IAW Chapter 10.</p> <p>Non-digital: Handwrite or date stamp the date. Sign on or after the close-out date. Select appropriate choice from drop down menu: Blank – member concurs and digitally signs evaluation “Member unable to sign” – use when member is incapacitated or unavailable to sign; rater or any higher evaluator on the form in the chain (digitally) signs. “Member declined to sign” – use when member refuses to sign the form; rater or any higher evaluator on the form in the chain (digitally) signs. See paragraph 3.19.</p>	
SECTION IX: PERFORMANCE FACTORS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
40	Job Knowledge	<p>If ratee meets standards, leave blank. If ratee does not meet standards in any of the listed areas, place an “X” in the “Does Not Meet Standards” block for Job Knowledge.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.</p>	
41	Leadership Skills	<p>If ratee meets standards, leave blank. If ratee does not meet standards in any of the listed areas, place an “X” in the “Does Not Meet Standards” block for Leadership Skills. See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.</p>	

42	Professional Qualities	If ratee meets standards (including fitness), leave blank. If ratee does not meet standards in any of the listed areas, place an "X" in the "Does Not Meet Standards" block for Professional Qualities. See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.	
43	Organizational Skills	If ratee meets standards, leave blank. If ratee does not meet standards in any of the listed areas, place an "X" in the "Does Not Meet Standards" block for Organizational Skills. See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.	
44	Judgment And Decisions	If ratee meets standards, leave blank. If ratee does not meet standards in any of the listed areas, place an "X" in the "Does Not Meet Standards" block for Judgment and Decisions. See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.	
45	Communication Skills	If ratee meets standards, leave blank. If ratee does not meet standards in any of the listed areas, place an "X" in the "Does Not Meet Standards" block for Communication Skills. See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.	
SECTION X: REMARKS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
46	Acronyms	Due to limited space on the front of the form, evaluators may spell out acronyms in this block. They will be listed alphabetically and separated by a semicolon (;).	Personnel Support for Contingency Operations (PERSCO); Manpower and Personnel System-Base Level (MANPER-B)
47	Approved Close-Out Extensions	If the commander has obtained an approved extension of the close-out date IAW paragraph 3.18., enter the statement from column C	"Close-out date was extended IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 3.18."

48	DG or TG Award	If ratee was awarded a DG or TG from a training course for which no TR was required, the rater may enter the criteria for the award in Section X, Remarks.	- Top 10%, awarded DG . . .
49	Other Comments	There will be instances where AFI 36-2406 requires additional remarks. The placement of comments not specified in this AFI may be placed here. Contact AFPC/DP2SPE for clarification.	i.e. paragraph 1.7., when rater died, MIA, POW, incapacitated, formally relieved from duty, the additional rater becomes the rater.
50	Mandatory Statements	Enter mandatory statement(s) prior to listing the acronyms.	i.e. "Reviewer's rank is lower than the Previous Rater", "Two GOs auth IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.7."
SECTION XI: REFERRAL EVALUATIONS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
51	Referral Report	Complete this section for referral evaluations only. Referrals see paragraph 1.10.	Specifically..... Or "See Attached" See paragraph 1.10.

Table 3.2. When to Prepare OPRs for RegAF and ANG Officers (Lieutenant thru Colonel).

R U L E	A	B	C
	If (see Notes 1, 2, and 3)	and supervision period was	Then write evaluation and enter reason as
1	the ratee has not had an evaluation, or one year has passed since the close-out date of last OPR or TR from school of 20 weeks or more.	120 calendar days	Annual See Note 4
2	the rater changes, officer departs PCS/PCA to school, or officer is separating. See Notes 5, 6, 7, and 8.	120 calendar days	CRO See Note 9
3	the ratee or rater departs TDY for more than 120 days for other than formal training or normal contingency (deployed) operations. See Notes 5 and 6.	120 calendar days	CRO
4	determination of appropriateness of action under AFIs 36-2907, 36-3206, 36-3207, or 36-3209 is needed, or ratee's performance or conduct is unsatisfactory or marginal and a special evaluation is appropriate.	60 calendar days See Note 10	Directed by Commander
5	the ratee has been declared missing in action (MIA), captured, or detained in captive status.	See Note 11	Directed by HQ USAF
6	a special evaluation is directed by HQ USAF (See Note 12), or NGB for ANG officers not on EAD.	as directed	Directed by HQ USAF
7	a referral LOE has been written or an LOE would contain referral comments, if written. See Note 13.	60 calendar days	
8	the ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status.	60 calendar days See Note 14	Directed by Commander
9	an evaluation is prepared to document significant improvement in duty performance.	120 calendar days See Note 15	
10	any sentence of confinement as the result of a courts-martial.	No minimum days required	

Notes:

1. If ratee is attending training or education, see Chapter 6.
2. Colonels selected for promotion to brigadier general receive evaluations IAW Chapter 7.
3. If the OPR is already a matter of record and the event or circumstances that brought about the evaluation changes or no longer exists, take no action. The OPR is a valid evaluation and remains in the ratee's records. **EXCEPTION:** The CSS/MPS/HR Specialist updates referral OPRs that are prepared as a result of a PCS and files them in the ratee's records regardless of whether or not the evaluation was a matter of record at the time authorities canceled or delayed an assignment.
4. If a CRO occurs after the original annual date has passed but before the 120-day supervision period ends, the evaluation is closed out the day prior to the rater change, provided at least 60 days of supervision have been obtained. The reason for the evaluation remains "Annual."
5. Do not confuse CRO with change of supervisor. For officers on the EAD and ANG officers, the home station commander may authorize a change of reporting official to the TDY location if **ALL** the following conditions are met: **NOTE:** The senior rater matched to the ratee's home station PAS code must perform senior rater duties.
 - a. Someone at the TDY location can perform normal rater duties.
 - b. The rater's rater meets the requirements of paragraph 1.5.
 - c. The home station and TDY unit commanders have approved the change [the ML must approve inter-command changes].
 - d. The home station commander assigns a new rater when the TDY ends.
6. If the ratee is selected to fill a 365-day extended deployment billet a CRO evaluation must be accomplished provided there has been at least 120 days supervision.
7. An evaluation is prepared on officers discharged from the ANG and reassigned to ARPC unless paragraph 3.4. applies.
8. If ratee is an ANG officer (not on EAD) serving on an AD tour of at least 120 days, AD supervisor prepares the evaluation.
9. CRO includes separation from EAD. However, no evaluation is required when the criterion in paragraph 3.4. applies.
10. For officers on the EAD and ANG officers, this includes placement on or removal from the control roster (Chief NGB; Office of Adjutant General; MAJCOM; wing, group, squadron, etc.).
11. Do not prepare evaluations for periods of MIA, captured, or detained in captive status of less than 15 calendar days. If the ratee remains in one of these categories for 15 calendar days or more, prepare an evaluation under this rule without regard to the number of days of supervision. Close the evaluation on the day the ratee was placed in MIA, captured, or detained in captive status. These evaluations are as directed by HQ AFPC/DP3SP.
12. HQ AFPC/DP3SP and USAF/DPO retain the authority to direct evaluations under this rule. Special evaluations covering outstanding duty performance are not permitted under this rule.
13. If the current rater does not consider the referral comments in an LOE to be serious enough to warrant permanent recording, an OPR will not be prepared.
14. The close-out date of the evaluation is the effective date the ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter and may only comment on the negative behavior.
15. The commander may direct an evaluation for significant duty improvement only if the previous evaluation was referred due to substandard duty performance.

Table 3.3. When to Prepare OPRs on AFR Officers (Lieutenant thru Colonel).

R U L E	A	B	C
	If (See Notes 1 and 2)	and supervision period covers at least	Then write evaluation and enter reason as (See Notes 12, 13 & 14)
1	the ratee has not had an evaluation, or one year has passed since close-out date of last OPR or TR from school of 20 weeks or more.	16 points and 120 calendar days	Annual See Note 3 and 15.
2	the rater changes, departs PCS/PCA to school, or is separating.	16 points and 120 calendar days	Change of Reporting Official (CRO)
3	the ratee or rater departs for an AD tour of at least 60 calendar days duration. See Notes 3, 4 and 5.	16 points and 120 calendar days	CRO
4	a determination of appropriateness of action under AFIs 36-3209 is needed, or ratee's performance or conduct is unsatisfactory or marginal and a special evaluation is appropriate.	8 points and 60 calendar days See Note 6	Directed by HQ USAF or Directed by Commander
5	the ratee has died, declared missing in action (MIA), captured, or detained in captive status.	See Note 7	Directed by HQ USAF
6	a special evaluation is directed by HQ USAF. See Note 8.	as directed	Directed by HQ USAF
7	a referral LOE has been written or an LOE would contain referral comments if written. See Note 9.	No minimum number of days required	Directed by HQ USAF or Directed by Commander
8	the ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status.	No minimum number of days required. See Note 10	Directed by Commander
9	an evaluation is prepared to document significant improvement in duty performance.	8 points and 60 calendar days See Note 11	
10	the ratee receives a sentence of confinement is the result of a courts-martial.	No minimum number of days required	

Notes:

1. If ratee is attending training or education, see Chapter 6.
2. Colonels selected for promotion to brigadier general receive evaluations IAW Chapter 7.
3. If a rater change (CRO) occurs after the original annual date has passed but before the 120-day supervision period ends, the evaluation is closed out the day prior to the rater change, provided at least 60 days of supervision and 8 active/inactive points have been earned. The reason for the evaluation remains "Annual." If this criterion has not been met, an informal LOE (formerly called "optional LOE") may be accomplished.
4. Do not submit a report when rater and ratee are ordered to AD together and the rater does not change.
5. If the ratee is selected to fill a 365-day extended deployment billet a CRO evaluation must be accomplished provided there has been at least 120 days supervision.
6. This includes placement on or removal from the control roster.
7. Do not prepare evaluations for periods of MIA, captured, or detained in captive status of less than 15 calendar days. If the ratee remains in one of these categories for 15 calendar days or more, prepare an evaluation under this rule without regard to the number of days of supervision. Close the evaluation on the day the ratee was placed in MIA, captured, or detained in captive status. These evaluations are as directed by HQ AFPC/DP3SP or HQ ARPC/DPTSE.
8. HQ USAF/REP retains the authority to direct evaluations under this rule. If HQ USAF/RE requires special evaluations on certain officers for selection board use, HQ ARPC/DPTSE furnishes ratee names to the MAJCOM along with appropriate suspense dates and directs submission of evaluations under this rule. Special evaluations covering outstanding duty performance are not permitted under this rule.
9. If the current rater does not consider the referral comments in an LOE to be serious enough to warrant permanent recording, an OPR will not be prepared.
10. The close-out date of the evaluation is the effective date the ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter.
11. The commander may direct an evaluation for significant duty improvement only if the previous evaluation was referred due to substandard duty performance.
12. For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Category E, the unit of assignment is responsible for completing the OPR.
13. For IMAs, only the points accumulated under the direct supervision of the rater apply. Subtract from the IMA's total any points accrued under the supervision of someone other than the IMA's rater.
14. Only include points since close-out of last OPR or TR and do not include Extension Course Institute (ECI) or membership points.
15. If the member has not earned the required number of points, HQ ARPC/DPTSE may extend the close-out to meet the requirement.

Chapter 4

ENLISTED PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

4.1. General Guidelines.

4.1.1. See Chapter 1 for general processing guidance applicable to all evaluations.

4.1.1.1. Do **NOT** deduct any periods of leave, TDY, absences or periods loaned out to other organizations. **EXCEPTION:** non-rated periods authorized IAW paragraph 4.8.

4.1.2. Evaluation ratings are used to determine selections for promotions, job and school recommendations, career job reservations, reenlistments, retraining, and assignments. Therefore, evaluators at all levels must use caution to prevent inflation; it is important to distinguish performance among peers and is a disservice to ALL Airmen when EPR ratings are inflated.

4.1.3. Marking Ratings. “*Wet Signature Evaluations Only.*” When electronic ratings (Xs) are not used, do not enter hand-marked ratings until signing the evaluation to prevent erroneous entry of ratings by other personnel. When hand marking, use only reproducible dark blue or black ink.

4.2. EPR Forms.

4.2.1. AF Form 910, (AB thru TSgt). When completing refer to Table 4.2.

4.2.2. AF Form 911, (MSgt thru SMSgt). When completing refer to Table 4.9.

4.2.3. AF Form 912, (CMSgt). When completing refer to Table 4.6.

4.3. Who Requires EPRs.

4.3.1. All enlisted personnel in the grade of airman basic through CMSgt who have at least 20 months Total Active Federal Military Service (TAFMS) or for ARC 20 months in service from Date Initial Entry Uniformed Services (DIEUS) as directed by Table 4.3. or Table 4.4.

4.3.2. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force retains discretionary authority to render evaluations on an optional basis on the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force.

4.3.3. Military/Civilian Confinement. AFPC will complete an AF Form 77 for those Airmen who choose to remain in the Air Force following overturn of a Courts-Martial Order (CMO) by a subsequent appeals court. The inclusive dates for AF Form 77s will be the day after the ratee’s last static close-out date (SCOD) evaluation close-out date, through the day they were transferred back to present for duty status (the date the courts-martial is overturned). The unit to which the Airman transfers following the return to present for duty status will take over performance evaluation responsibilities, beginning the day following AF Form 77 completion through to the applicable annual SCOD.

4.3.4. Separation/Retirement of Enlisted Personnel (applicable to RegAF and ARC personnel).

4.3.4.1. Evaluations are mandatory, regardless of separation or retirement status, provided the member has not *officially* separated or retired as of their applicable current, or projected grade’s SCOD. **EXAMPLE:** A MSgt with an effective date of retirement of 1 October, would require an evaluation on the MSgt static close-out date of 30 September, regardless

of if the member is on terminal leave, as they are not officially retired from the Air Force, until 1 October.

4.3.4.1.1. For retirements (only): An evaluation is mandatory; however, the rater may choose to or not to provide written performance comments on the evaluation as outlined below.

4.3.4.1.1.1. If the rater chooses to write comments on an evaluation, the comments are written (regardless of whether the ratee wants the comments to be written or not) and the evaluation will close-out on the ratee's applicable SCOD.

4.3.4.1.1.2. If the rater does not want to provide written performance comments on an evaluation, the unit commander (for an enlisted ratee in the rank of AB thru SMSgt), or the senior rater (for CMSgts), will decide whether comments will be written.

4.3.4.1.1.3. If the commander is the rater and does not want to provide written performance comments and the ratee has requested them, the senior rater will decide whether comments will be written.

4.3.4.1.1.4. If neither the rater nor ratee want written comments on the evaluation, the commander/senior rater (as applicable) may direct written comments be included on an evaluation.

4.3.4.1.1.5. In cases where written performance comments will not be included, the applicable evaluation form must still be completed on the SCOD, and must include performance assessment ratings and the following mandatory statement will be entered in every section of the AF Form 910, Sections III (2.), IV (2.), V(2.), VIII (1.), and IX (1.); AF Form 911, Sections III (2.), IV (2.), VII, and VIII; and AF Form 912, Sections II and IV: "FINAL REPORT NOT RENDERED". All applicable members of the ratee's rating chain must endorse the final report to include the ratee.

4.3.4.1.2. For separations (only): Evaluations are mandatory, regardless of separation status, provided the member has not *officially* separated as of their applicable current, or projected grade's SCOD. **EXAMPLE:** A SSgt with an effective date of separation of 1 February, would require an evaluation on the SSgt SCOD of 31 January, regardless of if the member is on terminal leave, as they are not officially separated from Air Force until 1 February.

4.3.4.2. If the member's official date of separation or retirement is prior to the SCOD for their current or projected grade, a SCOD evaluation will not be rendered, however an informal letter of evaluation is optional.

4.4. Evaluations not Authorized. Performance evaluations will not be accomplished on the following:

4.4.1. RegAF personnel with less than 20 months TAFMS and ARC personnel with less than 20 months DIEUS.

4.4.2. Individuals who died on active duty. **EXCEPTION:** if the death occurred on or after the close-out date of an evaluation that was already being processed, it becomes an optional evaluation.

4.4.3. Commissioning Program. Airmen who are enrolled in a commissioning program as of the SCOD. **NOTE:** If an Airman does not complete a program and is returned to enlisted service, a Directed by HAF EPR shall be conducted, effective the date of removal, by the commissioning program, documenting the performance that resulted in removal from the program.

4.4.4. Airmen in prisoner or confinement status as a result of courts-martial conviction, who have PCS'd, and are gained to a long term confinement facility managed by the Air Force Security Forces Center (AFSFC). **NOTE:** Airman awaiting publication of a CMO will remain the administrative responsibility of the losing unit commander/military or civilian director until such time as the CMO is published and the member is officially transferred to an AFSFC managed correctional facility; these Airmen will still require SCOD evaluations (as applicable), completed by the losing commander/director.

4.4.5. Airmen undergoing appellate review leave and awaiting an appeals court decision and still permanently assigned to a AFSFC managed confinement facility.

4.5. When to Submit an Enlisted Performance Report (EPR).

4.5.1. AF Forms 910 (AB thru TSgt), AF Form 911 (MSgt thru SMSgt), and AF Form 912 (CMSgt) (EPRs) for RegAF and ARC Airmen on Active Duty, see Table 4.3.

4.5.2. AF Form 910 (AB thru TSgt), AF Form 911 (MSgt thru SMSgt) and AF Form 912 (CMSgt) (EPRs) for ARC Airmen not on Active Duty, see Table 4.4.

4.6. “FROM” Dates. Establish the “FROM” date if the member:

4.6.1. Has a previous evaluation on file, use the day following the close-out date of the previous evaluation.

4.6.2. For RegAF Airmen who have not had a previous evaluation, the FROM date equals TAFMSD.

4.6.3. USAFA returnees: If an Airman is removed from cadet status to enlisted grade the FROM date will be the EAD date.

4.6.4. AFR: Members who have not had a previous evaluation, use the member's date of assignment to the ARC. For SrA and below use the Date Initial Entry Uniformed Services (DIEUS).

4.6.5. ANG: SrA & below who had not had a previous evaluation, the from date equals DIEUS. SSgt through CMSgt who are transferred from any branch or component, the from date equals date arrive station.

4.7. “THRU” Dates.

4.7.1. Initial Reports.

4.7.1.1. For RegAF the close-out date will be 20 months from the ratee's Total Active Federal Military Service (TAFMS) provided the 20 month anniversary date falls between 1 Apr through 1 Dec each year. For example, the ratee's TAFMS date is 15 Feb 15, then the close-out date will be 15 Oct 16. If the 20 month anniversary date is on 2 Dec through 31 Mar then the close-out date will be rolled-forward to the 31 Mar SCOD. For example

the ratee's 20 months TAFMS is 23 Dec, then the close-out date will be extended to 31 Mar. **NOTE:** If the close-out date is adjusted to 31 Mar under this paragraph the reason for the report is "Annual".

4.7.1.2. AFR: The close out date will be 20 months from the ratee's Date Initial Entry Uniformed Services (DIEUS), provided the 20 months falls between 1 Apr through 1 Dec each year. For example: the ratee's DIEUS date is 15 Feb 17, then the close out date will be 14 Oct 18.

4.7.1.2.1. If the close out date is on 2 Dec through 31 Mar of the biennial SCOD cycle then the close out date will be rolled forward to the 31 Mar SCOD. For example, the ratee's 20 months from DIEUS is 23 Dec 15, then the close out date will be rolled forward to 31 Mar 16.

4.7.1.2.2. If the close out date is on 2 Dec through 31 Mar of the non-biennial SCOD cycle then the close out date will be the 20 months DIEUS date and will not be rolled forward to the next SCOD cycle. For example, the ratee's 20 months from DIEUS is 23 Dec 16, then the close out date will be 23 Dec 16, there is not a 31 Mar 17 SCOD cycle.

4.7.1.3. ANG: Close-out date will be 20 months from the ratee's Date Initial Entry Uniformed Services (DIEUS) date provided the 20 months falls between 1 Apr through 1 Dec each year. For example: the ratee's DIEUS date is 1 Apr 14, then the close-out date will be 1 Dec 15. If the 20 months falls between 2 December through 31 Mar then the close-out date will be rolled-forward to the 31 Mar SCOD and the reason for the report will remain Initial. Subsequent evaluations will close out on the appropriate SCOD.

4.7.2. Annual/Biennial Reports.

4.7.2.1. Reports for RegAF members: reports will close-out on the next appropriate SCOD unless selected for promotion. Those on a select list will have their evaluation close-out on the appropriate SCOD for their promotion selected rank. **EXAMPLE:** The SSgt SCOD is 31 Jan, therefore SSgt evaluations will close-out on that date. However, TSgt selects (SSgts with a line number) will have their evaluations close-out on the TSgt SCOD on 30 Nov.

4.7.2.2. Reports for ARC members: reports will close-out on the next appropriate SCOD. If a promotion/demotion or transfer out of inactive/active status has occurred and the ratee will have more than 24 months (12 months for AGR) from the last evaluation and the new established SCOD for the new rank; a DBH report is required to close out the day prior to the status occurred. **EXAMPLE:** An AGR MSgt is promoted to SMSgt effective 1 Sep 16. A DBH report will be required to close out 31 Aug 16 because the member will have more than 12 months from the last evaluation and the new established SCOD for the new rank.

4.7.3. For Directed by HQ USAF, NGB, or Commander (MAJCOM, wing, group, or squadron, as appropriate) the "THRU" date will be established by the following:

4.7.3.1. Message Directed. Use the date specified in the message directing the evaluation.

4.7.3.1.1. MIA/Captured/Detained. Use the date the ratee was placed in missing-in-action (MIA), captured, or detained in captive status.

4.7.3.1.2. Stripes for Exceptional Performers (STEP) or supplemental promotions. If an Airman is STEP promoted or supplementally selected to the next higher grade and if completing an evaluation on the next SCOD in the new grade will create a reporting period of longer than one year, then a Directed by HAF (DBH) EPR must be completed with a close-out date effective the date of STEP promotion or the date which the results of the supplemental were released. **EXAMPLES:**

4.7.3.1.2.1. SSgt McDaniel was supplementally selected or STEP promoted to TSgt on 15 Apr 2016 and SSgt McDaniel had an EPR on the SSgt SCOD of 31 January 2016, then no EPR is required as TSgt (or TSgt select) McDaniel will receive an EPR on 30 November 2016 (TSgt SCOD).

4.7.3.1.2.2. SSgt Snowden was supplementally selected or STEP promoted to TSgt on 10 Jan 16. TSgt (or TSgt select) Snowden's last evaluation was completed on the 31 Jan 15 SSgt SCOD and the next projected EPR is the 30 Nov 16 TSgt SCOD. Since this creates a rating period of longer than one year, a DBH EPR is required with a close-out date effective the date of the supplemental release/STEP promotion date.

4.7.3.1.3. Otherwise Directed. Use the date as directed by the commander.

4.8. Non-Rated Periods. In particular circumstances, non-rated periods may be authorized. The documentation and/or approval authority required will vary depending on the nature of the circumstances (i.e., for medical conditions, non-rated period is initiated by the Airman's medical provider). During the reporting period, Airmen in a lengthy initial skills or advanced training environment may lack performance in the ratee's primary AFSC as they are learning their job versus performing their job. Those Airmen in or having been in military or civilian confinement, may lack to a degree, performance in their primary AFSC (dependent on the duration of confinement). Non-rated periods due to medical circumstances may include some degree of decreased duty performance and/or behavioral effects resulting from these circumstances. An Airman's medical circumstances for non-rated periods must be considered *individually* as each Airman's circumstance is unique. For example, there is no defined 'timeline' when a sexual assault victim becomes a survivor; every victim's recovery process is dependent on many variables, and therefore, time needed for recovery will vary. Airmen may present a variety of symptoms after a trauma that may impact duty performance. Some of these primary symptoms include effects on sleep and concentration. Responses to a trauma will vary among Airmen because the nature and intensity of a current trauma occurs in the context of an Airman's past history. As a result, commanders, senior leaders, and supervisors must be aware of potential duty performance changes. Likewise with post-traumatic stress, for Wounded Warriors, and Airmen requiring a recovery period as a result of surgery, invasive treatment (such as radiation or chemotherapy), counseling, and/or other rehabilitative treatments and services, the length of recovery period is dependent on many variables (severity of diagnosis, prognosis, type and duration of treatment, reoccurring/multiple conditions/trauma, Airman's support system, individual resiliency, dynamics in the duty section, family history, etc.). Being TDY or deployed is NOT an example of a period that is non-rated. **NOTE:** ARC personnel upon transfer out of the Inactive Ready Reserve or transfer from RegAF, or ANG, or AFR to another component, *must* include non-rated periods on the first SCOD evaluation following reentry/transfer. In such cases, the rater will place the applicable number of days in the appropriate AF Form, Section I, "*No. Days Non-Rated*". The total number of days non-rated will include all non-rated days from close out of the last report

through to the SCOD of the current evaluation. In addition, the following mandatory statement must be placed in the first line of the rater's comments in Section III (AF Form 910/911) and Section II (AF Form 912), "*Member not rated for the period of ____ days due to being assigned to Inactive Ready Reserve, or transfer from RegAF, AFR, or ANG*" (whichever is applicable).

4.8.1. Medical (physical, physiological, and/or psychological conditions; hospitalization, maternity, and/or convalescence in excess of 80 days, including, but not limited to, Airmen in Patient Status) Documentation: The Airman's provider will initiate the recommendation for a non-rated period to the Airman's unit commander using AF Form 469, *Duty Limiting Condition Report*.

4.8.1.1. Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director (or equivalent) Duties/Considerations. The presumption will be in favor of the Airman requesting the non-rated period. Counsel the Airman, directly, to ensure he or she is fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable career impacts (re-accomplish counseling prior to 60-day extensions). Make every reasonable effort to minimize disruption to their normal career progression.

4.8.1.2. Approval Authority. The unit commander/military or civilian director is the approval authority and if they recommend disapproval of the request for a non-rated period, justification must be provided and request will be forwarded to the member's wing commander/equivalent (may be delegated no further than vice commander/equivalent) for final approval/disapproval. This may be accomplished on an additional memo or under a separate attachment.

4.8.2. Sexual Assault (Unrestricted Report) Documentation: The Airmen will submit the request, using memorandum format (see example in Attachment 3) to their unit commander/military or civilian director for approval. The initial non-rated period, if approved, is 80 calendar days; additional periods (60-day increments) may be requested for the Airman's recovery, and will be requested in the same manner. It is prohibited to include comments on any correspondence (evaluation, evaluation notice, etc.) relating to or regarding the member's filing of an Unrestricted Report of sexual assault, receiving support services, and/or participating in the investigative process and/or judicial proceedings.

4.8.2.1. Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director (or equivalent) Duties/Considerations. See paragraph 4.8.1.1.

4.8.2.2. Approval Authority. See paragraph 4.8.1.2.

4.8.3. Lengthy Initial Skills and Advanced Training Courses (enlisted only). Non-rated periods are only considered for initial skills or advanced training courses in excess of 20 continuous weeks (for example the 1-year AFIT program). The following training courses do not qualify for use of non-rated: initial skills and advanced training courses that are under 20 continuous weeks; all other 3, 5, 7 skill level training courses; and/or other specific skills training courses (e.g. field detachment training, flight requalification courses, pre-deployment training, etc.) for which the ratee travels TDY from home station, or TDY enroute.

4.8.3.1. Approval Authority. AFPC/DP3SP serves as the approval authority for courses requesting consideration for non-rated periods of supervision. All requests must be signed/submitted by the applicable training course's ADCON wing commander/senior

rater. AETC courses of instruction will route their requests through 2 AF/A1, who will review, consolidate, and forward to AFPC for final approval.

4.8.3.2. Comments: Are required in Sections III and IV of the AF Form 911, and Sections III, IV and V of the AF Form 910, which capture academic performance, significant accomplishments (such as grade point average) or negative quality force indicators received during lengthy initial skills or advanced training courses, even if the period of training covers the entire reporting period. A minimum of one bullet is required in each section. However, comments are optional in Sections VII, VIII and IX of the AF Form 911, and Section VIII and IX of the AF Form 910. When comments are not included in optional sections, enter the statement "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK" in the applicable comment area. **EXCEPTION:** Referral evaluations will require the applicable referral comments in Section VII, VIII and/or Section IX of the AF Form 911, and Section VIII and/or Section IX of the AF Form 910 as required according to paragraph 1.10. **NOTE:** Training squadrons are prohibited from replicating bullets for use across multiple EPRs; comments must be unique to each trainee's accomplishments and level of performance.

4.8.4. Military or Civilian Confinement: Non-rated periods of supervision, regardless of the number of days served, may be considered for Airmen in military or civilian confinement (prisoner status), having served in military or civilian confinement during the reporting period, or those continuing to serve a term of confinement in a military or civilian confinement facility not managed by the Air Force Security Forces Center (AFSFC). The ratee's unit commander/military or civilian director will subtract periods of non-rated supervision as a result of confinement using the total days documented on Airman's AF Form 2098, *Duty Status Change*, from the total number days of supervision, for all evaluations, with the exception of Directed by Commander (DBC) reports. DBC evaluations, accomplished to capture the egregious event(s) that resulted in confinement (for enlisted may only comment on the negative behavior) and will not subtract days of confinement (non-rated days) from the total number of days supervision.

4.8.4.1. The losing unit commander/military or civilian director for those courts-martialed Airmen, transferred to a long term confinement facility managed by the AFSFC, are required to complete a DBC report (even when a DBC report has already been accomplished), to close out the day the courts-martial is adjudged, encompassing the courts-martial results, and capturing the egregious event(s) that resulted in the courts-martial ruling of long term confinement (if the egregious event(s) are not already captured in a previous DBC or SCOD evaluation).

4.8.4.2. Airmen in prisoner or confinement status as a result of courts-martial conviction, who have PCS'd, and are gained to a long-term confinement facility managed by the AFSFC, do not require annual evaluations. **NOTE:** Airman awaiting publication of a Courts-Martial Order (CMO) will remain the administrative responsibility of the losing unit commander/military or civilian director until such time as the CMO is published and the member is officially transferred to an AFSFC managed correctional facility; these Airmen will still require SCOD evaluations (as applicable), completed by the losing commander/director.

4.8.4.3. Airmen undergoing appellate review leave and awaiting an appeals court decision are not required an annual static close-out date evaluation, as they are still permanently assigned to a AFSFC managed confinement facility for reporting purposes.

4.8.4.4. AFPC will complete an AF Form 77 for those Airmen who choose to remain in the Air Force following overturn of a CMO by a subsequent appeals court. The inclusive dates for AF Form 77s will be the day after the ratee's last static close-out date evaluation thru date, through the day they were transferred back to present for duty status (the date the courts-martial is overturned). The unit to which the Airman transfers following the return to present for duty status will take over performance evaluation responsibilities, beginning the day following AF Form 77 completion through to the applicable annual SCOD.

4.8.5. Notification. Once the non-rated period is approved, the Airman's evaluation notice will be annotated accordingly and forwarded to the Airman's rater. If additional non-rated periods are deemed necessary, notification will follow in the same manner.

4.8.6. Reporting. The rater will not consider, nor comment on, the Airman's performance during a non-rated period, except as required IAW paragraphs 4.8.3. and 4.8.4. **EXCEPTION:** The rater may comment on significant accomplishments (such as completion of CCAF degree) if requested by the ratee. If the non-rated period covers the entire reporting period (exception as required IAW paragraph 4.8.3. and 4.8.4.), enter the statement: "Airman is not rated for this period: (date) through (date). No comments authorized IAW AFI 36-2406" in Sections III, IV, and V of the AF Form 910; or Sections III and IV of the AF Form 911; and enter "THIS SECTION NOT USED" in Sections VIII and IX of the AF Form 910 or Sections VII, VIII, and IX of the AF Form 911.

4.9. Number of Days Supervision.

4.9.1. Enter the number of days the rater supervised the ratee during the reporting period. To compute, use the "supervision began date" through the "close-out date" to determine the number of days of supervision.

4.9.2. Do NOT deduct any periods of leave, TDY, absences or periods loaned out to other organizations. **EXCEPTION:** Non-rated periods authorized IAW paragraph 4.8.

4.9.3. On an EPR being written by the rater's rater per paragraph 1.7., then enter number of days for which the evaluator had personal or written knowledge of the ratee's duty performance during the reporting period.

4.10. Completing Evaluations. The rater will evaluate how well the ratee performed during the rating period by completing this section of the AF Form 910/911/912; however, the additional evaluators will review evaluations to ensure ratings accurately describe performance and comments are compatible with/support the performance assessment rating. They must return evaluations with unsupported statements for additional information or reconsideration of ratings (see paragraph 1.9 for disagreements); however, no evaluator may coerce another into changing their comments or ratings unless they are missing mandatory comments (paragraph 1.11) or the evaluation includes prohibited comments (paragraph 1.12). **(T-0).**

4.11. Promotion Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Time-In-Service (TIS) Eligibility (AF Form 910 only).

4.11.1. This block will be marked accordingly based on TIG/TIS eligibility only, **not** promotion eligibility.

4.11.2. TIG/TIS is based on requirements outlined in AFI 36-2502 as of the SCOD. The rater fills out this portion of the AF Form 910 and marks the block “YES” or “NO” based on eligibility.

4.12. Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Senior Rater Stratification/Endorsement Eligibility (AF Form 911 only).

4.12.1. TIG/Senior Rater Stratification/Endorsement Eligibility. Senior raters are restricted to stratifying the top 10% of TIG/TIS eligible MSgts or top 20% of TIG/TIS eligible SMSgts within their senior rater ID (SRID) and by component. When determining the quota, normal rounding rules apply (.49 rounds down to the whole number and .50 rounds up to the whole number). (**NOTE:** Further stratifying ARC personnel by status within component is prohibited.). For a senior rater stratification/endorsement, the ratee must meet all of the following minimum requirements as of the close-out date of the evaluation (except as authorized by paragraph 4.13.4.2. due to forced endorsements):

4.12.1.1. In the grade of MSgt/SMSGt.

4.12.1.2. Meet the TIG eligibility requirements outlined in paragraph 4.12.5. and Table 4.5. Refer to AFI 36-2502 for ARC TIG/TIS promotion eligibility.

4.12.1.3. Successfully completed the SNCO Academy. The SNCOA requirement is defined as successful completion of the SNCOA by correspondence. Completion of the SEJPME does not fulfill this requirement. **EXCEPTION:** Airmen who have completed SNCOA in-residence prior to the implementation of the DL courses are not required to complete the DL courses to meet this requirement and will be considered complete.

4.12.1.4. Successfully met all the Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) degree requirements as of the close-out date of the evaluation.

4.12.1.4.1. The CCAF requirement is defined as having been successfully met when the degree is conferred/awarded. Completing the last required course/CLEP/DANTES/etc. is not sufficient.

4.12.1.4.2. Any CCAF degree may fill this requirement. Degrees received outside the CCAF do not fulfill this requirement, (i.e. A.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., etc.).

4.12.2. A senior rater will endorse a non-TIG eligible evaluation only when one of the following apply:

4.12.2.1. When the senior rater is the rater whether or not the ratee is TIG/TIS eligible or has completed the minimum requirements for senior rater stratification/endorsement. In this case, the SR will mark the “Forced Endorsement” box in Section IX block 1A of the AF Form 911.

4.12.2.2. When the senior rater is the evaluator named in a referral memorandum.

4.12.2.3. When the deputy evaluator does not qualify as a single evaluator.

4.12.3. A senior rater stratification/endorsement is not automatic or mandatory even if the member is TIG/TIS eligible and has met the requirements in paragraph 4.12.1. The decision to forward the evaluation for SR stratification/endorsement is determined by the evaluator who is eligible to close-out the evaluation; and each level thereafter, without necessarily going to the SR. **NOTE:** Blanket or locally developed policies restricting level of endorsement are strictly prohibited. Each evaluation will be reviewed on its own merit to determine level of endorsement. **EXAMPLE:** No organization may establish a "policy" directing the final evaluator on MSgt/SMSgt selectee (or any non TIG eligible) evaluation be restricted to the Intermediate Evaluator simply based on TIG eligibility.

4.12.3.1. The unit commander who meets the grade requirements to close-out the report as a final evaluator, determines if the ratee is deserving of a senior rater stratification/endorsement and forwards the report to the next level final evaluator. The deputy evaluator (the first O-6 in the ratee's chain of command, up from the ratee to the SR) may determine the report does not warrant senior rater stratification/endorsement. The deputy evaluator may then close-out the evaluation at his/her level, without forwarding the evaluation to the senior rater.

4.12.3.2. If both the intermediate and deputy evaluators feel the ratee is deserving of a senior rater stratification/endorsement and the minimum requirements have been met, the evaluation is forwarded to the senior rater. If the senior rater determines a senior rater stratification/endorsement is not warranted (i.e., the ratee is not in the top 10% MSgt/20% SMSgt of the SR TIG/TIS promotion eligibles), the senior rater is not authorized to endorse the report (unless required due to forced endorsement). The report will be sent back to the first O-6 in the ratee's chain of command, up from the ratee to the SR to close-out the report. In cases where there is no O-6/GS-15 between the ratee and the senior rater, the report will be returned to an officer with a minimum grade of O-4/GS-12 who works for and is rated by the senior rater. The level of endorsement below Senior Rater is not a weighted factor and should not be considered positively or negatively with regard to level of performance or potential for promotion.

4.12.4. If the member is not TIG/TIS eligible for a senior rater stratification/endorsement, the evaluation must be endorsed by, and the final evaluator will be, either the deputy evaluator or intermediate evaluator who meets the minimum grade requirement (except due to forced endorsements).

4.12.5. Determine TIG/TIS eligibility for senior rater stratification/endorsement using the formulas below. See the TIG Eligibility Chart, Table 4.5.

4.12.5.1. For MSgt Ratees (RegAF only). **NOTE:** Refer to AFI 36-2502 for ARC TIG/TIS promotion eligibility.

4.12.5.1.1. If close-out date is less than or equal to 30 Sep of current year, determine number of months TIG from Date of Rank (DOR) to 1 Mar of the next year following the evaluation close-out date. If less than 20 months, then TIG Eligible is "NO." If greater than or equal to 20 months, then TIG Eligible is "YES." All Airmen meeting a promotion board are required to have an EPR on file closed out within 12 months of the PECD.

4.12.5.1.2. If close-out date is greater than 30 Sep of current year, determine the number of months TIG from DOR to 1 Mar two years following the evaluation close-out date. If less than 20 months, TIG Eligible is “NO”. If greater than or equal to 20 months, TIG Eligible is “YES”. All Airmen meeting a promotion board are required to have an EPR on file closed out within 12 months of the PECD.

4.12.5.2. For SMSgt Ratees (RegAF only). **NOTE:** Refer to AFI 36-2502 for ARC TIG/TIS promotion eligibility.

4.12.5.2.1. If close-out date is less than or equal to 31 Jul of current year, determine number of months TIG from DOR to 1 Dec of current year. If less than 21 months, then Promotion TIG/TIS Eligibility is “NO.” If greater than or equal to 21 months, then Promotion TIG/TIS Eligibility is “YES.”

4.12.5.2.2. If close-out date is greater than 31 Jul of current year, determine number of months TIG from DOR to 1 Dec of next year following the evaluation close-out date. If less than 21 months, Promotion TIG/TIS Eligibility is “NO”. If greater than or equal to 21 months, Promotion TIG/TIS Eligibility is “YES”. All Airmen meeting a promotion board are required to have an EPR on file closed out within 12 months of the PECD. **(T-0).**

4.12.5.3. For SMSgt promotion selects (RegAF only). Promotion TIG/TIS Eligibility is based upon the SCOD of the EPR. If the SCOD falls on the day of/day after the promotion public release date (to include supplemental promotions), individuals on the selectee list are not eligible for senior rater endorsement on that evaluation; as they were SMSgt selectees on the SCOD. Conversely, if the SCOD EPR closed out prior to the promotion public release date, the member is eligible for senior rater endorsement because as of the SCOD, they were still a MSgt and not officially a SMSgt promotion selectee.

4.12.5.4. CMSgt and CMSgt selects. The Senior Rater must endorse all CMSgt or CMSgt select EPRs.

4.13. Final Evaluator’s Position and Single Evaluators.

4.13.1. The final evaluator must be, at a minimum, an officer serving in the grade of O-4, civilian equivalent, (GS-12), or higher, but no higher in organization than the senior rater. For CMSgt select and CMSgt (AF Form 912), the rater must be an E-9 (CMSgt or equivalent) or above; or an officer of the United States, or a foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee. The final evaluator must be the senior rater; final evaluator may not be delegated to a lower level evaluator. **NOTE:** For ANG AGR and non-AGR, the final evaluator must be at a minimum the full-time unit commander. If there is no full-time unit commander, the final endorser will be the senior full-time officer serving in the grade of O-4, civilian equivalent, (GS-12), or higher, but no higher in organization than the senior rater. **EXCEPTION:** The CMSAF may endorse EPRs as a senior rater and may also serve as the final evaluator.

4.13.2. Single Evaluator *only*. An evaluator must be an O-6 or a GS-15 (or equivalent). If the rater is a SR, the evaluation must close-out at this level unless it is a referral evaluation. The evaluator must meet both grade requirements and the evaluator requirements for each section of the applicable evaluation form (**EXAMPLE:** must meet both grade requirements as an O-6 [or equivalent/higher grade] and must meet the definition of a “unit commander/military or

civilian director/other authorized reviewer”). An O-6, or equivalent, in and of themselves meets the grade requirement to serve as a final [deputy] evaluator on the AF Form 911, and/or as a final [senior rater] evaluator on the AF Form 911 and AF Form 912, provided they are designated as a senior rater by the ML; however they must also meet the necessary requirements as a “unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer” (see definition) to sign the entire evaluation as a “single evaluator”. Also, see definition of final evaluator. Single evaluators will enter “RATER IS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL RATER” in the additional rater comment section. Signature elements, to include the signature, are required in all sections of the evaluation regardless of whether there are performance comments included, or the evaluator has entered “RATER IS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL RATER”.

4.13.3. An additional rater who meets the minimum grade requirement *may* close-out the evaluation. However, an official higher in the rating chain than the additional rater, may serve as the reviewer/final evaluator, if authorized. In any case, the reviewer/final evaluator may not be higher in the organizational structure than the senior rater.

4.13.4. Use the following to determine the final evaluator’s position.

4.13.4.1. Senior Rater. Used when the final evaluator is the highest level endorser in the ratee's rating chain. The senior rater must be in the grade of at least a colonel or civilian equivalent, (GS-15), or higher, serving as a wing commander or equivalent and designated by the Management Level. For MSgt – SMSgt. A civilian SR must be serving as a wing commander or equivalent, in a SR position designated by the Management Level and at least a GS-15.

4.13.4.2. Senior Rater Forced Endorsement. This block will be marked when the senior rater must complete Section IX, Final Evaluator’s Comments, of the AF Form 911, whether or not the ratee is TIG/TIS promotion eligible or has completed the minimum requirements for senior rater stratification/endorsement, due to rating chain or final evaluator requirements.

4.13.4.3. Deputy Evaluator. Is the first O-6/GS-15 evaluator in the ratee’s rating chain between (up from) the ratee and the senior rater, regardless of the organizational duty position of the O-6. In cases where there is no O-6/GS-15 between the ratee and the senior rater, then an officer with a minimum grade of O-4 who works for and is rated by the senior rater would qualify as a deputy evaluator to close-out an evaluation which is not stratified/endorsed or TIG/TIS eligible. Evaluators in the rating chain must not be skipped in order to garner a deputy evaluator endorsement by someone with a higher duty position within the organization/rating chain.

4.13.4.3.1. When the rater does not qualify as a single evaluator and is the unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer, and works directly for the SR [rater’s rater/additional rater], the unit commander, etc. completes the rater's assessment area as the rater. The SR completes the Additional Rater’s Comments, as the additional rater (to include allowing placement of the two optional bullets), and then the unit commander, etc. will complete the, Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer’s Comments, (to include allowing placement of the optional bullet). The SR will complete the Final Evaluator’s Comments, either as a forced endorsement or as the outright SR endorsement for those SNCOs who are promotion eligible and are receiving SR stratification/endorsement as a result of falling

within the SR's top 10% of promotion eligible MSgts or top 20% of promotion eligible SMSgts (to include allowing placement of the optional bullet).

4.13.4.3.2. Do not skip the O-6 squadron commander or branch chief in order to garner the O-6 group commander or division chief's final endorsement as a deputy evaluator.

4.13.4.4. Intermediate Evaluator. An individual in the ratee's rating chain who works directly for deputy evaluator and meets the grade requirement to complete the final endorsement on the EPR. For MSgt – SMSgt, a civilian final evaluator must be at least a GS-12. **EXAMPLE:** Unit Commanders not in the grade of O-6/civilian equivalent; MAJCOM section chiefs below the Division which are not in the grade of O-6/civilian equivalent.

4.13.4.4.1. When the rater, additional rater, and/or unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer is also the final evaluator, or qualifies as a final evaluator, and closes out the evaluation, they will complete Section VIII, Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer's Comments, and Section IX, Final Evaluator's Comments, to include allowing placement of the optional bullet, in each corresponding section if they decide not to include performance comments.

4.13.5. The individual who will be the final evaluator will ensure the proper final evaluator's position block is marked prior to signing the EPR.

4.13.6. Evaluators with Dual or Multiple Roles (This paragraph does not apply to Single Evaluators, see paragraph 4.13.2.). When an evaluator is responsible for dual or multiple roles on the AF Form 910, 911, or 912, i.e., serves as the rater and the FD/unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer (AF Form 910/911) or the rater and senior rater (AF Form 912), or when the additional rater is also the unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer, and/or the final evaluator (AF Form 911), each section of the evaluation will be considered independently, and may include written comments authorized in each separate section of the evaluation. When an evaluator chooses not to include performance comments in a section of the AF Form 910/911/912, the evaluator will enter "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK", in the applicable section. Signature elements, to include the signature, are required in all sections of the evaluation regardless of whether there are performance comments included, or the evaluator has entered "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK".

4.14. ACA/Performance Feedback.

4.14.1. ACA/Performance Feedback will be accomplished IAW Chapter 2.

4.14.2. In Section VII (AF Form 910), Section VI (AF Form 911), and Section III (AF Form 912) the rater certifies required ACA was conducted during the reporting period by signing. If ACA was not accomplished, an explanation must be provided in the remarks block (AF Form 910/911/912).

4.15. Forced Distributor, (Section IX, AF Form 910) Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer, (Section VIII, AF Form 911).

4.15.1. The review is performed by a military service member designated as the director of, or in command of, a unit (PAS code[s]). In the commander's or director's absence, an individual on G-Series orders or a senior official within the unit commander's jurisdiction designated in writing by the unit commander or director, may complete this section provided in both cases, the designated individual is the next most senior ranking officer or civilian within the organization (e.g., deputy commander, operations officer, deputy director). Individuals designated in writing to complete this section, in absence of the unit commander or director, may not use the title "commander" or "director" and they are to use their assigned duty title on the EPR. A civilian equivalent, assigned to the position of director, or unit director, responsible for the unit (PAS code [s]), may also complete this section. This section will be accomplished by the home station commander for all individuals assigned to 365-day extended deployment, regardless of the grade of the deployed rater and additional rater. **NOTE:** The FD as of the SCOD will sign all AF Form 910s on all Airmen assigned to their FDID, regardless of TIG/TIS eligibility. If the FD appointed another officer/civilian to represent the FD at the EFDP, the signature authority is still the FD.

4.15.2. The commander reviews evaluations to ensure ratings accurately describe performance and comments are compatible with/support ratings. They must return evaluations with unsupported statements for additional information or reconsideration of ratings. However, commanders may not coerce an evaluator to make changes. See paragraph 1.9. for disagreements. **NOTE:** First Sergeants are required to review all EPRs prior to the commander.

4.15.3. The commander will mark the "concur" or "non-concur" block. See paragraph 1.9. for disagreements.

4.15.4. Forced Distributors or Commanders/Directors may have multiple roles. The two signatures serve separate purposes, one as an evaluator regarding duty performance, and one as a commander regarding quality review. If the FD/unit commander/director qualifies as a single evaluator enter "RATER IS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL RATER" in the additional rater comment section. Signature elements, to include the signature, are required in all sections of the evaluation regardless of whether there are performance comments included, or the evaluator has entered "RATER IS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL RATER".

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

4.16.1. **(AF Form 911)** Promotion Recommendations and Assignment Recommendations: Written promotion recommendations are only allowed when a SNCO is TIG/TIS promotion eligible. Written promotion recommendations may only be made by the final evaluator, and may only be captured in Section IX, Final Evaluator's Comments. Written promotion recommendations by anyone other than the final evaluator, or in any other section are prohibited; i.e., written promotion statements made by the unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer, additional rater, or rater are prohibited. **(EXCEPTION:** When the rater qualifies as a single evaluator and the ratee is promotion eligible, the rater may

include a written promotion recommendation in Section IX, Final Evaluator's Comments.) Written promotion recommendations on promotion selectee evaluations are prohibited as the ratee is ineligible for promotion. Evaluators may only make promotion recommendations that refer to the ratee's next higher grade. Written assignment recommendations are authorized regardless of TIG/TIS eligibility (All AF Form 911s). See paragraph 4.16.1.3. Authorized examples are as follows:

4.16.1.1. For a TIG/TIS promotion eligible MSgt (eligible for promotion to SMSgt), the final evaluator may make a promotion recommendation stating: "promote to SMSgt, then select for Flight Chief." (Appropriate because it could be the next eligible grade/assignment for a promotion eligible MSgt and the promotion recommendation was done by the final evaluator).

4.16.1.2. However, for a MSgt who is not TIG/TIS promotion eligible, the following is prohibited, "promote to SMSgt, future Command Chief", as the ratee is not TIG/TIS eligible and as Command Chief positions are nominative positions held by Airmen in the grade of CMSgt. Therefore an Airman must, at a minimum, obtain the rank of CMSgt and meet minimum eligibility requirements before becoming eligible for nomination to this position.

4.16.1.3. Final evaluators may also provide assignment recommendations in their comments. Similar to promotion recommendations, assignment recommendations may only be made by the final evaluator (with the exception of the "Future Roles" section) and may only refer to the positions in the ratee's current grade if not promotion eligible. If the ratee is promotion eligible (or a selectee), assignment recommendations may be made for positions in the current and next higher grade (if a selectee, next higher grade comments are limited to the grade selected to).

4.16.2. (AF Form 910) Promotion recommendations that are pushes to the next higher grade are prohibited. **EXCEPTION:** Promotion statements that are statements of fact (i.e., "selected for promotion BTZ", or "STEP promoted to TSgt") are authorized. Additionally, pushes to commissioning sources are also authorized (i.e., Select for OTS, Selected for OTS, etc.).

4.16.3. Performance comments regarding Airman serving in ceremonial/event related positions that have a "title" higher than the rank the Airman currently holds are acceptable. **EXAMPLES:** An Honor Guard SrA serving as NCOIC, Firing Team or NCOIC, Colors during a ceremony. A SSgt serving as the First Sergeant of the Mess at a formal Order of the Sword Ceremony.

4.16.4. Future Roles. A recommendation provided by the FD/unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer (AF Form 910/911) or the senior rater (AF Form 912) that best serves the Air Force and continues the Airman's professional development. Future roles should follow the normal career progression for the ratee's career field based on their respective Career Field Education and Training Plan and may include Developmental Special Duty (DSD) positions. Future roles may not serve as a veiled promotion statement.

4.16.4.1. An Airman that is TIG/TIS eligible or a selectee may be recommended for a future role in their current grade, projected grade, or grade in which TIG/TIS eligible to be promoted to. **EXAMPLE:** FD/unit commander can make a future role recommendation

for a TIG/TIS eligible TSgt to the roles of Section Chief and First Sergeant, as these positions are commensurate with the grade of TSgt and MSgt.

4.16.4.2. An Airman that is not TIG/TIS promotion eligible and has no line number may *only* be given a future role in the grade they currently hold.

4.16.4.3. An Airman that has a line number may be recommended for a future role in their current grade or projected grade.

4.16.4.4. An Airman that is TIG/TIS promotion eligible, however is not promotion eligible for other individual reasons (e.g. SNCO without CCAF or SNCOA, Article 15, etc.) can only be given a future role for their current grade.

4.17. Inappropriate Comments Referring to Separation/Retirement, Civilian Employment, and Professional Military Education (PME).

4.17.1. Separation or retirement status. Comments referring to separation, retirement, or transfer to reserve status are prohibited. However, comments may be warranted when an Airman displays a reluctance to accept responsibility, a negative attitude toward the job, and/or exhibits a decrease in performance that can be reasonably attributed to a pending separation or retirement. Comments are limited to the behavior and not the fact the Airman is separating, retiring or transferring to a reserve status. **NOTE:** Although comments are mandatory, the minimum bullets required IAW Tables 4.2, 4.6 or 4.9 may be used.

4.17.2. Civilian Employment. Comments about civil service jobs or other civilian occupations are prohibited unless it directly relates to the military position and their military performance. Recommendations for civilian employment are prohibited.

4.17.3. Enlisted PME Comments in EPRs.

4.17.3.1. The only permissible PME comments in EPRs will be those referencing selections for an official PME award (e.g., John Levitow Award, Academic Achievement Award, Distinguished Graduate, Commandant Award and Leadership Award) or completion of Senior Enlisted Joint Professional Military Education (SEJPME/SEJPME II) courses (web based course). Comments that reference award of in-residence course “team awards” are prohibited. (e.g. the CMSgt Richard L. Etchberger Team Award). Receiving a PME award is a significant accomplishment and is appropriate to use in enlisted evaluations. *All other* comments, to include recommendation for any other PME and selection for any other PME attendance are prohibited. Comments referencing Air Force mandatory PME, residence or non-residence (Airman Leadership School, NCOA or SNCOA), selection, attendance and/or completion are prohibited to include implied comments.

4.17.3.2. SEJPME.

4.17.3.2.1. Comments on completion of SEJPME courses are allowed for TSgts and above (except the SNCOA sister service equivalents [i.e., Navy SNCOA]). Allowing SEJPME courses completion to be documented in evaluations will simply allow a valid Joint PME course to be appropriately documented in an Airman’s record.

4.17.3.2.2. SEJPME courses are in no way an equivalent to completion of the required Air Force PME and will not be reflected on SNCO promotion evaluation board briefs. The Air Force mandated PME (correspondence/in-residence) remains the expected PME for all Air Force enlisted personnel to complete. Completing any SEJPME does not fill the SNCOA requirement for senior rater endorsement consideration.

4.17.3.3. Comments referencing non-completion of CCAF or SNCOA as the reason for absence of a senior rater endorsement are prohibited.

4.18. Ratee's Acknowledgement.

4.18.1. The rater is required to conduct face-to-face (End-of-Reporting Period) feedback in conjunction with presenting the evaluation to the ratee IAW Table 2.1. The EPR serves as the feedback form. An Airman Comprehensive Assessment (ACA) form is not required. Electronic routing of the form does not excuse the rater from providing face-to-face feedback. Only in situations where face-to-face feedback is not feasible, will feedback be conducted either by telephone or electronically. The rater should first attempt to call the ratee and conduct the feedback via telephone. If that option is not available, the rater may provide clear, detailed feedback to the ratee via email, using a read receipt to verify the feedback was received and read.

4.18.2. The ratee's signature in the acknowledgment block does not constitute concurrence or non-concurrence of the content and/or rating of the evaluation. The signature is to acknowledge receipt of the evaluation and to certify the ratee reviewed the personal information on the form.

4.18.3. The ratee's signature will be obtained after all other evaluator's have signed. In cases where an Air Force Advisor or Acquisition/Functional Examiner signature is required, the ratee acknowledgment will occur after the advisor or examiner review.

4.18.4. The ratee must acknowledge receipt of the evaluation prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record unless the ratee refuses or is unable to sign. The ratee will review and verify all dates, markings and comments on the form. Significant discrepancies and administrative errors can be addressed at this time, and corrected if agreed by all parties, before the evaluation becomes a matter of record. This is not to be interpreted to mean the ratee can refuse to sign if they disagree with the evaluation. This is an acknowledgement of the evaluation **NOT** concurrence. If evaluators do not agree to change the evaluation and the ratee wishes to dispute it, they should pursue the established appeal/correction avenues available to them as outlined in [Chapter 10](#), Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Reports, once the evaluation is a matter of record.

4.18.5. The rater will suspense the ratee three (3) duty days (30 calendar days for ARC) to sign the evaluation.

4.18.6. In cases where the ratee refuses to sign, any evaluator signing the evaluation is authorized to select "Ratee refused" from the drop down menu in the ratee's acknowledgment and sign the evaluation in the ratee's acknowledgement block.

4.18.7. In cases where the ratee is unable to sign, any evaluator will select "Not available" from the drop down menu in the ratee's acknowledgment block and sign the evaluation in the ratee's acknowledgement block.

4.18.8. For the purpose of signing evaluations, the terms “Unavailable” or “Unable to Sign” indicates that the member does not have access to a CAC-enabled computer (i.e. convalescent leave, TDY to a contractor facility without government computer access, deployed to a location without computer access, no longer have digital signature capability, in AWOL or deserter status, etc.).

4.18.9. “Wet Signature Evaluations Only.” Evaluators can type, handwrite or use the drop down option to annotate the evaluation when the ratee is unable or declines to sign.

4.19. Forced Distribution (AF Form 910 Only).

4.19.1. Definition. Forced Distribution is the restriction on the top two promotion recommendations that a force distributor (see definition) can allocate on AF Form 910 for promotion eligible ratees, by grade.

4.19.2. Forced Distribution Process.

4.19.2.1. Promote Now (“PN”) and Must Promote (“MP”) recommendations are limited in number to ensure only the highest performing Airmen with the greatest potential to serve in the next grade receive “PN” and “MP” recommendations. The FD or forced distribution authority is sending a strong signal that the Airman is ready for immediate promotion. “PN” and “MP” allocation rates may vary by grade for each cycle. The intent is to ensure those Airmen awarded a “PN” or “MP” receive a distinct advantage when competing for promotion. FDs receive a share of “PN” and “MP” allocations based on the total number of TIG/TIS promotion eligible Airmen (by grade) assigned to a specific PAS code (unit) as of approximately 120-days prior to the established SCOD (the accounting date).

4.19.2.2. Accounting Date (see Table 4.12). On the accounting date (approximately 120 before the SCOD), AFPC will match eligible Airmen to their respective FD based on the Airman’s Date Arrived Station (DAS) in the personnel system (Effective Duty Date (EDD) for PCA actions). After this date, the number of allocations is adjusted to account for Airmen who become TIG/TIS eligible for promotion and for Airmen who are still not aligned under the correct FD as verified and reported by the servicing FSS. Adjustments are made until the SCOD. On that day, AFPC determines the actual number of allocations and distributes them to FDs based on the number of eligible TIG/TIS promotion eligible Airmen for each FD’s particular PAS code(s). No changes will be made to the number of allocations on or after the SCOD unless specifically authorized by HQ AFPC/DP3SP as an exception.

4.19.2.3. Static Close-out Date (SCOD). This is the date that all enlisted evaluations will close-out for a specific grade and is the date used to determine the final TIG/TIS eligible pool for senior rater stratification/endorsement and forced distribution allocations. EPRs cannot be signed before this date.

4.19.2.4. Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel (EFDP) (Small Units Only). A panel that provides a mechanism to aggregate small unit eligibles to the SR or ML for promotion allocation. The EFDP is comprised of the SR, who is the panel president (this can be delegated down to the vice commander only if the vice commander is not a FD); the FDs, who have promotion eligible Airmen competing for forced endorsement promotion allocations on the panel; and an AF senior enlisted advisor, who is the CCM or Air Force SEL for joint organizations or organizations without a sitting command chief, and serves

in an advisory role to the EFDP only. The EFDP may convene No Earlier Than (NET) the day after the applicable SCOD and after receipt of the final Master Eligibility Listing (MEL). EPRs meeting the EFDP cannot be signed by the FD, prior to the EFDP awarding “PN” and “MP” allocations.

4.19.3. Large and Small Unit.

4.19.3.1. A large unit is defined as any organizational structure (Forced Distributor Identification [FDID]) with 11 or more TIG/TIS eligible Airmen (by grade) as of the SCOD. Large unit “PN” and “MP” allocations are systematically determined based on the total population of TIG/TIS promotion eligible Airmen (by grade) in the FDID. **NOTE:** Aggregation of eligibles to the SR or ML EFDP is not allowed for large unit TIG/TIS eligible Airmen.

4.19.3.2. A small unit is defined as any organizational structure (FDID) with 10 or less TIG/TIS eligible Airmen (by grade) as of the SCOD. Small units “PN” and “MP” allocations are systematically determined based on the total population of TIG/TIS promotion eligible Airmen (by grade) in the FDID. Small units do not generate allocations to be awarded by the FD; therefore, the small unit TIG/TIS promotion eligible Airmen aggregate up to compete at the SR or ML EFDP. HAF/SAF/COCOM/MAJCOM FDs with 10 or less TIG/TIS eligible Airmen aggregate from the senior rater up to the ML EFDP. The total number of promotion eligible Airmen from small units will drive the number of “PN” and “MP” promotion recommendation allocations awarded by the SR or ML EFDP; if there are 10 or less promotion eligibles following aggregation to the SR or ML EFDP, the SR or ML EFDP will receive an outright allocation of 1 “PN” and 1 “MP”. **NOTE:** EFDP consideration is not automatic; FDs determine which eligibles compete at the EFDP based on the Airman’s documented performance and their potential to serve at the next higher grade.

4.19.3.3. Enlisted forced distribution panels/proceedings, may occur NET the day following each applicable grade’s SCOD, pending FD has the Final MEL. Any and all notional or pre-forced distribution proceedings, ahead of the completion of each grade’s entire reporting period (e.g. prior to 1159 hours on the applicable grade’s SCOD) are prohibited.

4.19.4. Forced Distribution of Students/Patients. FDs have a separate FDID for in-utilization permanent party students and patients and will receive a separate allocation for their TIG/TIS promotion eligible student/patient populations, see paragraph 4.19.10. **NOTE:** Airmen TDY to school (less than 20 weeks) will fall under their home station FDID.

4.19.5. Allocating Forced Distribution Promotion Allocations.

4.19.5.1. Forced Distribution provides an opportunity for commanders to award promotion recommendations through forced distribution allocations to exceptionally well qualified promotion eligible SrA, SSgts, and TSgts, to be effective on each grade’s applicable annual SCOD. Each FD authority’s Promote Now (PN) and Must Promote (MP) selection opportunity is calculated according to a percent of the promotion eligible population based on TIG and TIS.

4.19.5.2. The following is provided to outline mandatory procedures, restrictions, and overall guidance to FD authorities (unit commanders, senior raters and management levels), for the allocation of forced distribution promotion allocations via small unit organization roll-up to EFDP and large units.

4.19.5.2.1. Large units (11 or more TIG/TIS eligibles) will receive their own forced distribution promotion allocations, and large unit FD authorities will award their allocations at the unit level.

4.19.5.2.2. Small units (10 or less TIG/TIS eligibles) roll-up, compete at and receive promotion recommendation allocations via the Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) EFDP.

4.19.5.2.2.1. Small unit EFDP procedures are established by Senior Raters and Management Levels (whichever is applicable) using the guidance within this instruction. Large unit procedures are developed by large unit commanders with the approval of the Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable), and must follow the guidance contained within this instruction. Both large unit and Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) EFDP procedures must be fully documented to ensure fair, equitable, and timely forced distribution promotion consideration and must be IAW the guidance in this instruction. Requests for clarification of procedures outlined in the attached instructions should be addressed to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

4.19.6. Allocations. AF/A1 determines forced distribution promotion allocations.

4.19.6.1. Allocations are based on 5% of the total TIG and TIS promotion eligible SrA, SSgt and TSgt population for Promote Now; 10% of the total TIG and TIS promotion eligible SSgt and TSgt population for Must Promote allocations; and 15% of the total TIG and TIS promotion eligible SrA population for Must Promote allocations. In accordance with the aforementioned allocation rates, AFPC provides the actual number of Promote Now and Must Promote allocations to each FD authority at either the large unit level or to the EFDP via the final master eligibility listing. See Table 4.10 and Table 4.11 to view the allocation tables based on number to total TIG/TIS eligible. The tables are subject to change, therefore FDs/EFDPs will utilize the allocations provided on the final MELs.

4.19.6.2. Small units aggregate or “roll-up” to the Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) and may not aggregate to the group level. **EXAMPLE:** Medical Groups are typically divided into four squadrons and one group staff, with each squadron and the group commander having individual promotion authority (FDID). The collective total of promotion eligible airmen will not be calculated by the group to form a large unit for the purposes of awarding forced distribution allocations, but rather as individual units. In this example, any unit that does not qualify as a large unit would aggregate to the wing commander as the senior rater and the Senior Rater EFDP. The same holds true for SAF/HAF/COCOM/MAJCOM organizations; senior raters from the aforementioned organizations may not pool or aggregate their combined total of promotion eligibles under one or more senior raters in order to create a large unit. **EXAMPLE:** COCOM J-staffs (J1-J10) may not combine the promotion eligibles under a series of senior raters (J1, J2, J3, etc.) in order to create a large unit. Any J-staff senior rater that does not outright qualify as a large unit would aggregate to the management level and the Management Level EFDP.

- 4.19.6.2.1. In cases where after aggregation there are still not enough eligibles from all the Senior Rater or Management Level small units to meet the 11 TIG/TIS promotion eligible Airmen requirement to earn outright Promote Now and Must Promote promotion allocations, the Senior Rater or Management Level EFDP (whichever is applicable) will receive an outright allocation of 1 “Promote Now” and 1 “Must Promote” allocation.
- 4.19.6.2.2. When there is only 1 eligible out of the Senior Rater or Management Level’s total promotion eligible population, the Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) will receive an outright allocation of 1 “Promote Now (PN)” and 1 “Must Promote (MP)”. The Senior Rater or Management level (whichever is applicable) will determine if the promotion eligible’s record of performance warrants allocation of either a PN or an MP promotion recommendation and will award the appropriate promotion recommendation accordingly. In cases when the eligible’s record of performance and/or potential to serve at the next higher grade does not warrant receipt of a forced distribution promotion allocation, the Senior Rater and/or Management Level is not required to award a PN or an MP allocation and may return the evaluation to the owning FD authority for award of a Promote recommendation.
- 4.19.6.2.3. Allocations Not Used. FDs are not required to use all earned allocations if they believe the performance quality and promotion potential of Airmen in their unit does not warrant the full share of allocations. Additionally, redistribution or carry-over of allocations is strictly prohibited.
- 4.19.7. Notifying Units. Units receive initial MELs identifying whether they are considered a large or small unit as soon as possible, but not later than the applicable accounting date associated with each grade’s SCOD. A final MEL will be forwarded to each unit following the applicable SCOD, finalizing the list of promotion eligible and non-eligibles. Units should adjudicate each MEL to ensure all unit promotion eligibles and promotion ineligibles are accurately captured.
- 4.19.8. Identifying Units. AFPC will provide MELs identifying TIG/TIS and non-TIG/TIS eligible airmen assigned as of the accounting date. The MEL identifies all airmen with an EPR scheduled to close-out on the applicable SCOD and those promotion eligible airmen who meet TIS and TIG requirements for forced distribution consideration, regardless of an airman’s personal promotion ineligibility condition(s) (e.g., on the control roster, PAFSC skill level too low, undergoing Article 15 suspended reduction, etc.). See Table 4.12 for accounting dates.
- 4.19.9. Promotion Recommendation Restrictions. An evaluation containing negative comments/derogatory information that causes the report to be “referred”, or evaluations with a performance assessment of “Met some but not all expectations” anywhere within Sections III, IV, V or VI, of the AF Form 910, are not authorized a promotion recommendation any higher than a Not Ready Now.
- 4.19.10. Verifying Eligibility. Using the unit’s MEL, FD authorities verify the eligibility of each individual to ensure they meet the TIG/TIS requirements for promotion to the next higher grade. Only verify the TIG/TIS requirements and do not consider normal individual promotion ineligibility conditions. This will ensure only those meeting the TIG/TIS requirements are considered and the FD authority receives the correct number of forced distribution promotion allocations. **NOTE:** FD authorities with SrA, SSgt, or TSgt promotion eligible students

(student squadrons) or patients (patient squadrons) will receive forced distribution promotion allocations for their TIG/TIS promotion eligible student or patient populations separate from the forced distribution allocations for their TIG/TIS promotion eligible SrA, SSgt, or TSgt permanent party populations.

4.19.11. Nominations. Large or Small unit FDs are responsible for considering all individuals appearing on the unit's final MEL and must "consider" all promotion eligible airmen. FD will consider all individuals meeting TIG/TIS requirements, even if they are TDY or on leave.

4.19.12. Large Unit Forced Distribution Promotion Recommendation Allocation Procedures.

4.19.12.1. Large units (with 11 or more TIG/TIS promotion eligibles by grade) receive their own allocations and owning FD authorities award forced distribution promotion recommendations at the unit level. Large unit force distributors must adhere to the established written selection procedures within this instruction and any additional procedures directed by their applicable Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable), to ensure forced distribution allocations are awarded based on fair, equitable, and timely promotion recommendation consideration.

4.19.12.1.1. Following each grade's specific SCOD, the unit will receive a final master eligibility listing denoting which Airmen are and are not TIG/TIS promotion eligible as well as how many Promote Now and Must Promote allocations are earned by the unit. Large unit commanders (FD authorities) cannot exceed the promotion allocations listed on the final MEL.

4.19.12.1.2. Large unit FDs are the sole decision authority for allocating promotion recommendations to their eligible population. Large units will not hold scoring panels to derive a basic order of merit. (**NOTE:** Use of a rack-n-stack process or MLR scoring process is only authorized for use during execution of the EFDP and is prohibited for use in large unit forced distribution promotion allocation procedures.) Large units may utilize the information and documents authorized in paragraph 4.19.12.1.5. only. FDs are encouraged to have open discussions with lower level leadership (squadron superintendents, flight commanders, section chiefs, etc.) when developing their allocations.

4.19.12.1.3. Once selections are made, large unit FDs will annotate their MEL to identify the award of Promote Now and Must Promote promotion allocations as well as those eligibles awarded Promote, Not Ready Now, or Do Not Promote promotion recommendations, and then will sign the applicable listing, certifying their approved allocations.

4.19.12.1.4. Large unit forced distribution promotion allocation selections may not be made any earlier than one calendar day following each grade's SCOD.

4.19.12.1.5. Information Utilized During Large Unit Forced Distribution Process. Large unit commanders will only review up to the last 3 years of evaluations in current grade (this includes: the EPR being considered for forced distribution and the 2 years of evaluations immediately preceding it, to include "selectee" reports), and each eligible's career brief. The mandatory quality force review completed by commanders, in advance of the Forced Distribution decision, will acknowledge the ratee's personnel record has been reviewed for quality force indicators during the period of the report.

This review may include but is not limited to, the review of the nominee's PIF and official fitness report considering the period of the report only. The commander must have a discussion with the member's supervisory/rating chain prior to making a decision. Lower level leadership (e.g. flight level or division level OIC, branch chief, or superintendent) may submit a "push-note" to the unit commander in advance of physical large unit proceedings. Push-notes (limited to system space availability/two lines) may only convey the nominee's relative standing among all Airmen nominated within the applicable organization structure (e.g. flight, division, or branch); all other comments on the ratee's performance, or items not represented in the nominee's EPRs, are prohibited (e.g. AF Form 1206 award packages, data sheets, matrices, etc.). **NOTE:** EPRs for all promotion eligibles, considered under forced distribution, must be signed by the applicable rater and additional rater prior to any formal forced distribution decisions (NET one day following the SCOD). The results of the large unit forced distribution decisions will not change the performance assessment completed by the rater and additional rater. Changes made to rater/additional rater performance assessment ratings and/or bullets on reports post-forced distribution decisions, are strictly prohibited, with the exception of negative quality force indicators that occurred during the reporting period that are brought to light following rater/additional rater signature.

4.19.13. Small Unit/EFDP Forced Distribution Promotion Allocation Procedures.

4.19.13.1. Small units (with 10 or less TIG/TIS promotion eligibles by grade) are aggregated into one pool of eligibles to form the total EFDP eligible population. The ADCON Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) must adhere to the established written selection procedures within this instruction, to ensure EFDP proceedings are conducted fairly and equitably, and the resulting forced distribution allocations are awarded based on fair, equitable, and timely promotion recommendation consideration.

4.19.13.1.1. Under a wing level [Senior Rater] EFDP construct, squadrons, group staffs, wing staff agencies could be classified as small units. Under a Direct Reporting Unit or Field Operating Agency level Senior Rater EFDP construct, squadrons, group staffs, and directorates could be classified as small units.

4.19.13.1.2. Under a SAF/HAF/COCOM/MAJCOM [Management Level] EFDP construct, subordinate directorates with military or civilian directors that are senior raters could be classified as small units.

4.19.13.2. The following are the "approved" panel processes, to include any prohibitions.

4.19.13.2.1. Small unit promotion eligibles are nominated by the unit FD authority to compete for award of a forced distribution promotion allocation at the Senior Rater or Management Level EFDP (whichever is applicable). The maximum number of Promote Now and Must Promote promotion allocations the EFDP may award is based on the combined total number of TIG/TIS promotion eligibles from each small unit, by grade.

4.19.13.2.2. Each unit may nominate up to the maximum number of available allocations. **EXAMPLE:** If the total combined number of SSgt promotion eligibles

from all small units is 28, the total number promotion allocations the EFDP may award is 4 (1 Promote Now and 3 Must Promote) based on a 5% Promote Now allocation and 10% Must Promote allocation; therefore, small unit FDID authorities may nominate no more than 4 promotion eligible SSgts to compete at the EFDP.

4.19.13.3. EFDP President/Panel Member Delegation Authorities.

4.19.13.3.1. The intent is for senior rater or management level (ML) to act as the EFDP president and conduct the panel. Only under extraordinary circumstances may the EFDP president responsibilities be delegated to the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (normally the vice commander). If applicable, the vice commander, etc., will delegate the FD authority for the small unit to the next senior Air Force officer/civilian. **EXAMPLE:** MAJCOM/CV is appointed EFDP president by MAJCOM/CC, the next senior Air Force officer/civilian will be appointed FD for the MAJCOM's small unit FD.

4.19.13.3.2. NAF/Center/Wing/DRU/FOA: The vice wing commander, FOA or DRU vice commander/director or director of staff, will serve as the "small unit commander" only when there are TIG/TIS promotion eligibles assigned to those respective staff agencies, under the direct authority of the commander (senior rater). Senior raters will not serve in a dual-hatted capacity, where they act as both small unit commander and EFDP president during the EFDP. Allowing the vice wing commander or director of staff to represent promotion eligible staff agency airmen at the EFDP as a panel member gives the senior rater impartiality as the EFDP president.

4.19.13.3.2.1. If the vice commander/director or director of staff has been appointed as the EFDP president, he/she cannot be dual-hatted and also serve as a panel member. The next senior Air Force officer/civilian will serve as the FD (panel member).

4.19.13.3.2.2. NAFs/Centers will hold EFDPs at the NAF/Center level and not roll up to the ML. The NAF/Center commander/director as the president (unless delegated).

4.19.13.3.3. HAF Staff/Major Commands (MAJCOM). The commanders [MLs] may delegate management level EFDP president responsibilities no lower than the vice commander/deputy. When EFDP president responsibilities are delegated, the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (i.e. director of staff) will serve as the "small unit commander" when there are TIG/TIS promotion eligibles assigned to the staff, under the direct authority of the commander (the ML). MLs [themselves] or appointees, when ML EFDP president responsibilities have been delegated, will not serve in a dual-hatted capacity, where they act as both small unit commander and EFDP president during the EFDP. Allowing the vice commander (or appointee, when EFDP president responsibilities are delegated) to represent promotion eligible staff agency airmen at the EFDP when there are promotion eligibles assigned to the staff, gives the ML impartiality as the EFDP president. **EXCEPTION:** if the vice commander is unavailable due to a prolonged (deployment, extended TDY, etc.), EFDP president responsibilities may be further delegated to the next highest ranking Air Force officer or civilian equivalent (no lower than Colonel).

4.19.13.3.4. Combatant Commands (COCOM). COCOM EFDP president responsibilities will be the responsibility of the COCOM Air Force element commander (must be an Air Force Officer no lower than Colonel), unless the COCOM commander is Air Force and they specifically request to chair the EFDP proceedings on behalf the COCOM. COCOM [ML] EFDP president responsibilities cannot be further delegated below the Air Force Element Commander; this follows basic AF Doctrine. **EXCEPTION:** if the COCOM Air Force element commander is unavailable due to a prolonged (deployment, extended TDY, etc.), EFDP president responsibilities may be further delegated to the next highest Air Force General Officer. When no other Air Force general officer is assigned to the COCOM, delegation may extend to the senior most Air Force colonel (for the EFDP in question only, not on a permanent basis). Short absence (leave, routine TDY, etc.) do not qualify as a reason to delegate responsibilities below the AFELM/CC.

4.19.13.3.4.1. For joint organizations, such as United States Military Entrance Processing Command (USMEPCOM), which may not have an Air Force General Officer or Air Force Colonel assigned, an exception to policy may be submitted to HQ AFPC/DP3SP. The request must include detail the organization's proposed EFDP process.

4.19.13.3.4.2. For joint organizations, the FD can request to designate the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (no lower than Lt Col/civilian equivalent) to attend the EFDP. This request must be approved by the EFDP president and documented writing.

4.19.13.4. Once selections are made, Senior Raters or Management Levels (whichever is applicable) annotate the applicable master eligibility listing, identifying those promotion eligibles selected to receive forced distributed promotion allocations and will return all individual evaluations to the owning FD authority for application of the awarded forced distributed promotion allocations and EPR signature by the responsible unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer. Individual Senior Raters (wing/FOA/NAF/DRU/Center EFDP) and/or Management Levels (MAJCOM/COCOM/HAF/SAF EFDP) will not sign evaluations in-lieu of the FD.

4.19.13.5. EFDP forced distributed promotion allocation selections may not be made any earlier than one calendar day following each grade's SCOD.

4.19.13.6. Forced distributors will receive a MEL identifying eligible Airmen; if a small unit FD authority is not going to nominate an eligible to compete at the EFDP, he/she will annotate their MEL accordingly to include signature.

4.19.13.7. Information Utilized During the Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel Process. Small unit commanders will submit the last 3 years of evaluations in current grade (this includes: the EPR being considered for forced distribution and the 2 years of evaluations immediately preceding to include "selectee" reports) and each nominee's career brief. The mandatory quality force review completed by commanders, in advance of the EFDP proceedings, will acknowledge the ratee's personnel record has been reviewed for quality force indicators during the period of the report. This review may include but is not limited to, the review of the nominee's PIF and official fitness report considering the period of the report only. The commander must have a discussion with the member's supervisory/rating

chain prior to making a promotion recommendation. Commanders may submit a “push-note” only when the EFDP proceedings are held virtually and/or when nominee packages will be sent to panel members in advance of physical EFDP proceedings. Push-notes (limited to system space availability) may only convey the nominee’s relative standing among all Airmen nominated by a small unit commander; all other comments on the ratee’s performance, or items not represented in the nominee’s EPRs, are strictly prohibited. Commanders are encouraged to prepare to advocate for their respective nominee(s) by seeking the counsel of their respective enlisted and officer leadership teams, prior to the EFDP convening. **NOTE:** EPRs for all promotion eligibles, considered under forced distribution, must be signed by the applicable rater and additional rater prior to any formal forced distribution proceedings (no earlier than one day following the SCOD). The results of the EFDP proceedings will not change the performance assessment completed by the rater and additional rater. Changes made to performance assessment ratings and/or bullets on reports post-EFDP, are prohibited, with the exception of negative quality force indicators that occurred during the reporting period that are brought to light following the EFDP.

4.19.13.8. EFDP Procedures.

4.19.13.8.1. Physical or virtual panel. It is up to the Senior Rater or the Management Level (whichever is applicable) to determine how to hold the EFDP based upon the nature of the organization’s structure. Each panel member must be given the same amount of time and information to review. When a Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) chooses to hold a physical EFDP (i.e., in person), the SR or ML may choose to provide nominee records for review in advance of the physical proceedings. In such cases, the EFDP recorder will ensure all EFDP records are available for preview by all EFDP members in a timely fashion, ensuring ample time to review records in advance of the physical EFDP proceedings.

4.19.13.8.2. When a commander has promotion authority over two or more units, the eligibles are not combined and the unit commander complies with established large or small unit procedures based on each unit’s number of promotion eligible, by grade.

4.19.13.8.3. EFDP selection folders (electronic or otherwise) may only contain the current/considered AF Form 910, the 2 years of evaluations preceding the current year’s SCOD EPR (in current grade), the Forced Distribution Career Brief, and a “push-note” IAW paragraph 4.19.13.7. Allow Geographically Separated Units to use SharePoint, email or another automated program to transmit nomination packages.

4.19.13.8.4. Destroy selection folders when no longer needed.

4.19.13.8.5. Commanders must ensure all quality indicators are accurate before requesting the Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) take action to downgrade the promotion recommendation allocated by the EFDP.

4.19.14. EFDP Membership.

4.19.14.1. EFDP President (Senior Rater or Management Level themselves). A voting, scoring member of the EFDP. He or she must be the Senior Rater assigned to the Senior Rater Identification (SRID) or Management Level (assigned as the head of the

Management Level); for COCOMs this will be the Air Force Element Commander (the Air Force General Officer designated by the COCOM/CC as the AFELM/CC).

4.19.14.1.1. The panel president will:

4.19.14.1.1.1. Design and document procedures for their respective EFDP and perform administrative duties in connection with the EFDP proceedings.

4.19.14.1.1.2. Ensure all members understand discussions regarding individual records or awarded recommendations; and discussions between panel members are not to be shared outside of the EFDP. However, it is encouraged the FDs have open discussions with their Airmen regarding the EFDP process and how the panels are conducted.

4.19.14.1.1.3. Ensure the consideration of all promotion eligible airmen nominated to the EFDP without prejudice or partiality in a consistent, fair, and equitable manner.

4.19.14.2. The Senior Rater or Management Level may not delegate EFDP responsibilities to another senior official in the organization, except as detailed in paragraph 4.19.13.3.

4.19.14.3. FD Authorities with members meeting the EFDP:

4.19.14.3.1. Will represent the airmen they have nominated from their particular small unit.

4.19.14.3.2. In extraordinary circumstances the FD can request to designate the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (no lower than Major/civilian equivalent) to “represent” them at the EFDP. If the next highest ranking official does not meet the required rank, then another FD within the SR structure may represent the organization (i.e., another squadron commander, group deputy, etc.). The request must be approved by the EFDP president and documented in writing. The FD will maintain all other FD responsibilities (i.e. signing EPRs and MELs).

4.19.14.3.3. Small unit FDs may not delegate FD responsibilities to another party, unless the commander’s FD authority has been delegated to the next highest ranking officer within the commander’s organization as a result of the unit commander’s prolonged (deployment, extended TDY, etc.) absence and not short absence (leave, routine TDY, etc.).

4.19.14.4. Command Chief Master Sergeant or Air Force Senior Enlisted Leader serves in an advisory capacity to the EFDP and will not under any circumstances serve as a voting member during the EFDP process. In organizational structures that do not earn a Command Chief Master Sergeant or Air Force Senior Enlisted Leader authorization (9E000 AFSC), the Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable), will utilize the senior most enlisted Air Force member within the their respective organization, as a panel member for the EFDP. In cases where the Command Chief Master Sergeant or Air Force Senior Enlisted Leader (9E000 AFSC) is unavailable due to a prolonged (deployment, extended TDY, etc.) absence and not a short absence (leave, routine TDY, etc.), the “interim” Command Chief Master Sergeant or Air Force Senior Enlisted Leader, will serve in this advisory role.

4.19.14.5. EFDP Recorders.

4.19.14.5.1. Manage the flow of records to the EFDP members, review information for presentation to the EFDP, and advise the president and panel members on EFDP process and other administrative matters. Primarily, they ensure EFDP proceedings meet all requirements of this instruction.

4.19.14.5.2. Ensure at least one EFDP recorder is present during all physical deliberations.

4.19.14.5.3. Not serve as a recorder on EFDPs for which they are being considered.

4.19.14.5.4. Not serve as an EFDP member and a recorder for the same panel.

4.19.15. Scoring.

4.19.15.1. Records are scored on a best-qualified basis. EFDP members will ensure that airmen selected to receive forced distribution promotion allocations are fully qualified to assume the next higher grade.

4.19.15.2. The Senior Rater or Management Level (whichever is applicable) may use either:

4.19.15.2.1. A “rack-n-stack” process by which each panel member rank orders (e.g. 1, 2, 3...) all records from highest to lowest, then combines all rankings to develop an order of merit, or...

4.19.15.2.2. A panel or Management Level Review (MLR) scoring process by which EFDP records are scored, in 6 to 10 point increments.

4.19.15.3. Scoring is based upon the material in each eligible EFDP selection folder only. See paragraph 4.19.13.8.3. **EFDP members are prohibited from using any other document when scoring records.**

4.19.15.4. Panel members will assign each eligible a score (6 to 10 point) or ranking, reflecting their assessment of relative performance, leadership/followership, and the potential to serve at the next higher grade.

4.19.15.5. Scoring may be made in advance and without benefit of discussion during a records review or in person in a format similar to the officer promotion MLR process.

4.19.15.6. If a panel member identifies a record-based matter that causes concern, he/she will bring the matter to the other panel members, the panel recorder, or directly with the panel president, so that the matter has the attention of the other panel members.

4.19.15.7. Panel members are encouraged to discuss their own personal knowledge and evaluation of the professional qualifications of their respective promotion eligible airmen.

4.19.15.8. Panel members may not discuss or disclose the opinion of any person not a member of the panel concerning the member.

4.19.15.9. Scoring Scale. EFDP will use the following scale when holding a MLR style EFDP:

Table 4.1. EFDP Scale.

Score	Potential
10.0	Absolutely superior
9.5	Outstanding
9.0	Few could be better
8.5	Strong
8.0	Slightly above average
7.5	Average
7.0	Slightly below average
6.5	Well below average
6.0	Lowest

4.19.15.9.1. Defining "Splits". A "split" is a significant disagreement between EFDP members about the score of a record. A "split" is considered a difference in a score of 2 or more points between any two panel members (e.g., 6 and 8, or 8 and 10).

4.19.15.9.2. Resolving "Splits". All scoring stops and all voting EFDP members must be present (physically or virtually) to discuss the records involved in a "split." Only EFDP members with split scores may change their scores in the process of resolving a split. A "split" is resolved when there is a difference in a score of 1.5 or less points between any two panel members (e.g., 6 and 7.5, or 8 and 9.5).

4.20. Additional EFDP Guidance.

4.20.1. EFDPs are not required to use all Promote Now and/or Must Promote allocations.

4.20.2. In the event an egregious event or negative information, having transpired and been substantiated during the reporting period (prior to the applicable SCOD), is brought to light after the SCOD, and after the promotion recommendations have been allocated under forced distribution, and the FDID authority, Senior Rater, or Management Level (whichever is applicable), may remove from or downgrade the promotion recommendation (to a Promote or lower) on the ratee's evaluation. In such a case, the applicable forced distribution promotion allocation will not be reallocated.

4.21. EFDP Report. The panel report should contain a list of panel members, panel recorder, order of merit (identifying total score, if/when applicable), and forced distribution promotion recommendation status based on the available number of Promote Now and Must Promote allocations, and cut-off score.

4.21.1. The report should be approved and signed by the Senior Rater or Management Level as the panel president and by the panel recorder.

4.21.2. Supplemental EFDP consideration will not be given for the following reasons:

4.21.2.1. Incorrect data reflected on the career brief.

4.21.2.2. Denied EFDP nomination due to incorrect data reflected on the FDID output products or in the Forced Distribution Career Brief.

4.21.2.3. Master eligibility listings not returned to the MPS or individual was “overlooked” on the listing.

4.21.2.4. EFDP nomination packages not completed/turned in/approved in time to meet the board.

Table 4.2. Instructions for Preparing AF Forms 910, Enlisted Performance Reports.

SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and any suffix (i.e. JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of “NMI” is optional. Name will be in all upper case (see example).	HARRIS, MICHAEL L.
2	SSN	Enter full SSN. Do not use suffix.	123-45-6789
3	Rank	Enter appropriate rank. See paragraph 1.4.9.	AB, A1C, SrA, SSgt Select, SSgt, TSgt Select, TSgt
4	DAFSC	Enter DAFSC held as of the “THRU” date of the evaluation, including prefix and suffix, if applicable or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. 365-day extended deployments will use the TDY DAFSC. See paragraph 1.4.8.	3S051
5	Organization, Command and Location	<p>Enter information as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. Nomenclature does not necessarily duplicate what is on the EPR notice. The goal is an accurate description of what unit, location and command the ratee belongs. Command will be listed inside parentheses. 365-day extended deployments will use the home station unit, “with duty at ...”</p> <p>For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment.</p> <p>Information will be in all upper/lower case (use format in examples).</p> <p>See paragraph 1.4.7.</p>	<p>66th Mission Support Squadron (ACC), Mountain Home AFB ID</p> <p>902nd Security Forces Squadron (AETC), Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq</p> <p>HQ Air Combat Command, Joint Base Langley-Eustis VA</p>

ITEM	PAS Code	Enter PAS code for ratee’s unit of assignment as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. For those assigned to 365-day extended deployment billet, use the home station PAS code. AFR only: For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, use unit of attachment’s PAS code.	TE1CFYRZ
	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
7	FDID	Enter Force Distributor ID (FDID) for ratee’s unit of assignment (PAS code) as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. For those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment, use the home station FDID. AFR only: For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, SRID is that of unit of attachment	DP11MFN99
8	Period of Report	FROM DATE: See paragraph 4.6.	01 Dec 2015
		THRU DATE: This is the SCOD for the appropriate grade, with the exception of 20-month Initial EPRs not closing on the SrA SCOD. See paragraph 4.7. for variations.	30 Nov 2016
9	Number of Days Non-Rated	Enter the number of days Non-Rated from the authorized documentation, if applicable. See paragraph 4.8. for guidance on what circumstances qualify for non-rated.	120
10	Number of Days Supervision	Enter the number of days of supervision. See paragraph 4.9.	365 (deduct only the authorized number of days “non-rated”)
11	Reason for Report	Select the reason for evaluation from Table 4.3 or Table 4.4.	Annual
SECTION II. JOB DESCRIPTION			
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

12	Duty Title	<p>Enter the approved duty title from the Personnel Data System (PDS) as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date.</p> <p>If the duty title is abbreviated and entries are not clear text, spell them out. Consult with your CSS/MPS for any corrective actions. Ensure the duty title is commensurate with the ratee's grade, AFSC, and responsibility. Refer to AFI 36-2618 for guidance pertaining to duty titles.</p> <p>For personnel on a 365-day extended deployment, use the deployed duty title.</p> <p>Information will be in all upper/lower case (use format in example).</p>	NCOIC, Force Management
13	Key Duties, Tasks and Responsibilities	<p>Comments in bullet format are mandatory. Limit text to four lines. Enter information about the position the ratee held in the unit as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS/PCA, information as of the accounting date and the nature or level of job responsibilities. The rater develops the information for this section.</p> <p>This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job. Be specific--include level of responsibility, number of people supervised, dollar value of resources accountable for/projects managed, etc. Make it clear; use plain English.</p> <p>Avoid jargon, acronyms, and topical references-- they obscure rather than clarify meaning. Previous jobs held during the reporting period may be mentioned only if it impacts the evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authors guidance on performance evaluations - Prepares lesson plans for ALS curriculum - Supervises 2 Airmen ...
<p>SECTION III. PERFORMANCE IN PRIMARY DUTIES/TRAINING REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>SECTION IV. FOLLOWERSHIP/LEADERSHIP</p> <p>SECTION V. WHOLE AIRMAN CONCEPT. NOTE: If an Airman is marked "Met some but not all expectations" in Section III or Section IV then this block will not be completed.</p>			
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

14	Assessment Areas Listed on AF Form 910	<p>Select the block that accurately describes the ratee's performance during the rating period.</p> <p>Not-Rated: See paragraph 4.8.</p> <p>Met some but not all expectations: Performs below established AF standards and expectations, requires improvement. Routine and/or significant unacceptable performance, actions that are incompatible with, and/or Airmen who have failed to adhere to established AF standards and expectations. Performs routinely or significantly at an unacceptable level. Routinely (a repeated inability to meet standards that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below AF standards and/or expectations) and/or significantly (a single instance where failure to meet standards is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts overall aggregated performance assessment). Evaluations with a "Met some but not all expectations" will be referred as an AF standard or expectation that has failed to have been met.</p> <p>Met all expectations: Meets established AF standards and expectations.</p> <p>Exceeded some, but not all expectations: Performs beyond most AF established standards and expectations.</p> <p>Exceed most, if not all expectations: Performs at a higher level than peers, far exceeds AF standards and expectations, unique performer.</p>	The Rater (and subsequent evaluators) will not consider, nor comment on, the Airman's performance during an approved non-rated period (IAW paragraph 4.8.)
15	Comments	Comments are mandatory (minimum of one line), must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and in Section III comments are limited to 6 lines and Section IV and V comments are limited to 2 lines. May use "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK" as a mandatory line.	
SECTION VI. OVERALL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

16	Rater's Overall Performance Assessment	<p>Select the block that accurately describes the ratee's performance during the rating period.</p> <p>See Item 14 of this table for definitions of performance assessment ratings.</p>	The Rater (and subsequent evaluators) will not consider, nor comment on, the Airman's performance during an approved non-rated period (IAW paragraph 4.8.)	
SECTION VII. RATER INFORMATION				
I T E M	A	B	C	
	Heading	Instructions	Example	
	17	Rater's Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, and Location	Enter Rater's signature block as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. EXAMPLE: SMSgt Doe is rater on accounting date. Rater PCSs/PCAs between accounting date and SCOD. SMSgt Smith replaces SMSgt Doe in position. SMSgt Smith will be designated rater on SCOD and sign evaluation using signature block of the position on the accounting date.	JOHN J. DOE, SMSgt, USAF 39th Force Support Squadron (AFR) Incirlik AB TU
	18	Duty Title	Enter Rater's Duty Title block as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date in all upper/lower case (see example in Item 17).	Operations Flight Chief
	19	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	6789
20	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the SCOD (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.	
SECTION VIII. ADDITIONAL RATER'S COMMENTS				
I T E M	A	B	C	
	Heading	Instructions	Example	
	21	Concur/non-concur	Place an "X" in only one of the blocks.	X

22	Comments	Must be in bullet format. A comment is mandatory when the report is a referral; otherwise they are optional, if comments are not used insert "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK". Limited to two lines. If comments are not authorized state: "RATER IS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL RATER".	- Restructured Enlisted Force Policy.....
23	Additional Rater's Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, and Location	Enter Additional Rater's signature block as of the close-out date. See paragraphs 1.4.11.	JOHN J. DOE, Capt, USAF 36th Dental Squadron (PACAF) Andersen ABW GU
24	Duty Title	Enter Additional Rater's Duty Title in all upper/lower case (use format in example).	Operations Flight Commander
25	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	9876
26	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the SCOD (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION IX. FORCED DISTRIBUTOR COMMENTS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
27	Concur/non-concur	Place an "X" in only one of the blocks.	X
28	Comments	Must be in bullet format. A comment is mandatory when the report is a referral; otherwise they are optional, if comments are not used insert "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK". Limited to one line.	- Restructured Enlisted Force Policy.....
29	Future Roles (Optional) See paragraph 4.16.3.	Recommend up to three roles/ assignments that best serve the Air Force and continue the Airman's development. Future roles may not serve as veiled promotion statements, i.e. you may ONLY recommend an Airman for a future role that they are eligible for based on current or projected grade and/or the grade that they are TIG/TIS eligible for promotion to, as of the evaluation SCOD. EXAMPLE: a SSgt may not be recommended for a Section Superintendent duties as that constitutes a veiled promotion statement to MSgt.	1. NCOIC, Force Management 2. NCOIC, Operations

30	Promotion Eligibility	As of the close-out date of the evaluation, indicate whether the ratee is TIG/TIS promotion eligible. See paragraph 4.11.	Yes or No (drop down block)
31	This is a Referral Report	Indicate whether the report contains negative comments or derogatory information.	Yes or No (drop down block)
32	Quality Force Review	Indicates the ratee's personnel record has been reviewed for quality force indicators during the reporting period.	Yes or No (drop down block)

33	Promotion Recommendation	<p>This section is to be completed by Forced Distributor only when the member is eligible for a promotion recommendation.</p> <p>Do Not Promote: Not recommended for promotion based on unacceptable performance, failure to adhere to established AF standards and expectations, or actions that may be incompatible with continued AF service. DNP evaluation must have already been referred based on comments reflective of the commander's "Do Not Promote" recommendation, e.g., negative comments, derogatory information, or any performance assessment ratings of "Met some but not all expectations".</p> <p>Not Ready Now: Not considered ready for promotion at this time based on the need for additional grooming in the current grade, or where Airmen may require specific attention with regard to performance of established AF standards and expectations. NRN evaluations do not necessarily constitute a referral, provided the report contains no negative comments, derogatory information, or any performance assessment ratings of "Met some but not all expectations".</p> <p>Promote: Recommended for promotion based on performance at or above established AF standards and expectations. Performs with the majority of Airmen and at a level commensurate with peers. RegAF Airmen receiving a "P" receive a promotion advantage relative to their peers.</p> <p>Must Promote: Recommended for accelerated promotion based on stellar performance well above established AF standards and expectations. Designated for outstanding performers who perform at a level higher than their peers. RegAF Airmen receiving a "MP" receive a distinct promotion advantage over their peers.</p> <p>Promote Now: Recommended for immediate promotion based on exemplary performance that far exceeds established AF standards and expectations. Reserved for elite performers who perform well above other Airmen in their peer group. RegAF Airmen receiving a "PN" receive a significant promotion advantage over their peers.</p>	
----	--------------------------	---	--

I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
34	Forced Distributor Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, and Location	Enter appropriate signature block as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JOHN J. DOE, Lt Col, USAF 9th Force Support Squadron (ACC) Beale AFB CA
35	Duty Title	Enter Duty Title as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	Commander
36	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	1111
37	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwritten/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the SCOD (only after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION X. FUNCTIONAL EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
38	Functional Examiner or AF Advisor	When applicable, place an “X” in the appropriate box.	X
39	Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter Functional Examiner or Air Force Advisor signature block as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraphs 1.4.11.	JOE R. SMITH, Lt Gen, USAF 18th Air Force (AMC) Scott AFB IL
40	Duty Title	Enter Advisor/Examiner’s duty title.	Command Financial Manager
41	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	0001

42	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwritten/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the SCOD (only after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION XI. REMARKS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
43	Acronyms	Use this section to spell out uncommon acronyms in alphabetical order. Separate acronyms with a semicolon.	Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC); Casualty Report (CASREP)
SECTION XII. RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT			
44	Ratee's Acknowledgement and Date & Signature	<p>The ratee must acknowledge receipt prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record by signing in this block. Signing the evaluation does not imply concurrence, but acknowledgement. If ratee non-concurs with the evaluation, they may submit an appeal IAW Chapter 10, Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluations. Non-digital: Handwrite/date stamp/type the date. Sign after the close-out date. Select appropriate choice from drop down menu: Blank – member concurs and signs evaluation.</p> <p>“Not available to sign” – use when member is incapacitated or unavailable to sign; Rater or any higher evaluator in the rating chain signs. “Ratee refused to sign” – use when member refuses to sign the form; rater or any higher evaluator in the rating chain signs.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.4.11.</p>	

Table 4.3. When to Submit EPRs on RegAF and ARC AGR/Stat Tours.

R U L E	A	C
	If	then the reason for the evaluation is
1	RegAF ONLY: The ratee is an A1C or below, has 20 or more months TAFMS, and has a close-out date on or prior to 1 Dec. See Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4.	Initial
2	RegAF ONLY: The ratee is an A1C or below, has 20 or more months TAFMS, and has a close-out date on or after 2 Dec. See Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4.	Annual
3	ARC ONLY: The ratee is a SrA or below, has 20 or more months' time from the DIEUS date on or prior to 1 Dec, and has not had an evaluation. See Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4.	Initial
4	ARC ONLY: The ratee is a SSgt or above and has not had an evaluation for at least one year. See Notes 3 and 4.	Annual
5	RegAF ONLY: Subsequent evaluations will close-out on the SCOD (based on rank). See Notes 3, 4 and 5.	Annual
6	The ratee requires an EPR due to placement on the control roster according to AFI 36-2907. See Notes 1, 3 and 6.	Directed by Commander (DBC)
7	An evaluation is necessary to document unsatisfactory or marginal duty performance or conduct. See Notes 1 and 3.	DBC
8	The ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status. See Notes 3, 6 and 7.	DBC
9	The member needs an evaluation in conjunction with AFI 36-3208, <i>Administrative Separation of Airmen</i> , discharge action. See Notes 1, 3 and 8.	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
10	Authorities place the ratee in evaluating identifier 9A100 or 9A000. See Note 3, 9 and 10.	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
11	Personnel have declared the ratee missing in action, captured, or interned. See Notes 1, 3 and 10.	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
12	HQ USAF directs a special evaluation. See Notes 3 and 11.	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
13	The ratee is a CMSgt. See Note 3.	Annual
14	The ratee needs an evaluation in conjunction with involuntary removal from ANG AGR or Statutory Tour.	Directed by Full-time unit commander, TAG or NGB/CF
15	ANG unit commander, TAG or NGB/CF directs a special evaluation.	Directed by Full-time unit commander, TAG or NGB/CF
16	A1C who enlisted under the National Call to Service (NCS) program. See Note 12.	Initial

17	Any sentence of confinement as the result of a courts-martial. See Note 1.	DBC
18	ARC ONLY: In cases where a promotion/demotion has occurred and a member will have more than 24 months from the closeout date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new rank.	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
19	AGR ONLY: In cases where a promotion/demotion has occurred and a member will have more than 24 months from the closeout date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new rank. AGR personnel will require annual evaluations. A DBH report is required in cases where a promotion/demotion has occurred and a member will have more than 12 months from the closeout date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new rank.	DBH
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SrA and below with less than 20 months TAFMS (or DIEUS for ARC) do not receive an EPR. 2. The close-out date is the day the Airman has 20 months TAFMS or 20 months from DIEUS date for ARC personnel, unless the Airman reaches his/her 20 months TAFMS/DIEUS on or after 2 Dec, at which time, the Airman's closeout will be extended to the 31 Mar SCOD for SrA and below. Subsequent evaluations will close-out on the appropriate SCOD (based on rank). 3. Only one day is required for raters to close-out an evaluation. 4. The period of required supervision is reduced to 1 calendar day for referral evaluations. 5. The close-out date is on the SCOD for the applicable rank (for example, a SSgt will have their close-out on 31 Jan (SSgt SCOD). EXCEPTION: Airman selected for promotion will have their evaluation closed out on the SCOD of their projected rank. EXAMPLE: A SSgt selected for promotion to TSgt will now have their evaluation close-out on 30 Nov (TSgt SCOD). 6. Evaluations IAW AFI 36-2907, are optional. The close-out of the evaluation prepared when placing a member on the control roster is the day before the date of placement on the control roster. 7. The close-out date is the effective date the Ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter. 8. When a member is undergoing an involuntary separation due to substandard performance, and the period of supervision has been 60 calendar days, then a commander will complete a Directed by Commander (DBC) evaluation and may only comment on the negative behavior. This applies to TSgts and below and the commander will close out the evaluation one day before the written notice of the proposed action to the airman. If a member is being involuntarily separated for reasons other than substandard performance, then a DBC evaluation is not required. 9. The evaluation's close-out is the day before the date that authorities place the Ratee in reporting identifier 9A100 or 9A000. 10. Do not prepare evaluations for periods of missing in action, captured, or interned status of less than 15 calendar days. For periods of 15 calendar days or more, prepare an evaluation as HQ AFPC/DP3SP directs. 11. HQ AFPC/DP3SP (or HQ AFPC/DP2SP) if the evaluation is necessary for promotion consideration) directs evaluations under this rule. 12. A1Cs who enlisted under the NCS program will receive their initial Evaluation upon completion of 16 months TAFMS minus 1 day. 		

Table 4.4. When to Submit EPRs on ARC Airmen (Non-AGR).

R U L E	A	B
	If (see Notes 1 and 8)	then the reason for the evaluation is
1	The ratee is a SrA and below, with 20 or more months' time in service (from DIEUS date), and has not had a report. See Notes 2, 3 and 7.	Initial
2	The ratee is a SSgt or above and has not had a report for at least two years. See Note 3.	Biennial
3	The commander directs an evaluation.	Directed by Commander (DBC) (see note 9)
4	Commander directs evaluation to document unsatisfactory duty performance or conduct.	
5	The ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status. See Note 6.	
6	HQ USAF, HQ USAF/RE, ARPC or NGB directs a special evaluation. See Note 4.	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
7	The ratee needs an evaluation in conjunction with discharge.	DBH
8	The ratee is declared missing in action/captured/interned. See Note 5.	DBH
9	The ratee is a CMSgt. See Note 3.	Biennial
10	ARC ONLY: In cases where a promotion/demotion has occurred and a member will have more than 24 months from the closeout date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new rank.	DBH
11	AGR ONLY: In cases where a promotion/demotion has occurred and a member will have more than 24 months from the closeout date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new rank. AGR personnel will require annual evaluations. A DBH report is required in cases where a promotion/demotion has occurred and a member will have more than 12 months from the closeout date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new rank.	DBH

Notes:

1. For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Category E, the unit of attachment is responsible for completing the evaluation.
2. The close-out date is the day the Airman has 20 months from DIEUS date, unless the Airman reaches his/her 20 months on or after 2 Dec, at which time, the Airman's closeout will be extended to the 31 Mar SCOD. The reason for the report remains Initial. Subsequent evaluations will close-out on the appropriate SCOD (based on rank).
3. If the ratee did not participate during the period, the report must state this information.
4. HQ USAF/REP directs EPRs under this rule for AFR; NGB/A1P for ANG.
5. Do not prepare evaluations for periods of MIA, captured, or detained in captive status of less than 15 calendar days. If the ratee remains in one of these categories for 15 calendar days or more, prepare an evaluation under this rule without regard to the number of days of supervision. Close the evaluation on the day the ratee was placed in MIA, captured, or detained in captive status. These evaluations are as directed by HQ AFPC/DP3SP or HQ ARPC/DPTSE.
6. The close-out date of the evaluation is the effective date the ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter.
7. Initial evaluation implementation for ANG Non-AGR SrA and above who have no previous report; refer to paragraph 4.5.
8. Only one day is required for raters to close-out an evaluation.
9. Only negative behavior/substandard performance is documented. Positive behavior/performance will be documented on the next SCOD EPR.

Table 4.5. Time-in-Grade (TIG) Senior Rater Eligibility Chart**NOTE:** This table is used for SCOD and out-of-cycle EPRs such as DBH, DBC, etc.

MSGT CHART			
If ratee is:	and EPR c/o date is:	and DOR is:	TIG Eligible
MSgt	1 Jan 16 - 30 Sep 16	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 15	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 16 - 30 Sep 16	after 1 Jul 15	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 16 - 31 Dec 16	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 16	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 16 - 31 Dec 16	after 1 Jul 16	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 17 - 30 Sep 17	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 16	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 17 - 30 Sep 17	after 1 Jul 16	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 17 - 31 Dec 17	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 17	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 17 - 31 Dec 17	after 1 Jul 17	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 18 - 30 Sep 18	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 17	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 18 - 30 Sep 18	after 1 Jul 17	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 18 - 31 Dec 18	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 18	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 18 - 31 Dec 18	after 1 Jul 18	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 19 - 30 Sep 19	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 18	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 19 - 30 Sep 19	after 1 Jul 18	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 19 - 31 Dec 19	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 19	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 19 - 31 Dec 19	after 1 Jul 19	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 20 - 30 Sep 20	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 19	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 20 - 30 Sep 20	after 1 Jul 19	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 20 - 31 Dec 20	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 20	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 20 - 31 Dec 20	after 1 Jul 20	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 21 - 30 Sep 21	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 20	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 21 - 30 Sep 21	after 1 Jul 20	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 21 - 31 Dec 21	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 21	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 21 - 31 Dec 21	after 1 Jul 21	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 22 - 30 Sep 22	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 21	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 22 - 30 Sep 22	after 1 Jul 21	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 22 - 31 Dec 22	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 22	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 22 - 31 Dec 22	after 1 Jul 22	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 23 - 30 Sep 23	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 22	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 23 - 30 Sep 23	after 1 Jul 22	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 23 - 31 Dec 23	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 23	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 23 - 31 Dec 23	after 1 Jul 23	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 24 - 30 Sep 24	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 23	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 24 - 30 Sep 24	after 1 Jul 23	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 24 - 31 Dec 24	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 24	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 24 - 31 Dec 24	after 1 Jul 24	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 25 - 30 Sep 25	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 24	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 25 - 30 Sep 25	after 1 Jul 24	NO

SMSGT CHART			
If ratee is:	and EPR c/o date is:	and DOR is:	TIG Eligible
SMSgt	1 Jan 16 - 31 Jul 16	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 15	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 16 - 31 Jul 16	after 1 Mar 15	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 16 - 31 Dec 16	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 16	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 16 - 31 Dec 16	after 1 Mar 16	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 17 - 31 Jul 17	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 16	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 17 - 31 Jul 17	after 1 Mar 16	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 17 - 31 Dec 17	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 17	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 17 - 31 Dec 17	after 1 Mar 17	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 18 - 31 Jul 18	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 17	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 18 - 31 Jul 18	after 1 Mar 17	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 18 - 31 Dec 18	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 18	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 18 - 31 Dec 18	after 1 Mar 18	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 19 - 31 Jul 19	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 18	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 19 - 31 Jul 19	after 1 Mar 18	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 19 - 31 Dec 19	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 19	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 19 - 31 Dec 19	after 1 Mar 19	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 20 - 31 Jul 20	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 19	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 20 - 31 Jul 20	after 1 Mar 19	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 20 - 31 Dec 20	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 20	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 20 - 31 Dec 20	after 1 Mar 20	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 21 - 31 Jul 21	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 20	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 21 - 31 Jul 21	after 1 Mar 20	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 21 - 31 Dec 21	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 21	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 21 - 31 Dec 21	after 1 Mar 21	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 22 - 31 Jul 22	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 21	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 22 - 31 Jul 22	after 1 Mar 21	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 22 - 31 Dec 22	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 22	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 22 - 31 Dec 22	after 1 Mar 22	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 23 - 31 Jul 23	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 22	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 23 - 31 Jul 23	after 1 Mar 22	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 23 - 31 Dec 23	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 23	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 23 - 31 Dec 23	after 1 Mar 23	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 24 - 31 Jul 24	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 23	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 24 - 31 Jul 24	after 1 Mar 23	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 24 - 31 Dec 24	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 24	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 24 - 31 Dec 24	after 1 Mar 24	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 25 - 31 Jul 25	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 24	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 25 - 31 Jul 25	after 1 Mar 24	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 25 - 31 Dec 25	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 25	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 25 - 31 Dec 25	after 1 Mar 25	NO

Table 4.6. Instructions for Preparing AF Form 912, CMSgt Enlisted Performance Reports

SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and any suffix (i.e. JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of “NMI” is optional. Name will be in all upper case.	HARRIS, MICHAEL L.
2	SSN	Enter full SSN. Do not use suffix.	
3	Rank	Enter appropriate rank. See paragraph 1.4.9.	CMSgt, CMSgt Select
4	DAFSC	Enter DAFSC held as of the “THRU” date of the evaluation, including prefix and suffix, if applicable or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. 365-day extended deployments will use the TDY DAFSC. See paragraph 1.4.8.	3S000
5	Organization, Command and Location	<p>Enter information as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. Nomenclature does not necessarily duplicate what is on the EPR notice. The goal is an accurate description of what unit, location and command the ratee belongs. Command will be listed inside parentheses. 365-day extended deployments will use home station unit, “with duty at ...”</p> <p>For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. Information will be in all upper/lower case (use format in examples). See paragraph 1.4.7.</p>	<p>366th Mission Support Squadron (ACC), Mountain Home AFB ID</p> <p>902nd Security Forces Squadron (AETC), Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq</p> <p>HQ Air Combat Command, Joint Base Langley-Eustis VA</p>

6	PAS Code	Enter PAS code for ratee's unit of assignment as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. For those assigned to 365-day extended deployment billet, use the home station PAS code. AFR only: For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, use unit of attachment's PAS code.	TE1CFYRZ
7	SRID	Enter Senior Rater ID (SRID) for ratee's unit of assignment as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. For those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment, use the home station SRID. AFR only: For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, SRID is that of unit of attachment.	1LPCC
8	Reason for Report	Select the reason for evaluation from the EPR notice and as determined by Tables 4.3 and 4.4.	Annual, Biennial, Directed By Commander, or Directed by HAF
9	TAFMSD PAY DATE (ARC)	The date the member entered military service. Use date format in example.	4 Dec 1996
10	Period of Report	FROM DATE: See paragraph 4.6. THRU DATE: 31 May of current year. This is the SCOD for the appropriate grade. See paragraph 4.7. for variations.	
11	Number of Days Supervision	Enter the number of days of supervision. See paragraph 4.9.	365 (deduct only the authorized number of days "non-rated" IAW paragraph 4.8.)
12	HYT	Use date format in example. For ANG, enter date ratee will turn age 60 unless extended beyond age 60 IAW ANGI 36-2002.	1 Jan 2027
SECTION II. JOB DESCRIPTION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

13	Duty Title	<p>Enter the approved duty title from the Personnel Data System (PDS) as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date.</p> <p>If the duty title is abbreviated and entries are not clear text, spell them out. Consult with your CSS/MPS for any corrective actions. Ensure the duty title is commensurate with the ratee's grade, AFSC, and responsibility. Refer to AFI 36-2618 for guidance pertaining to duty titles.</p> <p>For personnel on a 365-day extended deployment, use the deployed duty title.</p> <p>Information will be in all upper/lower case (use format in example).</p>	Group Superintendent
SECTION II. RATER'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
14	Comments	<p>Minimum 1 line; when Referral, minimum 2 lines. Must be bullet format. Four lines highly encouraged when making current year Command Chief Master Sergeant (CCM) recommendation. May use "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK" as mandatory line.</p>	- Spearheaded rewrite of AFI 36-2102...
SECTION III. RATER INFORMATION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

15	Rater's Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command and Location	Enter Rater's signature block as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraphs 1.4.11. EXAMPLE: SMSgt Doe is rater on accounting date. Rater PCSs/PCAs between accounting date and SCOD. SMSgt Smith replaces SMSgt Doe in position. SMSgt Smith will be designated rater on SCOD and sign evaluation using signature block of the position on the accounting date.	JOHN J. DOE, Col, USAF 36th Air Base Wing (PACAF)
16	Duty Title	Enter Rater's Duty Title block as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. All upper/lower case (use format in examples).	Commander
17	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
18	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/date stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION IV. SENIOR RATER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
19	Concur/non-concur	Place an "X" in only one of the blocks.	X
20	Comments	Must be bullet format. Comments are mandatory when the report is a referral or "Do Not Retain" recommendation; otherwise they are optional if comments are not used insert "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK", but highly encouraged when making current year Command Chief Master Sergeant nomination.	- Restructured work order schedule.....

21	Consider for Higher Responsibility	<p>Select the block that accurately describes the ratee's next level of responsibility:</p> <p>READY NOW - Select this category when CMSgts are ready to immediately assume greater responsibility in a more challenging position than currently held.</p> <p>ON-TRACK - Select this category when CMSgts are excelling in their current position, demonstrating growth potential, and are ready to transition to a position in a related specialty, or at a different organizational level, at the first available opportunity.</p> <p>CURRENT ASSIGNMENT - Select this category when CMSgts should remain in their current assignment for one or some of the following reasons: are not forecasted to be moved in the near-term; have not been evaluated as a CMSgts in their current position; may have a specific expertise required in-place; be in pre-defined tour lengths; or be in nominative positions.</p> <p>GROOM - Select this category when CMSgts require additional grooming in their duty position or as a CMSgt prior to being placed in a position with greater responsibilities. These CMSgt may be ready for increased responsibilities in the future.</p> <p>DO NOT RETAIN – Select this category when CMSgt are not recommended for retention. Do not retain recommendations constitute a referral EPR and therefore require Senior Rater Comments in Section II, part 1. Comments that exceed one line will require the use of an AF Form 77.</p>	
----	--	---	--

22	Recommended Future Roles (Optional)	<p>If the Senior Rater marks either “Ready Now, On-Track, Current Assignment, or Groom” then select the block that accurately describes the ideal future roles (no more than two roles; first recommendation or “primary vector” has highest precedence).</p> <p>NOTE: Senior rater’s may not recommend future roles for those ratee’s considered “Do Not Retain” for higher responsibility.</p> <p>NOTE: Senior raters will stratify all CMSgts receiving a primary vector for the current year’s Command Chief Screening Board. CMSgts being nominated will be stratified against all CMSgts under the senior rater’s purview, not just those CMSgts eligible for or nominated for CCM duty. CMSgt selects may not to be included in the total number of CMSgts under the senior rater’s purview.</p> <p>Stratification is prohibited for those CMSgts not receiving nomination for the current year’s Command Chief Screening Board. CCM nominations must be accompanied by a “Ready Now” recommendation. CMSgts not receiving a “Ready Now” recommendation for higher responsibility are not eligible for a primary vector CCM duty nomination.</p> <p>(RegAF Only) CMSgt ratees may only be nominated for CCM duty provided they meet the minimum CCM TIG requirements established by AF/DPE for the applicable year’s Command Chief Screening Board.</p>	
23	Senior Rater’s Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, and Location	Enter senior rater’s signature block as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraphs 1.4.11.	JOHN J. DOE, Col, USAF 10th Air Base Wing (USAFA) United States Air Force Academy, CO
24	Duty Title	Enter senior rater’s duty title	Wing Commander

25	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	1111
26	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION V. FUNCTIONAL EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
27	Functional Examiner or AF Advisor	When applicable, place an "X" in the appropriate box.	X
28	Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter Functional Examiner or Air Force Advisor signature block as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraphs 1.4.11.	JOE R. SMITH, Lt Col, USAF 49th Wing (ACC) Holloman AFB NM
29	Duty Title	Enter advisor/examiner's duty title as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date.	Financial Manager
30	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	0002
31	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION VI. RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

32	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION VII. REMARKS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
	33	Remarks	Use this section to spell out uncommon acronyms alphabetically. Separate acronyms with semicolons.
SECTION VIII. REFERRAL REPORT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
	34	Referral Report	Complete this section for referral evaluations only. See paragraph 1.10.
35	Name, Grade, Branch of Service of Referring Evaluator	Enter: Name, Grade, Branch of Service of referring evaluator.	JOE R. SMITH, Lt Col, USAF 49th Wing (ACC) Holloman AFB NM
36	Duty Title	Enter referring evaluator duty title.	Wing Commander
37	Signature	Signature will be “wet” signature.	
38	Date	Date will be hand written/stamped/typed in day, month and full year format.	12 Dec 2014
39	Signature of Ratee	Signature will be “wet” signature.	

Table 4.7. Static Close-out Date (SCOD) Enlisted Chart for RegAF, ARC AGR, and Stat Tour.

RegAF Personnel	
RANK	SCOD
SrA and Below	31 Mar
SSgt and SSgt selects	31 Jan
TSgt and TSgt selects	30 Nov
MSgt and MSgts selects	30 Sep
SMSgt and SMSgt selects	31 Jul
CMSgt and CMSgt selects	31 May

Table 4.8. Static Close-out Date (SCOD) Enlisted Chart for AFR and for ANG Non AGR.

AFR and for ANG Non AGR Personnel	
RANK	SCOD
SrA and Below	31 Mar (Even years)
SSgt	31 Jan (Odd years)
TSgt	30 Nov (Even years)
MSgt	30 Sep (Odd years)
SMSgt	31 Jul (Even years)
CMSgt	31 May (Odd years)

Table 4.9. Instructions for Preparing AF Forms 911, Enlisted Performance Reports (MSgt Select, MSgt, SMSgt Select, SMSgt).

	SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA		
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and any suffix (i.e. JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of “NMI” is optional. Name will be in all upper case.	SMITH, JOHN D.
2	SSN	Enter full SSN. Do not use suffix.	123-45-6789
3	Rank	Enter appropriate rank. See paragraph 1.4.9.	MSgt Select, MSgt, SMSgt Select, SMSgt
4	DAFSC	Enter DAFSC held as of the “THRU” date of the evaluation, including prefix and suffix, if applicable or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. 365-day extended deployments will use the TDY DAFSC. See paragraph 1.4.8.	3S071

5	Organization, Command, Location, and Component	<p>Enter information as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. Nomenclature does not necessarily duplicate what is on the notice. The goal is an accurate description of what unit, location and command the Ratee belongs. Command will be listed inside parentheses. 365-day extended deployments will use the home station unit, “with duty at ...”</p> <p>AFR only: For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment.</p> <p>Information will be in all upper/lower case (use format in examples).</p> <p>See paragraph 1.4.7.</p>	<p>366th Mission Support Squadron (ACC), Mountain Home AFB ID</p> <p>902nd Security Forces Squadron (AETC), Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq</p> <p>HQ Air Combat Command, Joint Base Langley-Eustis VA</p>
6	PAS Code	<p>Enter PAS code for ratee’s unit of assignment as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. For those assigned to 365-day extended deployment billet, use the home station PAS code.</p> <p>AFR only: For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, use unit of attachment’s PAS code.</p>	TE1CFYRZ
7	SRID	<p>Enter Senior Rater ID (SRID) for ratee’s unit of assignment (PAS code) as of SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. For those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment, use the home station SRID.</p> <p>AFR only: For IMAs, PIRR, and PIRR Cat E, SRID is that of unit of attachment.</p>	0D107
8	Period of Report	FROM date: See paragraph 4.6.	1 Aug 2015
		THRU date: This is the SCOD for the appropriate grade. See paragraph 4.7. for variations.	31 Jul 2016

9	Number of Days Non-Rated	Enter the number of days Non-Rated. See paragraph 4.8.	96
10	Number of Days Supervision	Enter the number of days of supervision. See paragraph 4.9.	365 (deduct only the authorized number of days “non-rated” IAW paragraph 4.8.)
11	Reason for Report	Select the reason for evaluation as determined by Table 4.3. and Table 4.4.	Annual
SECTION II. JOB DESCRIPTION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
12	Duty Title	<p>Enter the approved duty title from the Personnel Data System (PDS) as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date.</p> <p>If the duty title is abbreviated and entries are not clear text, spell them out. Consult with your CSS/MPS for any corrective actions. Ensure the duty title is commensurate with the ratee’s grade, AFSC, and responsibility. Refer to AFI 36-2618 for guidance pertaining to duty titles.</p> <p>For personnel on a 365-day extended deployment, use the deployed duty title.</p> <p>Information will be in all upper/lower case (use format in example).</p>	NCOIC, Safety

13	Key Duties, Tasks and Responsibilities	<p>Comments in bullet format are mandatory. Limit text to four lines. Enter information about the position the ratee held in the unit as of the closeout date or in the event of PCS or PCA to a new PAS code, information as of the accounting date and the nature or level of job responsibilities. The rater develops the information for this section.</p> <p>This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job. Be specific--include level of responsibility, number of people supervised, dollar value of resources accountable for/projects managed, etc. Make it clear; use plain English.</p> <p>Avoid jargon, acronyms, and topical references as they obscure rather than clarify meaning. Previous jobs held during the reporting period may be mentioned only if it impacts the evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authors guidance on performance evaluations ... - Prepares lesson plans for ALS curriculum - Supervises 2 Airmen ...
SECTION III. PERFORMANCE IN LEADERSHIP/PRIMARY DUTIES/ FOLLOWERSHIP/TRAINING REQUIREMENTS SECTION IV. WHOLE AIRMAN CONCEPT. NOTE: If an Airman is marked "Met some but not all expectations" in Section III then this block will not be completed.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

14	Assessment Areas Listed on AF Form 911	<p>Select the block that accurately describes the Ratee's performance during the rating period.</p> <p>Not-Rated: See paragraph 4.8.</p> <p>Met some but not all expectations: Performs below established AF standards and expectations, requires improvement. Routine and/or significant unacceptable performance, actions that are incompatible with, and/or Airmen who have failed to adhere to established AF standards and expectations. Performs routinely or significantly at an unacceptable level. Routinely (a repeated inability to meet standards that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below AF standards and/or expectations) and/or significantly (a single instance where failure to meet standards is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts overall aggregated performance assessment). Evaluations with a "Met some but not all expectations" will be referred as an AF standard or expectation that has failed to have been met.</p> <p>Met all expectations: Meets established AF standards and expectations.</p> <p>Exceeded some, but not all expectations: Performs beyond most AF established standards and expectations.</p> <p>Exceed most, if not all expectations: Performs at a higher level than peers, far exceeds AF standards and expectations, unique performer.</p>	The rater (and subsequent evaluators) will not consider, nor comment on, the Airman's performance during an approved non-rated period (IAW paragraph 4.8.)
15	Comments	Comments are mandatory (minimum of one line), must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and in Section III comments are limited to 8 lines and Section IV comments are limited to 2. May use "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK" as a mandatory line.	

SECTION V. OVERALL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
16	Rater's Overall Performance Assessment	<p>Select the block that accurately describes the Ratee's performance during the rating period.</p> <p>The Rater (and subsequent evaluators) will not consider, nor comment on, the Airman's performance during an approved non-rated period (IAW paragraph 4.8.)</p>	See definitions of performance assessments in Item 14 of this table.
SECTION VI. RATER INFORMATION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
17	Rater's Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, and Location	Enter rater's signature block as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JOHN J. DOE, SMSgt, USAF 72d Force Support Squadron (AFMC) Tinker AFB OK
18	Duty Title	Enter rater's duty title block as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date in all upper/lower case.	Operations Flight Chief
19	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	6789
20	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). Rater assessment and feedback block will be locked and additional rater signature capability unlocked with rater digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION VII. ADDITIONAL RATER'S COMMENTS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

21	Concur/non-concur	Place an "X" in only one of the blocks	X
22	Comments	Must be in bullet format. A comment is mandatory when the report is a referral; otherwise they are optional. If comments are not used insert "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK". Limited to two lines. If comments are not authorized state: "RATER IS ALSO THE ADDITIONAL RATER".	- Restructured Enlisted Force Policy.....
23	Additional Rater's Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, and Location	Enter additional rater's signature block as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JOHN J. DOE, Capt, USAF 72d Force Support Squadron (AFMC) Tinker AFB OK
24	Duty Title	Enter additional rater's duty title as of the SCOD or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date in all upper/lower case (use format in examples).	Operations Flight Commander
25	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	9876
26	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). Rater assessment and feedback block will be locked and additional rater signature capability unlocked with rater digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION VIII. UNIT COMMANDER/MILITARY OR CIVILIAN DIRECTOR/OTHER AUTHORIZED REVIEWER'S COMMENTS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
27	Concur/non-concur	Place an "X" in only one of the blocks	X

28	Comments	Must be in bullet format. A comment is mandatory when the report is a referral; otherwise they are optional. If comments are not used insert "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK". Limited to one line.	- Restructured Enlisted Force Policy.....
29	Future Roles (Optional)	Recommend up to three roles that best serve the Air Force and continues the Airman's development. Future roles may not serve as veiled promotion statements, i.e. you may ONLY recommend an Airman for a future role that they are eligible for based on current or projected grade, as of the evaluation SCOD. However, for TIG/TIS eligible you may recommend a future role for the next grade. EXAMPLE: a MSgt may not be recommended for a Command Chief duties as that constitutes a veiled promotion statement to CMSgt. See paragraph 4.16.4.	1. Section Chief 2. Flight Chief 3. First Sergeant
30	Education	As of the close-out date of the evaluation, indicate whether the ratee has had a CCAF completed and conferred (Yes or No) in any discipline/specialty. Also indicate whether the ratee completed PME (SNCOA or equivalent sister-service academy, via in-residence or correspondence).	Yes or No (drop down block)
31	Promotion Eligibility	As of the close-out date of the evaluation, indicate whether the ratee is TIG/TIS promotion eligible. See paragraph 4.12.	Yes or No (drop down block)
32	This Is A Referral Report	Indicate whether the report contains negative comments or derogatory information.	Yes or No (drop down block)
33	Quality Force Review	Indicates the ratee's personnel record has been reviewed for quality force indicators during the reporting period.	Yes or No (drop down block)
34	Unit Commander / Military or Civilian Director / Other Authorized Reviewer Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, and Location.	Enter appropriate signature block as of the close-out date block or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JOHN J. DOE, Lt Col, USAF 56th Force Support Squadron (ACC) Luke AFB AZ

35	Duty Title	Enter duty title.	Commander
36	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	0001
37	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto- date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and write the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION IX. FINAL EVALUATOR'S COMMENTS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
38	Concur/non-concur	Place an "X" in only one of the blocks.	X
39	Final Evaluator's Comments	Completed by authorized final evaluator as of the close-out date. Limit to one line. If comments are not provided state: "THIS LINE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK".	- My #1 of 20 promotion eligible MSgts - Outstanding leader and mentor...
40	Final Evaluator Position	This is the final evaluator's position (see paragraph 4.13.)	Senior Rater Deputy Evaluator Intermediate Evaluator
41	Senior Rater Stratification	This is the senior rater stratification and is limited to the Senior Rater's top 10% TIG/TIS promotion eligible MSgts and the top 20% of TIG/TIS promotion eligible SMSgt as of the SCOD. See paragraph 4.12.	Top 10% of MSgts; Top 20% of SMSgts
42	Final Evaluator's Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter appropriate signature block as of the close-out date block or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JOE R. SMITH, Col, USAF 56th Fighter Wing (ACC) Luke AFB AZ
43	Duty Title	Enter duty title as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	Wing Commander
44	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the SSN. See paragraph 1.4.11.	1111

45	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and write the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). Rater assessment and feedback block will be locked and additional rater signature capability unlocked with rater digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION X. FUNCTIONAL EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
46	Functional Examiner or AF Advisor	When applicable, place an “X” in the appropriate box.	X
47	Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter functional examiner or Air Force advisor signature block as of the close-out date or in the event of PCS or PCA, information as of the accounting date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JOE R. SMITH, Lt Col, USAF 16th Air Force (USAFE) Ramstein AB GE
48	Duty Title	Enter advisor/examiner’s duty title.	Command Financial Manager
49	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	1111
50	Date & Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite/stamp/type the date. Do not sign blank forms or sign before the close-out date (only on or after). See paragraph 1.4.11.	All digital or all wet signatures. A combination of both is not authorized.
SECTION XI. REMARKS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example

51	Acronyms	Use this section to spell out uncommon acronyms alphabetically. Separate acronyms with a semicolon.	Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC); Casualty Report (CASREP)
SECTION XII. RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
52	Ratee's Acknowledgement and Date & Signature	<p>The ratee must acknowledge receipt prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record by signing this block. Signing does not imply concurrence, but acknowledgement. If ratee non- concurs with the evaluation, they may submit an appeal IAW Chapter 10, Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluations. Non-digital: Handwrite or date stamp the date. Sign on or after the close-out date. Select appropriate choice from drop down menu:</p> <p>Blank – ratee concurs and digitally signs evaluation.</p> <p>“Not Available to Sign” – use when the ratee is incapacitated or unavailable to sign; rater or any higher evaluator in the rating chain (digitally) signs.</p> <p>“Ratee Refused to Sign” – use when member refuses to sign the form; rater or any higher evaluator in the rating chain (digitally) signs. See paragraph 1.4.11.</p>	

Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP	Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP	Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP
11 - 12	1	1	178 - 182	9	27	343 - 347	17	52
13 - 17	1	2	183 - 187	9	28	348 - 349	17	53
18 - 22	1	3	188 - 189	9	29	350 - 357	18	53
23 - 27	1	4	190 - 197	10	29	358 - 362	18	54
28 - 29	1	5	198 - 202	10	30	363 - 369	18	56
30 - 37	2	5	203 - 207	10	31	370 - 377	19	56
38 - 42	2	6	208 - 209	10	32	378 - 382	19	57
43 - 47	2	7	210 - 217	11	32	383 - 387	19	58
48 - 49	2	8	218 - 222	11	33	388 - 389	19	59
50 - 57	3	8	223 - 227	11	34	390 - 397	20	59
58 - 62	3	9	228 - 229	11	35	398 - 402	20	60
63 - 67	3	10	230 - 237	12	35	403 - 407	20	61
68 - 69	3	11	238 - 242	12	36	408 - 409	20	62
70 - 77	4	11	243 - 247	12	37	410 - 417	21	62
78 - 82	4	12	248 - 249	12	38	418 - 422	21	63
83 - 87	4	13	250 - 257	13	38	423 - 427	21	64
88 - 89	4	14	258 - 262	13	39	428 - 429	21	65
90 - 97	5	14	263 - 267	13	40	430 - 437	22	65
98 – 102	5	15	268 - 269	13	41	438 - 442	22	66
103 – 107	5	16	270 - 277	14	41	443 - 447	22	67
108 - 109	5	17	278 - 282	14	42	448 - 449	22	68
110 – 117	6	17	283 - 287	14	43	450 - 457	23	68
118 – 122	6	18	288 - 289	14	44	458 - 462	23	69
123 – 127	6	19	290 - 297	15	44	463 - 467	23	70
128 – 129	6	20	298 - 302	15	45	468 - 469	23	71
130 – 137	7	20	303 - 307	15	46	470 - 477	24	71
138 – 142	7	21	308 - 309	15	47	478 - 482	24	72
143 - 147	7	22	310 - 317	16	47	483 - 487	24	73
148 - 149	7	23	318 - 322	16	48	488 - 489	24	74
150 - 157	8	23	323 - 327	16	49	490 - 497	25	74
158 - 162	8	24	328 - 329	16	50	498 - 500	25	75
163 - 167	8	25	330 - 337	17	50			
168 - 177	9	26	338 - 342	17	51			

Note: This table is provided for clarification only and is subject to change, therefore FDs/EFDPs will utilize the allocations provided on the Final MELs.

Table 4.11. Forced Distribution Allocation Table (SSgt and TSgt).

Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP		Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP		Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP
11 - 16	1	1		177 - 183	9	18		344 - 349	17	35
17 - 23	1	2		184 - 189	9	19		350 - 356	18	35
24 - 29	1	3		190 - 196	10	19		357 - 363	18	36
30 - 36	2	3		197 - 203	10	20		364 - 369	18	37
37 - 43	2	4		204 - 209	10	21		370 - 376	19	37
44 - 49	2	5		210 - 216	11	21		377 - 383	19	38
50 - 56	3	5		217 - 223	11	22		384 - 389	19	39
57 - 63	3	6		224 - 229	11	23		390 - 396	20	39
64 - 69	3	7		230 - 236	12	23		397 - 403	20	40
70 - 76	4	7		237 - 243	12	24		404 - 409	20	41
77 - 83	4	8		244 - 249	12	25		410 - 416	21	41
84 - 89	4	9		250 - 256	13	25		417 - 423	21	42
90 - 96	5	9		257 - 263	13	26		424 - 429	21	43
97 - 103	5	10		264 - 269	13	27		430 - 436	22	43
104 - 109	5	11		270 - 276	14	27		437 - 443	22	44
110 - 116	6	11		277 - 283	14	28		444 - 449	22	45
117 - 123	6	12		284 - 289	14	29		450 - 456	23	45
124 - 129	6	13		290 - 296	15	29		457 - 463	23	46
130 - 136	7	13		297 - 303	15	30		464 - 469	23	47
137 - 143	7	14		304 - 309	15	31		470 - 476	24	47
144 - 149	7	15		310 - 316	16	31		477 - 483	24	48
150 - 156	8	15		317 - 323	16	32		484 - 489	24	49
157 - 163	8	16		324 - 329	16	33		490 - 496	25	49
164 - 169	8	17		330 - 336	17	33		497 - 500	25	50
170 - 176	9	17		337 - 343	17	34				

Note: This table is provided for clarification only and is subject to change, therefore FDs/EFDPs will utilize the allocations provided on the Final MELs.

Table 4.12. Accounting Dates for Static Close-out Date Evaluations.

Rank (includes selectees)	Static Close-out Date	Accounting Date
SrA and below	31 Mar	3 Dec
SSgt	31 Jan	3 Oct
TSgt	30 Nov	3 Aug
MSgt	30 Sep	3 Jun
SMSgt	31 Jul	3 Apr
CMSgt	31 May	3 Feb
Note: Accounting dates are approximately 120 days prior to each SCOD and are established as the 3rd of the month for consistency.		

Chapter 5

AF FORM 77, LETTER OF EVALUATION

5.1. Purpose. An AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation (LOE) can be very helpful for a rater when preparing OPRs/EPRs. Therefore, we strongly encourage the use of LOEs whenever possible, to give the rater tasked to prepare the evaluation, as much detail and accurate information on the ratee's performance as possible. Additionally, evaluators may request LOEs from others (such as TDY supervisors and former or temporary raters with less than 120 days of supervision during the OPR/EPR reporting period, etc.) at any time; however, unless the LOE is mandatory, the LOE is optional and only a courtesy. Evaluators preparing an OPR/EPR or TR using an LOE may quote or paraphrase information contained in LOEs. When authorized, stratification obtained from an LOE must be quoted.

5.2. Types of Letters of Evaluation (LOE). There are four types of LOEs:

5.2.1. Formal Letters of Evaluation.

5.2.1.1. Formal Letters of Evaluation, (commonly known as the mandatory LOEs), are LOEs that must be accomplished and required to be made a matter of record; placed in the Master Personnel Record Group (MPerRGp).

5.2.1.2. As of this printing the only formal LOEs are the Deployed Commander LOE and when required for separation. **NOTE:** When applicable, administrative and supplemental LOEs will also be placed in the MPerRGp.

5.2.1.2.1. Deployed Commander LOEs (Mandatory). See Table 5.2.

5.2.1.2.1.1. Definition. The Deployed Commander LOE is a formal LOE that is used to document performance for those officers deployed to fill squadron, group, and wing commander positions. When completed will be made a matter of record and placed in the MPerRGp. Completed deployed commander LOEs will not restart the OPR "clock" regardless of the TDY tour length. They are considered "embedded" evaluations. Further, there is no minimum or maximum number of days "supervision" required—the requirement is based upon the number of days the officer filled the commander's position, which must be at least 45 days.

5.2.1.2.1.2. Eligibility. All deployed officers (RegAF, Guard, and Reserve) through the grade of Colonel, serving as commanders for 45 days or more in support of named operations will receive a Deployed Commander LOE.

5.2.1.2.1.2.1. Deployed commanders are defined as those officers appointed on G-Series orders for 45 days or more, occupying a squadron, group, or wing commander position.

5.2.1.2.1.2.2. If a commander position was filled for less than 45 days, an informal LOE will be prepared, unless referred. The informal LOE will not be made a matter of record, but home station raters may use the information in the member's next OPR.

5.2.1.2.1.2.3. For those officers filling 365-day extended deployment positions as the squadron, group, or wing commander, a deployed commander's LOE is not appropriate. Those officers will receive an OPR IAW paragraph 3.9.

5.2.1.2.1.3. Effective Date and Implementation. In Oct 2004, this CSAF initiative became effective with AEF Cycle 5, Pairs 1 and 2. This policy will not be grandfathered for officers who were filling deployed commander positions prior to AEF Cycle 5.

5.2.1.2.1.4. Deployed Commander LOE Processing Specifics.

5.2.1.2.1.4.1. See Table 5.1 for instruction on how to complete AF Forms 77, Letter of Evaluations (LOEs) for deployed commanders.

5.2.1.2.1.4.2. Deployed CC LOEs are mandatory and will be filed in the Officer Selection Record for officers through the grade of Colonel deployed for 45 days or more in support of named operations and on G-Series orders in a squadron, group, or wing commander position. If a commander position was filled for less than 45 days, the LOE is informal and will not be filed in the Officer Selection Record (OSR). Completed deployed CC LOEs will not restart the OPR "clock" regardless of the TDY tour length. They are considered "embedded" reports. Further, there is no minimum number of days "supervision" required--the requirement is based upon the number of days the officer filled the commander position; a minimum 45 consecutive days.

5.2.1.2.1.4.3. A negative assessment or negative comments will make the LOE a referral and require additional rater comments. If the evaluation is a referral, the reverse side of the form (Section VIII) is also completed. There is no minimum number of days (served in the CC position or days of supervision) required for completion of a referral LOE. **NOTE:** A non-concur does not necessarily make the report a referral.

5.2.1.2.1.4.4. The AF Form 77 must be completed by two evaluators: the immediate next-level commander in the rating chain (the rater), and the rater's rater (the additional rater). **EXCEPTION:** If the rater is a General Officer, then the rater is considered a single evaluator (see definition) and an additional rater is not required (unless referral).

5.2.1.2.1.4.5. Digital signatures will be used except in the following cases: referral evaluations; when at least one evaluator does not have a CAC; or at least one evaluator does not have access to a CAC enabled computer. In these cases the LOEs will be printed and signed with "wet" (hand signed) signatures.

5.2.1.2.1.4.6. A typed form is mandatory, but if no word processor is available, may be handwritten, and completed NLT seven (7) calendar days after ratee relinquishes command. The goal should be to ensure that the LOE is completed before returning to home station. The "FROM" and "THRU" dates are determined by the date assumed/relinquished command.

5.2.1.2.1.4.7. LOEs will be accepted directly from individual officers; however, the LOE will not be processed until the PERSCO Team/AFFOR A1

verifies the eligibility of the officer and approves the LOE. It is suggested that the officer contact their PERSCO Team/AFFOR A1 to route the LOE through the appropriate channels.

5.2.1.2.1.5. Deployed Responsibilities.

5.2.1.2.1.5.1. COMAFFOR: Determines the rating chain and ensures compliance with policy at the deployed location. **NOTE:** Normally the TACON determines the rating chain.

5.2.1.2.1.5.2. AF Component A1: Ensures G-series orders are completed for expeditionary organization structure. Identifies commanders, forwards list to AFFOR/A1, and ensures G-Series orders are completed on all wing, group, and squadron commanders (colonel and below) and maintained IAW AFRIMS RDS.

5.2.1.2.1.5.3. AFFOR/A1: Prepares list of eligible deployed commanders, identifies the officers' service component and forwards to the appropriate PERSCO team. Upon receipt of PERSCO validated roster, AFFOR/A1 will forward roster to AFPC/DP2SPE. **NOTE:** Since G-Series orders are normally accomplished and maintained at the unit where the commander is serving, AFFOR/A1 and PERSCO teams must work closely with the servicing JA and commanders when reviewing and validating the list of required LOEs. Ensure only those commanders on official G-Series orders are included.

5.2.1.2.2. For A1C and below with less than 20 months' Total Active Federal Military Service (TAFMS), an LOE is required for separation cases involving parenthood; conditions that interfere with military service; unsatisfactory performance; or failure in the fitness program. See AFI 36-3208.

5.2.1.2.3. Palace Chase/Front or Transfer to another Service. If the ratee is separating to go into the ARC, or transferring to another branch of service, an OPR/EPR is required. However, (Officers only) if there is less than 120 days supervision, an LOE is required. If required, an AF Form 77 will also be completed to cover any gaps there may be in the record.

5.2.2. Informal Letters of Evaluation (LOE).

5.2.2.1. Informal Letters of Evaluation (LOE), (commonly known as the optional LOE), are those LOEs that will NOT be placed in the Master Personnel Records Group (MPerRGp).

5.2.2.1.1. Informal LOEs may be mandated; however only formal LOEs will be filed in the MPerRGp, see Table 5.2.

5.2.2.1.2. Informal LOEs are used by the designated rater to assist in preparing the individual's next performance evaluation. Although encouraged, using the information from the LOE is at the discretion of the designated rater; and if used, evaluators may paraphrase or quote information from LOEs; however, they may not paraphrase or quote stratification statements from these LOEs.

5.2.2.1.3. Informal LOEs are not attached to the completed evaluations when the evaluations are made a matter of record.

5.2.2.2. Informal LOEs are used to:

5.2.2.2.1. Document periods when someone other than the designated rater supervises the ratee, (optional, but highly encouraged).

5.2.2.2.2. Document duty performance for periods of performance of at least 60 days, unless otherwise stated in this AFI; and are too short (less than 120 days supervision), to require an OPR (mandatory).

5.2.2.2.3. Document duty performance for periods of time when the ratee is under another chain of command other than the designated rater, i.e. loaned out to another section (optional, but highly encouraged). **NOTE:** This would *only* apply to officers when there is no approved rating change deviation, see paragraph 1.7.

5.2.2.2.4. Document duty performance of deployed personnel not assigned to a deployed commander's billet (mandatory).

5.2.2.2.5. Document duty performance for deployed personnel not assigned to a 365-day extended deployment billet (mandatory).

5.2.2.2.6. Document duty performance for enlisted personnel who have a PCS/PCA prior to the SCOD (mandatory). **NOTE:** In circumstances where the Rater departs, a draft EPR will be completed to fulfill this requirement.

5.2.2.2.7. Document performance for other purposes when directed by HQ USAF (may be mandatory or optional).

5.2.2.3. LOEs During Contingency Operations.

5.2.2.3.1. LOEs during contingency operations are informal LOEs that may be required on all personnel in support of contingency operations, that are not filling deployed commander positions, or extended deployment positions. LOEs will be accomplished no later than seven days prior to the ratee's departure for home station and will cover the period from the first day of supervision (at the attached unit) through the last day of supervision while at the deployed location. Although they are mandatory, they will not be made a matter of record. They are used to provide information to home station raters in preparation of the ratee's next performance evaluation.

5.2.2.3.2. Since there are no official means to track LOEs in a deployed environment, the sole responsibility will rest on the deployed rater. As a matter of integrity; the deployed rater is responsible for ensuring they document the performance of the personnel under them during contingency operations and make every effort to do so and forward to the home station rater.

5.2.2.3.3. Ratee's are also encouraged to ensure LOEs are accomplished by their deployed rater. Failure to receive an LOE is not grounds to appeal a future evaluation based on the absence of, or the lack of deployment information in an evaluation.

5.2.2.3.4. When an entire unit deploys to the same location, and/or when the member's home station rater is also the deployed rater, no LOE is required. The member's performance can be documented in the member's next performance evaluation.

- 5.2.2.3.5. When the deployed rater is not the home station rater an informal LOE is required.
- 5.2.2.3.5.1. Minimum number of days supervision is 60 days, however deployed raters may write LOEs for periods of less than 60 days.
 - 5.2.2.3.5.2. There is no maximum number of days supervision required. The close-out of the LOE will be one day prior to the departure date of the ratee and/or rater.
 - 5.2.2.3.5.3. Deployed rater's who have supervised for at least 60 days, who departs prior to the ratee, will prepare an LOE to pass to the incoming deployed rater. The incoming deployed rater can use the information in his/her LOE or prepare a separate LOE, in which case the ratee could possibly have more than one LOE for the same deployment.
 - 5.2.2.3.5.4. Deployed raters prepare LOEs and provide a copy to the individual and forward the original to the servicing PERSCO team.
 - 5.2.2.3.6. In most cases, PERSCO teams can and will set up local procedures to ensure LOEs are being prepared on the deployed personnel they service. **EXAMPLE:** They can add the LOE requirement to their out-processing checklist.
 - 5.2.2.3.7. PERSCO teams will forward the original LOE to the member's servicing MPS or CSS/HR Specialist who will forward the LOE to the rater to review when accomplishing the next evaluation. Although highly encouraged, home station raters may or may not use the information when preparing the next evaluation.
 - 5.2.2.3.8. In the event circumstances preclude a rater from accomplishing an LOE at the time of departure, (i.e. mass evacuation or interruption or loss of automated data processing capabilities), the rater should make every attempt to provide an LOE to the member's home station CSS/HR Specialist when feasible or upon return to their home station. Remember as a supervisor, it is your responsibility to take care of your people.
- 5.2.3. Supplemental Letters of Evaluation. Are LOEs that are required to be made a matter of record and will be placed in the MPerRGp attached to the evaluation they are supplementing.
- 5.2.3.1. Types of Supplemental LOEs include:
 - 5.2.3.1.1. Continuation Sheets for Referral Evaluations. See paragraph 1.10.
 - 5.2.3.1.2. Continuation Sheets for Evaluator Disagreements. See paragraph 1.9.
 - 5.2.3.1.3. Continuation Sheets for the Air Force Advisor. See paragraph 1.6.8.
 - 5.2.3.1.4. Continuation Sheet for the Functional/Acquisition Examiner. See paragraph 1.6.8.
- 5.2.4. Administrative Letters of Evaluation. Are LOEs that are required to be made a matter of record and will be placed in the MPerRGp to document missing/voided evaluations in performance records.
- 5.2.4.1. Administrative LOEs are not derogatory in nature.
 - 5.2.4.2. Administrative LOEs are used to justify legitimate gaps between evaluations such as:

5.2.4.2.1. To document a break in service, see Table 5.1.

5.2.4.2.2. To document extended periods of lost time, including prisoner status and appellate leave. Upon release an AF Form 77 will be accomplished by the servicing MPS/CSS. The start date will be the day after the close-out of the last evaluation and the end date will be the day the member is released from confinement. The next evaluation will begin the day after the close-out date of the LOE, see Table 5.1.

5.2.4.2.3. To document an Educational Leave of Absences; i.e. Bootstrap and/or Educational Leave to a civilian institution, see Table 5.1.

5.2.4.2.4. To document a legitimate gap when the ratee was on the Temporary Disability Retired List (TDRL); then removed and returned to AD, see Table 5.1.

5.2.4.3. Administrative LOEs are used to substitute lost, missing or removed evaluations such as those:

5.2.4.3.1. Ordered removed by the AFBCMR, in accordance with AFI 36-2603. See Table 5.1.

5.2.4.3.2. Ordered removed by the ERAB, in accordance with [Chapter 10](#), see Table 5.1.

5.2.4.3.3. Lost and/or missing evaluations in which all actions to locate have failed. See paragraph 1.14. for procedures and Table 5.1 for preparation of AF Form 77.

5.2.4.4. The use of Administrative LOEs must be approved by HQ AFPC or HQ ARPC prior to placing them into the MPerRGp.

5.2.5. Other Purposes.

5.2.5.1. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE may use the AF Form 77 to document when a board specific PRF is not required or available as stated below:

5.2.5.1.1. For officers who are on appellate leave or in prisoner status.

5.2.5.1.2. For officers who entered RegAF directly into Air Force-level training or officers who had a break in service and reentered directly into Air Force-level training.

5.2.6. When directed by HQ USAF.

5.3. Who Will Prepare.

5.3.1. Raters, or any evaluators.

5.3.1.1. Refer to paragraph 1.7. when the rater has been relieved from their rating responsibilities.

5.3.1.2. Do not skip evaluators who are temporarily unavailable or to afford a higher level evaluator the opportunity to endorse or comment on the LOE.

5.3.2. Personnel responsible for observing a ratee's performance when the ratee is not under the direct supervision of the designated rater.

5.3.3. Records custodians responsible for maintaining the MPerRGp, OSR, OCSR and NSR.

5.3.4. Personnel directed to do so by the AFBCMR or ERAB.

5.3.5. MPS/CSS/HR Specialist personnel as authorized.

5.4. Administrative Practices.

5.4.1. LOEs will cover the period from the first day of supervision (or the day following the close-out of the last EPR, OPR or TR, whichever is later) through the last day of supervision.

5.4.2. Type the AF Form 77 when possible; legibly hand-write or print as a last resort.

5.4.3. Limit comments to space provided on formal LOEs. If additional space is required on informal or supplemental LOEs, continue comments on bond paper and attach it to the LOE.

5.4.4. Correct minor errors using a pen or correction fluid. Corrections and/or erasures that change the meaning of a sentence must be initialed. Re-accomplished forms with excessive corrections and/or erasures. Do not use self-adhesive correction tape.

5.4.5. Prepare LOEs in one copy.

5.4.6. Prepare LOEs using bullet format only.

5.4.7. Prohibited Comments. See paragraph 1.12. for prohibited comments.

5.4.8. Raters may show an AF Form 77 to the ratee.

5.5. Completing AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation.

5.5.1. See Table 5.1. for step-by-step procedures on completing all LOEs.

5.5.2. Deployed Commander LOEs, see paragraph 5.2.1.2.1.

5.5.3. Formal LOE procedures, see paragraph 5.2.1.

5.5.4. General Officer Letters of Evaluation. For GOs and GO selects see Chapter 7.

5.6. Routing, Updating and Disposition Responsibilities.

5.6.1. Formal LOEs. Formerly known as the mandatory LOE, are required to be made a matter of record and will be placed in the MPerRGp and a copy forwarded to ARMS. Perform any personnel system updates as required.

5.6.1.1. Deployed Commander's LOE. The officer must be on G-Series orders for at least 45 days, filling a squadron, group or wing commander requirement, in the deployed location to qualify for the deployed commander LOE. See PSD guide for processing.

5.6.1.2. Separation. If an LOE is mandated for separation, it will be placed in the ratee's MPerRGp. Prepare when required by AFI 36-3205, AFI 36-3206, AFI 36-3207, AFI 36-3208, or AFI 36-3209.

5.6.2. Informal LOEs. Informal LOEs will NOT be placed in the MPerRGp. For all other informal LOEs, to include deployed enlisted ANG AGR/Statutory Tour personnel, the rater/supervisor forwards the completed LOE to the CSS/MPS/HR Specialist/PERSCO who will forward the LOE to the ratee's new and/or designated rater. The rater will hold the LOE until the next OPR/EPR/TR is prepared.

5.6.3. Supplemental LOEs. Supplemental LOEs are required to be attached to the evaluation they are supplementing and will be made a matter of record. Supplemental LOEs will be placed in the OSR/NSR (officers/SNCOs) attached to the documents they are supplementing and a copy forwarded to ARMS.

5.6.4. Administrative LOEs. Administrative LOEs are required to be placed in the OSR/NSR/ARMS to substitute a missing evaluation or explain a gap between evaluations. The preparing agency forwards the original to the OSR/NSR/ARMS. Perform any updates if required.

5.6.5. All other LOEs not listed above. For LOEs not covered above, you may contact AFPC/DP2SPE or ARPC/DPT for procedures and/or further guidance.

5.7. CSS/HR Specialist/MPS/PERSCO Responsibilities.

5.7.1. Quality review LOEs and take corrective action if appropriate.

5.7.2. When applicable, make appropriate updates and forward the LOE to the rater pending the next evaluation.

5.7.3. Provide LOEs to the member's rater for use in preparing the next performance evaluation or TR. LOEs closing during the period of the performance evaluation will accompany the OPR/EPR notice through the rating chain and remain with the notice and evaluation until received by the MPS.

5.7.4. Forward LOEs to the member's gaining CSS/HR Specialist or MPS when the member departs PCS and no evaluation was required prior to departure.

5.7.5. Give the LOE to the member upon separation, retirement, or completion of the next performance evaluation. **NOTE:** LOEs closing during the period of the performance evaluation will accompany the OPR/EPR notice through the rating chain and remain with the notice and evaluation until received by the CSS/HR Specialist/MPS. Once the CSS/HR Specialist/MPS determines the evaluation is acceptable for processing to file, they return the LOE to the ratee. LOEs are transitory evaluations that are not filed in any personnel record group. **EXCEPTION:** Formal LOEs.

5.7.6. PERSCO Teams Specific Responsibilities.

5.7.6.1. Identifies raters and ratees projected departure dates to AFFOR/A1, works with AFFOR/A1 to review/validate the list of commanders they service on G-Series orders, establish tracking and suspense control for all deployed commander LOEs at the deployed location. See paragraph 5.6. for disposition of completed LOEs.

5.7.6.2. Provide the deployed rating chain the G-Series Order # and Date for LOE preparation.

5.7.6.3. Upon receipt of final LOE from deployed rating chain, verify if AF Advisor is required and forward to AF Advisor if required.

5.7.6.4. Final disposition of completed deployed CC LOEs.

5.7.6.4.1. Digitally signed LOEs: Upload the completed LOE into the Case Management System (CMS) evaluation application and submit to AFPC for transmission to ARMS. For locations that do not have CMS access, the home station will load the AF 77 into CMS.

5.7.6.4.2. Wet signed LOEs: Mail the completed LOEs (AD, Guard, Reserve) to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. In cases where the servicing PERSCO team is not collocated with the rater, the rater forwards the report to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE (or to the AF Advisor if

necessary). If in locations where there is no established system for mailing, the ratee, rater, PERSCO or trusted agent will be allowed to hand-carry the completed LOE back to their home station. In this event, the PERSCO Team will place the completed LOE in a sealed envelope, pre-addressed to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. In such cases, the determination to allow the LOE to be hand-carried is made by the AFFOR/A1 and the report must be in a sealed envelope preaddressed to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. Upon arrival back to home station, the carrier will then simply drop the completed evaluation in the mail. The address is: HQ AFPC/DP2SPE, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150. See paragraph 5.6. for disposition of completed LOEs.

5.7.7. Additional Processing Responsibilities.

5.7.7.1. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

5.7.7.1.1. Upon receipt of AF Form 77, HQ AFPC/DP2SPE will validate the form and update MilPDS for AD officers and send to ARMS.

5.7.7.1.2. If it is determined that the officer is not eligible at any time in the process, then the LOE will be changed to an “Optional” LOE and forwarded to member’s home unit rater.

5.7.7.1.3. For RegAF officers, AFPC/DP2SPE forwards original LOEs to ARMS via CMS for digitally signed LOEs. Or sends “wet” signed LOEs to ARMS, AF/DPO for O-6s, and either mails or emails a scanned copy to the respective MAJCOM and MPS, if applicable.

5.7.7.1.4. For ARC officers, HQ AFPC/DP2SPE forwards the original to HQ ARPC/DPT, who will then be responsible for distribution and/or update to applicable organizations, depending on component/status.

5.7.7.2. HQ ARPC/DPT // AF/DPO.

5.7.7.2.1. Will coordinate with HQ AFPC/DP2SPE to identify officers meeting upcoming promotion boards.

5.7.7.2.2. Will conduct a quality control review of all deployed CC LOEs, process through ARMS, and file the LOE in the officer’s selection record.

5.7.7.3. ARMS. Once a deployed CC LOE is received, ARMS will transfer to permanent storage.

5.7.7.4. MAJCOM or Combatant/Component Command. Responsible for designating the AF Advisor (must be an Colonel or above) when the final evaluator on a deployed commander LOE is not an AF officer or DAF official.

Table 5.1. Instructions for Completing the AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation. See Note 5.

SECTION I – RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA	
Item/Description	Instructions
1. Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial and Jr., Sr., III, etc. Use of “NMI” (no middle initial) is optional. The name will be in all upper case.
2. SSN	Enter the SSN. Do not use suffix.
3. Rank	Drop Down Menu. Select the appropriate rank. See Note 1.
4. DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC held as of the “THRU” date of the evaluation to include prefix and suffix.
5. Duty Title OR Title of Additional Duty	Enter the approved duty title as of the “THRU” date of the evaluation.
6. Deployed Location or Name Operation	Deployed CC LOEs Only. If applicable, enter the operation/contingency name ratee was deployed in support of. (i.e. Operation ENDURING FREEDOM).
SECTION II – GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	
Item/Description	Instructions
PART A - Type of Report	Drop Down Menu. For Formal/Informal LOEs, enter: Letter of Evaluation; For Supplemental Sheets, enter: Supplemental Sheet; For Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor, enter: Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor For Administrative LOEs, leave blank.
SECTION II – GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	
Item/Description	Instructions
PART B	
1. From Thru See Note 2	From Date: Enter the date supervision began Thru Date: Enter the date supervision ended
2. Report Is	Drop Down Menu. Select either Mandatory or Optional. (See Table 5.2.)
3. Level of Deployed Commander Duties Performed	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Drop Down Menu. Select either Squadron CC, Group CC, or Wing CC.

4. Number of Days in CC Position	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the number of consecutive days served in the deployed commander position, on G-Series orders.
5. G-Series Order Number	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the G-Series Order Number.
Date of Order	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the date of the G-Series Order.
SECTION III – DEPLOYED COMMANDER ASSESSMENT (For Deployed CCs Only)	
Item/Description	Instructions
Officer Satisfactorily Completed Their Deployed Command Tour	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Select “Yes” if the officer satisfactorily completed their deployed commander tour. Select “No” if completion was unsatisfactory. If “No,” the report must be referred.
SECTION IV – COMMENTS/ IMPACT ON MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT	
Item/Description	Instructions
Comments Area	This section is prepared by the deployed rater and the focus of the evaluation should be on what the officer did and on the officer’s leadership, team building, and problem solving abilities in accomplishing the mission. Limit comments to space provided on formal LOEs. If additional space is required on informal or supplemental LOEs, continue comments on bond paper and attach it to the LOE. Comments must be in bullet format. See paragraph 1.12. for prohibited comments; paragraph 1.11. and Notes 5 and 6 for mandatory comments; and paragraph 1.10. for referral procedures.
SECTION V – RATER IDENTIFICATION DATA (See Note 3)	
Item/Description	Instructions
Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, Location	Enter evaluator identification as of close-out.
Duty Title	Enter Authorized Deployed Duty Title.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwritten, type or stamp. Do not date before close-out date.
SSN	Enter only the last four of the evaluator’s SSN.
Signature	Digitally Sign. If digital capability is unavailable, sign in “wet signature” in reproducible blue or black ink. Do not sign before the close-out date.
SECTION VI – ADDITIONAL RATER (Deployed CC LOEs Only)	
Item/Description	Instructions
Concur/Non-concur Boxes	Place an “X” in the appropriate box. If non-concur is marked, explain the reason for the non-concurrence in the comments area.

Comments Area	Insert comments only if referral or to document non-concurrence. Referral LOEs must contain the applicable mandatory statement IAW paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.2.
Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, Location	Enter the name in all uppercase. Enter evaluator identification in upper/lower or all upper case. All information will be as of close-out. See Note 3.
Duty Title	Enter the Duty Title as of the close-out.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwrite, type or stamp. Do not date before close-out date.
SSN	Enter only the last four of the evaluator's SSN.
Signature	Digitally Sign. If digital capability is unavailable, sign in "wet signature" in reproducible blue or black ink. Do not sign before the close-out date.
SECTION VII – RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	
Item/Description	Instructions
I understand my signature does not constitute agreement or disagreement	Drop Down Menu. If ratee is unavailable or refuses to sign, select the applicable statement, "Ratee Unavailable to Sign" and "Ratee Declined to Sign". In this case the rater or additional rater in the rating chain may sign for the ratee.
Signature	Digitally Sign. If digital capability is unavailable or the LOE is a referral, sign in "wet signature" in reproducible blue or black ink. Do not sign before the close-out date.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwrite, type or stamp. Do not date before close-out date.
SECTION VIII – REFERRAL REPORT (Deployed CC LOEs Only) (All other referral LOEs must use the same procedures as outlined in Chapter 5. The AF Form 77 is designed to include the Referral Memorandum directly on the form.)	
Item/Description	Instructions
I am referring.	State specifically what comments make the LOE a referral.
Send Comments to	Enter the Rank and Name of the Referring Evaluator's deployed rater.
Name, Rank, Br of Svc of Referring Evaluator	Enter evaluator identification as of close-out. See Note 3. If the evaluator named in this section is the additional rater, Section VI will be completed IAW paragraph 1.10.
Duty Title	Enter the Duty Title as of the close-out.
Date	Dates will be handwritten, typed or stamped. Do not date before close-out date. The ratee has 3 duty days (30 calendar days for AND/AFR) to submit comments and the rebuttal. All supporting documentation is limited to a total of 10 pages, 5 pages front and back.
Signature	Sign "wet signature" in reproducible blue or black ink. Do not sign before the close-out date.

SECTION VIII – REFERRAL REPORT (Deployed CC LOEs Only)	
Item/Description	Instructions
Signature of Ratee	Signature is for acknowledging receipt. It does not constitute agreement or disagreement. Sign in “wet signature” in reproducible blue or black ink. Do not sign before the close-out date.
Date	Date may be handwritten, typed or stamped. Do not date before close-out date.
SECTION IX – REFERRAL REVIEWER (Deployed CC LOEs Only. Used Only if Additional Rater Refers the LOE or as authorized by HQ AFPC/DP3SP)	
Item/Description	Instructions
Ratee Did/Did Not Submit Comments Box	Place an “X” in the appropriate box.
I Do/Do Not Concur With Assessment Box	Place an “X” in the appropriate box.
Comments Area	Insert comments for non-concurrence only.
Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, Location	Enter evaluator identification as of close-out. See Note 3.
Duty Title	Enter the Duty Title as of the close-out.
Date	Date may be handwritten, typed or stamped. Do not date before close-out date.
SSN	Enter only the last four of the evaluator’s SSN.
Signature	Sign in “wet signature” in reproducible blue or black ink. Do not sign before the close-out date.
SECTION X – ACQUISITION OR FUNCTIONAL EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR REVIEW (Used only as applicable)	
Item/Description	Instructions
Acquisition Examiner Box	Place an “X” in the applicable box
Functional Examiner Box	
Air Force Advisor Box	See Note 4.
Name, Rank, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, Location	Enter evaluator identification as of close-out. See Note 3.
Signature	Digitally Sign. If digital capability is unavailable or a referral sign in “wet signature” in reproducible blue or black ink. Do not sign before the close-out date.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available or referral handwrite, type or stamp. Do not date before close-out date.

Notes:

1. Grade Data. Use the information below to determine the appropriate grade entry. For:
 - a. Officers. Enter the AD grade in which serving on the close-out date. If the ratee has been "frocked," enter actual grade; not the grade he or she is wearing.
 - b. Non-EAD ANG and AFR Officers, enter grade in which serving and "Non-EAD." When an officer awaiting federal recognition of a unit vacancy promotion to a higher grade is due an evaluation, show the officer's federally recognized grade as of the close-out date of the evaluation, not the projected grade.
 - c. All AGR on EAD under Title 10, U.S.C. 10211, 10305, 12310, 12402 or Title 32, U.S.C. 708 (Property and Fiscal Officers). Enter grade in which serving and "AGR". LEAD officer on EAD under Title 10 U.S.C. Section 12301(d), enter grade in which serving and "LEAD".
2. "FROM" and "THRU" Dates. Use the criteria below to establish the correct date to use:
 - a. On all LOEs, the "FROM" date is the first day of supervision or observation; the day following the close-out of the last EPR, OPR or TR whichever is later; or if there is not previous evaluation, the EAD or TAFMSD.
 - b. On informal LOEs, the "THRU" date is the last day of supervision or observation.
 - c. On formal LOEs, the "THRU" date is the day before the effective date (departure date) of the PCS, PCA, TDY action, or the day before the commander's written notice of a planned separation IAW AFI 36-3208.
3. Signatures and Dates.
 - a. Sign and date the original form. Do not sign or date before the close-out date. Enter only the last four digits of the evaluator's SSN. If the evaluator is a civilian or a member of a foreign service the SSN is not required.
 - b. For RegAF and ARC. Upon Senate confirmation, colonels on the brigadier general Select List are permitted to sign all OES forms as "Brig Gen (Sel)" provided they are either designated by their respective management level (ML) as a senior rater or they are assigned to an authorized, funded or nonfunded, brigadier general officer position, frocked or not.
 - c. For RegAF and ARC. Upon Senate confirmation, brigadier generals on the major general Select List are permitted to sign all OES forms as "Maj Gen (Sel)" provided that they are either evaluating other general officers or are assigned to an authorized, funded or nonfunded, major general officer position, frocked or not.
 - d. For RegAF and ARC. Upon Senate confirmation, all general officer selects, assigned to joint billets or unified commands, may sign all OES forms as "NAME, Brig Gen (Sel), USAF".
 - e. For RegAF and ARC. Any LOEs closing out prior to the senate confirmation date will not reflect the "(Sel)" and, if necessary, be forwarded up the chain for endorsement. In addition, all frocked general officers are authorized to sign all OES forms in their frocked grade without designating their "frocked" status (i.e. major general vice major general "frocked").
4. The examiner/advisor may provide clarification about the ratee's duty performance, or elaborate on types of functions ratee performs (Advisor), or clarify acquisition-related considerations (Examiner), and explain any uncommon phrases or terms. Limit comments to the space provided. See paragraph 1.6.8. to determine when an Acquisition/Functional Examiner/AF Advisor is required.

5. Gaps and Unrated Periods between Evaluations. See AFI 36-2608.
- a. Documenting Unrated Periods between Officer Evaluations. Complete an AF Form 77 with the inclusive dates of the unrated period. Enter the statement “Prior-service enlistee (or officer) not rated for the above period” in Section IV of the AF Form 77. When an office enters the Air Force from another Service, prepare an AF Form 77 to cover the period between the close-out date of the officer’s last performance evaluation, in the other Service and the date of entry into the Air Force. The servicing MPS prepares the AF Form 77 and forwards a copy to the custodian of the NSR, OCSRGP, OSR and ARMS. The servicing MPS informs the officer of the preparation and filing of the AF Form 77. Responsibility for the preparation of the AF Form 77 is as follows:
- (1) ARPC for individuals recalled under Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 10301, 10211, 12301(d), 12310, 10305, 8038 and 12402; US Property and Fiscal Officers recalls under Title 32, U.S.C., Section 708; and recalls to serve with the Selective Service.
 - (2) The losing ARC MPS, if assigned to nonparticipating status:
 - (a) For Reservists, HQ ARPC/DPTSE documents voids in records for periods of service for officers assigned to a Reserve section (ORS, NARS, ISLRS, and so forth), voids caused by a Guard officer moving from one state to another, and voids caused when a member's federal recognition date is not the day following the close-out of his or her last Officer Performance Report (OPR).
 - (b) For unit recalls, the servicing MPS/CSS prepares the AF Form 77.
 - b. For individuals with prior service, who have earlier evaluations. When the ratee, including an enlistee with prior service, has earlier performance evaluations on file but has gaps in ratings due to the breaks in military service, the “from” date becomes the day after the close-out date of the last evaluation prepared. Enter the statement “*Prior-service enlistee (or officer) not rated for the above period*” in Section IV of the AF Form 77. For the “thru” date:
 - (1) Update the day before the EAD date in the system for AD personnel.
 - (2) Update the day before the assignment begins in the system for non-AD SrA and above.
 - (3) For Enlisted members, project the *annual evaluation* one year from their EAD, unless the ratee does not have at least 20 months TAFMS on the EAD date; then, close-out the evaluation when the ratee completes 20 months TAFMS, as an *initial evaluation*.
EXCEPTION: A Directed by HQ USAF (DBH) evaluation is required for promotion consideration. For ARC, less than 20 months DIEUS.
 - (4) For officers, project the annual evaluation one year from their EAD date. **EXCEPTION:** A Directed by HQ USAF (DBH) evaluation is required for promotion consideration.
 - c. For individuals with prior service, but no earlier evaluations. When an individual with prior service has no evaluations reports on file, the period of the AF Form 77 begins with the ratee’s Total Active Federal Military Service Date (TAFMSD) (Enlisted), or Extended Active Duty (EAD) date (Officers), and closes out the AF Form 77 one day before the reentry to EAD which is reflected in the system.
 - (1) Enter the statement “Prior-service enlistee (or officer) not rated for the above period” in Section IV of the AF Form 77.

- (2) For Enlisted members, update the system with rating code "PB" and the close-out date. For Officers, forward the AF Form 77 to the MPerRGp custodian, for routing and distribution.
- (3) For Enlisted members, project the evaluation to the next SCOD unless the ratee does not have at least 20 months TAFMS on the EAD date; then, close-out the evaluation when the ratee completes 20 months TAFMS, as an initial evaluation.
- (4) For Officers, project the annual evaluation one year from their EAD date. **EXCEPTION:** A Directed by HQ USAF (DBH) evaluation is required for promotion consideration.
- d. Restored to Regular Active Duty. A Release from AD that has been voided by the Board for Correction of Military Records (BCMR) and the ratee has been ordered back to AD. HQ AFPC/DP2SP will prepare the AF Form 77. Enter the statement: *"No evaluation available for the period (date) through (date). Officer restored to regular active duty by direction of the Secretary of the Air Force"* in Section IV of the AF Form 77.
- e. Lost Time, Confinement/Prisoner Status or Appellate Leave. To document extended periods of lost time, including military and/or civilian confinement, prisoner status and appellate leave. The member's servicing MPS or personnel service office will prepare the AF Form 77. Enter the statement: *"No evaluation available for the period (date) through (date). No evaluation required according to AFI 36-2406"* in Section IV of the AF Form 77.
- f. Hospitalizations/Convalescent and/or Casual/Patient Status. To document unrated periods on individuals who are in full-time student (functional category "L") or , hospitalizations, periods of convalescent and/or casual/patient status. Enter the statement: *"No evaluation available for the period (date) through (date). No evaluation required according to AFI 36-2406"* in Section IV of the AF Form 77.
- g. Educational Leave of Absences. To document unrated periods on individuals who are on an Educational Leave of Absences; i.e. Bootstrap and/or Educational Leave to a civilian institution. The period will be from the time the individual started the Educational Program through when the member returned to the unit (subtracting any ordinary leave). Section II A will have marked "Supplemental Sheet". No other areas will be marked on the AF Form 77. The AF Form 77 will be signed ("wet") by no lower than the unit commander of the members' assigned unit. Enter the statement: *"Educational Leave of Absence from (date) through (date). No evaluation required IAW AFI 36-2406"* in Section IV of the AF Form 77. The next evaluation period will start the day after the thru date on the AF Form 77.
- h. Temporary Disability Retired List (TDRL). To document an unrated period when the ratee was on the TDRL; then removed and returned to AD. TDRL removal and return to AD is prepared by HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. Enter the statement: *"No evaluation for the period (date) through (date). Officer not rated due to placement on the Temporary Disability Retired List"* in Section IV of the AF Form 77.
- i. Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) Directed. Board actions taken by the AFBCMR under AFI 36-2603, will enter the statement: *"Not rated for the above period. Evaluation removed by the order of the SecAF"* in Section IV of the AF Form 77.
- j. Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB) Directed. Board actions taken by the ERAB in accordance with Chapter 10, *Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Reports*, will enter the statement: *"Not rated for the above period. Evaluation removed by order of the Chief of Staff, USAF"* in Section IV of the AF Form 77.

k. Lost and/or Missing Evaluations. See paragraph 1.14. for procedures. For lost and/or missing evaluations in which all actions have failed, use the AF Form 77 as a substitute for a missing evaluation. Complete the name, SSN, and grade blocks in section I. Mark the "Supplemental Sheet" block and complete the "FROM" and "THRU" blocks in section II. Enter the statement: *"No evaluation available for the period (date) through (date) for administrative reasons which were not the fault of the member. The system [reflects an overall rating of "X"]/[does not reflect an overall rating]* in Section IV of the AF Form 77.

6. When an AF Form 77 is used for other than performance evaluations, the HR specialist enters signature block and signs in Section IV.

Table 5.2. When to Submit a Letter of Evaluation.

R U L E	When to Prepare an LOE	Type	File in MPerRGp Yes/No	Mandatory	Optional
1	Deployed Commander LOEs. See Note 1.	Formal	Yes	X	
2	Separation. See Note 3.	Formal	Yes	X	
3	CRO due to the PCS/PCA of the ratee or rater; and the ratee is an AD A1C or below, with less than 20 months TAFMS, or an AFR SrA or below with less than 20 months from DIEMS. Only 16 months for those airmen who enlisted under the National Call to Service (NCS) program. See Notes 2 and 6.	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No	X	
4	CRO due to the PCS/PCA of the ratee or rater and less than 120 days supervision. See Note 2. <i>(Officers Only)</i> CRO due to the PCS/PCA of the ratee or rater with any days of supervision <i>(Enlisted Only)</i> .		No	X	
5	Enlisted AFR personnel when the rater departs PCS.		No	X	
6	RegAF officer and enlisted personnel when deployed in support of contingency operations. See Note 2.		No	X	
7	ANG personnel when deployed in support of contingency operations.		No	X	
8	Supplemental LOE. See Note 4.	Supplemental	Yes	X	
9	Administrative LOE. See Note 5.	Administrative	Yes	X	

10	All LOEs, (Lt Col and below), not covered above are optional; however they are highly recommended	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No		X
----	---	--	----	--	---

Notes:

1. Deployed CC LOEs. Prepare for officers (in the grade of colonel and below) deployed in support of contingency operations to fill squadron, group, and wing commander requirements. Tour length of deployment to fill commander requirement must be 45 calendar days or more. If a commander is forward deployed to fill another commander requirement at a different location, he/she may receive more than one LOE provided the minimum 45 calendar day requirement is met at each location. The commander must be designated on G-Series orders. **EXCEPTION:** Commanders filling 365-day extended deployment billets will have an OPR accomplished.
2. Supervision Requirements. A minimum of 60 days and not more than 120 days supervision is required. Deployed personnel not covered in Rule 1, or deployed personnel not filling a 365-day extended deployment, require a minimum of 60 days supervision. However, supervision may be greater than 120 days, depending on how long the member is deployed and/or extended. The close-out date will be one day prior to the member's departure date.
3. Prepare when required by AFI 36-3205, AFI 36-3206, AFI 36-3207, AFI 36-3208 and AFI 36-3209.
4. Supplemental LOEs are required to be attached to the document they are supplementing and will be file in the MPerRGp with that document.
5. Administrative LOEs are filed in the MPerRGp for informational purposes, to explain gaps in records, missing evaluations, breaks in service, etc.
6. If the ratee has less than 20 months TAFMS and comments in the LOE are referral in nature, only an informal LOE is authorized. The comments from this LOE may be included in the ratee's initial evaluation.

Chapter 6

AF FORM 475, EDUCATION/TRAINING REPORT

6.1. When to Use Training Reports (TR).

6.1.1. Mandatory Submission (See Table 6.2).

6.1.1.1. Upon completion or interruption of, or elimination from formal training or education when the scheduled course length is eight weeks or more (see note) or as authorized in this chapter when the specific course is less than eight weeks (Chaplain programs, Medical Programs, Aerospace Basic Course [ASBC], Squadron Officer School [SOS], and COT). AFR Air Reserve Technicians (ART) and ANG Military Technicians attending formal training or education in civilian status receive a TR and credit in the civilian evaluation system. **NOTE:** All training of 20 weeks or more will be updated in MilPDS and restart the next evaluation inclusive dates.

6.1.1.1.1. If the interruption or elimination from training was of no fault of the officer, a TR will be completed if the officer was enrolled in training for 10 duty days (or more) to document performance. If the officer was enrolled in training for 9 duty days (or less), a TR is not required. However, a memorandum for record will be produced by the training squadron commander stating the interruption or elimination was of no fault of the officer and they are eligible to attend the training, provided they continue to meet the requirements.

6.1.1.1.2. If the officer is at fault regarding the interruption or elimination from training, a TR is required regardless of length of time enrolled in training.

6.1.1.2. Enlisted. AF Form 475s are not authorized.

6.1.1.3. Officer. For self-paced courses when the prescribed course length is eight weeks or more, regardless of the time actually required to complete the course.

6.1.1.4. Officer. At the end of each academic year, unless the course completion date is within four months of the annual TR. The academic year for officers attending law school under Funded Legal Education Program (FLEP) or Excess Leave Program (ELP) ends after the officer's summer internship training.

6.1.1.5. Officer. For personnel participating in the World Class Athlete Program (WCAP), one year from beginning training, then annually until training is completed or member is eliminated from training.

6.1.1.6. Reserve Chaplain Candidates. At the end of each active duty training tour of 10 days or more and processed as prescribed by HQ AFRC.

6.1.1.7. Officer. Member is assigned to a full-time degree program through the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT). Requirements are same as in effect for officers in attendance. The rater on the TR is designated by the commandant of each Air Force school or the detachment commander. The designee must serve in a grade equal to or higher than the Ratee.

6.1.1.8. Officer. Interrogator Duty Training. Members fulfilling these requirements must complete six months of training with the US Army prior to departing for the actual

deployment. Therefore, students attending Interrogator Training are administratively assigned to the 314th Training Squadron, Fort Huachuca, for the 23-week program. These evaluations will be updated in MilPDS.

6.1.2. Submission for Advanced Academic Degree Subsequent Completion.

6.1.2.1. Upon completion of AADs, a member who left full-time student status prior to completing thesis or dissertation degree requirements may request to have a TR filed in his or her record. The eligibility criteria (all of which must be met) and the procedures which a member must follow to reflect degree completion are as follows:

6.1.2.1.1. The member was assigned to a full-time degree program through the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT).

6.1.2.1.2. The member completed all but the thesis or dissertation portion of the degree program.

6.1.2.1.3. The member has a previous AF Form 475 posted to the MPerRGp that clearly identifies the reason for non completion as, "Thesis or dissertation not completed during AFIT tour," in accordance with Table 6.1.

6.1.2.1.4. The member completes the degree requirements of the AFIT program in which he or she was originally enrolled.

6.1.2.1.5. The officer documents degree completion through AFIT channels (verified via Personnel Data System inquiry).

6.1.2.2. The member who meets the above criteria is responsible for submitting an official transcript to AFIT/RRE requesting completion of a TR.

6.1.3. Directed Submission. When directed by HQ USAF, for courses 8 weeks (officers) or longer unless specifically waived.

6.1.4. Officer. AFIT Master Degree Students and Other Long School Students. AFIT Master Degree student, and other long school students, will receive one final TR upon completion of a course 18 months or less. **EXCEPTION:** Above the Promotion Zone (APZ) officer students will receive "Directed by HQ USAF" TRs (as required) for their applicable central selection boards. AFIT PhD students will receive a mid-course and final training report. If a student is disenrolled for unsatisfactory progress or eliminated/withdrawn for other reasons, a TR is rendered when the member is reassigned. In addition, Directed by Commander referral TR should be considered if student does not meet standards in an area other than training progress.

6.1.5. Guard and Reserve.

6.1.5.1. Students completing initial skills training courses will not receive a TR. It is a total force policy and same consistent rules apply.

6.1.5.2. Students completing training (not initial training) courses 20 weeks or longer in duration will receive a TR.

6.1.5.3. Students taking advanced or supplemental courses longer than 20 weeks will receive a TR.

6.1.5.4. There are no special or unique distribution instructions for Guard or Reserve members on TR. The same procedures used to process OPRs/EPRs will be used to process TR.

6.2. Who Prepares Training Reports.

6.2.1. The officer designated by the commandant of each Air Force school or the commander of each Air Reserve squadron. The designee must be serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee, except for TRs submitted under paragraph 6.2.2.

6.2.2. In exceptional cases, the student's commander and a military training institution may mutually agree on an evaluator (civilian or military) not under the jurisdiction of the unit of assignment. An official of a civilian institution will not sign or submit a TR.

6.2.3. The education services officer may complete a TR only when he or she is the rater.

6.2.4. AFIT personnel prepare TR for officers under FLEP or ELP. The Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) of the student's assigned unit for internship training may prepare an optional LOE and submit it to AFIT at the end of each summer internship.

6.2.5. Graduate School of Engineering and Management, AFIT, prepares TRs for officers participating in the PhD. program during both the academic and the research phases. During the research phase, sponsoring laboratory and research facility personnel may prepare an optional LOE and submit it to AFIT.

6.2.6. AFIT/RRE standardizes TRs that document completion of AADs received after leaving AFIT full-time student status, if all the criteria listed in paragraph 6.2.2 are met.

6.2.7. AFIT personnel prepare TRs on officers in graduate level study Bootstrap programs that are 26 weeks or longer. The evaluator may communicate directly with the institution to obtain the information required to prepare the evaluation. See Table 6.1 for recording adverse actions.

6.2.8. Commissioned Officer Training (COT) School personnel prepare TRs for officers who complete COT.

6.2.9. HQ AFSVA/CC prepares TRs on members participating in the WCAP.

6.3. Referral Training Reports. See paragraph 1.10.6.4.

6.4. Routing and Responsibilities.

6.4.1. For officers attending school in TDY status:

6.4.1.1. The school prepares the TR, performs a quality review, and makes distribution as follows:

6.4.1.1.1. Forward the original to HQ AFPC (ADL) or HQ ARPC/DPTSE (RASL), who files the TR into the MPerRGp and updates MilPDS. For judge advocates (lieutenant colonel and below), forward a copy of the TR to HQ USAF/JAX.

6.4.1.2. TR on EAD officers are due to HQ AFPC 60 calendar days after evaluation close-out date. AGR and LEAD officers' evaluations are due to HQ ARPC/DPTSE 60 days after the close-out date.

6.4.1.3. TRs on non-EAD officers are due to HQ ARPC/DPTSE 60 calendar days after evaluation close-out date.

6.4.2. For officers attending school in PCS status:

6.4.2.1. The school prepares the TR and forwards the original to HQ AFPC.

6.4.2.2. TRs are due to HQ AFPC 60 calendar days after evaluation close-out date (120 calendar days for AFIT/civilian institution programs).

6.4.3. For non-EAD ANG officers, send TRs to the servicing MPS for quality review, adding of opening dates and AFSCs. The MPS will distribute the completed original TR to HQ ARPC/DPTSE and copies to OCSRG and State Adjutant General not later than 60 calendar days after close-out date.

6.4.4. AFIT/RRE will forward the completed TR that documents subsequent completion of an advanced academic degree to all appropriate agencies for filing in the MPerRGp. The TR will be filed based on the signature date of the AF Form 475, not with the original AF Form 475 that indicated non completion of the advanced academic degree.

Table 6.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 475, Training Report (Officers Only).

SECTION I – Identification Data (See Notes 1 and 2)		
I T E M	A	B
	Item To Complete	Instructions
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and Jr., Sr., etc. Use of “NMI” when there is no middle initial is not mandatory. The name will be in all upper case.
2	SSN	Enter SSN. Do not use suffix.
3	Rank	Enter rank.
4	Duty AFSC	Enter DAFSC held as of the "THRU" date of the TR. Include prefix and suffix.
5	Organization, Command, and Location	Enter organization data. For Squadron Officer School (SOS) students and Officer Training Students (OTS) enter the organizational data for SOS and OTS.
6	Period of Report	See Table 6.2.
7	Length of Course	For all formal training or education, enter number of weeks (rounded down to the nearest whole week and followed by the word “weeks”) of the scheduled training or education. Use scheduled length of training even if the officer completes a self-paced course early, course completion is delayed, the officer is temporarily held beyond the actual course/training completion date, or the officer is eliminated from training (see Note 3 and Note 9).
8	Reason for Report	Place an “X” in the appropriate box (see Note 4).
9	Name and Location of School or Institution	Enter required information (see Note 5).
10	Name or Title of Course	Enter title of major subject or problems presented or discussed.
SECTION II – Report Data		
I T E M	A	B
	Evaluation Report Data	
1	AFSC/Aero Rating/Degree Awarded	Enter AFSC, aeronautical rating, or degree awarded.
2	Completion	Place an “X” in the box, if applicable.

3	Distinguished Graduate	Place an "X," if appropriate, in the "Yes" or "No DG Program" block on final TR. Leave item blank if DG program exists and ratee did not receive such a designation.
4	DG Award Criteria/Course Non-completion Reason	Enter DG Award Criteria or Course Non-completion Reason. For a student designated as a DG in item 3, provide the criteria (EXAMPLE: Top 10 percent of class or GPA above 3.5) (see Note 6.)
SECTION III - Comments		
I T E M	A	B
	Item To Complete	Instructions
1	Academic Training Accomplishments	Do include comments if the ratee received recognition for specific or above average achievement, such as designation as a DG. Do not make promotion/DE recommendations (see Notes 7 and 8).
2	Professional Qualities	Comments are mandatory concerning general attitude, military bearing and appearance, conduct and fitness. When an evaluator cannot observe professional qualities due to geographic separation (e.g., civilian institution AFIT students), include the statement, "Ratee is geographically separated from evaluator" in the "Professional Qualities" block of section III. Do not make promotion/DE recommendations (see Notes 7 and 8).
3	Other Comments	Section may be used to clearly identify uncommon acronyms or other information outside the training environment (ie., performance during the inclusive periods).
SECTION IV - Evaluator		
I T E M	A	B
	Item To Complete	Instructions
1	Evaluator Data	Enter information required and command of assignment for evaluator in the spaces provided. Sign the original (Copies: sign, initial, or stamp SIGNED). Do not sign or date an evaluation before close-out date. The grade and duty title must coincide with those held on the close-out date of the evaluation. Enter only the last four digits of the SSN. If the evaluator is a civilian or a member of a foreign service the SSN is not required.

Notes:

1. See TR notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the CSS/HR Specialist and MPS for computer correction.
2. See Table 6.2 for "FROM" and "THRU" areas.
3. For AFR Selective Service officers attending a National Security Seminar, leave blank.
4. Use the following guidelines in determining the reason for the evaluation:
 - a. Final. On completion of, interruption by official orders of, or elimination for any reason from scheduled course/training program, or when released by the training organization.
 - b. Annual. At the end of each academic year, except for final year, for officers in extended programs. When the graduation date is within four calendar months of the annual evaluation, submit a final TR in place of the annual TR.
 - c. Directed. When directed by HQ USAF or an appropriate commander for EAD officers or AFR officers not on EAD, or NGB for ANG officers not on EAD. Evaluations will reflect "Directed."
5. For AFR officers in Selective Service performing their annual active duty tour for training through attendance at a National Security Seminar, enter "National Security Seminar" and location.
6. If the student has failed to complete the course of training, use one of the following phrases and indicate whether the elimination was due to factors over which the student did or did not have control (if derogatory comments are used, the TR must be referred):
 - a. Withdrawn without prejudice for the needs of the Air Force (*ONLY* used for those in training for 10 duty days (or more) and training was interrupted or the officer was eliminated due to no fault of their own).
 - b. Withdrawn for humanitarian reasons (*ONLY* used for those in training for 10 duty days (or more) and training was interrupted or the officer was eliminated due to no fault of their own).
 - c. Eliminated for academic deficiency.
 - d. Eliminated for flying deficiency.
 - e. Eliminated for physical reasons.
 - f. Eliminated for fear of flying.
 - g. Eliminated for manifestation of apprehension.
 - h. Eliminated for instructor non-adaptability.
 - i. Eliminated for skill or aptitude deficiency.
 - j. Voluntary self-elimination.
 - k. Physical Fitness failure.
 - l. Thesis or dissertation not completed during AFIT tour.
 - m. If none of the above reasons apply, state the reason. To explain further, also enter "See Comments," and explain in the appropriate comment section.
7. The following entries are mandatory when applicable:
 - a. Comments regarding courts-martial convictions.
 - b. Comments regarding elimination or interruption of training by official orders, citing specific reason when possible.
 - c. Comments mandatory for AFR Selective Service officers: enter "Officer is attending this section of National Security Seminar as his or her annual short tour." Note: Although not mandatory for inclusion, evaluators are strongly encouraged to consider making comments on TRs regarding Article 15 action, letters of reprimand, admonishment or counseling, or Control Roster action.

8. Comments are standardized on TRs prepared by AFIT/RRE.
9. Hold evaluations for students who complete a course early (**EXAMPLE:** Self-paced course) until the course supervisor determines whether the student is a distinguished or outstanding graduate. The thru date on the TR is the date the officer completes the course, not the date the school determines the officer is a distinguished or outstanding graduate.

Table 6.2. When to Prepare AF Form 475, Training Report. (T-0).

R U L E	A	B	C
	If the member is attending	and education or training is	then the IMT is
1	A degree granting academic education program through AFIT.	any length. See Notes 1 and 2.	filed in OCSRG, NSRG and MPerRGp. See Note 3
2	Developmental Education, In-Residence, PDE, IDE, SDE.	8 weeks or more, but less than 20 weeks. See Notes 4 and 5.	
3		20 weeks or more. See Note 1.	
4	The National Security Seminar for all Selective Service AFR officers not on EAD, (<i>AFR Officers only</i>).		
5	A course or series of courses considered initial training in an utilization field. See Note 6.	8 weeks or more, but less than 20 weeks. See Notes 5 and 9.	
6		20 weeks or more. See Notes 1 and 9.	
7	A direct commissioning program, such as Commissioned Officer Training. See Note 7.	8 weeks or less	
8	The World Class Athlete Program. See Note 12.	any length. See Note 1.	
9	The Air Force Intern Program. See Note 8.	20 weeks or more. See Note 1.	
10	The Reserve Chaplains Program, (<i>AFR Officers only</i>).	10 days or more. See Note 9.	filed in the OSR at HQ ARPC/ DPTS
11	The Chaplain Candidate Program, (<i>AFR Officers only</i>).	active duty tour of 10 days or more. See Notes 1 and 10.	
12		8 weeks or less	
13	Training or education not covered above. See Note 11.	8 weeks or more but less Than 20 weeks. See Notes 5 and 9	filed in OCSRG, NSRG and MPerRGp. See Note 3
14		20 weeks or more. See Notes 1 and 9	

15	Interrogator Duty Training.	23 weeks or more. See Note 13	
<p>Notes: (T-0).</p> <p>1. Evaluations prepared under this rule begin the day following the “THRU” date of the student’s last OPR or TR unless it is an initial evaluation. For initial evaluation, the “FROM” date is: the date of officer’s entry on EAD or start of the current AGR/LEAD assignment; or the date of the first federally recognized appointment for ANG students not on EAD; or for AFR students not on EAD, the date of the last assignment to the Ready Reserve position presently held. The "THRU" date is the date the training or course ends or when the officer is released by the training organization. EXAMPLE: A student has an OPR that closed out on 1 July 2014 and attends a course beginning on 6 August 2014. The course graduated on 5 August 2015. The period of evaluation should be 2 July 2014 to 5 August 2015. In the event the officer remains in Casual Status with the training organization, the period of the evaluation will be to the date the officer is released. AFR Air Reserve Technicians (ART) and ANG Military Technicians attending formal training or education in civilian status receive TRs and credit in the civilian evaluation system. NOTE: For course lengths, refer to the Air Force Education and Training Course Announcements (ETCA) at site https://etca.randolph.af.mil, or other appropriate directive. ETCA is a database that replaced AFCAT 36-2223, USAF Formal Schools Catalog.</p> <p>2. Do not accomplish TRs on students in the Education Leave of Absence Program (ELAP) in TDY status unless course length is 26 weeks or more.</p> <p>3. The OCSRG is not maintained on lieutenants or non-promotion eligible captains on the ADL.</p> <p>4. ASBC graduates will receive AF Form 475 regardless of course length.</p> <p>5. Evaluations prepared under this rule cover a period independent of the officer’s OPR period of evaluation. Therefore, it is not necessary to prepare an OPR solely because the officer is going to school. Use the following period of report: “FROM” date is the course start date; and the “THRU” date is the date of completion, interruption, or elimination from formal training or education training. EXAMPLE: An officer had an OPR that closed out on 1 Nov 2014 and attends a course from 1 January 2015 to 1 Apr 2015. The AF Form 475 covers the period from 1 January 2015 to 1 Apr 2015. The officer’s next OPR will have a “FROM” date of 2 November 2014 and the time the officer is absent will be subtracted from the period of supervision on the next OPR. AFR ART and ANG Military Technicians attending formal training or education in civilian status receive TRs and credit in the civilian evaluation system. NOTE: For course lengths, refer to the Air Force Education and Training Course Announcements (ETCA) at site https://etca.randolph.af.mil, or other appropriate directive. ETCA is a database that replaced AFCAT 36-2223, USAF Formal Schools Catalog.</p>			

6. Includes Undergraduate Pilot Training (UPT), Student Undergraduate Pilot Training (SUPT), Undergraduate Navigator Training (UNT), Student Undergraduate Navigator Training (SUNT), Undergraduate Space and Missile Training (USMT), Aircraft Maintenance Officer Course and other entry-level courses (as determined by the MAJCOM). Officials at MAJCOM HQs and HQ USAF are responsible for the course content and curriculum and determine if the course is initial qualification. **NOTE:** Officers in the second year of AF/XO-sponsored Nuclear Technology Fellows Program, working in their primary specialty, and Health Profession Officers who are in-utilization training for 1 Year or more will have an OPR versus a TR. AF/XO and AF/SG will determine the rating chain for the identified officers and in coordination with HQ AFPC/DP3SP, will determine which positions will be designated Senior Rater for these officers. These nuclear technology fellows and health profession officers still remain students in training status. This policy affects OPRs only and will have no impact on the requirement for narrative only PRFs for the officers in training.
7. This training applies to judge advocates, chaplains, and medical officers.
8. Annual, Directed, and Final TRs, as appropriate, will be prepared at the end of each training phase.
 - a. Annual TRs will be prepared by the sponsoring organization for interns in Phase IIIA; they will close-out on 30 Jun.
 - b. Directed TRs will be prepared by the sponsoring organization for interns in Phase IIIB who opt to complete a master's degree or elect a third rotation; TRs will cover the period 1 Jul to 31 Dec.
 - c. Final TRs will be prepared by the sponsoring organization for interns who opt for a post-training assignment upon completion of Phase IIIB or who opt for and complete a third rotation.
9. For self-paced formal AF training courses when the prescribed course length is eight weeks or more, regardless of the time actually required to complete the course.
10. AF Form 475 on chaplain candidates are prepared and processed as prescribed by HQ ARPC. ARPC/DPTSE will file chaplain AF Forms 475 in the selection folder.
11. This is generally training designed to upgrade or enhance an officer's qualification in a utilization field. Includes initial qualification in a weapon system for officers qualified in that utilization field. **EXAMPLE:** Pilots undergoing initial F-15 training would be evaluated under this rule.
12. For members participating in the WCAP, one year from beginning training, then annually until training is completed or member is eliminated from training.
13. Members fulfilling these requirements must complete six months of training with the US Army prior to departing for the actual deployment. Therefore, students attending Interrogator Training are administratively assigned to the 314th Training Squadron, Fort Huachuca, for the 23-week program. These evaluations will be updated in MilPDS.

Table 6.3. Updating Officer Training Reports. See Note.

Rule	MilPDS Data Element	Officer Input
1	Type	TR
2	Status	Clos
3	Reason	Annual/Final/DBH
4	Rating	N/A
5	Start Date	20 weeks or more: Date following the close-out of the last evaluation. Less than 20 weeks: Class start date.
6	Close Date	Date ratee completes training, graduation date, or date eliminated from training.
7	Performance Indicator	T (Meet Standards) N (Does Not Meet Standards)
8	History Control OPR	F (19 weeks or less) E (20 weeks or more)
9	OPR Grade	Applicable Grade
10	OPR DAFSC	Applicable DAFSC
11	Course Length	Scheduled Course Length. See Table 6.2.
Note: When updating officer TRs use the applicable data that applies. For assistance use the List of Values (LOV) drop down menu options located in the upper left hand corner.		

Chapter 7

GENERAL OFFICER EVALUATIONS

7.1. Overview. This chapter covers procedures for completing GO evaluations (AF Form 78). It applies to all ADL and Reserve of the Air Force brigadier generals and major generals (and selectees to those grades) except State adjutants general who are not required to be rated. **NOTE:** The ANG does not have GO selects or frocking.

7.2. Forms Used.

7.2.1. Use AF Form 78, to document performance and promotion recommendation (as applicable) for all brigadier generals, major generals and those selected or frocked to those grades (see Table 7.1).

7.2.2. Use AF Form 77 to document performance and potential and to provide that information to the ML (see Table 7.2.). It is also used to document performance of GOs/selectees who are serving in a TDY status for more than 60 days but less than 179 days. GOs/selectees who are serving in a TDY status for more than 180 days receive an AF Form 78 (see Table 7.1.).

7.3. Reasons for Reports.

7.3.1. Annual Reports. Brigadier general and brigadier general selectee reports close-out 31 July; NonEAD brigadier general (to include BG select) reports close-out 31 May; ANG brigadier general reports close out 31 January. Major general and major general selectee reports close-out 30 June.

7.3.2. CRO Reports. In the event a CRO occurs and there are at least 90 days of supervision, a CRO report is optional if the CRO occurs outside 90 days from the annual requirement with the approval of AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD Officers and NGB-GO for ANGUS general officers).

7.3.3. Directed by HQ USAF Reports. AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD officers) may direct GO reports at any time, regardless of the days of supervision.

7.3.4. Directed by CNGB Reports. NGB-GO may direct GO reports at any time, regardless of the days of supervision.

7.3.5. Officers Selected for brigadier general (RegAF and ARC). This report covers the period of supervision since the member's last report as a colonel and transitions the member to the brigadier general Annual Report cycle. The AF Form 78 is used to document the member's performance. See paragraph 7.4.8 for further details.

7.3.6. For ANG Only. Upon Federal recognition to brigadier general, an ANG colonel will receive one final AF Form 707, either a CRO or Directed by CNGB Report, documenting all duty performed as a colonel. The day of Federal recognition to brigadier general will be the start date of the officer's first AF Form 78 with a report closeout the following 31 January to align the member to the brigadier general Annual Report cycle. If less than 90 days has occurred since the colonel's last AF Form 707, coordinate with NGB-GO to determine appropriate procedures.

7.4. General Instructions.

7.4.1. Who receives reports. Brigadier and major generals and selectees to those grades will receive at least one AF Form 78 per calendar year. If a CRO occurs between January and the date the annual report is due (31 July for brigadier generals and selects and 30 June for major generals and selects) coordinate with AF/DPG to determine appropriate procedures. For ANG, coordinate with NGB-GO to determine appropriate procedures.

7.4.2. GOs nominated for lieutenant general (RegAF and ARC). Once a GO is nominated for appointment to lieutenant general, completion of the report is optional. Remove the GO from the ML control group. For ANG. Upon Federal recognition to lieutenant general, GO evaluations are no longer required.

7.4.3. GOs who have applied for retirement (RegAF and ARC). Completion of the report is optional for all major generals if AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD officers) publicly announces a GO's retirement before the annual close-out date. If the GO is a brigadier general and is eligible for promotion consideration to major general and the approved retirement date is more than 90 days from the promotion board convening date, a report is mandatory. If the brigadier general is promotion eligible and the approved retirement date is within 90 days of the major general board convening date, remove the GO from the ML control group. For ANG. Completion of the report is optional for all brigadier and major generals once NGB-GO has received the state retirement package requesting transfer to ARPC, Retired Reserves.

7.4.3.1. Write a report if a GO withdraws his or her retirement. The report will close-out on the appropriate current cycle OPR close-out date.

7.4.3.2. (For RegAF and ARC). Make a promotion recommendation on AF Form 78, block 15, only if the promotion-eligible officer withdraws his or her retirement within 90 days prior to the annual cycle close-out date. For ANG. AF Form 78, blocks 15a and 15b, are completed for brigadier generals who have at least one year in grade.

7.4.4. Officers with Dual Responsibilities in Separate MLs. The ratee's ML of administrative assignment controls the promotion recommendation (or evaluation) of officers with dual responsibilities in separate MLs. However, any of the ratee's supervisors may submit appropriate communications to the ML for consideration.

7.4.4.1. Use the ratee's duty effective date and the annual cycle close-out date to determine the ML of administrative assignment.

7.4.4.2. Any member of the ratee's rating chain (in either ML) may submit appropriate communications to the endorsing official for consideration.

7.4.5. Officers Removed for Cause. Document the reason an officer was removed from duty for cause in the appropriate annual or CRO report. Contact AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD Officers, or NGB-GO for ANGUS general officers) if you have less than 90 days supervision as the individual's rater.

7.4.6. Officers Reassigned to a New ML during the Evaluation Process (includes Command Redesignations). If an officer is reassigned to a new ML within 60 days before or after the annual cycle close-out date, either the gaining or losing ML completes the endorser portion (block 16) on the AF Form 78. Both MLs must agree on which ML will function as the endorsing official. HQ AF/A1, AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD Officers) and NGB-GO for

ANGUS general officers must concur with the decision. If a CRO occurs within the period 60 to 90 days before the annual cycle closes out and the ratee changes MLs during this period, the losing ML completes the CRO report (do not complete block 15). Follow the directions in the next subparagraphs to determine who completes the final endorsement and/or promotion recommendation.

7.4.6.1. If the ratee worked directly for the losing ML (no intermediate supervisor), then the losing ML prepares the rater portion of the AF Form 78 (through block 14) and forwards it to the gaining ML for completion, to include the final endorsement or promotion recommendation (blocks 15a and 15b).

7.4.6.2. If the ratee did not work directly for the losing ML, then the losing rater completes the rater portion of the AF Form 78 (through block 14) and forwards it to the losing ML. The losing ML completes a mandatory AF Form 77, attaches it to the AF Form 78 and forwards both forms to the gaining ML for completion, to include the final endorsement or promotion recommendation (blocks 15a and 15b).

7.4.7. Officers Reassigned within the current ML during the evaluation process. If an officer moves within 90 days of the appropriate annual cycle close-out date and the officer's ML does not change, the rater completes a CRO report (minimum 90 days supervision). This report will serve in place of the annual report. Provide the report to the ML for completion of blocks 15 through 19 (on promotion-eligible officers [for ANG, brigadier generals who have at least one year in grade]) or blocks 16 through 19 (officers not promotion-eligible [for ANG, brigadier generals who do not have at least one year in grade]). The ML will complete the report upon the annual cycle close-out date along with other annual reports on officers in the same control group. If a CRO occurs within the period 60 to 90 days before the annual cycle closes out and the ratee does not change MLs during this period (e.g., rater departs PCS or ratee changes jobs within ML), the rater completes a CRO report and the ML holds the report until the end of the annual cycle. The CRO report will serve as the annual report.

7.4.8. Officers Selected for Brigadier General (RegAF and ARC).

7.4.8.1. When an officer's selection for brigadier general is publicly announced by HQ AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD Officers), prepare an AF Form 78. Comply with Table 7.1. Open the ratee's evaluation report on the day following the close-out of the colonel's previous report.

7.4.8.2. If the member's last OPR as a colonel closes out before the annual brigadier general cycle (31 Jul or 31 May for Non-EAD), the member's next performance report will close-out 31 Jul or 31 May for Non-EAD, unless a CRO or directed by HQ USAF report is required. The member's next report will comply with paragraph 7.3.

7.4.8.3. If the member's last OPR as a colonel closes out after the annual brigadier general cycle (31 Jul), AF/DPG will direct a "Directed by HQ USAF Report" be completed with a close-out of 31 Jul, unless a CRO report is required beforehand. For Non-EAD, if the member's last OPR closes out after the annual brigadier general cycle (31 May), AF/REG will direct a DBH with a close-out date of 31 May, unless a CRO is required beforehand. The member's next report will comply with paragraph 7.3.

7.4.8.4. Forward reports within 30 days of the close-out to: AF/DPG for EAD officers and AF/REG for Non-EAD officers.

7.4.9. (For ANG Only). See paragraph 7.3.6 for ANG colonels transitioning to brigadier general.

7.5. Processing General Officer Evaluations. Email all digitally signed general officer evaluation reports to AF/DPG for EAD officers, AF/REG for Non-EAD officers and NGB-GO for ANGUS general officers. AF/DPG, AF/REG and NGB GO will upload evaluations into the member's PRDA record. NGB-GO is also responsible for updating MilPDS for ANGUS general officers.

7.5.1. EAD Officers Assigned to an Air Force Activity. In activities with a director of personnel (A1) function (e.g., MAJCOMs), the A1 ensures evaluators complete all reports correctly and forwards them to AF/DPG within 30 days of the report close-out date.

7.5.2. EAD Officers Assigned to Air Force Secretariat, Air Staff, or Non-AF activities. For activities not serviced by an Air Force A1, AF/DPG assists executive officers with the preparation of the AF Form 78.

7.5.3. Air Force Reserve General Officers. Send reports to AF/REG within 30 days of the report close-out date.

7.5.4. ANGUS GOs. Send reports on ANG GOs to NGB-GO within 30 days of the report close-out date.

7.5.5. When a Report Becomes A Matter of Record. For EAD officers, once the CSAF reviews the report and AF/DPG accepts the report for file, the report becomes a matter of record. For ANGUS GOs, the report becomes a matter of record when NGB-GO accepts the report for file. For non-EAD officers, the report becomes a matter of record when AF/REG accepts the report for file.

7.5.6. Release of Reports to Ratees by Reporting, Reviewing, and Endorsing Officials. The ML should provide a copy of the completed report to the ratee. The rater, reviewing official or ML (at their discretion) should discuss its contents with the ratee. Ratees may access copies of their reports via PRDA under a folder called "Selection Folder" within their PRDA account or request copies from AF/DPG, NGB-GO for ANG general officers, or AF/REG for non-EAD officers. Advise ratees a report is not considered a matter of record until it is reviewed by CSAF (does not apply to ANG GO or AFR reports) and filed in the member's general officer selection record.

7.5.7. AF/DPG maintains all EAD performance reports with close-out dates on or after 1 February 1991. **NOTE:** AF Forms 71, 77, and 78 that closed out on or before 31 January 1991 are not available for review. They were rendered under an express promise of confidentiality and are exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act.

Table 7.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 78, Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation.

A	B	C
To Complete		Instructions
Block	Item	
1	Name	Self-Explanatory.
2	SSN	
3	Grade	Enter the appropriate grade. Include the status if the ratee is a selectee frocked (N/A for ANG). For example Maj Gen, Brig Gen (Sel) or Brig Gen (Frocked).
4	Duty Title	Self-Explanatory. (For ANG) Only use Federally recognized duty titles.
5	Organization	
6	TAFCSO/ TYSD	
7	MRD/DOS	
8	Reason	
9	Fitness	Check appropriate block regarding member's most recent, current fitness assessment. Only mark the exempt block if the member is exempt from all components of the fitness assessment.
10	"FROM" Date	Members selected to brigadier general and publicly announced by AF/DPG: The report opens on the day following the close-out of the colonel's previous report. For ANGUS general officers, see paragraph 7.3.6. Subsequent general officer reports will open the day following the close-out date of the previous report.
	"THRU" Date	Brigadier general reports (includes brigadier general selectees and those frocked to brigadier general) will close-out 31 July (31 May non-EAD) unless a CRO or directed by HQ USAF report is necessary. ANG brigadier general reports will close-out 31 January unless a CRO or Directed by CNGB report is necessary. All major general reports (includes major general selectees and those frocked to major general) will close-out on 30 June unless a CRO, directed by HQ USAF (for ANG officers, directed by Chief, NGB) report is necessary.
11	Comments	Limit comments to 5 bullet statements in Times New Roman, 12 pitch. Format will be bullet, followed by a blank line, bullet, etc., within the space provided. Include comments concerning the ratee's personal and professional characteristics with emphasis on the ratee's potential to assume a higher grade or increased responsibilities. Also, consider ratee's success in contributing to a healthy organizational climate, or command climate (if ratee is a commander). As supporting rationale, identify specific jobs where he or she could be used in a higher grade. If not being recommended for promotion, but is being recommended for further service in his or her current grade, identify options for future use. If an officer is the subject of a

		substantiated allegation, complaint, or investigation, or if the officer was removed from duty for cause, use this section to address issue. Do not consider or comment on marital status or the employment, educational activities, or volunteer service activities of his/her spouse. As applicable, include comments on achievements in implementing the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense's Report to the President on Defense Management of July 1989.
12	Rater's ID (name, grade, and duty title)	Major general selectees may, once confirmed by the Senate, sign the AF Form 78 as a selectee. See Notes in Table 7.2. Do not date or sign prior to the "THRU" date.
13	Signature	Digital Signature
14	Date	Date of signature will auto populate.
15a	Promotion Recommendation	FOR MAJOR GENERALS: Because major generals (to include selects and those serving in a frocked status) do not meet a promotion board or federal recognition board, leave this block blank. FOR BRIGADIER GENERALS: Block 15a will be completed on all brigadier general and brigadier general selects. Title 10, U.S.C., Section 619, <i>Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion: Time in Grade and Other Requirements</i> requires that all officers have at least one year time in grade to be considered for promotion. If the brigadier general or brigadier general select will have one year Time In Grade as of the board convening date, or as of the report close-out date for ANG GOs, mark "ELIGIBLE FOR PROMOTION THIS CYCLE." If the brigadier general or brigadier general select will not have one year Time In Grade as a brigadier general as of the board convening date, or as of the report close-out date for ANG GOs, mark "NOT ELIGIBLE FOR PROMOTION THIS CYCLE." If the brigadier general has an approved retirement on file mark "RETIREMENT." Contact AF/DPG if you have any questions regarding the board convening date. Contact NGB-GO if you have any questions regarding on year Time in Grade as of the report close-out date.
15b	Numerical Rank	Complete this block for brigadier generals only if "Eligible For Promotion This Cycle" is checked in block 15a. The exception to this rule is for officers who are approved for retirement. For RegAF/ARC. Title 10, U.S.C., Section 619, <i>Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion: Time in Grade and Other Requirements</i> "requires officers who have an approved DOS 90 or more days from the date the board convenes are eligible for promotion consideration." If an officer has a DOS within 90 days of the board convening date, do not complete this block. If the DOS is 90 or more days from the convening date the officer must be considered and block 15b must be completed.
16	Comments	See instructions for block 11 (this table). Limit comments to 3 bullets. If the rater is also the ML, use block 11 to enter comments and type "The rater is also the endorsing official" in block 16.

17	Endorser's ID (name, grade, and duty title)	Do not sign or date prior to the "TO" date. This block will still be completed if marked "The rater is also the endorsing official."
18	Signature	Digital Signature.
19	Date	Date of signature will auto populate.

Table 7.2. Instructions for Completing AF Form 77 for General Officers.

A	B	C
To Complete		
Sec	Block	
I	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and Jr., Sr., etc. Use of "NMI" when there is no middle initial is not mandatory. The name will be in all upper case.
	SSN	Enter SSN. Do not use suffix.
	Rank	Enter the appropriate rank. For RegAF/ARC. Include the status if the ratee is a selectee or is frocked. For example, Maj Gen, Brig Gen (Sel) or Brig Gen (Frocked).
	DAFSC	Enter "90G0."
	Duty Title or Title of Additional Duty	Enter the approved duty title as of the "THRU" date of the evaluation.
	Deployed Location or Named Operation	Deployed CC LOEs Only. If applicable, enter the operation/contingency name ratee was deployed in support of. (i.e. Operation ENDURING FREEDOM).
IIA	Type of Report	Drop Down Menu. For Formal/Informal LOEs, enter: Letter of Evaluation; For Supplemental Sheets, enter: Supplemental Sheet; For Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor, enter: Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor For Administrative LOEs, leave blank.
IIB	Report Dates	Enter the dates as they appear on the AF Form 78. If a TDY rating official is rendering a report because of the ratee's TDY of 90 days or more, enter the inclusive dates of the TDY.
	"Report is..."	Drop Down Menu. Select either Mandatory or Optional. (See Table 5.2.). If the AF Form 77 will be attached to the AF Form 78, or is being rendered by a TDY rating official resulting from the ratee's TDY of 60 days or more, mark the box entitled, "Mandatory." All other AF Forms 77 are optional.
	Level of Deployed CC Duties Performed	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Drop Down Menu. Select either Squadron CC, Group CC, or Wing CC.

	Number of Days in CC Position	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the number of consecutive days served in the deployed commander position, on G-series orders.
	G-Series Order Number/Date of Order	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the G-Series Order Number.
		Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the date of the G-Series Order.
III	Deployed Commander Assessment	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Select “Yes” if the officer satisfactorily completed their deployed commander tour. Select “No” if completion was unsatisfactory. If “No,” the report must be referred.
IV	Comments	Hand-write comments in dark blue or black ink (for ANG, type comments in bullet format). Limit comments to space provided. Include comments concerning personal and professional characteristics with emphasis on potential to assume a higher grade or increased responsibilities. Also, consider ratee’s success in contributing to a healthy organizational climate, or command climate (if ratee is a commander). As supporting rationale, identify specific jobs where he or she could be used in a higher grade. If not being recommended for promotion but is being recommended for further service in his or her current grade, identify options for future use. If an officer is the subject of a substantiated allegation, complaint, or investigation, or if the officer was removed from duty for cause, use this section to address issue. Do not consider or comment on the marital status or the employment, educational activities, or volunteer service activities of his or her spouse. As applicable, include comments on achievements in implementing the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense's Report to the President on Defense Management of July 1989.
V	Rater Data	Information will be as of the “THRU” date of the report. Sign original on or after “THRU” date. For RegAF/ARC, once the Senate confirms the promotion, major general selectees may sign the AF Form 77 as a selectee.

Notes: For RegAF/ARC. *Major general & brigadier general “(Sel)”/“Froked” signing OES forms:*

- a. Once Senate confirmed, colonels on the brigadier general select list are permitted to sign all OES forms as “(Sel)” provided that they are either designated by their respective management level (ML) as a senior rater or they are assigned to an authorized brigadier general officer position.
- b. Once Senate confirmed, brigadier generals on the major general select list are permitted to sign all OES forms as “(Sel)” provided that they are either evaluating other general officers or are assigned to an authorized maj gen officer position.
- c. Froked GOs are authorized to sign all OES forms in their froked grade without designating their “Froked” status (i.e. major general vice major general “Froked”).
- d. Once Senate confirmed, all GO selects assigned to joint billets or unified commands may sign all OES forms as “(Sel)”.

For ANG. For ANGUS general officers returning from a retired status through the indispensability program, contact NGB-GO for appropriate procedures to document retired status on the AF Form 77.

Chapter 8

PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION AND MANAGEMENT LEVEL REVIEW PROCESS

8.1. AF Form 709 (for Active Duty List [ADL] officers).

8.1.1. Purpose. The purpose of the promotion recommendation process is to provide performance-based differentiation to assist Central Selection Boards (CSBs). The AF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation (PRF)*, is used for promotion purposes only. **NOTE:** Except for paragraphs 8.2. and 8.6., this chapter does not pertain to ANG or AFR officers who are not on the ADL.

8.1.2. Types of PRFs:

8.1.2.1. Narrative-Only (N-O) PRFs. The losing senior rater completes these on all lieutenant colonels and below (**EXCEPTION:** Not required for majors who are lieutenant colonel selects) departing PCS for a school (e.g., Developmental Education, AFIT, or other AF-level training programs as described by 8.3.5.2) or PCA/PCS to patient status. Complete N-O PRFs regardless of promotion zone. Do not complete PRFs on lieutenants or captains who will have less than four years TIG as a captain upon completion of schooling. **EXCEPTION:** For Medical Corps/Dental Corps officers only, complete N-O PRF regardless of their current grade, DOR or promotion selection status, due to the possibilities of their continual long term training status. See paragraph 8.1.5.6. **NOTE:** In the rare cases where a PRF is required for colonels and colonel/lieutenant colonel selects while in a student status, the senior rater prior to the officer's departure to DE will write the PRF.

8.1.2.2. Recommendation-Only (R-O) PRFs. The Air Force Student MLR President completes these for all officers who are eligible for consideration by that review. Attach the R-O PRF to the N-O PRF and file both in the OSR. See paragraph 8.1.5.6.

8.1.2.3. Regular PRFs. An eligible officer's senior rater completes the PRF no earlier than 60 days prior to the CSB for which the officer is promotion eligible (PRF cutoff date) and awards one of three recommendations:

8.1.2.3.1. A "Definitely Promote" ("DP") recommendation: The strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential warrants promotions.

8.1.2.3.2. A "Promote" ("P") recommendation means the ratee is qualified for promotion and should compete on the basis of performance, performance-based potential, and other considerations such as duty history, developmental education, advanced degrees, etc.

8.1.2.3.3. A "Do Not Promote This Board" ("DNP") recommendation: The strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential does not warrant promotion by the CSB for which the officer is eligible. A senior rater must make comments explaining to the CSB why the officer should not be promoted. Comments must focus on the substandard behavior of the officer and if desired the punishment received.

8.1.3. Completing the PRF. See Table 8.1 (and paragraph 8.6 on promotion-eligible colonels) for specific guidance on preparing PRFs.

8.1.3.1. Comments in Section IV, Promotion Recommendation, of the PRF are mandatory for In and Above the Zone (I/APZ) eligible officers (Table 8.1.), except on PRFs for officers two or more times above the zone and PRFs prepared to the grade of brigadier general when the overall recommendation in AF Form 709, Section IX, *Overall Recommendation*, is "Promote." Final decision authority for including comments on BPZ and two or more times above-the-zone officers remains with the SR. SRs retain the latitude to push their best-qualified officers but are not required to complete Section IV of the PRF on all APZ officers already deferred two or more times. Comments are required on all PRFs with a "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation, regardless of zone (Table 8.1.).

8.1.3.2. If promotion opportunity is 100%, regular PRFs are not required. This includes individuals competing for I/APZ; any officers competing for BPZ will still require a completed PRF. **EXCEPTIONS:** Senior raters will prepare PRFs on all officers who receive "DNP" recommendations and on all officers who receive a "P" recommendation but have derogatory information (Article 15, courts-martial, referral evaluation, LOR, etc.) filed in their OSR.

8.1.3.3. For LAF Capt PRFs: MLRs are prohibited (except for AF Level Students); "Definitely Promote" recommendation PRFs are not authorized any comments; "Promote/Do Not Promote" recommendations are limited to a maximum of 5 lines. Each SR with one eligible officer (regardless of zone) will receive one allocated "DP". Any additional "DPs" will be awarded based on the allocation rate which is announced approximately 60 days prior to the CSB.

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

8.1.3.4.1. Quoted or attributed stratification remarks from OPRs, provided that they are also quantified, may be used on PRFs.

8.1.3.4.2. Statements that refer or imply to the stratification of an officer's standing at an MLR, such as: "#1 of 22 DPs awarded at the MLR," or "If the MLR had one more DP, he/she would get it," are prohibited. This means the head of the ML or MLR President may not use the denominator of the MLs eligibles when stratifying their respective officers, which may have or have not competed at the MLR.

8.1.3.5. Promotion statements, reserved for the senior rater, will only be made on the PRF.

8.1.3.5.1. As a general rule, prohibited promotion statements are any comments, direct or implied, that refer to a higher grade. For example, any comments that state the individual is performing above his/her grade, occupying a position requiring a more senior grade, comparing an individual to officers of higher rank, or alluding to a higher ranking position are all prohibited.

8.1.3.5.2. While it is impossible to provide an all-inclusive list of prohibited statements; some examples are:

8.1.3.5.2.1. "Maj Burgess is senior officer material." (The term "Senior" is a euphemism for colonel and above, therefore not authorized).

8.1.3.5.2.2. "Capt DeSantis has excelled in a major's billet." (Refers to a rank higher than the one the individual currently holds).

8.1.3.5.2.3. "Major Moody should be a group commander now." (Recommends the individual for a position two grades higher than the ratee—not normal progression).

8.1.3.5.2.4. "Capt Korte is ready for our toughest field grade jobs." (Compares a company grade officer with higher ranking (Field Grade) officers).

8.1.3.5.2.5. "Already performing above her current position." (Refers to higher grade).

8.1.4. Responsibilities:

8.1.4.1. The Senior Rater:

8.1.4.1.1. Reviews the ratee's Officer's Command Selection Records Group (OCSRGP), decoration citations, Duty Qualification History Brief (DQHB) and UIF (if applicable) before preparing the PRF. May consider other reliable information about duty performance and conduct except as paragraph 1.12. or other regulatory guidance prohibits. Examples of other reliable information may include but are not limited to LOEs, bullets from a draft OPR and/or decoration, etc. To reference the "other reliable information" in their record, the officer meeting the board may submit a letter to the CSB. Do not use any other Single Uniform Request Formats (SURFs) other than those indicated above when preparing the PRF (i.e., AMS SURFs). **NOTE:** The intent of the "other reliable information" passage is to allow SRs to comment on performance accomplishments since the close-out of the last evaluation. This allows a SR who has personal knowledge of an accomplishment to comment about it in the PRF although not part of the official record yet.

8.1.4.1.2. Must be knowledgeable of the ratee's most recent performance. The senior rater may request subordinate supervisors to provide information on an officer's most recent duty performance and performance-based potential and may ask for suggestions based upon the officer's duty performance for PRF recommendations.

8.1.4.1.3. Will ensure no subordinate commander/supervisor asks or allows, an officer to draft or prepare his or her own PRF. **NOTE:** Eligible officers may provide input.

8.1.4.1.4. Will ensure there are no boards, meetings or panels of officers convened to collectively score, rate, rank, stratify, produce stratification inputs for use in PRFs, or tally the records and/or generate a priority list of eligible officers unless specifically authorized by this instruction. **NOTE:** Senior Raters may request subordinate supervisors provide their assessment (without the use of any boards, meetings, or panels) of the rank order of officers in their chain of command).

8.1.4.1.5. Is solely responsible for evaluating each officer's OCSRGp and DQHB and for either awarding PRF recommendations among officers or submitting officers to compete for aggregation or carry-over "DP" recommendations. The senior rater submits the PRF with Section IX unmarked when submitting an officer for competition in aggregation or carry-over categories at an MLR and/or HQ USAF review.

8.1.4.1.6. Completes promotion recommendations. Corrects any error that results in awarding more "DP" recommendations than allocated by the ML. However, if he or she fails to fulfill this responsibility, the management level review president makes the appropriate corrections, to include re-accomplishing a PRF a senior rater prepared.

8.1.4.1.7. Provides the ratee a copy of the PRF (hand-delivered or sent in a sealed envelope clearly marked, "To Be Opened By Addressee Only") approximately 30 days before the CSB. The reason for this is twofold:

8.1.4.1.7.1. Advise the ratee of the senior rater's promotion recommendation.

8.1.4.1.7.2. Provide the ratee an opportunity to point out any typographical, administrative or errors of fact to the senior rater so they may be corrected prior to the CSB. **NOTE:** If the ratee is geographically separated, send it to the ratee by "return receipt requested" mail. Contact the MPS for assistance if necessary.

8.1.4.1.8. Will ensure the PRF remains a private matter with access being only between the senior rater, the ratee, senior rater administrative support staff if senior rater desires (i.e. executive officer, secretary, MPS), the MLR, and the CSB. Subordinate evaluators or others may have access to a PRF's comments or rating only if permitted by the ratee. **NOTE:** No officer eligible for a particular board will be involved with the PRF process for that particular board.

8.1.4.1.9. Must attach a memo (Figure 8.1) telling the ratee who receives a PRF with a "DNP" recommendation that he or she has the right to submit a letter to the CSB.

8.1.4.1.10. Considers preparing a PRF on a newly assigned eligible officer who received an outright "P" recommendation from his or her previous senior rater, (an outright "P" is someone who received a promote recommendation from the senior rater and was not competed at a MLR). The exception is AF-level students meeting the AF Student MLR, and whose effective date of duty as a result of PCS or PCA to a new senior rater occurs after the PRF accounting date, but on or before the PRF cutoff date. See paragraph 8.4.1.

8.1.4.1.11. Provides a signed master eligibility list (MEL) of officers considered for promotion recommendations to the ML.

8.1.4.1.12. Ensures the ML receives PRFs as required by paragraph 8.1.5.

8.1.4.1.13. Ensures his or her SRID in Air Force Promotion System (AFPROMS) reflects only his or her eligible officers NLT 105 days before the CSB.

8.1.4.1.14. Evaluates all additions to and deletions from the MEL through their MPSs to their ML (i.e., officers who are gains as a result of a PCA/PCS movement occurring prior to the PRF accounting date or officers initially assigned to the wrong PAS code and SRID).

8.1.4.1.15. Officers Added or Deleted from Promotion Eligibility. This paragraph applies to officers who become eligible or ineligible for promotion consideration in a particular competitive category on or after the PRF accounting date. Causes for a change in eligibility status may include: SSB or Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) actions, administrative errors, changes in DOS, or similar circumstances.

8.1.4.1.15.1. For officers whose eligibility for promotion consideration is established after the PRF accounting date, the senior rater of record at the time eligibility is established will write the PRF.

8.1.4.1.15.2. If the PRF is written after the senior rater completes the rank ordering (Day-66) and determines that a “DP” should be awarded, then place a “1” in block VI for BPZ/IPZ officer, or place a “0” in block VI for APZ officers. See Table 8.2.

8.1.4.2. The MPS.

8.1.4.2.1. Assists the ML in verifying accuracy of SRIDs and PAS codes.

8.1.4.2.2. Provides two copies of PRF notices, a MEL, and a DQHB on each eligible officer to the senior raters. **NOTE:** For officers not located with the SR, provide these documents to eligible officers servicing MPS to be used in preparing PRF inputs for the SR.

8.1.4.2.3. Provides other senior rater support and review as requested (sends PRFs to the appropriate ML when requested by the senior raters).

8.1.4.2.4. Makes OCSRGS available to senior raters, to include records of officers serviced by other MPSs.

8.1.4.2.5. Reviews PRFs to ensure administrative accuracy, when requested.

8.1.4.2.6. Processes narrative-only PRFs. (See paragraph 8.1.5.6).

8.1.4.2.7. Advises senior raters when officers change promotion eligibility status after PRF allocation date (Day 66). (See paragraph 8.1.4.1.15.)

8.1.4.2.8. Ensures senior raters are provided a listing of newly assigned eligible officers. **NOTE:** RIPs are produced in AFPROMS, ensure SR validate RIPs by signing them and keep on file until public release.

8.1.4.2.9. Evaluates any potential adds or deletions to the MELs for the senior raters and MLs they service. (See paragraph 8.1.4.1.14).

8.1.4.2.10. Monitors AFPROMS Audit Transactions at least twice a week to identify any board adds, deletions, SRID changes, PCS/PCA/DAS actions.

8.1.4.2.11. Coordinates with ML and senior raters as needed.

8.1.4.2.12. Check AFPROMS news daily.

8.1.4.2.13. Upon receipt of PRFs following the USAF Student MLR, distribute these PRFs to the eligible officers. See paragraph 8.1.4.1.7.

8.1.4.3. The ML.

8.1.4.3.1. Designates senior rater positions for all units within their jurisdiction and assigns SRIDs to those positions.

8.1.4.3.2. Identifies officers occupying those senior rater positions by name, assigns them SRIDs by name and PAS code and ensures AFPROMS is updated accordingly.

8.1.4.3.3. Validates SRID alignment in MilPDS with PAS code. **NOTE:** Ensure MilPDS is updated accordingly, contact AFPC for any assistance.

8.1.4.3.4. Notifies senior raters and MPSs of preliminary "DP" allocations.

8.1.4.3.5. Notifies affected senior raters on the final PRF allocation date of available "DPs" senior raters may award.

8.1.4.3.6. Ensures all eligible officers are considered for promotion recommendations and are guaranteed at least one look for a "DP" recommendation (the guaranteed look is the senior rater).

8.1.4.3.7. Ensures senior raters and MLRs do not exceed the authorized number of "DP" allocations.

8.1.4.3.8. Ensures PRF results of I/APZ and BPZ eligible officers are updated in the AFPROMS information system no later than 35 days before the CSB.

8.1.4.3.9. Send all regular PRFs to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE to arrive no later than 30 days before the CSB.

8.1.4.3.10. Maintains copies of all PRFs and MELs until announcement of CSB results. Destroy all materials pertaining to the MLR upon announcement of results. **EXCEPTION:** MLs must maintain a copy of the OCSRG, including the PRF and DQHB, that earned the last DP and the top two that earned a P rating in carry-over competition for each competitive category. These OCSRGs will serve as the "Benchmark" records in support of Supplemental Management Level Review (SMLR) requirements (paragraph 8.7).

8.1.4.3.11. Processes PRFs in accordance with paragraph 8.1.5.

8.1.4.3.12. Evaluates any potential adds or deletions to their senior raters and coordinates with HQ AFPC/DP2SPE as needed.

8.1.4.3.13. Monitors AFPROMS Audit Transactions at least twice a week to identify any board additions, deletions, SRID changes, PCS/PCA/DAS actions.

8.1.4.3.14. Coordinates with senior raters, MPSs, and HQ AFPC/DP2SPE as needed.

8.1.4.3.15. Monitors AFPROMS news daily.

8.1.4.3.16. Ensures the SecAF Memorandum of Instruction (MOI), available on myPers, is referenced and utilized for all MLR and SR promotion processes within their purview. The MOI provides instructions to all MLs and SRs to ensure decision makers throughout the officer promotion process are focused on the same priorities and special emphasis areas as the CSB.

8.1.4.4. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

8.1.4.4.1. Establishes and announces PRF eligibility criteria and administrative requirements for processing PRFs.

8.1.4.4.2. Ensures completed PRFs are disposed of in accordance with paragraph 8.1.5.

8.1.4.4.3. Flows PRF Notices and DQHBs approximately 120 days prior to the CSB in AFPROMS.

8.1.4.4.4. Processes all SRID changes with multiple MLs involved. **NOTE:** It remains the initiating MLs responsibility to obtain all concurrences for other affected MLs prior to submission to AFPC.

8.1.4.5. The Ratee.

8.1.4.5.1. Contacts the senior rater if they have not received a copy of their PRF NLT 15 days prior to CSB. Prior to the CSB, the ratee must contact the senior rater to discuss any inaccuracies, omissions or errors pertaining to their PRF.

8.1.4.5.2. Ensures their record is current and accurate.

8.1.4.5.3. May correspond by letter with the CSB and address any matter of record concerning themselves that they believe important to their consideration. Letters must be submitted in good faith and contain accurate information to the best of the ratee's knowledge and must be signed by the ratee.

8.1.4.5.4. Air Force Level students/patients (SRID "ST101") eligible for promotion may write a letter to the Air Force Student MLR to address any matter of record concerning themselves that they believe important to their consideration. Letters must be submitted in good faith and contain accurate information to the best of the ratee's knowledge and must be signed by the ratee. The letters will be destroyed upon conclusion of the Student MLR and will not be forwarded to the CSB.

8.1.5. Processing and Use of the PRF.

8.1.5.1. MPSs send PRF notices and MELs to senior raters upon receipt, normally day 120 prior to the CSB.

8.1.5.2. Senior raters sign completed PRFs on or after the PRF cutoff date. Senior raters who intend to compete in aggregation (see paragraph 8.3.1.10), or carry-over (8.3.1.9), must prepare and sign the PRFs, leaving Section IX blank.

8.1.5.3. Senior raters will submit all completed I/APZ PRFs for quality review and ensure all BPZ PRFs are available for AFPROMS update by the ML no later than 40 days before the CSB.

8.1.5.4. The ML sends completed PRFs to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE, 550 C Street West Suite 7, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4705 to arrive no later than 30 days before the CSB. MLs forward PRFs for non-line aggregate and carry-over officers to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE, 550 C Street West Suite 7, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4709, with the "Overall Recommendation" left blank, to arrive NLT 35 days prior to the CSB.

8.1.5.5. HQ AFPC/PB ensures the removal of the PRFs from the OSR immediately following the CSB and forwards them to HQ AFPC/DP1ORM to be placed on optical disk.

DP1ORM destroys the PRFs after imaging. PRFs filed on optical disk have limited access. Do not use them for assignments, promotions (except Special Selection Boards [SSB]), or other personnel actions. Retain these PRFs for historical, legal, and appeal purposes only.

8.1.5.6. Narrative-only/Recommendation-only PRFs.

8.1.5.6.1. MPSs are responsible for processing N-O PRFs and ensuring all eligible officers receive a copy of their N-O PRF prior to departure for PCS. **NOTE:** Officers will not depart without a N-O PRF being accomplished unless an approved waiver was granted IAW paragraph 8.1.5.6.4.1.

8.1.5.6.2. The senior rater sends the N-O PRF to the MPS no later than 30 days prior to the officer departing PCA or PCS for school. **NOTE:** An officer may become eligible for BPZ or I/APZ consideration by a CSB before departing for school. In this case, both a narrative-only PRF and a regular PRF (see paragraph 8.1.2.3.) must be prepared. An officer may also be eligible for two or more promotion boards while in AF-level student status, depending on the length of training. Since N-O PRFs are not board specific, statements such as “My #1 BPZ” may become outdated before the officer meets a promotion board, however this should not preclude the senior rater from stratifying the officers as he would on a regular PRF.

8.1.5.6.3. The senior rater sends the N-O PRFs to the MPS for officers in patient or Missing in Action (MIA)/Prisoner of War (POW) status. The MPS will process the PRF to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE no later than 60 days after the officer enters this new status.

8.1.5.6.4. The MPS forwards the original PRFs to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE NLT 30 days after the officer departs and updates a code “B” in MilPDS. The MPS maintains copies of the PRFs until PRF receipt is confirmed by an update of NAR PRF Flag to code “C” in MilPDS by HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. MPSs can verify that the “C” code is updated under officer grade data/grade miscellaneous in PDS. Once confirmed, the MPS destroys its copies. All N-O PRF waiver requests will be worked directly with HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. See PSD Handbook for update instructions.

8.1.5.6.4.1. All N-O PRF waiver requests will be worked directly with HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

8.1.5.6.4.2. When requesting N-O PRF waivers, please include the following information: Full name, SSN, DOR, competitive category, projected graduation date, and reason for the request. **NOTE:** As waivers are reviewed using current schedules, should an officer become eligible after a waiver has been granted, the N-O PRF will then be required from the senior rater whom was in the position when the officer departed for school. Only if the senior rater is not available (retired and unable to be contacted or deceased, etc.) will the current senior rater in the position be authorized to sign the N-O PRF after the officer departed.

8.1.5.6.5. Senior raters provide a copy of the N-O PRF to the ratee approximately 30 days prior to departure for AF level training/patient status.

8.1.5.6.6. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE maintains N-O PRFs until officers leave student, patient, or MIA/POW status. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE destroys narrative-only PRFs when the officer no longer competes as a student. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE maintains the N-O PRFs until distributed as specified below:

8.1.5.6.6.1. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE forwards the N-O PRF to the HQ USAF Student MLR. After completion of the recommendation-only PRFs (which are attached to the narrative-only PRFs), HQ AFPC/DP2SPE forwards the N-O PRF and R-O PRF to the official record (ARMS) for inclusion in the OSR and provides copies to ratees via the ratees' servicing MPS.

8.1.5.6.6.2. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE maintains the original narrative-only PRF in a separate file for use during future promotion consideration as a student. Exceptions to the disposition of PRFs must be approved by HQ AFPC/DP2SPE and be in the best interest of the officer and the Air Force.

8.1.5.6.6.3. Immediately after completion of the CSB, HQ AFPC/PB removes the PRFs from the OSR and forwards them to HQ AFPC/DP1ORM for placement on optical disk.

8.1.5.7. The HQ USAF Student MLR (see paragraph 8.3.5.2.2.) prepares R-O PRFs and attaches them to the student N-O PRFs.

8.2. AF Form 709 (for Reserve Active Status List officers).

8.2.1. Reserve of the Air Force. Use AF Form 709 for promotion to lieutenant colonel and colonel. Refer to paragraph 8.6. for recommending colonels for promotion to the grade of brigadier general. AFR will use AF Form 709 for Position Vacancy promotion nomination to all grades. HQ ARPC/PB will issue instructions specific to each board.

8.2.1.1. Mandatory Boards. An eligible officer's senior rater completes the PRF no later than 45 days prior to the CSB. The senior rater awards one of three recommendations:

8.2.1.2. A "Definitely Promote" ("DP") recommendation: The strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential warrants promotions.

8.2.1.3. A "Promote" ("P") recommendation means the ratee is qualified for promotion and should compete on the basis of performance, performance-based potential, and other considerations such as duty history, developmental education, advanced degrees, etc.

8.2.1.4. A "Do Not Promote This Board" ("DNP") recommendation: The strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential does not warrant promotion by the CSB for which the officer is eligible. A senior rater must make comments explaining to the CSB why the officer should not be promoted.

8.2.1.5. The ResAF is not constrained by the number of "DPs" it can award. A senior rater may award as many "DPs" as desired.

8.2.2. Completing the PRF. See Table 8.1. for specific guidance on preparing PRFs.

8.2.3. Responsibilities:

8.2.3.1. The Senior Rater:

8.2.3.1.1. Reviews the ratee's OPRs, decoration citations, DQHB, PIF, and UIF (if applicable) before preparing the PRF. They may also consider other reliable information about duty performance and conduct except as outlined in paragraph 1.12. or other regulatory guidance. Examples of other reliable information may include but are not limited to LOE, bullets from a draft OPR and/or decoration, etc. To reference the "other reliable information" in their record, the officer meeting the board may submit a letter to the CSB. **NOTE:** Do not use any other SURFs other than those indicated above when preparing the PRF (i.e. AMS SURFs). The intent of the "other reliable information" passage is to allow SRs to comment on performance accomplishments since the close-out of the last evaluation. This allows a SR who has personal knowledge of an accomplishment to comment about it in the PRF although not part of the official record yet. The senior rater of record on the PRF accounting date will write the PRF.

8.2.3.1.2. May obtain information on an officer's most recent duty performance and performance-based potential from subordinate or previous supervisors and may consider their suggestions based upon the officer's duty performance for PRF recommendations. No officer will be asked to draft or prepare his or her own PRF. There will be no boards or panels of officers convened to collectively score, rate, rank, or tally the records and/or generate a priority list of eligible officers.

8.2.3.1.3. Is solely responsible for evaluating each officer's ROP and DQHB, to award recommendations.

8.2.3.1.4. Completes promotion recommendations.

8.2.3.1.5. Provides the ratee a copy of the PRF (hand-delivered or sent in a sealed envelope clearly marked, "To Be Opened By Addressee Only") approximately 30 days before the CSB. PRFs are a private matter between the senior rater and the ratee. Subordinate evaluators may have access to a PRF rating to assist in the feedback process only if desired by the ratee. The senior rater must attach a memo (Figure 8.1) telling the ratee who receives a PRF with a "DNP" recommendation that he or she has the right to submit a letter to the CSB. The ratee must acknowledge receipt of the memorandum. If the ratee is geographically separated, send it to the ratee by "return receipt requested" mail. Contact the MPS for assistance, if necessary.

8.2.3.2. The MPS or HQ ARPC/PB (as applicable):

8.2.3.2.1. Verifies accuracy of SRIDs and PAS codes.

8.2.3.2.2. Provides to senior raters the PRF notice, a MEL, and a DQHB on each eligible officer.

8.2.3.2.3. Provides other senior rater support as requested (sends PRFs to the appropriate ML as requested by senior raters).

8.2.3.2.4. Makes ROPs available to senior raters, to include records of officers serviced by other MPSs.

8.2.3.2.5. Reviews PRFs to ensure administrative accuracy, when requested.

8.2.3.2.6. Informs senior raters when officers have a change in promotion eligibility status after the PRF accounting date.

8.2.3.2.7. Provides senior raters a listing of newly assigned eligible officers.

8.2.3.3. HQ ARPC/PB. Will announce PRF criteria for ResAF CSBs.

8.2.4. Processing and Use of PRFs.

8.2.4.1. MPSs send PRF notices and MELs to senior raters upon receipt, usually just after the PRF accounting date.

8.2.4.2. The senior rater will complete the PRF in enough time to arrive at HQ ARPC not later than 45 days before the CSB.

8.2.4.3. HQ ARPC/PB posts the OSRs from eBOSS back to ARMS. The PRF becomes part of the as-met records for the officer's future reference.

8.2.5. Officers Relocating During the PRF Process. To ensure officers with a change in assignment to a new senior rater effective after the PRF accounting date, but on or before the CSB, receive full consideration for their PRF, special provisions apply. For ANG/AFR, the senior rater of record on the PRF accounting date will write the PRF and award performance rating.

8.2.5.1. To provide these officers fair consideration, the losing and gaining senior raters may discuss the officer's performance and their intentions (via phone, memo, etc.).

8.2.5.2. Award a "DNP" recommendation when derogatory information has been received since departure from previous assignment. If the losing senior rater awards a "DNP" recommendation, the gaining senior rater has no further action. A senior rater must make specific comments to support the DNP recommendation in Section IV of the PRF.

8.2.5.3. The MPS or HQ ARPC/PB (as appropriate) will:

8.2.5.3.1. Screen all officers gained after the PRF accounting date to determine eligibility and notify senior raters accordingly (refer to AFPROMS user's guide). Ensure senior raters certify a review of all gained eligibles.

8.2.5.3.2. Provide the senior rater a DQHB on newly assigned officers.

8.2.5.3.3. Update corrections to SRIDs on officers who arrive at new locations on or before the PRF accounting date. Notify HQ ARPC/PB when an update to AFPROMS is needed.

8.2.6. Officers added to Promotion Eligibility. This paragraph applies to officers who become eligible for promotion consideration or change component or competitive categories on or after the PRF accounting date. Cause for a change in eligibility may include (but is not limited to): ANG to AFR transfer; AFR to ANG transfer; change from Participating Reserve to Non-Participating Reserve or Non-Participating Reserve to Participating Reserve; change from active duty list to Reserve active status list (without a break in military status); change from other branch of service to USAF Reserve active status list; change in DOS; administrative errors; SSB or AFBCMR actions; or similar circumstances.

8.2.7. Ranking of Definitely Promotes. Enter the rank order for all officers awarded a “DP” recommendation within each competitive category, e.g. line, judge advocate, nurse corps, etc. **EXAMPLE:** 2/5/10; the senior rater has 10 officers in that competitive category meeting the Promotion Selection Board. The officer is ranked number 2 of 5 officers awarded a DP. For officers awarded other than a DP, leave GROUP SIZE blank. For officers gained after completion of PRFs, to which the SR chooses to award a DP, the ranking will be 1/1/1. For a Position Vacancy (PV) Board, enter the rank order for all officers nominated for PV within each competitive category. **EXAMPLE:** 3/5; the senior rater has 5 officers in that competitive category meeting the PV Promotion Selection Board. This officer is ranked number three of five officers awarded a DP.

8.2.8. Prisoners, Deserters, and Officers on Appellate Leave. Do not accomplish PRFs for officers who become prisoners or deserters, or who are on appellate leave on or before the PRF accounting date. HQ ARPC/DPTSE will prepare an AF Form 77. However, officers identified as prisoners, deserters, or on appellate leave after the PRF accounting date will require PRFs from the losing senior rater. His or her total number of eligibles will include these officers.

8.2.9. Air Force Advisors for PRFs. If the senior rater on the PRF is not an Air Force officer or DAF official, an Air Force advisor is designated to advise evaluators on matters pertaining to PRFs. Normally, this will be the same officer who conducts the review of the officer’s OPR. The Air Force advisor will not change any statements or the promotion recommendation on the PRF.

8.2.10. Promotion Recommendations for Colonels. See paragraph 8.6 for AFR general officer CSB or an ANGUS Federal Recognition Board information and instruction.

8.2.11. AGR Officers in Student Status. The Deputy to the Chief of Air Reserve (Deputy RE) is the senior rater for AGR students only (AFR only).

8.2.11.1. When an AGR officer leaves for a school tour, the losing senior rater will prepare a PRF as if the officer is still assigned. The PRF will be signed, but blocks VI, Group Size; VII, Board; and IX, Overall Recommendation will remain blank. The PRF follows the officer to the next assignment, and a copy is sent to HQ USAF/REPS.

8.2.11.2. If, while in student status, the officer becomes eligible for consideration by a promotion board, the N-O PRF is sent to the Deputy RE for a R-O PRF.

8.2.11.3. The Deputy RE prepares the R-O PRF according to Table 8.1. and rank orders all officers awarded a “DP” recommendation by competitive category within the student population. **EXAMPLE:** 1/2/2 rank order means the senior rater has two officers in that competitive category meeting the selection board; the officer is ranked number one of the two “DPs” awarded. **NOTE:** Student AGR PRFs are not included within the SRID that applies to the Chief of Air Force Reserve.

8.2.11.4. The N-O PRF is attached to the signed R-O PRF, and is forwarded to the promotion secretariat at the Air Reserve Personnel Center.

8.3. MLRs (ADL Lieutenant Colonel and Below).

8.3.1. The Allocation Process:

8.3.1.1. Definitely Promote. “DP” recommendations are limited in number to ensure only the most qualified records are endorsed. They send a strong signal to the CSB that the

officer is ready for immediate promotion. “DP” allocation rates for IPZ and APZ officers are lower than the IPZ promotion opportunity; this ensures a significant number of officers receiving “P” recommendations will be promoted. MLs receive a share of “DP” allocations based on the number of IPZ or BPZ officers assigned. Allocation rates vary for each competitive category, grade and promotion zone, and may fluctuate according to changes in the promotion opportunity to guarantee the minimum promotion rate for eligibles receiving a “P” recommendation (40% to major, 35% to lieutenant colonel and 25% to colonel); this is called the promotion rate (P-Rate). Allocation rates for BPZ officers are higher than the BPZ promotion opportunity to ensure all senior raters have the same opportunity to nominate their most deserving officers for an early promotion with the limited number of BPZ promotions available. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE publicizes the “DP” allocation rates for each PRF cycle in the Day 66 message.

8.3.1.2. PRF Accounting Date (150 days before the CSB). On the PRF accounting date, AFPC matches eligible officers to SRs based on the officers’ unit of assignment data in MilPDS. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE announces the actual PRF accounting date. Between the PRF accounting date and the 66th day before the CSB, MLs ensure AFPROMS is accurate.

8.3.1.3. PRF Allocation Dates (150/66 days before the CSB). The initial allocation date is 150 days before the CSB. This is when MLs estimate the number of allocations available to each senior rater and evaluation board under their jurisdiction. After this date, the number of allocations is adjusted to account for officers who become eligible or ineligible for promotion and for officers who are still not aligned under the correct SRID as verified and reported by the management level activity to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. These adjustments are made up until the day before the PRF final allocation date (which is 66 days before the CSB). On that day, the ML determines the actual number of allocations and distributes these allocations to SRs and MLRs based on the number of eligible officers for that level. No changes are made to the number of an ML's allocations on or after the final allocation date unless specifically authorized by HQ AFPC/DP3SP as an exception. In addition, no changes in the ML's allocations are authorized in cases where a Brigadier General (Sel) is confirmed by the U.S. Senate on or after day 66 and subsequently becomes eligible to be the SR for Lt cols in the organization. HQ AFPC/DP3SP will approve exceptions in order to maintain integrity in the OES and to ensure fair and proper consideration is given to all affected officers. **NOTE:** The DP Allocations will not be adjusted automatically in AFPROMS for any approved exceptions, these calculations will need to be accomplished manually.

8.3.1.4. PRF Cutoff Date. This date is 60 days prior to the CSB. PRFs cannot be signed prior to this date.

8.3.1.5. Determining Line of the Air Force (LAF) Allocations.

8.3.1.5.1. MLs determine the number of "DP" allocations they have by applying the appropriate allocation rate to their IPZ or BPZ eligibles. Round up fractions to the next whole number, e.g., if an ML has 462 BPZ eligibles and the allocation rate is 10%, the ML earns 47 “DP” allocations (462 BPZ eligibles x 10% allocation rate=46.2 which rounds up to 47 allocations). AFPROMS should be reviewed to determine DP allocation but this should not preclude MLs from doing a manual calculation.

8.3.1.5.2. Although the allocation rate for I/APZ eligibles is different, the same procedure applies. APZ officers do not generate separate allocations. However, if the ML has only LAF APZ eligibles, then a single “DP” is available. In this case, the APZ officers would receive a “0” in Section VI on the PRF. Refer to Table 8.2.

8.3.1.5.3. MLs receive separate allocations for in-utilization permanent party students.

8.3.1.6. Determining Senior Rater Allocations.

8.3.1.6.1. Minimum group size for one DP allocation is at least three eligibles, even if the DP allocation rate is 50% or higher. See Table 8.3.

8.3.1.6.2. MLs determine each SRs share of allocations in the same manner as discussed in paragraph 8.3.1.5.1, except instead of rounding up, SRs round down. **EXAMPLE:** A 55% allocation rate applied to a SR’s 10 IPZ captains would yield five “DP” allocations (10 IPZ eligibles x 55% allocation rate = 5.5 which rounds down to 5 allocations).

8.3.1.7. Returning Allocations. SRs may return earned allocations to the ML if they believe the quality of officers in their unit does not warrant the full share of allocations. Additionally, any “DPs” awarded by the senior rater to eligibles that subsequently become ineligible is returned to the SR which may be reallocated using the SRs order of merit or returned to the ML for distribution.

8.3.1.8. Redistributing “DP” allocations.

8.3.1.8.1. Prior to the MLR convening, if a SR chooses not to use the full quota of “DPs,” those unused “DPs” go to the carry-over quota.

8.3.1.8.2. Following an MLR, the MLR owns all “DPs.” Any returned “DP” allocations for IPZ/APZ eligibles are redistributed through the MLR carry-over process using the carry-over order of merit.

8.3.1.8.3. BPZ “DPs” are redistributed at the next higher level or through the ML review carry-over process.

8.3.1.8.4. Redistribution must occur prior to the PRF becoming a matter of record.

8.3.1.9. Carry-over. Since allocations are rounded down when applying the allocation rate to a senior rater's eligible population, there are normally fractions of allocations remaining. These fractions accrue at the ML and result in allocations called “carry-over” DP allocations. Carry-over allocations (and any returned allocations) are awarded to account for variations of quality within organizations under the ML. For I/APZ officers, MLs distribute allocations to MLRs for award. For BPZ eligibles, they distribute carry-over allocations directly to senior raters or through the MLR process.

8.3.1.10. Aggregation.

8.3.1.10.1. SRs without the minimum number of I/APZ officers assigned to earn a “DP” in their (SR’s) own right may compete their officers for “DP” recommendations through aggregation. Grouping of all such officers and the application of the allocation rate yields, after rounding down, the number of “DP” allocations available to officers competing in aggregation.

EXAMPLE: If there are 2 SRs in a given ML with eligible officers and each SR has only 1 eligible and the “DP” allocation rate is 65% then:

1 eligible x 65% = 0.65 + 1

eligible x 65% = 0.65 ML total = 1.30

NOTE: After rounding down, the ML earns 1 “DP” to award in aggregation and transfers the remaining .30 to carry-over.

8.3.1.10.2. SRs without the minimum number of BPZ officers assigned to earn an allocation aggregate their officers to the next higher SR in the rating chain until the number of eligibles is large enough to earn at least one allocation.

8.3.1.10.3. SRs below the head of the ML who award BPZ “DP” recommendations to eligible officers aggregated from subordinate senior raters’ populations must make the promotion recommendation decision without convening a board or panel of subordinates.

8.3.1.10.3.1. If aggregation proceeds to the ML to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 8.3.1.10.2, the head of the ML may: **NOTE:** For Joint MLs, all PRFs (including BPZ) must be quality reviewed and the quality review process is extremely important in every ML during the IPZ/APZ process. See paragraph 8.3.2.4.2.2.:

8.3.1.10.3.1.1. Personally distribute DPs on their own.

8.3.1.10.3.1.2. May convene MLRs and allow the MLRs to score records determining the DPs awarded based on order of merit.

8.3.1.10.3.1.3. Can convene a MLR, seek inputs, and still make all final decisions on DPs awarded.

8.3.1.10.4. If the total number of line BPZ officers aggregated to the MLR is still too small to earn a “DP” allocation, all panel members, not just those with officers competing for aggregation, score the records of the officers in the aggregated group and may award one “DP” recommendation. If awarded, this “DP” allocation will come from the carry-over allocation.

8.3.1.11. Determining Non-line of the Air Force and Line of the Air Force Judge Advocate (LAF-J) allocations. Non-line (Chaplain [HC], Medical Corps [MC], Dental Corps [DC], Nurse Corps [NC], Biomedical Sciences Corps [BSC], and Medical Service Corps [MSC]) and LAF-J officers compete for promotion within their own separate competitive category.

8.3.1.11.1. Minimum group size for one “DP” allocation is three eligibles, even if the DP allocation rate is 50% or higher. For allocation rates below 35%, the minimum group size will increase relative to the DP allocation rate.

8.3.1.11.2. MLs determine the number of “DP” allocations in the same manner as discussed in paragraph 8.3.1.5.1 and 8.3.1.5.2, except MLs round down when computing I/APZ allocations and round up when computing BPZ allocations. If the ML does not have enough IPZ eligibles to earn an allocation, the MLR may submit I/APZ officers to compete at the Air Force Management Level Review for non-line officers, subject to the limits established by HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

8.3.1.11.3. Allocation rates applied to non-line I/APZ and BPZ officers within competitive categories may be different from those applied to line officers. Changes in promotion opportunity will cause adjustment of allocation rates.

8.3.1.11.4. SRs without enough BPZ or I/APZ eligible officers to receive an allocation may submit their officers to compete for aggregation allocations at their ML review, subject to limits established by the ML.

8.3.1.11.5. SRs may submit their officers to compete for carry-over allocations at the MLR, subject to the limits established by the ML. The MLR may submit I/APZ officers to compete for carry-over allocations at the Air Force MLR for non-line officers, subject to the limits established by HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

8.3.1.12. Determining Non-Line SR Allocations. SR compute allocation rates as they do for line officers, by rounding down for both I/APZ and BPZ officers. If SRs do not have enough I/APZ eligible officers to receive an allocation, they may compete them for “DP” recommendations through aggregation at the ML. SR who do not have enough BPZ officers assigned to earn an allocation aggregate their officers to the next higher senior rater in the rating chain until the number of eligibles is large enough to earn at least one allocation.

8.3.2. MLR Requirements:

8.3.2.1. General. MLs designate the organization or agency responsible for holding a review. The commander or head of the designated organization holds the MLR and may establish more than one MLR (e.g., at the Numbered Air Force level or Center level). If the head of the ML is the sole SR, there is no MLR and the completed PRFs are forwarded to USAF MLR for quality review.

8.3.2.2. Timing and functions. Conduct MLRs 60 to 40 days before the CSB. They have five functions: (1) to quality review all I/APZ PRFs; (2) to award “DP” recommendations to those officers whose SR had too few eligibles to earn a “DP” allocation; (3) to award carry-over “DP” allocations available to the ML; (4) to award “DP” allocations to ML students; and (5) to nominate non-line officers from their ML to compete for DP allocations available at the HQ USAF Non-line MLR.

8.3.2.3. Composition: President (must be an Air Force line officer), those SRs who have either awarded a “DP” recommendation or have officers competing for aggregation or carry-over “DP” recommendations, and a nonvoting recorder designated by the commander or head of the organization responsible for conducting the MLR. **NOTE:** No officer eligible for a particular board will be involved with the process for that particular board.

8.3.2.3.1. The head of the ML designates the MLR president. The president must be an AF GO when evaluating lieutenant colonels, and at least an AF colonel when evaluating majors and below.

8.3.2.3.2. In cases where SRs are not available to serve on the panel due to some extraordinary circumstance, the head of the ML may authorize SRs to designate senior officials who meet the minimum grade requirement (a GO or equivalent when evaluating lieutenant colonels or at least a colonel or equivalent when evaluating

majors and below) from their organization or higher chain of command to serve on their behalf.

8.3.2.3.3. If extraordinary circumstances require a SR's departure during the MLR, the MLR president or another SR, as designated by the affected SR, may represent him or her. In all cases, the MLR president or SR designated to represent another group of officers is still limited to one vote. Additionally, if extraordinary circumstances require the MLR president to depart during an MLR, the head of the ML will designate another MLR president or assume the MLR presidency. In these cases, the records already scored will remain and the MLR will continue.

8.3.2.3.4. MLs may establish a representative sample of SRs to conduct the quality review of the I/APZ PRFs and OCSRGP's at the MLR. At the discretion of the ML, all SRs who awarded a "DP" or who are competing officers for a "DP" recommendation do not need to participate in the quality review process at the MLR.

8.3.2.3.4.1. All SRs with eligibles competing for an aggregation "DP" must serve as a member of the MLR during the aggregation phase. However, in those cases where SRs are not available to serve on the MLR due to some extraordinary circumstance, the MLR president may authorize SRs to designate senior officials (a GO or equivalent when evaluating lieutenant colonels or at least a colonel or equivalent when evaluating majors and below) from their organization or higher chain of command to serve on their behalf. If necessary, the MLR President may represent those SRs, however the MLR President is still limited to one vote. If during the MLR a senior rater must be excused, the SR may designate another SR already attending the MLR or the MLR president to act on their behalf, however, the MLR president or another senior rater which was designated is still limited to one vote.

8.3.2.3.4.2. When practical, all SRs competing officers for carry-over "DPs" attend the MLR. If the ML determines this is not practical or deems it otherwise appropriate, it may establish a representative sample of SRs to award carry-over "DPs." The ML uses a representative sample to ensure the SRs selected do not score the records of officers for whom they are the SR.

8.3.2.4. MLR Preparation.

8.3.2.4.1. MLs.

8.3.2.4.1.1. Establish MLRs.

8.3.2.4.1.2. Distribute aggregation and carry-over "DP" allocations to the MLR.

8.3.2.4.1.3. Notify each SR of the number of officers he or she may submit to compete for carry-over allocations subject to limits established by the ML.

8.3.2.4.1.4. Ensure MLRs are completed no earlier than 60 or no later than 40 calendar days before convening of the CSB for which the PRFs are prepared.

8.3.2.4.1.5. Determine the location of the MLR (normally held where performance records on the officers being considered are available).

8.3.2.4.1.6. Ensure the OCSRGp and DQHB for each officer are available for the review.

8.3.2.4.1.7. Ensure the MLR president is provided a listing of eligible officers, identifying those with UIFs, LORs and/or Articles 15. MLR presidents use this list at their discretion to ensure senior raters (and MLR members, when appropriate) have considered this information when preparing promotion recommendation forms.

8.3.2.4.1.8. Establish scoring procedure for MLRs.

8.3.2.4.2. MLR Purpose and Process:

8.3.2.4.2.1. Ensure SRs do not exceed their share of “DP” recommendations.

8.3.2.4.2.2. Ensure all BPZ records are reviewed separately from I/APZ eligibles.

8.3.2.4.2.3. Quality review the OCSRGps, DQHBs and PRFs of all I/APZ officers in order to identify and discuss with appropriate SRs those PRFs that appear to contain exaggerated or unrealistic comments or comments that do not appear to support the overall recommendation based on the OCSRGp and information considered according to paragraph 1.12. **NOTE:** DP recommendations are limited in number to ensure that only the best qualified records are endorsed. A DP recommendation sends a strong signal to the CSB that this officer is ready for immediate promotion. If a SR or Head of the ML does not have officers fitting this definition, a DP should not be awarded even though DPs may be available. To award DPs to BPZ when the record does not support a DP recommendation, gives the officer unrealistic feedback and sends mixed signals to the CSB.

8.3.2.4.2.4. Award “DP” recommendations to I/APZ officers aggregated from units with less than minimum group size needed for senior raters to award “DP” recommendations.

8.3.2.4.2.5. Award carry-over “DP” recommendations to I/APZ officers.

8.3.2.4.3. Senior Raters:

8.3.2.4.3.1. Serve as members of the MLR.

8.3.2.4.3.2. Submit PRFs to the MLR on all I/APZ officers including officers competing for aggregation and carry-over “DP” recommendations. **NOTE:** Since BPZ records are not required to be quality reviewed, SRs must submit their BPZ PRFs to the ML for update.

8.3.2.4.3.3. Submit to the MLR recorder a single list of the names of their I/APZ officers. For those officers on the list with completed PRFs, include name and overall promotion recommendation; for those officers on the list submitted to compete for aggregation or carry-over, indicate whether competing for aggregation or carry-over “DP” recommendations by annotating a “A” for aggregation or “C” for carryover.

8.3.2.5. Review Procedures.

8.3.2.5.1. General Procedures.

8.3.2.5.1.1. For all MLRs, the recorder provides to the MLR president the total number of “DP” recommendations to be awarded by each SR.

8.3.2.5.1.2. The MLR president ensures no SR exceeds the allowable number of “DP” recommendations. If a SR has awarded more “DP” recommendations than allowed, the SR specifies which PRFs need correction, new PRFs are prepared, and the SR completes Sections IX and X.

8.3.2.5.1.2.1. If the SR does not specify which PRFs need correcting, the panel reviews the OCSRGps and DQHBs of all officers assigned to that SR to determine which overall recommendations need changing. The panel then prepares a new PRF, with Sections I through VIII copied verbatim from the original PRF submitted by the SR.

8.3.2.5.1.2.2. The MLR president marks the "Promote" block in section IX of the re-accomplished PRF and signs the form. **NOTE:** The president will leave Section IX blank when the officer competes under aggregation or carry-over.

8.3.2.5.1.2.3. The panel will change the minimum number of PRFs required to ensure compliance with prescribed “DP” limits.

8.3.2.5.1.2.4. The records of any officer whose PRF is re-accomplished under this provision will automatically compete for carry-over “DP” recommendations.

8.3.2.5.2. PRF Review. MLR members will review the OCSRGps, DQHBs and completed PRFs of all I/APZ officers assigned to a SR as a group. If the MLR believes a “DP” recommendation is unsupported by the ratee’s OCSRGp, they discuss this with the SR. Open discussion among MLR members is encouraged. In all cases, a SR has the final authority to determine the content of the PRFs they prepare (unless the content is inappropriate IAW paragraph 1.12. of this instruction), and to award “DP” recommendations allocated by the ML.

8.3.2.5.3. Aggregation and Carry-over. The MLR assesses the relative merit of OCSRGps of competitors for aggregation and carry-over “DP” recommendations. This is by a combination of numerical scoring and open discussion among panel members. The MLR must ensure consistent and equitable procedures apply to the OCSRG of each officer. The scores of all MLR members are totaled, rank-ordered and “DP” recommendations awarded. If two or more records tie, and there are insufficient numbers of “DP” recommendations to award one to each, the MLR President will determine an appropriate method for breaking the tie.

8.3.2.5.4. Procedures for Award of I/APZ Aggregation “DP” Recommendations:

8.3.2.5.4.1. Officers submitted to compete for aggregation “DP” recommendations compete among themselves. The MLR president and only those senior raters with officers competing under aggregation will review and score the OCSRGps of these officers.

8.3.2.5.4.2. If the total number of line IPZ officers aggregated to the MLR is still too small to earn a “DP” allocation, all panel members, not just those with officers competing for aggregation will score the records of the officers in the aggregated

group and may award one “DP” recommendation. If awarded, this DP allocation will come from the carry over allocations. **EXAMPLE:** If there are 2 SRs with eligible officers and each SR has 1 eligible and the DP allocation rate is 45%, then: **NOTE:** The fraction in aggregation (0.90) is added to the remainder in carry-over (1.15) and rounded up from 2.05 (for LAF officers) to equal 3 “DPs.” Since the ML didn’t have enough eligibles to earn a “DP” in aggregation, a “DP” is taken from the carry-over. This results in 1 “DP” to award in aggregation and 2 “DPs” to award in carry-over.

8.3.2.5.4.3. After all records are reviewed and scored and the MLR has awarded the “DP” recommendations, SRs or their designated representatives complete Section IX on the PRFs for their officers. The MLR President verifies the results of the completed MLR by signing the order of merit. SRs may make any changes to the PRF as a result of the MLR (i.e., if the last line states “my next DP” and the officer received a “DP” from the MLR then the SR should change the last line).

8.3.2.5.4.4. The records of officers from the aggregated group that did not receive a “DP” recommendation may compete for carry-over “DP” recommendations at the discretion of the SR, within the limits prescribed by the ML.

8.3.2.5.5. Procedures for Award of I/APZ Carry-over “DP” Recommendations:

8.3.2.5.5.1. At the MLR’s discretion, and subject to the limit of DPs available in the carry-over phase, those officers who do not receive a “DP” recommendation from aggregation will be submitted for carry-over “DP” recommendations. **NOTE:** This is based on the order of merit from the aggregation phase.

8.3.2.5.5.2. Normally, the MLR president and all SRs with officers competing for carry-over recommendations participate in the carry-over decision (**EXCEPTION:** See paragraph 8.3.2.3.3). At the discretion of the MLR President, other SRs available may also participate in carry-over decisions.

8.3.2.5.5.3. SRs or their designated representatives complete Section IX on PRFs for their officers by marking either a “DP” or a “P” as appropriate. The MLR president verifies the results of the MLR by signing the order of merit. SRs may make any changes to the PRF as a result of the MLR (i.e., if the last line states “my next DP” and the officer received a “DP” from the MLR then the SR should change the last line).

8.3.2.5.6. Recorder Responsibilities. The MLR recorder forwards all PRFs and annotated MELs to the personnel activity responsible for updating AFPROMS. **NOTE:** No officer eligible for a particular board will be involved with the PRF process for that particular board.

8.3.3. Officers Assigned Outside the DoD and to Other Military Departments:

8.3.3.1. LAF officers in this category require special provisions because their organizations of assignment do not fall within the jurisdiction of a ML.

8.3.3.1.1. Allocation Process. For these officers, the Air Force District of Washington (AFDW) acts as the ML. The responsibilities of AFDW are the same as those in

paragraph 8.1.4.3 , except for aggregated BPZ officers. The HQ USAF MLR (as described in paragraph 8.3.3.3) evaluates BPZ officers aggregated to the highest SR in the rating chain for whom the SR does not have the minimum group size required to receive an allocation.

8.3.3.1.2. PRFs. SR submitting officers to compete for aggregation or carry-over “DP” recommendations prepare and forward PRFs to AFDW, leaving Section IX blank.

8.3.3.2. Non-LAF Officers:

8.3.3.2.1. Allocation Process. HQ AFPC acts as the ML for promotion recommendations only. When the primary SR does not have the minimum group size required to receive an allocation, the HQ USAF Non-line MLR at AFPC will review and evaluate the PRFs for these officers as a separate group. SRs for non-line officers assigned outside DoD earn “DP” allocations as specified in paragraph 8.3.1.11.

8.3.3.2.2. PRFs. SRs who submit their officers to compete for aggregation or carry-over “DP” recommendations prepare PRFs, leaving Section IX blank. SRs forward PRFs to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE NLT 35 days prior to CSB.

8.3.3.3. HQ USAF Review:

8.3.3.3.1. The AFDW Commander directs the HQ USAF MLR to convene 40 to 60 days before the CSB for which the PRFs are prepared. The AF/CV, or officer designated by the AF/CC, serves as MLR president. The AFDW Commander with the assistance of HQ USAF/A1, selects a minimum of four members, consistent with the minimum grade requirements for SRs, to serve as members.

8.3.3.3.2. The HQ USAF MLR will review all completed I/APZ and BPZ PRFs and award aggregation and carry-over “DP” recommendations. AFDW is responsible for providing SRs copies of completed PRFs on their ratees. This MLR will also review all PRFs completed by sole SRs (see definition of sole senior rater in this instruction).

8.3.3.3.3. The recorder consolidates information on the number of BPZ officers assigned, the number of BPZ “DP” recommendations available, and the number of “DP” recommendations awarded. **NOTE:** No officer eligible for a particular board will be involved with the PRF process for that particular board.

8.3.3.3.4. If, during the review of completed PRFs, the board discovers that a senior rater awarded more “DP” recommendations than allowed, the MLR president discusses this with the SR.

8.3.3.3.4.1. After the SR decides which PRFs to correct, they forward the re-accomplished PRFs to the MLR by the most expeditious means.

8.3.3.3.4.2. If the SR does not specify which PRFs need correcting, the panel reviews the OCSRGS and DQHBs of all officers assigned to that SR to determine which overall recommendations need changing. The panel then prepares a new PRF, with Sections I through VIII copied verbatim from the original PRF submitted by the SR.

8.3.3.3.4.2.1. The MLR President marks the "Promote" block in section IX of the re-accomplished PRFs and signs Section X.

8.3.3.3.4.3. The MLR holds PRFs they re-accomplish pending receipt of a re-accomplished PRF from the SR. If they receive the SR's re-accomplished PRF before MLR conclusion, the re-accomplished PRF is submitted to the MLR for review. If the MLR has concluded, the PRF is re-accomplished by the panel president, submitted to AFDW and the original submitted by the SR will be destroyed. The ML will then process the PRF as appropriate.

8.3.3.3.5. Award of "DP" recommendations to I/APZ officers is always separate and distinct from award of "DP" recommendations to BPZ officers.

8.3.3.3.6. The MLR President completes PRFs with Section IX left blank.

8.3.3.3.7. Since panel members may not be SRs for the officers meeting the MLR, members are encouraged to discuss an officer's OCSRGP and current performance with the SR in any case where the panel members believe it necessary.

8.3.4. Joint MLRs:

8.3.4.1. Evaluation Reviews. The president of a panel held to evaluate Joint officers is always an Air Force GO. Joint MLs may exercise one of two options: 1) hold their own reviews, or 2) allow the HQ USAF MLR to evaluate their officers. If the Joint ML is the sole SR, the HQ USAF MLR will review all completed Joint ML sole SR PRFs.

8.3.4.2. PRF. When SRs submit officers to compete at the HQ USAF MLR, Section IX of the PRF is left blank.

8.3.4.3. If the ML chooses to hold a review but there is no Air Force GO assigned to the activity, the ML may obtain the assistance of an Air Force GO assigned to another activity. If necessary, the HQ USAF/A1 will assist the ML in obtaining a GO to serve as the president.

8.3.4.3.1. SRs submit to the panel all I/APZ and BPZ completed PRFs as well as the PRFs (Section IX blank) on all I/APZ officers submitted to compete for aggregation or carry-over "DP" recommendations.

8.3.4.3.2. The responsibilities and procedures of Joint Reviews are the same as in paragraph 8.3.2, except for the requirement for all BPZ PRFs, regardless of recommendation, to be reviewed by an MLR (Joint MLR hosted by an Air Force GO or HQ USAF MLR). This is to ensure our Air Force officers in a Joint environment are getting an Air Force look.

8.3.5. Officers Assigned as Permanent Party Students.

8.3.5.1. Management Level Students - officers assigned as permanent party students training in their utilization field to include TDY in a training status. In-utilization training includes any follow-on, specialized, requalification, upgrade, enhancement, or broadening training in the officer's utilization field. MLs receive separate allocations based on those populations since permanent party eligibles and students must be evaluated as two distinct categories. For both I/APZ and BPZ LAF permanent party students, allocations round up at the ML and down at the SR level. For I/APZ non-line permanent party students, allocations round down. BPZ non-line permanent party student allocations round up at the

ML and down at the SR level. Evaluation procedures are the same as outlined in paragraph 8.3.2.5. Responsibilities of the ML with regard to students are the same as those in paragraph 8.3.2.4.1.

8.3.5.2. AF Level Students - officers assigned as permanent party students training outside their utilization field. Outside utilization training includes DE, degree-granting programs (usually AFIT sponsored), language training, Education With Industry (EWI) programs, attaché/designate training, MC/DC residency programs (when a new AFSC or suffix is awarded upon completion of training or when determined by the competitive category functional representatives), internships, and initial qualification training into a new utilization field.

8.3.5.2.1. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE acts as the ML for AF level students and receives “DP” allocations based on the number of BPZ or IPZ officers eligible for consideration by the HQ USAF Student MLR discussed in paragraph 8.3.5.2. The allocation rate is applied to students, patients and MIAs/POWs separately and rounded up at the ML.

8.3.5.2.2. HQ USAF Student ML Review. Convened by USAF/A1, it considers both Line and Non-Line permanent party students, patients and MIAs/POWs. It convenes approximately 70 days prior to the CSB. HQ USAF/A1 designates an MLR president and a minimum of four MLR members consistent with the minimum grade requirements for senior raters. The MLR is responsible for the following:

8.3.5.2.2.1. Reviewing the OCSRGP, DQHB and N-O PRFs.

8.3.5.2.2.2. Separately evaluating the records of those officers competing for BPZ “DP” recommendations and those officers competing for I/APZ “DP” recommendations.

8.3.5.2.2.3. Scoring all BPZ and I/APZ records and awarding “DP” recommendations based on the allocation rate prescribed for that grade and zone.

8.3.5.2.2.4. Scoring records and awarding promotion recommendations to officers inpatient, MIA and POW status.

8.3.5.2.2.5. Awarding all promotion recommendations. There are no separate procedures to award aggregation and carry-over allocations.

8.3.5.2.2.6. Ensuring the R-O PRF is accomplished for each officer, the appropriate recommendation in Section IX is marked, the PRF is signed by the MLR president, and is attached to the N-O PRF prepared by the officer’s last permanent party SR.

8.3.5.2.2.7. Ensuring ratees receive a copy of the completed R-O and the attached N-O PRFs. **NOTE:** These are distributed per paragraph 8.1.4.2.13.

8.3.5.3. Writing Letters to Air Force Student MLR.

8.3.5.3.1. Air Force-level students eligible for promotion may write a letter to the Air Force Student MLR. The submitter must:

8.3.5.3.1.1. Submit the letter in good faith and ensure it contains accurate information to the best of your knowledge.

8.3.5.3.1.2. Sign and date the letter.

8.3.5.3.1.3. Send the letter to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE so it arrives no later than the 5 days prior to the MLR convening date. The MLR will not consider letters that arrive on or after the convening date. Address letters to: CY (insert appropriate year and grade) USAF Student MLR, HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. Letters may be faxed, emailed or mailed but must have an actual signed signature (i.e., payroll signature).

8.3.5.3.1.4. If requesting return of the letter, provide a stamped self-addressed envelope. Otherwise, the letter will be destroyed upon conclusion of the Student MLR. Letters will not be forwarded to the CSB.

8.3.5.3.2. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE advises officers when letters do not meet the above requirements and either returns or destroys the letter.

8.3.5.3.3. Letters on behalf of other officers are not permitted (to clarify: eligible officers may provide letters as attachments to their letter; however, a stand-alone letter cannot be submitted on their behalf).

8.3.5.3.4. The following attachments are not permitted: documents that can become a permanent part of the officer's selection folder (i.e., PRFs considered by previous CSBs, unsigned OPRs and TRs, decoration narratives or LOEs which become part of the permanent record).

8.3.6. Non-line officers and LAF-J. Non-line officers (HC, MC, DC, NC, BSC, MSC) and LAF-J compete for promotion by competitive category. In some cases, their promotion opportunity is different from line officers. Also, the total number of officers in each of these competitive categories is relatively small. Consequently, the number of eligible officers under a SR will frequently be insufficient to receive a "DP" allocation, as is often the case even when officers aggregate to the ML.

8.3.6.1. PRFs. Section IX is blank on PRFs for officers submitted by the MLR to the USAF Non-Line MLR. The USAF Non-Line MLR president completes Section IX with either a "DP" or, "P" recommendation. Section VI (Group Size) for I/APZ non-line officers will always be "N/A".

8.3.6.2. Non-Line Evaluation Reviews. An MLR and/or the HQ USAF MLR may evaluate I/APZ and BPZ non-line officers.

8.3.6.3. MLR. SRs submit completed PRFs, and PRFs with Section IX left blank, on all officers submitted to compete for aggregation or carry-over recommendations. This includes PRFs on permanent party ML students.

8.3.6.3.1. For each competitive category, the MLR composition is: The president (a line officer); SRs who awarded a "DP"; SRs with officers competing for aggregation or carry-over "DP" recommendations; an officer from the competitive category concerned who meets the minimum grade requirement to be a SR and non-voting recorders. If an officer from a competitive category in the Health Professions who meets the criteria is not available, the ML may designate an officer from one of the other Health Professions who meets the minimum grade requirements to serve on the panel. For promotion to colonel, if a GO is not assigned to represent the competitive

category, the ML may designate a colonel from the competitive category to serve on the MLR.

8.3.6.3.2. The MLR evaluates the records of officers competing for BPZ “DP” recommendations as a separate process.

8.3.6.3.3. MLs identify officers to compete for aggregate and carry-over recommendations at the Air Force MLR for non-line officers (subject to limits established by HQ AFPC/DP2SPE).

8.3.6.4. HQ USAF Non-Line MLR:

8.3.6.4.1. This panel considers those officers aggregated from MLs and senior raters outside DoD and those recommended to compete for aggregate and carry-over “DP” recommendations. It also evaluates non-line officers assigned as permanent party Air Force-level students and non-line officers in patient, MIA and POW status. HQ AFPC convenes these reviews at AFPC approximately 30 days before the CSB.

8.3.6.4.2. Composition: President (a line officer) and a minimum of four members as designated by the AF/A1, or designated representative, consistent with the minimum grade requirements, where possible. The competitive category under consideration will not form the majority of MLR membership. For MLRs considering the Health Professions (MSC, BSC, MC, DC, and NC), no more than two members may come from the competitive category under consideration. The remaining two normally will be from a medical profession competitive category not under consideration. Line officers may serve if obtaining panel members from the medical professions is impractical.

8.3.6.4.3. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE limits the number of officers each ML may submit to compete for aggregate and carry-over allocations to the total number of “DP” allocations available. Ensures a OCSRGP and PRF on each officer being submitted are available for review, and holds an Air Force Non-Line/LAF-J MLR for each competitive category.

8.3.6.4.4. MLR responsibilities are the same as discussed in paragraph 8.3.2.4.

8.4. Special Provisions (applies to ADL officers only).

8.4.1. Officers Relocating During the PRF Process. To ensure officers with a PCA or PCS assignment to a new SR effective after the PRF accounting date, but on or before the PRF cutoff date, receive full consideration for a “DP” recommendation, special provisions apply. The gaining SR considers all eligible officers (except patients) regardless of promotion zone, who have a DAS (in PDS) effective after the PRF accounting date, but on or before the PRF cutoff date, for a “DP” recommendation. For similar rules on promotion-eligible colonels, see paragraph 8.6.2.

8.4.1.1. The losing SR’s total number of eligibles always includes officers in this category when determining the losing SR’s share of “DP” allocations. As a result, the losing SR is responsible for preparing PRFs and ensuring quality review is completed.

8.4.1.2. Do not adjust the gaining SR’s number of “DP” allocations to include officers in this category. Take any “DP” recommendations awarded by a gaining SR from available allocations already established by the gaining SR’s ML.

8.4.1.3. To provide these officers fair consideration, the losing and gaining SRs may discuss the officer's performance and their intentions (via phone, memo, etc.).

8.4.1.4. The gaining SR:

8.4.1.4.1. Must consider only those eligible officers who will be given an outright "Promote" recommendation by their losing SR. Gaining SRs have no option to award an outright "DP", nor can they nominate newly assigned officers for aggregation or carry-over consideration when the losing senior rater nominates them to the aggregation or carry-over process at the officer's losing ML review or to the AF Non-Line MLR regardless of the outcome from the ML review.

8.4.1.4.2. Must consider all newly assigned officers who received a "Promote" recommendation on their PRF from the HQ USAF Student MLR. Eligibles considered by the HQ USAF Student MLR are not competed in aggregation or carryover; therefore, the gaining senior raters may award an outright "DP", or compete the officer(s) in aggregation and/or carry-over.

8.4.1.4.3. Will accomplish a new PRF only if this provision is authorized IAW paragraph 8.4.1.4.1. The new accomplished PRF will contain the gaining SRID in Section VIII of the PRF and complete ratee identification data, unit mission description, and job description as of the DAS (PCS) or duty effective date (PCA) to the gaining senior rater. **NOTE:** If the gaining SR is unable to obtain a "DP" recommendation, either outright or by aggregation/carryover, then the accomplished PRF is destroyed and the original PRF accomplished by the losing SR will be used for the CSB.

8.4.1.5. The gaining SR will exercise the following options, as appropriate:

8.4.1.5.1. Decide to take no action to submit an individual for a "DP" recommendation.

8.4.1.5.2. Award a "DP" recommendation from earned allocations.

8.4.1.5.3. Submit I/APZ officers to compete for aggregation and carry-over.

8.4.1.5.4. Submit BPZ officers for aggregation and/or carry-over as appropriate for the officer's competitive category.

8.4.1.5.5. Award a "DNP" recommendation when substantiated derogatory information has been received since departure from previous assignment if time does not allow for not-qualified-for-promotion action processing. This is considered a Stop File (see paragraph 8.5.) and must be submitted in writing through the ML to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. Gaining SRs must get the concurrence of the gaining MLR President and ensure the losing SR is informed of the "DNP" action. This will allow the opportunity for possible redistribution of any previously awarded "DPs" to other deserving officers prior to the CSB.

8.4.1.6. If the gaining SR submits an officer for aggregation or carry-over "DP" recommendation, the gaining SR must ensure the officer's record of performance is available.

8.4.1.7. The gaining SR should notify the losing SR of his or her intentions.

8.4.1.8. The ML will:

8.4.1.8.1. Ensure consideration of all officers in this category for promotion recommendation and manage all necessary actions to ensure full consideration by the losing and gaining SRs.

8.4.1.8.2. Work with MPSs to notify SRs of their eligible officers who fall in this category to ensure consideration for a “DP” recommendation, as outlined in paragraph 8.4.

8.4.1.8.3. Notify HQ AFPC/DP2SPE when a gaining SR awards a “DP” or “DNP” recommendation. This includes those awarded within a ML as a result of a PCA action. This is considered a Stop File under paragraph 8.4 (commonly known Old Guy/New Guy) circumstances and must be in writing IAW paragraph 8.5.

8.4.1.8.4. Ensure allocations are not adjusted to account for officers in this category.

8.4.1.9. The MPS will:

8.4.1.9.1. Screen all officers gained after the PRF accounting date to determine eligibility and notify SRs accordingly. Ensure SRs certify a review of all gained eligibles by signing the old guy/new RIP or projected eligibles MEL which is generated from AFPROMS.

8.4.1.9.2. Notify the ML of newly assigned officers whose SRID is not correct as soon as possible; monitor DAS for changes (resulting from finance office updates) that would necessitate a correction to the SRID.

8.4.1.9.3. Provide the senior rater a OCSRGP and DQHB on newly assigned members.

8.4.1.10. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE will:

8.4.1.10.1. Update all “DP” and “DNP” recommendations awarded by gaining SRs and updates inter-command SRID changes upon Stop File requests from MLs.

8.4.1.10.2. Receive “DP” PRFs accomplished by the gaining senior rater thru the Stop File process. If the losing and gaining senior rater both award the same overall recommendation, the PRF from the gaining senior rater is destroyed.

8.4.2. Officers Added to or Deleted from Promotion Eligibility. This paragraph applies to officers who become eligible or ineligible for promotion consideration in a particular competitive category on or after the PRF allocation date. Causes for a change in eligibility status may include: SSB or AFBCMR actions, administrative errors, changes in dates of separation (DOS), or similar circumstances.

8.4.2.1. When an officer is added to a CSB or changes promotion zone eligibility, the SR:

8.4.2.1.1. Prepares a PRF without a restriction as to the type of recommendation awarded, since there are no adjustments made to allocations of “DP” recommendations on or after the PRF allocation date.

8.4.2.1.2. Only awards “DP” recommendations to officers whose OCSRGP and DQHB are comparable to other officers who received “DP” recommendations during the normal PRF process.

8.4.2.1.3. Completes PRFs according to Table 8.1 (except section VI, Group Size). In this section, enter a "1" for IPZ or BPZ officers and a "0" for APZ officers. **NOTE:** Group size for Non-Line is always "N/A"

8.4.2.1.4. Either recommends or does not recommend the officer for promotion, if the promotion opportunity is 100%. A PRF is required only for officers who are not recommended for promotion.

8.4.2.2. SRs void PRFs completed on officers subsequently deleted from promotion eligibility following the PRF allocation date. When a PRF is voided and an outright "DP" was awarded, SRs may reallocate these "DPs" to other officers and re-accomplish PRFs. See paragraph 8.3.1.8.2. for disposition of "DPs" after the MLR convenes. The appropriate MLR must approve changes to I/APZ, Joint BPZ and Non-line BPZ PRFs. Line BPZ PRFs changes do not require MLR approval.

8.4.2.3. When an officer's zone of eligibility for promotion changes (i.e., from BPZ to IPZ), the above provisions apply. SRs prepare a new PRF as appropriate to reflect the officer's correct promotion zone and void the old PRF.

8.4.3. Prisoners, Deserters, and Officers on Appellate Leave. Do not accomplish PRFs for officers who become prisoners or deserters, or who are on appellate leave on or before the PRF accounting date. Notify HQ AFPC/DP2SPE through the ML to have these officers removed from the SR MEL unless the status is after the PRF accounting date. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE prepares a board-specific AF Form 77 for ADL officers who fall into this category and places it into their selection record. However, officers identified as prisoners, deserters, or on appellate leave after the PRF accounting date will require PRFs from the losing SR. His or her total number of eligibles will include these officers when determining "DP" allocations.

8.4.4. Officers Eligible for Promotion when the Promotion Opportunity is 100%. When the promotion opportunity for any grade at the CSB is 100%, SRs will prepare PRFs only on officers who receive "DNP" recommendation and on officers who receive a "P" but have derogatory information (e.g. Article 15, courts-martial, referral evaluation, LOR, etc.) filed in their OSRs. Exceptions to this rule can be addressed to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. SRs will annotate the MEL with either a "P" (for "promote") or "N" (for "do not promote this board") and forward the SRs MEL and "DNP" PRFs to the ML. MLs will review all "DNP" promotion recommendations at the MLR, update AFPROMS to show either "P" (recommended for promotion) or "N" (not recommended for promotion), and forward any completed PRFs and the MLs master MEL, signed by the MLR President, to arrive at HQ AFPC/DP2SPE no later than 30 days prior to the CSB start date. MLs may use a representative sample of senior raters to evaluate these "DNP" recommendations.

8.4.5. Officers assigned to units Above the Management Level (AML). Officers assigned directly to the Offices of the CSAF, SecAF CJCS, SECDEF, VPOTUS, or POTUS, with that individual as their direct reporting official, are "above the management level." As such, officers in this category require special provisions because these offices do not fall within the usual jurisdiction of an ML. These select units generally have few promotion eligible officers for most boards.

8.4.5.1. Allocation Process. To ensure these officers receive full and fair consideration, the individual AML unit acts as the ML and receives separate DP allocations for IPZ and

BPZ officers assigned. Since there is no opportunity for this small pocket of quality officers to aggregate up or compete for carry-over, the AML heads are authorized to award additional DPs.

8.4.5.2. PRFs. The AML heads are sole SRs and must prepare PRFs on all promotion eligible officers under consideration by the appropriate CSB. They award all PRF recommendations.

8.4.5.3. MLR. Since the AML heads are sole SRs, they do not conduct MLRs; the PRFs are forwarded to the HQ USAF MLR (AFDW) for a quality review only.

8.5. Correction of Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRF) (ADL Officers) (Stop File process). A PRF is considered a working copy until the start of the CSB. If the PRF is not a matter of record, SRs have the flexibility to change PRFs. **NOTE:** All changes to PRFs should be completed no later than 2 weeks prior to the CSB. However, in extreme circumstances and on a case-by-case basis, AFPC/DP2SPE may approve changes up to one duty day prior to the CSB. The request must be from an O-6/equivalent or above, who has oversight of the MLR process and justification as to why the correction was not discovered within the time limit.

8.5.1. For typographical errors, concurrence by the MLR President is not required. For content changes, MLR president concurrence is necessary. The following steps should be followed:

8.5.1.1. SR contacts the ML to discuss the issue. The ML will notify HQ AFPC/DP2SPE to place an immediate “Stop File” on the affected officer’s PRF(s) with written communication, identifying the change, (fax, email, letter) within 24 hours of initial notification.

8.5.1.2. The SR must notify the affected officer (in writing or, if verbal, follow-up in writing) of the intent to change the PRF.

8.5.1.3. SR forwards the corrected PRF to the ML and provides a copy to the officer.

8.5.1.4. ML forwards the corrected PRF to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

8.5.2. If the change to the PRF serves to weaken the narrative portion, is a negative content change, or a downgrade in the overall rating, the MLR process that the original PRF met must be re-accomplished. In addition to the steps above, the officer must be provided a copy of the re-accomplished PRF and a letter, similar to the letter provided to an officer who receives a “DNP” recommendation, stating the officer’s right to write a letter to the CSB.

8.5.3. Correction of PRFs (ResAF Officers) (Stop File process). A PRF is considered a working copy until the start of the CSB. If the PRF is not a matter of record, SRs have the flexibility to change PRFs. **NOTE:** All changes to PRFs should be completed NLT two weeks prior to the CSB. However, in extreme circumstances and on a case-by-case basis, ARPC/PB may approve changes up to one duty day prior to the CSB. The request must be from the SR (in writing or, if verbal, follow-up in writing/electronic mail within 24 hours of initial notification).

8.5.3.1. The SR must notify the affected officer (in writing or, if verbal, follow-up in writing) of the intent to change the PRF.

8.5.3.2. If the change to the PRF serves to weaken the narrative portion, is a negative content change, or a downgrade in the overall rating, the PRF must be re-accomplished. In addition to the steps above, the officer must be provided a copy of the re-accomplished PRF and a letter, similar to the letter provided to an officer who receives a “DNP” recommendation, stating the officer’s right to write a letter to the CSB.

8.6. Promotion Recommendations for Colonels. This section describes how to recommend colonels for promotion to the grade of brigadier general. It applies to officers eligible for consideration by the HQ USAF or AFR GO CSB or an ANGUS Federal Recognition Board (FRB).

8.6.1. Responsibilities in the Promotion Recommendation Process.

8.6.1.1. Heads of MLs must:

8.6.1.1.1. Prepare PRFs on all promotion-eligible colonels under consideration by the appropriate selection or federal recognition board (e.g., colonels with two years’ time in grade as of the board convening date). **NOTE:** Do not prepare PRFs on prisoners or officers on appellate leave. When preparing PRFs on promotion-eligible colonels, MLs may consider, in addition to the OCSRGP, other reliable sources of information, to include the Senior Officer Unfavorable Information File (SOUIF) (if applicable). Table 8.1., Notes 4 and 6, contain further guidance. Instructions in this AFI take precedence over those printed on the AF Form 709. For ANGUS colonels, the AF Form 709 must be signed by the adjutant general. For adjutants general, the AF Form 709 must be signed by the Governor.

8.6.1.1.2. Personally complete, must be handwritten, PRFs by competitive category on all promotion-eligible colonels who receive a “DP” recommendation. Complete PRFs no earlier than 60 calendar days and no later than 30 calendar days before the selection or federal recognition board convenes. For ANG, PRFs must be typed.

8.6.1.1.3. Designate one or more representatives to perform this function for all other promotion recommendations. Representatives must be senior in grade to the ratees. **NOTE:** brigadier general selectees may not be designated as a representative for PRF purposes.

8.6.1.1.4. Rank order all colonels who receive a “DP” recommendation. Rank order the colonels of each competitive category separately (AFR does not rank order by competitive category). Include the ranking on the PRF in Section VI, “Group Size.” Rankings must be sequential with no duplication within an ML. This paragraph does not apply to ANGUS officers.

8.6.1.1.5 For ANGUS FRBs, Sections V-VIII must be typed “N/A” in each section. Section IX must be marked “Definitely Promote”.

8.6.1.1.6. Send completed PRFs on all AFR colonels to HQ USAF/REPS no later than 30 calendar days prior to the CSB convening date.

8.6.1.1.7. Provide each ratee a copy of his or her PRF approximately 30 calendar days prior to the appropriate board. Attach a memo (Figure 8.1) for ratees who received a “DNP” to advise him or her of the right to submit a letter to the CSB.

8.6.1.2. Vice Chief of Staff, USAF (AF/CV). The AF/CV, or designated representative, serves as the single ML for Air Force colonels assigned outside the DoD, to other military services, or as Air Force-level (e.g. senior service school) students.

8.6.1.3. Air Force Colonel Management Office (AF/DPO). Manages the PRF process for all ADL colonels. It announces the PRF accounting date and matches promotion eligible officers to the appropriate ML on that date.

8.6.1.4. General Officer Management (AF/REG). Manages the PRF process for all AFR colonels.

8.6.1.5. National Guard Bureau ANG General Officer Management Office (NGB-GO). Manages the PRF process for all ANGUS colonels.

8.6.2. Officers Relocating During the PRF Process. Colonels reassigned to a new ML within 60 days (before or after) the PRF accounting date may have their PRF written by either the gaining or losing ML at the discretion of the two MLs. If there is a conflict, the officer's ML of administrative assignment (as of the PRF accounting date) prepares the PRF. **NOTE:** For promotion-eligible colonels, the head of the ML is the person serving in that capacity as of the date PRFs are due to AF/DPO. For ANGUS colonels, their PRF must be written by the Adjutant General of their state affiliation.

8.6.3. Processing and Use of the PRF for colonels.

8.6.3.1. Send completed PRFs on all ADL colonels to AF/DPO no later than 30 calendar days prior to the CSB convening date.

8.6.3.2. Send completed PRFs on all AFR Colonels to HQ USAF/REPS approximately 30 calendar days prior to the CSB convening date.

8.6.3.3. Send completed PRFs on all ANGUS colonels to NGB-GO no later than 30 calendar days prior to the ANGUS Federal Recognition Board convening date, or as directed by NGB-GO.

8.6.3.4. N-O/R-O PRFs for permanent-party students, patients and MIAs/POWs.

8.6.3.4.1. The SR sends the narrative-only PRF to AF/DPO no later than 30 days prior to the officer departing PCA or PCS for school.

8.6.3.4.2. The SR sends evaluations for officers in patient or MIA/POW status to AF/DPO no later than 60 days after the officer enters this new status.

8.6.3.4.3. SRs provide a copy of the N-O PRF to the ratee prior to the officer's departure from home station.

8.6.3.4.4. AF/DPO maintains N-O PRFs until the officer leaves student, patient, or MIA/POW status. AF/DPO destroys N-O PRFs when the officer no longer competes for promotion in this status. AF/DPO maintains the N-O PRFs until distributed as specified below:

8.6.3.4.4.1. For officers who become eligible for promotion consideration by a brigadier general CSB before they change status, AF/DPO forwards the narrative-only PRFs to 11 WG/DPJ.

8.6.3.4.4.2. After completion of the AF/CV recommendation-only PRFs (which

are attached to the N-O PRFs), the AF/CV forwards the PRFs back to Air Force Colonel Management Office for inclusion in the HQ USAF selection folder and provides copies to the ratees.

8.6.3.5. Restrict the use of the AF Form 709 to the brigadier general CSBs or ANG FRB. Do not use PRFs for any other personnel action.

8.6.3.6. A PRF becomes a “matter of record” upon the convening date of the CSB or ANG FRB for which it was prepared.

8.6.3.7. Destroy a colonel’s PRF within 30 days of the officer’s promotion, retirement, or separation.

8.6.3.8. Only the offices listed below may maintain copies of the PRF.

8.6.3.8.1. AF/DPO for all ADL colonels.

8.6.3.8.2. HQ USAF/REPS for all AFR colonels.

8.6.3.8.3. NGB-GO for all ANGUS colonels.

8.6.4. Instructions for Completing the AF Form 709 for colonels. See Table 8.1.

8.7. Supplemental Management Level Reviews (SMLRs) for Recommendation Upgrade (POST-CSB), (For ADL Only). The SMLR is a “competitive process” required to ensure fairness and equity in the “post-CSB” PRF appeal process. As stated in paragraph 8.1.4.3.10., MLs must maintain copies of OCSRs awarded to the bottom DP and the top two Ps in carry-over at their MLR for each competitive category as it appeared before the MLR. The OCSR will serve as the “DP benchmark” record to be competed via SMLR against OCSRs of officers seeking a “post-CSB” PRF upgrade of the overall recommendation (Section IX) to a “definitely promote” (DP) rating.

8.7.1. Granting SMLR Consideration. MLs will grant SMLR consideration only if they have the written support of both the original SR and MLR President in accordance with Attachment 2, paragraph A2.6.

8.7.2. SMLR Procedures. MLs will conduct SMLRs in conjunction with their next scheduled MLR, when appropriate membership is present. When conducting a SMLR, the applicant’s OCSR, to include the revised PRF as supported by both the original SR and MLR president, will be competed head-to-head against the “DP” and “P” benchmarks and scored by all members of the MLR. MLs must ensure the applicant’s OCSR contains only those documents that would have been present during the original MLR. Scoring of the records will be a simple vote. The applicant’s OSR must tie or beat the bottom “DP” benchmark in order to be awarded a DP rating.

8.7.3. Disclosing of SMLR Results. At the conclusion of the SMLR, the ML must ensure the MLR President certifies the results via a results letter. If the applicant earned a “DP” rating from the SMLR, the letter, along with the PRF, should be returned to the applicant to be included in his/her appeal package (Evaluation Report Appeals Board process IAW [chapter 10](#)), see paragraph 8.4.4.1.2. In addition, a copy of the letter and PRF must be forwarded to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. If the applicant is not granted a “DP” from the SMLR, his/her appeal to change the overall recommendation of the PRF to a “DP” is without merit.

As such, the results letter and PRF should be returned to the applicant, and only a copy of the letter must be forwarded to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE.

Figure 8.1. Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB) or ResAF CSB. See AFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions*, for further guidance.

(date)

MEMORANDUM FOR (Ratee)
(Ratee's address)

FROM: (Senior Rater's functional address symbol)
(Senior Rater's functional address)

SUBJECT: Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB)

I have recently completed your AF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation*. In this evaluation, I recommended to the CSB that you not be selected for promotion at this time. Because of this recommendation, I am reminding you of your right to submit a memorandum to the CSB.

If you believe this evaluation is inaccurate, unjust, or unfairly prejudicial, you may write a memorandum to the CSB concerning these matters. In addition, you may apply for a correction/appeal of the evaluation under Chapter 10 of this instruction once the evaluation becomes a matter of record.

AFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, provides further instruction as to what is permissible in a memorandum to the CSB. If you require further information concerning your right to submit a memorandum to the board, the MPS is available to assist you.

(Signature)
Senior Rater's Signature Block

Attachment:
AF Form 709

Table 8.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Form.

L I N E	A B		C
	To Complete		Instructions (See Note 1 and Note 4)
	Sec	Item	
1	I	Ratee Identification Data	See PRF notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the CSS/HR Specialist and MPS for computer correction for ADL officers. For RASL officers, notify the MPS (unit assigned) or HQ ARPC/DPTSE to correct any erroneous data.
2		Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial and Jr., Sr., etc. If the officer has no middle initial, the use of "NMI" is not mandatory. The name will be in all upper case.
3		SSN	Enter SSN. Suffix is optional.
4		Rank	Enter Rank.
5		DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC to include prefix and suffix as of the date the PRF notice is generated. See Note 2; See Note 3 for R-O PRFs.
6		Organization	Enter organization, command, and location of assignment (with attachment if applicable). For IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. See Note 3 for R-O PRFs.
7		PAS Code	Enter PAS code as reflected on PRF notice. If PAS code is incorrect, advise the CSS/HR Specialist and MPS (ADL officers) or MPS (unit) or HQ RIO (IMAs). For IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. See Note 3 for R-O PRFs.
8	II	Unit Mission Description	Provides a description of primary unit responsibilities (e.g., what it is and does, and to whom it is responsible), and is the same for all members of a unit. Limit to four lines. This is normally for the organization listed on the PRF. However, in very large organizations, it may be necessary to use the mission description for a lower level, such as the division level if it more accurately portrays the activity in which the officer performs duty. NOTE: For R-O PRFs, leave blank.
9	III	Job Description	Complete as you would on an AF Form 707.

10		Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title as reflected in the Personnel Data System. Pending or projected duty titles will not be used (EXAMPLE: Officer departs to new duty location, losing SR may not use new duty title). See the PSD Handbook for further guidance on duty title construction. For students, enter the student duty title (see Note 2). For AGR student R-O PRFs, enter "Student, type of school" (i.e., Student, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, etc.). For AFR PV, see Note 10. For those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment billet enter deployed title.
11		Key Duties	This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job and not be standardized. Be specific—include level to which responsible, number of people supervised, dollar value of resources accountable for/projects managed, etc. Make it clear; avoid jargon, acronyms and topical references as they obscure rather than clarify meaning. You may mention significant additional duties only if directly related to mission accomplishment, and previous jobs held during the period of the evaluation that impact on the evaluation. For accessions receiving an evaluation while awaiting the start of formal training, the first line of the description will read "Officer is awaiting training." This may mirror the job description. See Notes 4 and 5. For R-O PRFs, leave blank.
12	IV	Promotion Recommendation	<p>Explain why the officer should or should not be promoted. This section covers the entire record of performance and provides key performance factors from the officer's entire career, not just recent performance. Limit comments to the next higher grade, see Notes 4 and 5. For N-O PRFs and RASL officers, comments on all PRFs are mandatory.</p> <p>Comments are mandatory for IPZ, one time deferred (passed over) APZ eligible officers and for ANGUS colonels meeting an ANG FRB. Comments are optional for BPZ eligible officers; and two or more times deferred (passed over) APZ eligible officers; and for promotion to the grade of brigadier general when the overall recommendation is "Promote." When comments are optional, the final decision authority for including comments remains with the SR. Comments are required on all PRFs with a "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation, regardless of zone. For ADL R-O PRFs, this section is blank. See Note 6 for expanded guidance on PRFs for ADL colonels being considered for brigadier general selection. Comments are limited to nine lines on all PRFs.</p>

13	V	Promotion Zone	Place an "X" in the BPZ block for ADL BPZ officers. For ADL I/APZ officers, place an "X" in the I/APZ block. See PRF notice for promotion zone. Type or hand-write entries. No entry is required on PRFs for ADL colonels being considered for brigadier general selection. For ResAF officers, leave blank. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter "N/A." For N-O PRFs, leave blank.
14	VI	Group Size	For ADL officers, see Table 8.2. Type or hand-write the entry. For N-O PRFs, leave blank. See Note 6 for instructions pertaining to colonels being considered for brigadier general selection. For ResAF, (I/APZ) rank order all officers awarded a "DP" recommendation, within each competitive category, i.e., 2/5/10; the officer is ranked number 2 of 5 officers awarded a "DP" out of 10 officers in that competitive category meeting the CSB. PV: rank order all officers nominated for PV within each competitive category, i.e., 2/5; the officer is ranked number 2 of 5 officers. (The SR has 5 officers in that competitive category meeting the PV CSB). The Deputy RE ranks AGR student R-O PRFs according to the competitive category within the student population. These PRFs are not included with the PRFs under the SRID that applies to the Chief of Air Force Reserve. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter "N/A."
15	VII	Board ID	Enter the CSB for which the senior rater prepared the PRF (EXAMPLE: P0408A indicates the CY08 major board, and A0409A indicates the FY09 ANG major board). The PRF notice includes the board ID. For N-O PRFs, enter the date signed in this section. For RASL N-O PRFs, leave blank. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter "N/A."
16	VII I	SRID	The five-character code used to identify the position of the SR. Enter this code as shown on the PRF notice. For IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. For N-O PRFs, and PRFs on colonels being considered for brigadier general, leave blank. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter "N/A."
17	IX	Overall Recommendation	The SR marks one of three recommendations, as appropriate. Electronically "X" or hand-write this entry in dark blue or black ink. See Note 7 for additional information on N-O PRFs, Non-Line and aggregate PRFs. For RASL, do not mark a recommendation for Position Vacancy or N-O PRFs. Nominees for ANG colonel are exempt. For ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter "Definitely Promote".

18	X	SR Data	See instructions at Note 8 for lieutenant colonels and below, Note 9 for ADL colonels and Note 11 for ANGUS colonels nominated for brigadier general.
----	---	---------	---

Notes:

1. SRs complete PRFs no earlier than 60 days before the CSB (the PRF cutoff date). For AFR, complete the PRFs in time to arrive at HQ ARPC not later than 45 days before the board convening date. SRs award one of three overall recommendations: "Definitely Promote," "Promote," or "Do Not Promote This Board." Excluding AFR and AGR officers, there is a limit on "DP" recommendations to ensure they convey the intended message. Except for PRFs written on promotion-eligible colonels (see also Note 6), there is a limit on "DP" recommendations to ensure they convey the intended message. There is no limit on "P" and "DNP" recommendations.

2. If changes to DAFSC or duty title are approved after the MLR, but before the CSB, see paragraph 8.5. for correction procedures. Once the PRF is a matter of record, a formal application for correction must be submitted in accordance with Chapter 10 of this instruction. For RASL officers, contact HQ ARPC/DPS if data is incorrect. For AGR students, enter "Student of (type of school)," (i.e. PDE, IDE, SDE, etc).

3. For R-O PRFs.

a. Enter in Item 4, student DAFSC; for Item 5, the organizational designation, MAJCOM, and location of the ratee's assigned school; and for Item 6, student PAS code.

b. For AGR students only. Enter in Item 4, student DAFSC; for Item 5, Office of Air Force Reserve (HAF), Washington DC; and for Item 6, student PAS code.

4. Some general guidelines:

a. Comments must be in bullet format.

b. May include recommendations for promotion, DE, and next assignment (limit comments to the next higher grade).

c. In applying the whole-person concept, evaluators may consider grade-appropriate DE when preparing PRFs, however; DE should not be a pass/fail item. Evaluators are prohibited from commenting on candidacy, selection, completion of, or enrollment of DE. **NOTE:** Comments are authorized only on those officers which will be departing for DE and may only be on the PRF completed just prior to departure. This may be a regular PRF or a Narrative-Only PRF.

d. SRs may consider and/or include information from other reliable sources (i.e. UIF, LOE, ROTC DGs, OTS DGs, etc). For promotion-eligible colonels and brigadier generals; SRs may consider information in an officer's SOUIF. Most comments on a PRF are factual (i.e., CGO of the Quarter) and does not need to be quoted or attributed. However, when using stratification (because this is individual/previous evaluator specific) on the PRF and when that stratification statement is from someone other than the individual signing the PRF then it needs to be quoted or attributed (i.e., "#1 of 50" or #1 of 50 - 2 WG/CC). (The intent is to put the stratification which an officer receives in their career in its proper content).

e. Do not comment on ratings or recommendations on prior AF Forms 709. However, a previous BPZ selection may be mentioned.

f. Comments may be warranted if an officer displays a reluctance to accept responsibility, a negative attitude toward the job, or a decrease in performance-based potential. However, if an officer has a date of separation, has an approved retirement date, or is unsure about career intent, it does not necessarily detract from performance-based potential and should not be commented on in the PRF.

- g. Do not discuss classified information.
- h. Do consider including comments related to Article 15 action, or letters of reprimand, admonishment or counseling. It is strongly recommended that Control Roster action be recorded. It is mandatory to record courts-martial results unless actions resulted in acquittal.
- i. Do not make recommendations for selective continuation since Selective Continuation Boards do not see PRFs. On CSBs where promotion and selective continuation are involved, PRFs are removed from the selection records before the start of the selective continuation process.
- j. Refer to paragraph 1.12. for guidance on inappropriate evaluator considerations and comments on PRFs.
- k. Duty information must be within the SR's jurisdiction as of the PRF accounting date.
 - 1. May not comment on an officer's prior enlisted time.
 - 5. Comments are mandatory when an officer receives a "DP" or "DNP" recommendation, and must substantiate, amplify, or explain the recommendation. Comments for "P" recommendations are optional for BPZ ADL officers.
 - 6. On PRFs prepared on promotion-eligible colonels, entries in Section VI may be handwritten (in dark blue or black ink) but on all "DP" PRF entries must be "Handwritten" (must be typed for ANG FRB). Rank officers by competitive category. Focus on potential to serve at the GO level. Use ratee's accomplishments as a colonel to demonstrate potential and to explain why an officer uniquely qualifies for promotion more so than others. Use comparative terms and gauge difficulty of job challenge, but do not repeat content of OPRs (unlike PRFs for FGOs and CGOs). Highlight factors that demonstrate desired GO traits (breadth, depth, versatility, adaptability, generalist qualities, leadership, management intellect, presence, image, communication skills, experience, functional expertise, appreciation for future vision, etc.). Use personal terms and be clear and concise. Identify true contenders and place heavy emphasis on future use as a GO. The head of the ML (or designated representative) may solicit advice and information from the ratee's supervisors and commanders, both current and past. If rendering a "DP" recommendation, indicate the officer's rank order among the total number of promotion-eligible officers in the ML and competitive category. **EXAMPLE:** An officer receiving a "DP" recommendation who is second in an ML of 150 total eligibles would have the entry "2/150" in Section VI. If the officer does not receive a "DP" recommendation, leave this section blank or enter "N/A." MLs are not limited in the number of "DP" recommendations they award to their eligibles.
 - 7. For N-O PRFs, do not mark any of the three blocks and type/select from the drop down menu "No Overall Recommendation" in the top of this section. For Non-Line of the AF officers: MC and DC promotion to major and lieutenant colonel. Do not prepare a PRF for Judge Advocate (LAF-J) promotion to captain. For officers submitted in aggregate or carry-over to an evaluation board, leave this section blank.

8. SR (lieutenant colonels and below):
 - a. Enter name, grade, branch of service (military officers and DAF civilians only), organization, command of assignment, and location. Grade must be that in which the SR is serving, **EXCEPTION:** Enter "Brig Gen (S)" for brigadier general selectees confirmed by the U.S. Senate and designated as SR by the ML. Enter "Major Gen (S)" for major general selectees confirmed by the U.S. Senate. Retired grade is not authorized. If an officer has been "frocked," enter his or her actual grade unless the officer is serving in a funded billet and the ratee is a lieutenant colonel or above.
 - b. Enter only the last four digits of the SSN if the evaluator is a USAF officer (suffix not entered). The SSN is optional, though encouraged, if the evaluator is a civilian or a member of another U.S. military service.
 - c. Do not include command level, unless it is an integral part of the duty title, with the official duty title.
 - d. Do not enter any classified information.
 - e. For ADL officers, enter current data as of the date of PRF completion. Do not complete the PRF before the PRF cut-off date.
 - f. For ADL R-O PRFs, the President of the Air Force MLR acts as the SR. Enter the following information: name; grade; branch of service; for organization, enter "HQ USAF Student MLR;" for location, enter the location of the review; SSN; and for duty title, enter "President, HQ USAF Student MLR."
9. For ADL colonels, the head of the ML must complete this section if the recommendation is a "DP." For other recommendations, the head of the ML may designate one or more representatives, senior in grade to the ratees, to complete this section.
10. For PV nomination, place the position number to the far right in this block. All PV nominations must have a valid funded position number with an authorized grade higher than the officer's current grade when it arrives at HQ ARPC/PB. PRFs with missing/invalid position numbers or those for nominees not the incumbent (an UMD overage) in the position for which nominated, may be returned. Questions should be directed to HQ ARPC/PB.
11. For ANGUS colonels, their PRF must be signed by the Adjutant General of their state affiliation.

Table 8.2. What to Enter in (Group Size) on the PRF (ADL Lt Col and below only).

R U L E	A	B	C
	If the allocation rate is	and the number of IPZ or BPZ eligibles in an entire ML is (See Notes 1 and 2)	then enter
1	10 percent	10 or more	"N/A."
2		9 or less	the actual number of eligibles within the entire ML.
3	15 percent	7 or more	"N/A."
4		6 or less	the actual number of eligibles within the entire ML.
5	20 percent	5 or more	"N/A."
6		4 or less	the actual number of eligibles within the entire ML.
7	25 to 30 percent	4 or more	"N/A."
8		3 or less	the actual number of eligibles within the entire ML.
9	35 to 90 percent	3 or more	"N/A."
10		2 or less	the actual number of eligibles within the entire ML.

Notes:

1. For Line of the Air Force (LAF) officers only, the following rules apply: APZ eligibles do not generate "DP" allocations; therefore, they do not apply when determining the entry for Section VI on the PRF. If there are only APZ eligibles in an ML, a single "DP" allocation is still available. In this case, the most deserving APZ officer, with a record of such quality to warrant a "DP," may be awarded a "DP" recommendation, and all APZ officers in the ML receive a "0" in section VI on the PRF. When an officer is added to a CSB to change promotion zone eligibility after Day 66, enter a "1 for IPZ or BPZ officers or a "0" for APZ officers. Group size for BPZ eligibles are calculated in the same manner as IPZ.

2. For Non-Line officers (I/APZ and BPZ), always enter "N/A" regardless of the number of eligibles unless they fall under the criteria of paragraph 8.4.2. (Board Adds/Promotion Zone Changes).

Table 8.3. Senior Rater “Definitely Promote” Allocation Rate Table - ADL Officers,
See Note.

	Allocation Rates (Percentages)																		
Number of IPZ or BPZ Eligibles	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3
5	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
6	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5
7	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6
8	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	6	7	7
9	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8
10	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9
11	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10
12	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	10	11
13	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	11	11	12
14	0	1	2	2	3	4	4	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	11	11	12	13
15	0	1	2	3	3	4	5	6	6	7	8	9	9	10	11	12	12	13	14
16	0	1	2	3	4	4	5	6	7	8	8	9	10	11	12	12	13	14	15
17	0	1	2	3	4	5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	11	12	13	14	15	16
18	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
19	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
20	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
21	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
22	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
23	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	16	17	18	19	20	21
24	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	21	22
25	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13	15	16	17	18	20	21	22	23
26	1	2	3	5	6	7	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	22	23	24
27	1	2	4	5	6	8	9	10	12	13	14	16	17	18	20	21	22	24	25
28	1	2	4	5	7	8	9	11	12	14	15	16	18	19	21	22	23	25	26
29	1	2	4	5	7	8	10	11	13	14	15	17	18	20	21	23	24	26	27
30	1	3	4	6	7	9	10	12	13	15	16	18	19	21	22	24	25	27	28
31	1	3	4	6	7	9	10	12	13	15	17	18	20	21	23	24	25	27	29
32	1	3	4	6	8	9	11	12	14	16	17	19	20	22	24	25	27	28	30
33	1	3	4	6	8	9	11	13	14	16	18	19	21	23	24	26	28	29	31
34	1	3	5	6	8	10	11	13	15	17	18	20	22	23	25	27	28	30	32

	Allocation Rates (Percentages)																		
Number of IPZ or BPZ Eligibles	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95
35	1	3	5	7	8	10	12	14	15	17	19	21	22	24	26	28	29	31	33
36	1	3	5	7	9	10	12	14	16	18	19	21	23	25	27	28	30	32	34
37	1	3	5	7	9	11	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	25	27	29	31	33	35
38	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36
39	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37
40	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
41	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
42	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39
43	2	4	6	8	10	12	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	30	32	34	36	38	40
44	2	4	6	8	11	13	15	17	19	22	24	26	28	30	33	35	37	39	41
45	2	4	6	9	11	13	15	18	20	22	24	27	29	31	33	36	38	40	42
46	2	4	6	9	11	13	16	18	20	23	25	27	29	32	34	36	39	41	43
47	2	4	7	9	11	14	16	18	21	23	25	28	30	32	35	37	39	42	44
48	2	4	7	9	12	14	16	19	21	24	26	28	31	33	36	38	40	43	45
49	2	4	7	9	12	14	17	19	22	24	26	29	31	34	36	39	41	44	46
50	2	5	7	10	12	15	17	20	22	25	27	30	32	35	37	40	42	45	47

Note: To determine the number of senior rater “DP” allocations when there are more than 50 BPZ or IPZ eligible officers, multiply the number of BPZ or IPZ eligibles times the allocation rate. If the result is not a whole number, round down to the next lower whole number.

EXAMPLE: A SR who has 63 eligibles applied to a 65% allocation rate earns 40 “DP” allocations ($63 \times 65\% = 40.95$ allocations, rounded down to 40). This table applies to all competitive categories. **EXCEPTION:** When the SR has three IPZ officers and the allocation rate is 65%, SRs may award two “DP” allocations even though the computation does not result in two allocations (1.95). This Table reflects this exception.

Chapter 9

AF FORM 3538, RETENTION RECOMMENDATION FORM

9.1. When to Use the AF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation Form (RRF)*. Use the AF Form 3538 to provide performance-based differentiation and retention recommendations to assist involuntary separation/retirement CSBs (such as Force Shaping, Reduction in Force [RIF], or Selective Early Retirement Boards [SERB]).

9.2. Responsibilities.

9.2.1. First Evaluator:

9.2.1.1. Reviews the ratee's OCSRGp, DQHB, and UIF before preparing the RRF. May consider other reliable information about duty performance and conduct except as prohibited by paragraph 1.12. or other regulatory guidance.

9.2.1.2. Must be knowledgeable of the ratee's most recent performance. The first evaluator may request subordinate supervisors provide information on an officer's most recent duty performance and may ask for suggestions based upon the officer's duty performance for PRF recommendations.

9.2.1.3. Is responsible for evaluating each officer's OCSRGp and DQHB and awarding one of two retention recommendations for eligible officers:

9.2.1.3.1. A "Definitely Retain" recommendation means the strength of the ratee's performance and performance based potential alone warrants retention.

9.2.1.3.2. A "Retain" recommendation means the strength of the ratee's performance warrants retention.

9.2.1.3.3. A "Do Not Retain" recommendation means the ratee does not warrant retention and should not be retained by the board for which the officer is eligible. The first evaluator must make comments explaining to the board why the officer should not be retained.

9.2.1.3.4. Evaluators may not base their retention recommendations on a member's intention to separate or retire or a board's retention or separation quota. Recommendations must be based on the member's record of performance and his/her potential for further service.

9.2.1.3.5. Comments are mandatory. Refer to paragraph 1.12. for inappropriate comments. In addition, promotion recommendations are not permitted in the RRF.

9.2.1.3.6. For Colonel RRFs only: Comments may be handwritten. Comments should only relate to the officer's record as a colonel.

9.2.2. Second Evaluator:

9.2.2.1. Endorses the RRF no earlier than 60 days before the CSB (the RRF cutoff date).

9.2.2.2. Ensures no subordinate commander/supervisor asks, or allows, an officer to draft or prepare his or her own RRF.

9.2.2.3. Ensures there are no boards or panels of officers convened to collectively score, rate, rank, or tally the records and/or generate a priority list of eligible officers unless specifically authorized by this instruction. However, senior raters may request subordinate supervisors to provide their assessment of the rank order of officers within their direct chain of command.

9.2.2.4. Comments only if he/she non-concurs with the first evaluator's recommendation. If the second evaluator non-concurs with the first evaluator's recommendation, then comments are mandatory explaining his/her decision. **NOTE:** AFPC may provide alternate guidance when appropriate.

9.2.2.5. Provides the ratee a copy of the RRF (hand-delivered or sent in a sealed envelope clearly marked, "To Be Opened By Addressee Only") approximately 30-45 days prior to the board (see note). The reason for this is two-fold: 1) to advise the ratee of the retention recommendation and 2) to provide the ratee an opportunity to point out any errors of fact so they may be corrected prior to the CSB. **NOTE:** If the ratee is geographically separated, send it to the ratee by "return receipt requested" mail.

9.2.2.6. Ensures the RRF remains a private matter with access being only between the evaluators, the ratee and the board. Subordinate evaluators or others may have access to a RRF's comments or recommendation only if permitted by the ratee.

9.2.2.7. Attaches a memo telling the ratee who receives an RRF with a 'Separate/Retire' recommendation that he or she has the right to submit a letter to the board. See Figure 9.1.

9.2.3. The Ratee:

9.2.3.1. It is the ratee's responsibility to contact the second evaluator if he/she has not received a copy of the RRF NLT 15 days prior to the board.

9.2.3.2. It is the ratee's responsibility to ensure his/her record is current and accurate.

9.3. RRF Submission. Administrative processing for the RRF, to include SRID accounting, AFPROMS management, etc, unless stated otherwise, will mirror that of the PRF except for those actions directly associated with the MLR process. There is no MLR process for the RRF. Refer to paragraph 8.1.5., for processing procedures and responsibilities.

9.4. Air Force Advisor Examination. When applicable, type, "AF Advisor Review" on the left margin of the RRF and include the AF advisor's name, grade, "USAF," date, and signature. See paragraph 1.6.8. for more guidance.

9.5. Correction of Retention Recommendation Form (RRF). A RRF is considered a working copy until the start of the board. If the RRF is not a matter of record, second evaluators have the flexibility to change RRFs no later than 2 weeks prior to the CSB. Use the "Stop File" process (see paragraph 8.5.) when correcting RRFs.

9.5.1. If the change to the RRF serves to weaken the narrative portion, is a negative content change, or is a downgrade in the recommendation, the officer must be provided a copy of the re-accomplished RRF and a letter, similar to the letter provided to an officer who receives a "Separate" recommendation, stating the officer's right to write a letter to the CSB.

9.5.2. A RRF becomes a "matter of record" upon the convening date of the CSB for which it was prepared.

Figure 9.1. Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB).

(date)

MEMORANDUM FOR (Ratee)
(Ratee's address)

FROM: (Senior Rater's functional address symbol)
(Senior Rater's functional address)

SUBJECT: Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB)

I have recently completed your AF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation Form*. In this evaluation, I recommended to the CSB that you not be selected for retention at this time. Because of this recommendation, I am reminding you of your right to submit a memorandum to the CSB.

If you believe this evaluation is inaccurate, unjust, or unfairly prejudicial, you may write a memorandum to the CSB concerning these matters. In addition, you may apply for a review of the evaluation under Chapter 10 of this instruction once the evaluation becomes a matter of record as defined in paragraph 1.4.3.2.

AFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, provides further instruction as to what is permissible in a memorandum to the CSB. If you require further information concerning your right to submit a memorandum to the board, the MPS is available to assist you.

(Signature)
Senior Rater's Signature Block

Attachment:
AF Form 3538

Table 9.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).

I T E M	A	B	C
	To Complete		Instructions. See Note 1.
	Sec	Item	
1	I	Ratee Identification Data	See RRF notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the CSS/HR Specialist and MPS for computer correction.
		Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial and Jr., Sr., etc. If the officer has no middle initial, the use of NMI is not mandatory. The name may be all upper case.
		SSN	Enter SSN.
		Rank	Enter appropriate rank.
		DAFSC/Core ID	Enter the DAFSC to include prefix and suffix or three-digit Core ID as of the date the RRF notice is generated, as directed in specific board guidance. See Note 2.
		Organization	Enter organization, command, and location of assignment (with attachment if applicable).
		PAS Code	Enter PAS code as reflected on RRF notice. If PAS code is incorrect, advise the CSS/HR Specialist and MPS.
	II	Job Description	Complete as you would on an AF Form 707.
		Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title as reflected in the Personnel Data System. Pending or projected duty titles will not be used. For students, enter the student duty title. See Note 2.
		Key Duties	List Key Duties.
	III	First Evaluator Comments	Explain why the officer should or should not be retained. This section covers the entire record of performance and provides key performance factors from the officer's entire career, not just recent performance. Comments must be typed. Do not make prohibited comments, see paragraph 1.12. See Note 3.
	IV	First Evaluator Recommendation	The first evaluator marks one of three recommendations, as appropriate by electronically placing an "X" in the block.
	V	Board ID/Senior Rater ID	Enter the board for which the SR prepared the RRF. The RRF notice includes the board ID. Enter the five-character code used to identify the position of the SR. Enter this code as shown on the RRF notice.

	VI	Second Evaluator	The second evaluator indicates concurrence or nonconcurrence with the first evaluator's recommendation by placing an "X" in the appropriate box. See Note 3.
	VII	Second Evaluator Comments	Comments are mandatory when the second evaluator marks the nonconcur block. The second evaluator must provide specific comments to explain the disagreement. Comments must be typed. Comments are not allowed if the second evaluator concurs.

Notes:

1. Some general guidelines:
 - a. Comments must be in bullet format.
 - b. May include recommendations for PME and next assignment, but not promotion.
 - c. Paragraph 1.12. applies.
 - d. Evaluators may consider and/or include information from other reliable sources (i.e. ROTC DGs, OTS DGs, etc).
 - e. Do not comment on rankings or recommendations from prior AF Forms 3538.
 - f. Comments may be warranted if an officer displays a reluctance to accept responsibility, has a negative attitude towards the job, or performance has diminished. However, if an officer has a DOS, an approved retirement date, intends to separate or retire, or is unsure about career intent, it should not be commented on in the RRF.
 - g. Do not discuss classified information.
 - h. Do consider including comments related to Article 15 action, or letters of reprimand, admonishment or counseling. It is strongly recommended that Control Roster action be recorded. It is mandatory to record courts-martial results unless actions resulted in acquittal.
2. If changes to DAFSC or duty title are approved after the RRF is a matter of record, a formal application for correction must be submitted in accordance with Chapter 10.
3. Senior Rater (lieutenant colonels and below):
 - a. Enter name, grade, branch of service (military officers and DAF civilians only), organization, command of assignment, and location. Grade must be that in which the SR is serving. **EXCEPTION:** Enter "Brig Gen (S)" for brigadier general selectees. Retired grade is not authorized. If an officer has been "frocked," enter his or her actual grade unless the officer is serving in a funded billet and the ratee is a lieutenant colonel or above.
 - b. Show SSN if the evaluator is a USAF officer (last four only). SSN is optional though encouraged if the evaluator is a civilian or a member of another US military service.
 - c. Do not include command level, unless it is an integral part of the duty title, with the official duty title.
 - d. Do not enter any classified information.

Chapter 10

CORRECTING OFFICER AND ENLISTED EVALUATIONS

10.1. Purpose.

10.1.1. The Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB) was established to provide all Air Force personnel with an avenue of relief for correcting errors or injustices in evaluations at the lowest possible level.

10.1.2. If an evaluation cannot be corrected under Table 10.2, an applicant's first avenue of relief for correcting an evaluation is through the ERAB, which is accessible via the vMPF/vPC, (see the PSD Guide for further guidance).

10.1.3. An applicant's second and last avenue of relief is via the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) by submitting a DD Form 149, *Application for Correction of Military Records under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552*, IAW AFI 36-2603 and AFPAM 36-2607, *Applicant's Guide to the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*. **NOTE:** Applicant should exhaust all other avenues of relief (i.e. the ERAB) before submitting their request to the AFBCMR.

10.1.4. Retired or separated personnel are not eligible to apply for correction through the ERAB; therefore, they must submit a DD Form 149 to the AFBCMR.

10.2. Program Elements.

10.2.1. Who Establishes the Board. The Commander, Headquarters Air Force Personnel Center (HQ AFPC/CC) directs the Chief of AF Evaluation Programs to establish an Evaluation Report Appeals Board (ERAB) to assess requests to correct evaluations and to correct substantiated errors or injustices for RegAF. The Commander, Headquarters Air Reserve Personnel Center (HQ ARPC/CC) directs the establishment of the ERAB to assess requests to correct evaluations and to correct substantiated errors or injustices on ARC personnel.

10.2.1.1. For officer appeals, the board president must be at minimum an Air Force commissioned officer or civilian in the grade of O-5/GS-12 and above. For enlisted appeals, the board president must be equal to or higher than the requester or at a minimum an Air Force SNCO or civilian in the grade of E-7/GS-9.

10.2.1.2. Each Board will consist of a three-person panel composed of two board members and a board president. A board member or president who was, or is, an evaluator for an applicant cannot consider that person's appeal.

10.2.1.3. The ERAB works under the assumption that evaluations are accurate and objective. The applicant filing an appeal must provide strong evidence to overcome the evaluation's presumed validity beyond a reasonable doubt.

10.2.2. Who Administers the Appeal Process. The Evaluations Programs Section (HQ AFPC/DP2SPE and HQ ARPC/PB) manages the appeals process and executes board decisions. Following the Board's decision, destroys all working papers, memoranda, worksheets, recommendations, and notes between the board members or between the Board and the Evaluation Section which pertain to the case. The Board does not create nor maintain formal records of proceedings.

10.2.3. How the Board Will Operate:

10.2.3.1. Board Members Review applications and make recommendations to the ERAB President.

10.2.3.2. The ERAB President:

10.2.3.2.1. Reviews the member's request, considers each board member's recommendations, and makes the final decision for the appeal.

10.2.3.2.2. Acts for the full Board on applications which involve administrative and technical corrections, or in cases that clearly lack the evidence necessary for presentation to the full board, or in cases that require waiving the time limit for an appeal.

10.2.3.3. The Board:

10.2.3.3.1. May be formal or informal.

10.2.3.3.2. Does not permit personal appearances. Neither applicants nor their representatives can appear before the ERAB.

10.2.3.3.3. Handles all appeals confidentially and does not normally disclose information to outside agencies.

10.2.3.3.4. Refers cases for action to appropriate agencies or individuals, such as Air Force Office of Special Investigations, unit commander, and so on, if documents or statements do not appear to be authentic. The Manual for Courts-Martial specifies penalties for creating false or forged official statements and documents. Civilian Air Force employees may be punished under federal law.

10.2.3.3.5. Reviews cases based on information supplied in the application. The ERAB is not an investigative body and does not solicit additional documentation in support of an application. However, if the board decides to consider information that was not available to the applicant, the ERAB will notify the applicant and allow him/her time to comment on the information. **EXCEPTION:** Information contained in PDS or the MPerRGp.

10.2.3.3.6. Directs removal, inclusion, substitution and/or corrections to evaluations. The ERAB is authorized to modify evaluations that differ from the applicant's request, (i.e. the applicant request the report be voided because the feedback date is incorrect; the ERAB may deny voiding the report and instead direct the feedback date be corrected).

10.2.4. Prohibited Requests. The Board will not consider nor approve requests to:

10.2.4.1. Void an evaluation when the error or injustice can be corrected administratively.

10.2.4.2. Void an evaluation while keeping attachments to that evaluation.

10.2.4.3. Void an evaluator's section while keeping comments or ratings of subsequent evaluators.

10.2.4.4. Void an evaluator's comments, but keep the ratings (or vice versa).

10.2.4.5. Delete required information or add unauthorized information to an evaluation.

10.2.4.6. Change (except for deletions) an evaluator's ratings or comments if the evaluator does not support the change. When an evaluator supports changing ratings, all subsequent evaluators must also agree to the changes, (including the commander on EPRs, the reviewer on OPRs, and the MLR Board President on PRFs); see Attachment 2, paragraph A2.3.

10.2.4.7. Re-accomplish an evaluation without the applicant furnishing the new evaluation.

10.2.4.8. Void, correct or change an evaluation that does not meet the 3-year time limit without a waiver, see paragraph 10.5.

10.2.4.9. Correct or rewrite an evaluation post-board based solely on the omission of an optional statement, or to make the evaluation stronger (i.e. PME/DE/Assignment recommendations, awards, deployment information, SR endorsement and/or stratification are not mandatory, therefore omission of any does not make the report inaccurate or unjust).

10.2.4.10. Void or correct an evaluation because an action, (i.e. UIF, Control Roster, Article 15, etc.), was removed:

10.2.4.10.1. Early or on the disposition date. Removal does not mean the action did not take place. If the corrective action existed on or before the close-out date of the evaluation, the evaluation is still valid.

10.2.4.10.2. Because the corrective action was “set-aside.” If the corrective action (i.e. Article 15) was “set-aside,” but the behavior that led to the corrective action is still valid and the behavior existed on or before the close-out date of the report, the evaluation may still be valid if the report only reflects the behavior and not the corrective action that was “Set Aside.” If the action that was “Set Aside” is mentioned in the evaluation, the ERAB would only remove the reference to it; not the behavior that led to the action. **EXAMPLES:**

10.2.4.10.2.1. The ratee received an Article 15 for DUI, and later the Article 15 was set aside for reasons other than innocence. However, the report only states “Used poor judgment—picked up for DUI.” Since the ratee was picked up for DUI, and the evaluation does not mention the Article 15, the evaluation is still a valid report.

10.2.4.10.2.2. The ratee received an Article 15 for DUI, and later the Article 15 was set aside for reasons other than innocence. The report states “Used poor judgment—rcvd Art 15 for DUI.” In this case, the ERAB would not void the evaluation but would correct the evaluation to reflect “Used poor judgment—DUI.”

10.2.4.10.2.3. For the ERAB to decide favorably to void the evaluation, the applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the behavior did not take place and the corrected action taken was officially set aside and not just removed or expired.

10.2.5. Appeals based on Promotion/Career Opportunity. Although not prohibited, ERAB requests based solely on a willingness by evaluators to change evaluations after non-selection for promotion will not be favorably considered unless proven the evaluation was erroneous or unjust based on content, see Attachment 2, paragraph A2.5.1.

10.3. Correcting Evaluations.

10.3.1. Prior to Becoming a Matter of Record. Once a digital signature is applied, the comments and ratings are locked and cannot be changed. In addition, the digital signatures cannot be deleted. If a correction needs to be made after the form has been digitally signed, then the rater will need to re-accomplish the form. He/she will be able to copy the text areas from the erroneous form and paste them into the new form. The corrections can be made and the form resigned. The form will reflect the date of the new signature.

10.3.2. Appealing Evaluations and Requesting Changes After Evaluations Have Become a Matter of Record. See paragraph 1.4.3. to determine when an evaluation becomes a matter of record. Applicants must exhaust all avenues of relief before submitting their requests to the AFBCMR. The other avenues available are:

10.3.2.1. Administrative Correction. See Table 10.2. to determine if the requested correction can be made through administrative procedures without referral to the ERAB or AFBCMR. Due to the electronic process only HQ AFPC/DPS2PE can make corrections to evaluations; and in most cases, once an evaluation becomes a matter of record, even administrative corrections will require an applicant to submit an ERAB. An example of a case that would not require an ERAB or AFBCMR would be when a report is not viewable in ARMS. In this case a simple email would suffice; or when the "YE" is not updated in PDS. In this case the MPS should be contacted; since these changes does not require the evaluation itself to be *corrected*.

10.3.2.2. When the correction cannot be corrected administratively, the next avenue of relief is through the ERAB. Procedures for appealing evaluations through the ERAB are prescribed in this chapter.

10.3.2.3. If the correction cannot be corrected administratively, the ERAB denies the appeal, or the requested action is not authorized by this chapter, the next avenue of relief would be through the AFBCMR. Procedures can be found in AFI 36-2603.

10.3.2.4. Airman Comprehensive Assessment (ACA) worksheets and sessions are not subject to appeal.

10.3.3. Any changes or corrections that substantially alter the content from the original version require original signatures from all evaluators. If an evaluator (other than the rater) is unavailable (due to retirement, for example) and all attempts to contact him or her have failed, the individual who replaced the missing evaluator must sign the evaluation. When correcting an *administrative* error prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record, and one or more of the evaluators are unavailable (due to retirement, for example) to sign the re-accomplished evaluation, an Air Force Personnel official (officer or SNCO) in the MPS will certify the authenticity of the comments of the missing evaluator. The Commander/Superintendent, MPS is the lowest level which will authenticate a missing signature. The SR may also certify authenticity. To do this, copy the evaluator's comments and ratings verbatim, and place the following statement in the block where the missing evaluator would have signed: "Original

Signed." Enter in the right margin (on the reverse side of the form) the grade, name, signature, duty title, unit of the certifying official, and the original date signed. **NOTE:** When utilizing the "original signed" all other signatures must be "wet" signed. Digital signatures are not authorized.

10.3.4. Re-accomplish evaluations containing an excessive number of erasures, change sentence meaning, or requiring corrections to the ratings. Do not use paper correction tape. Do not correct ratings.

10.3.5. Evaluations will not be appealed under Chapter 10 or AFI 36-2603 before becoming a matter of record.

10.3.6. For PRF corrections, see paragraph 8.5. and Attachment 2, paragraph A2.6.

10.3.7. Corrected Copies of Digitally Signed Documents. See paragraph 1.4.5.2.

10.4. Responsibilities.

10.4.1. The Military Personnel Section (MPS).

10.4.1.1. Responsible for training the base population on the ERAB process.

10.4.1.1.1. A detailed explanation of the new process and complete documentation for the new process can be found in the PSD Guide.

10.4.1.1.2. Detailed training information is also available on myPers.

10.4.1.2. Retains only an advisory role in the ERAB process and will provide guidance to members after they have exhausted support from their local HR specialist. **EXCEPTION:** When the request is initiated by someone other than the ratee, or the ratee does not have access to the vMPF/vPC. See paragraph 10.4.1.3. and paragraph 10.4.5.

10.4.1.3. Opens a CMS case when paragraph 10.4.5. is applicable. See paragraph in the PSD Guide for instructions.

10.4.2. The Unit/Group Level Human Resource (HR) Specialist.

10.4.2.1. The HR Specialist will have a very limited role in the ERAB appeal process. However, the HR Specialist must have a basic knowledge of the process and be able to provide applicants with guidance on how to access the HQ AFPC Evaluations/vPC. **(T-0)**.

10.4.2.2. The HR Specialist may be asked to provide HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or HQ ARPC/PB copies of UIF if applicable, or other documents kept at the unit/group level.

10.4.2.3. The HR Specialist may be required to open a CMS case when paragraph 10.4.5. is applicable. See the PSD Guide for instructions.

10.4.3. The Total Force Service Center (TFSC) Personnel.

10.4.3.1. Must be knowledgeable of the appeals process, thoroughly familiar with the contents of this AFI, and in particular, must carefully review Attachment 2.

10.4.3.2. General Responsibilities. When an applicant contacts the TFSC regarding the ERAB process, the TFSC will:

10.4.3.2.1. Be responsible for answering customer inquiries concerning corrections and appeals.

10.4.3.2.2. Determine if the correction is minor or requires a formal application by the member. Minor corrections will be processed by the applicable office of primary responsibility IAW Table 10.2. **NOTE:** Any and all corrections involving AF Forms 709, *Promotion Recommendation Forms* (PRFs) and AF Forms 3538, *Retention Recommendation Forms* (RRFs) will immediately be forwarded to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE for correction.

10.4.3.2.3. Counsel applicants.

10.4.3.2.4. Explains application procedures and documentation requirements via the vMPF/vPC. The addresses for sending original documents are:

10.4.3.2.4.1. RegAF:

HQ AFPC/DP2SPE
Attn: ERAB
550 C Street West, Suite 7
Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4709

10.4.3.2.4.2. AFR/ANG (ARC):

HQ ARPC/PB
Attn: ERAB
18420 E Silver Creek Ave, Bldg 390 MS 68
Buckley AFB CO 80011-9502

10.4.3.2.5. Assist applicants in completing the on-line application through the vMPF/vPC. If applicant is other than the ratee, the TFSC refers the applicant to the MPS/HR Specialist who will initiate a CMS case. If the applicant does not have access to the vMPF/vPC, the TFSC will refer the applicant to the MPS/HR Specialist who will initiate a CMS case.

10.4.3.2.6. Provide the military addresses of personnel, and assists applicants in contacting retirees through the Worldwide Locator IAW AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*. **NOTE:** The Privacy Act protects retirees' addresses. See Attachment 2, paragraph A2.3.7. for procedures.

10.4.3.2.7. Explain and emphasize expedite and waiver procedures IAW paragraph 10.5. and Attachment 2, paragraph A2.4. Advise member that it takes approximately 30-90 days (AD) or 90-120 days (ARC) to process a case, and if they are requesting a correction to be completed before a board to please plan accordingly. Expedited cases must reach HQ AFPC/DP2SPE no later than 45 days before the board convening date, (not applicable for ARC). **NOTE:** Although every attempt is made to get cases completed prior to a pending board, there is no guarantee that an application will be completed prior to the board.

10.4.3.3. The TFSC will provide a cadre of specialists to act as liaisons for, and provide guidance to, base level commanders and MPS/HR Specialist personnel for any questions related to the ERAB process or to check on the status of an application.

10.4.4. The Applicant.

10.4.4.1. Submits request for correction, insertion or removal of evaluations via the vMPF/vPC, see the PSD Guide for guidance. All requests are submitted thru the vMPF/vPC/CMS unless authority is granted otherwise (see paragraph 10.4.4.1.2).

10.4.4.1.1. If applicant does not have access to the vMPF/vPC, he/she may contact the servicing MPS/HR Specialist who will open a CMS/vPC case.

10.4.4.1.2. If applicant does not have access to the vMPF and the servicing MPS/HR Specialist, then he/she must obtain HQ AFPC/DP2SPE approval. If approved, the applicant must submit an AF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Report*, see Table 10.6 for instructions. AF Form 948 will be authorized only on a case-by-case basis, and under extremely extenuating circumstances, (i.e., someone who is in confinement and has absolutely no access to the vMPF). Non-availability waiver requests due to being out-of-the office, on leave or TDY, will not be approved, (not applicable for ARC).

10.4.4.2. Clearly and concisely state what he/she wants (i.e., “Request my EPR rendered for the period 1 Jan 08 – 31 Dec 08 be removed,” or “Correct the duty title in my EPR that closed out on 15 Jun 08”).

10.4.4.3. Supply clear and credible evidence to support your application, see Attachment 2.

10.4.4.3.1. Supporting statements are required when making changes to an evaluation and must have dates and signatures. These statements must relate specifically to the period of the contested report. When information is not firsthand, the author must identify the source, see Attachment 2.

10.4.4.3.2. All documents can be processed through the vMPF. All documents will be scanned into the Personnel Processing Application of the vMPF with the application; however all original documents must then be mailed to: HQ AFPC/DP2SPE, Attn: ERAB, 550 C Street West, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph, TX 78150-4709, (not applicable for ARC).

10.4.4.3.3. The applicant can obtain copies of the contested evaluations and or documents required for their appeal through the PRDA (ARMS) access in vMPF/vPC.

10.4.4.4. Make sure that no rule in this instruction prohibits their request, see paragraph 10.2.4. and Attachment 2.

10.4.4.5. Applicant’s may contact the TFSC for guidance and application procedures.

10.4.4.6. Corrected Copies. See paragraph 1.4.5.2. and paragraph 1.4.5.3.

10.4.5. Corrections Initiated by Someone Other than the ratee. When someone other than the ratee finds an error in an evaluation, they will:

10.4.5.1. Determine if the evaluation can be corrected administratively IAW Table 10.2.

10.4.5.2. Take corrective action by contacting the MPS/HR Specialist to initiate a CMS/vPC case, or have the ratee to take corrective action on his/her own behalf via the vMPF/vPC. **(T-0)**.

10.4.5.3. Provide a statement from the ratee, acknowledging he/she is aware of the pending action and concur/non-concur with the request. **NOTE:** The ratee does not have to concur to submit the request. This statement is for acknowledgement purposes only, and gives the ratee an opportunity to dispute the action.

10.4.5.3.1. If the ratee disagrees, he/she must explain why the correction should not be approved and suggest an alternative. The omission of any remarks will be considered acceptance by the ratee.

10.4.5.3.2. If the ratee is unavailable to submit a statement, send a copy of the appeal to the member with a memorandum explaining the error, and ask the member to provide written comments within 10 calendar days from the date received. To ensure the member has had an opportunity to review the appeal, have him/her acknowledge receipt on the statement or use certified mail to document the date of receipt.

10.4.5.3.3. Reasonable requests for an extension of the time limit should be approved.

10.4.5.3.4. When the member provides written comments, submit the applicant's response and a copy of the memorandum with the application.

10.4.5.3.5. If the member fails to respond, annotate the remarks section of the application with, "Comments from the ratee were requested but not received." Attach a copy of the memorandum and either the member's acknowledgment or the certified mail receipt with the application.

10.4.6. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE and HQ ARPC/DPT.

10.4.6.1. Review all ERAB applications for compliance with this AFI.

10.4.6.2. Process all applications that meet the requirements for submitting an ERAB.

10.4.6.3. Return all applications that do not meet the requirements for submitting an ERAB.

10.4.6.4. When applicable, make corrections to evaluations; update PDS; and forward the corrected evaluations to the appropriate offices.

10.4.6.5. Notify applicant of results via the vMPF/vPC or email. **(T-0).**

10.4.6.6. Provide guidance to commanders, MPS and HR Specialist as required.

10.5. Meeting Time Limits and Expedited Requests.

10.5.1. Time Limits.

10.5.1.1. You must submit your appeal within 3 years following the date the evaluation became a matter of record. If you do not know the exact date, add 2 months to the date the final evaluator signed the evaluation.

10.5.1.2. If the evaluation is more than 3 years old, you must submit a waiver of the time limit, see Attachment 2, paragraph A2.4.

10.5.1.3. Normal processing time for appeal applications is 90-120 days from a completed application. This does not include periods which applications are returned for corrections or missing documents.

10.5.1.4. Promotion Boards are closed out (cut-off) 30 to 45 days prior to the board convening date. In order to process an appeal in time, AFPC/DP2SPE or ARPC/PB must receive the appeal no later than 45 day before the cut-off date, (90 days before the particular special selection board or supplemental board). Although every attempt is made to expedite these cases, there is no guarantee that the case will be worked in time to meet the particular board, even when the case is marked "Expedited."

10.5.2. Expedited Processing.

10.5.2.1. If you must resolve an appeal before a specific date or event, such as a pending promotion or special selection board, you must submit your application to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE (RegAF) or HQ ARPC/PB (ARC) no later than 90 days before the specific date or event.

10.5.2.2. See the PSD Guide for procedures for requesting expedited processing.

10.5.2.3. The only cases that will be accepted for expedited processing after the 90-day cut-off will be evaluations, including PRFs, that have closed out within 90 days of the board convening date.

10.6. Using Classified, Privacy Act, and Restricted Release Information:

10.6.1. Do not include classified information in the body of an appeal. You may, if necessary, include classified information in attachments. The applicant ensures classified attachments are submitted in accordance with security directives establishing control and mailing rules.

10.6.2. When submitting documents on someone else (i.e. evaluations on other individuals, AF Forms 2096, *Classification/On-The-Job Training Action*, PCS orders, travel vouchers, etc., on supervisors or coworkers), you must submit a statement from the concerned individual granting you permission to submit the particular document. Applications that do not comply will be returned without action. The applicant may then resubmit the application with the permission statement, or remove the document from his/her application.

10.6.3. If you feel that information in a restricted release file is essential to your case, you may ask the releasing agency to forward the information directly to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or ARPC. When submitting your request to the releasing agency, you must waive, in writing, the right to review the information. Include a copy of this waiver with the appeal application. When the Board has decided the appeal, HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or ARPC/PB destroys the restricted file or returns it to the releasing agency.

10.7. Requesting Special Selection Board (SSB) or Supplemental Promotion Consideration:

10.7.1. RegAF officers can, in conjunction with their appeal, request SSB consideration for promotion, RegAF appointment, In-resident PME, Selective Early Retirement, or Reduction-in-Force separation boards. You should review AFI 36-2501, for additional information on SSBs.

10.7.2. AFR officers can, in conjunction with their appeal, request SSB consideration for promotion. You should review AFI 36-2504, *Officer Promotion, Continuation, and Selective Early Removal in the Reserve of the Air Force* for additional information on SSBs.

10.7.3. RegAF enlisted personnel may request supplemental promotion consideration in conjunction with the appeal application. Such a request must be indicated on the appeal

application; however, squadron commander's concurrence is required when submitting the request. The commander must complete the endorsement on Personnel Processing Application (PPA) by using the HR Review button in CMS; by submitting a statement for application submitted by someone other than the ratee; or by signing the AF Form 948 when the applicant does not have access to the vMPF or MPS/HR Specialist, see paragraph 10.4.4.1.2. The commander must indicate concurrence or non-concurrence and provide an explanation for non-concurrence.

10.8. Resubmitting an Appeal:

10.8.1. Applicants can resubmit an appeal only if they have substantial new evidence which the board did not initially consider.

10.8.1.1. Do not resubmit an application when the only documentation added to the case is a statement which simply rebuts the ERAB's previous decision. The ERAB does not view a rebuttal statement as new evidence and will decline to reconsider the case. Statements from members of the rating chain which respond directly to questions or concerns posed in the previous decision memorandum are acceptable new evidence.

10.8.1.2. Include all previous documentation with the new application.

10.8.2. If dissatisfied with the decision of the ERAB, submit an appeal to the AFBCMR, see paragraph 10.1.3.

Table 10.1. How to Submit Requests for Correction.

R U L E	A	B	C	D
	If you are	the desired action is	then submit the request	then forward to
1	the ratee is serving on RegAF	allowed under this instruction (See paragraph 10.4.4.)	To the ERAB via the vMPF/ using the Personnel Processing Application (PPA). See paragraph 10.4.4.1.2. when the PPA is unavailable. See Notes 1 and 2.	AFPC/DP2SPE, Attn: ERAB 550 C Street West, Suite 7 (Bldg 499), Joint Base San Antonio- Randolph TX 78150-4709
2	the ratee is a participating USAF Reserve or Air National Guard enlisted or officer		on AF Form 948, <i>Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports</i> , via vPC, see paragraph 10.4.4. See Note 1.	ARPC/PB, Attn: ERAB 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave Bldg 390 MS 68, Buckley AFB CO 80011-9502
3	the ratee is a non-participating reservist, retired, discharged, separated, dismissed, or dropped from rolls; or request is not allowed	not allowed under this instruction. (See paragraph 10.1.4.)	on DD Form 149, Application for Correction of Military Record Under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552, IAW AFI 36-2603.	Air Force Review Boards Office (SAF/MRBR), 550 C Street West Suite 40 (Bldg 499), Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4742
4	not the ratee and have found an error in an evaluation	allowed under this instruction (See paragraph 10.4.5.)	IAW paragraph 10.4.5. and rules 1 or 2 above (as applicable).	the office shown in rules 1 or 2 above (as applicable).
Notes: 1. Table 10.2. lists errors that are correctable without a formal application. 2. Submit the original AF Form 948, see paragraph 10.4.4.1.2, with all supporting documents. Submit original AF Form 948, see paragraph 10.4.4., or DD Form 149 (whichever is applicable) with all supporting documents.				

Table 10.2. Correcting Minor Errors on Evaluations.

R	Minor Errors
U	<p>NOTE: Once a digitally signed evaluation has been transmitted to AFPC/ARPC, only AFPC/ARPC is authorized to make the correction. Submit an ERAB request via the PPA, vMPF/vPC.</p> <p>The error is considered minor if the request is to correct an error in:</p>
L	
E	
1	<p>The Ratee identification data:</p> <p>Name, grade, Social Security Number (SSN), (component, ANG/AFR only), or organizational element, or the identification data of an evaluator who signed the evaluation.</p> <p>Name, grade, SSN, duty title, organizational element, date of signature, or final evaluator's position.</p> <p>Education or Promotion or TIG/TIS eligible blocks</p> <p>See Notes 1, 2, and 3. Go to Table 10.3.</p>
2	<p>The Ratee's Duty Air Force Specialty Code (DAFSC), duty title, or level of duty.</p> <p>Enlisted: DAFSC must be reflected in the ratee's duty history.</p> <p>Officers: Not an administrative correction. Applicant must submit an ERAB via the vMPF/vPC. For ADL officers, the DAFSC authorization must be approved by the applicable HQ AFPC Assignment Functional Manager and reflected in the ratee's duty history.</p> <p>NOTE: The MPS/HR Specialist performs the duty history update once duty title is approved.</p> <p>See Notes 1, 4, and 8. Go to Table 10.3.</p>
3	<p>The "from" or "thru" date of the evaluation, the number of days of supervision, or the reason for evaluation. See Notes 1, 5 and 6. Go to Table 10.3.</p>
4	<p>The marking of a concur or non-concur box, or to add a missing rating.</p> <p>See Notes 1 and 7. Go to Table 10.3.</p>
5	<p>Spelling, punctuation, or heading in an evaluator's comments.</p> <p>See Notes 1, 9, and 10. Go to Table 10.3.</p>
6	<p>The ratee's name or grade in an evaluator's comments.</p> <p>See Notes 1 and 9. Go to Table 10.3.</p>

Notes: (T-0)

1. Do not make corrections using this table if any doubt exists about the appropriateness of the request. Instead, submit a formal application IAW Table 10.1. with the questionable circumstances fully outlined. Any person who knows of an error that is correctable under Table 10.2. should bring it to the attention of the MPS Evaluations or the records custodian responsible for maintaining the original evaluation.
2. Submit an application according to Table 10.1. if the request is to change or add signatures, change or add signature dates on referral evaluations and supporting documents, and/or to substitute a re-accomplished evaluation. Changes to the final evaluator's position (AF Form 911) will be made only when the MPS Evaluations or the records custodian having custody of the original evaluation determines conclusively that an error exists. Do not correct TIG eligibility as an administrative correction; it must be corrected through the ERAB.
3. If a Supplemental Promotion Board (SSB), or the AFBCMR has changed an individual's grade due to retroactive promotion resulting from a review, submit a request according to Table 10.1. In these cases, the evaluation will be annotated with a statement that reads "Member promoted to ***** with a retroactive effective date prior to the date this evaluation was rendered."
4. You can change the evaluation when approved documentation existed on or before the close-out date of the evaluation and a CSB has not considered the evaluation. If approved documentation did not exist, was subsequently approved, or the contested evaluation has been considered by a CSB, submit a request according to Table 10.1.
5. If a correction to either the period of the evaluation or the number of days of supervision would invalidate the requirement for that or any other evaluation on file, you must submit a request according to Table 10.1.
6. If changing the close date of an enlisted evaluation would result in the ratee receiving a supplemental promotion consideration, the Rater must submit a request according to Table 10.1.
7. Caution: Take extreme care when adding missing ratings or correcting concur/non-concur boxes. Submit an application IAW Table 10.1. any time the Rater's or endorser's rating(s) are missing and the non-concur box is also marked, or neither box is marked. However, you can correct an unmarked or mismarked concur or non-concur box when, after reviewing the evaluator's comments and ratings, there is no question as to which box should have been marked. If a rating is also missing or doubt exists, submit an application according to Table 10.1.
8. Submit a formal application according to Table 10.1. to request changes to the Unit Mission Description or the Job Description.
9. Do not change references such as Airman or Sergeant to reflect the person's actual grade.
10. Do not change words (other than misspellings), phrases, sentence structure, or grammar under this table.

Table 10.3. Minor Corrections – Offices Authorized to Make Corrections and Disposition.

R U L E	A	B
	If the correction is authorized IAW	NOTE: Once the evaluation has been transmitted to AFPC, only AFPC is authorized to correct digitally signed evaluations and an ERAB case must be submitted via the vMPF/vPC.
1	All enlisted grades (RegAF) AB -CMSgt	AFPC See Notes 1 through 5.
2	2Lts through Lt Cols	
3	CMSgts selectees and CMSgts	AF/DPE Chiefs Group
4	Colonel selects and colonels (ADL)	Colonels Group USAF/DPO
5	All general officers and brigadier general selectees (RegAF, AFR, ANG)	General Officers Group AF/DPG 1040 AF Pentagon, Room 5C238 Washington DC 20330-1040 See Notes 1 through 5
6	All ANG or AFR officers and enlisted personnel in the grade of colonel and below	HQ ARPC/PB Attn: ERAB 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave, Bldg 390 MS 68 Buckley AFB, CO 80011-9502 See Notes 1 through 5
Notes: (T-0) 1. Do not change words (other than misspellings), phrases, sentence structure, or grammar under this table. 2. If the request is invalid, incomplete or questionable, return it through any previous processing levels to the correction initiator with appropriate instructions. The initiator must identify all required changes because changing an evaluation's closing date can change the number of days of supervision, the reason for evaluation, the signature dates, or the "from" date of the subsequent evaluation. 3. If the correction is authorized, the office that maintains the original evaluation will make the correction to the original and forward copies to the appropriate offices. 4. The ERAB and the AFBCMR has the authority to correct or direct correction and distribution of all evaluations. 5. Disposition. Digitally signed via automated system. "Wet Signed" below. a. TSgt and below (RegAF): Original – AFPC/DP1ORM (ARMS) b. MSgt selects and above: Original – AFPC/ DP1ORM (ARMS) c. ARC: Original – HQ ARPC/PB, AFPC/DP1ORM (ARMS)		

Table 10.4. Board Directed Corrections - Correcting and Disposition of Documents.

R U L E	A	B	C	D	E
	If the action is a correction	that	then the agency authorized to make the	who will	and
1	directed by the ERAB	changes an evaluation	HQ AFPC/DP2SPE ARPC/DPB AF/DPG AF/DPO	correct and initiate correction of the evaluation. See Notes 1 and 2. prepares an AF Form 77	distributes copies of the corrected evaluation, AF Form 77, or other documents to records custodians with appropriate instructions. See Note 8.
				See Notes 3, 4 and 5. annotates the document. See Note 6.	
2	directed by the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)		HQ AFPC/DP2SPE ARPC/DPB AF/DPG AF/DPO	correct and initiate correction of the evaluation as directed by the AFBCMR. See Note 7.	

Notes:

1. On the bottom, reverse margin, type "CC" (for corrected copy), followed by the date, authenticator's organization, office symbol, and signature. (**EXAMPLE:** CC, 1 Jun 97, HQ AFPC/DP2SPE...) Align authenticator data in margin to allow adequate space for punched holes. The person signing the annotation must be a SSgt/GS-5 or above.
2. For evaluations being re-accomplished, you can annotate the signature blocks of evaluators not reasonably available ORIGINAL SIGNED. If used, the comments and ratings of the evaluators must be copied verbatim from the original evaluation. **NOTE:** All measures must be exhausted before this measure can be used.
3. For voided evaluations (excluding imbedded training reports and PRFs), prepare an AF Form 77 with the statement: "Not rated for the above period. Evaluation was removed by Order of the Chief of Staff, USAF." If voiding evaluations for two or more consecutive reporting periods, you can prepare one AF Form 77, but you must show the close-out dates of each evaluation.
4. For voided imbedded training reports, prepare an AF Form 77 with the statement: "A training report for the above period was removed by Order of the Chief of Staff, USAF." For missing imbedded training reports, no action will be taken since there is no gap in the ratee's record. The best course of action is to obtain a certified true copy (CTC) (see paragraph 1.4.5.2.) or a replacement TR and request it be included through the ERAB.

5. For a voided PRF, enter the statement: "AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation, for promotion board (specify the promotion board, for example, 0589A) was removed by Order of the Chief of Staff, USAF." Use a similar statement for voided retention forms.
6. For documents that are attached to an evaluation, annotate documents with ACCEPTED FOR FILE--ATTACH TO (closing date) EVALUATION followed by the authenticator's data listed in Note 2.
7. Unless otherwise directed by the AFBCMR, annotate evaluations according to Note 2. For voided evaluations, prepare an AF Form 77 according to Note 4 except show the evaluation was removed "By Order of the Secretary of The Air Force."
8. Disposition. Digitally signed via automated system. "Wet Signed" below.
 - a. TSgt and below: Original – AFPC/DP2SPE, processing to AFPC/DP1ORM (ARMS)
 - b. MSgt selects & above: Original – AFPC/DP2SPE, processing to AFPC/DP1ORM (ARMS) and officers
 - c. ARC: Original – ARPC/PB, processing to AFPC/DP1ORM (ARMS)

Table 10.5. Correcting AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Forms.

R U L E	A	B	C	D
	If you wish to correct an error in See Note 1	and the error is verified by, and supporting documents come from:	then request the correction by:	and forward the request for correction to:
1	Sections I, III (Item 1), V, VI, VIII, or X; or the spelling or punctuation in the comments. See Notes 2 and 3.	the SR, MPS or the management level	Message, scan or fax	HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or HQ ARPC/DPB
2	Sections II or III (Item 2)	the SR	an application under Table 10.1. See Note 4.	
3	Sections IV or IX	the SR and the president of the Management Level Review Board (MLR). See Note 5 and Attachment 2, paragraph A2.6.		

Notes:

1. When you have sent a PRF to HQ AFPC//ARPC, but it is not yet a matter of record (has not been filed in the Officer Selection Folder/Scanned into ARMS) contact the Evaluations Operations Branch (HQ AFPC/DP2SPE //ARPC/DPT) for instructions.
2. You can change the duty title under this rule when the approved documentation existed on or before the date the PRF was prepared. If approved documentation did not exist, or was approved after the PRF preparation date, submit a formal application under Rule 2.
3. Do not change words (except misspellings), phrases, sentence structure, or grammar under this rule.
4. If a promotion board has not considered the PRF, you can scan or fax the application to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE. Please state that the evaluation it is a pre-board PRF that requires EXPEDITE processing and list the board date.
5. If a promotion board has not considered the PRF, the management level can confirm coordination with the MLR president, with his/her recommendation, by message, scan or fax.

Table 10.6. Instructions For Completing AF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports.

NOTE: See paragraph 10.4.4. before completing.

I T E M	TITLE	INSTRUCTIONS
1	Name	Self-explanatory.
2	Grade	Enter data pertaining to the ratee of the contested evaluation.
3	SSN	If an appeal was previously submitted under another name (i.e. changed due to marriage, divorce, etc.), indicate the previous name in Item 12, Remarks.
4	Return Address	Provide current mailing address of applicant.
5	Office Phone	Enter DSN and Commercial.
6	Current Military Status	Place an “X” in the appropriate box.
7	Email Address	Enter a working email address to contact you in case of questions and/or to forward the Decision Memorandum.
8	Type of Evaluation(s) being appealed and the thru date	<p>List all evaluations being appealed by type of evaluation (i.e. EPR, OPR, Training Report, LOE, or PRF).</p> <p>Identify OPR/EPR/Training Reports/LOEs by their THRU (close-out) date.</p> <p>Identify PRFs by the BOARD ID (Found in Section VII on the AF Form 709).</p>
9	SSB/Supplemental Promotion consideration for officers and active duty enlisted personnel	<p>Applies only to: Enlisted: RegAF Only Officers: RegAF, Reserve, and Air National Guard. For Reserve and Air National Guard enlisted personnel, check the “N/A” block.</p> <p>Special Selection Board (SSB) consideration applies to Central Promotion Boards; Regular AF Boards; In-Resident Central DE Boards; SERB and RIF Boards.</p> <p>Clearly identify the Board for which you desire reconsideration. EXAMPLE: “Promotion to Major, CY04A” P0404A, “RegAF augmentation, CY 05”, or “SMSgt, 07E8”.</p> <p>See paragraph 10.5. for expedited processing requirements</p>

10	Commander's Certification	Enlisted Only. CC must recommend approval/disapproval for SSB consideration, by placing an "X" in the appropriate box and signing/dating this section.
11	Action Requested	Clearly identify the action desired for each evaluation being appealed. EXAMPLE: "Void 31 Dec 08 OPR;" "Change DAFSC to reflect..."; "Add Senior Rater Deputy endorsement." If a new evaluation is to be substituted, ask for substitution, not to void the original evaluation (e.g., "Substitute attached evaluation containing Senior Rater endorsement for evaluation currently on file"). Make sure the action you are requesting is not prohibited by paragraph 10.2.4. For enlisted members, indicate if you are also requesting supplemental promotion consideration; you must have the commander complete Item 10 of the application.
12	Reasons to Support Requested Action	Completely describe the error or injustice. For ease of consideration, list each allegation that applies to your application sequentially. Then, as needed, fully address each allegation. If you need more space, continue on plain bond paper. If your statement is extremely lengthy, you may enter "See Statement at Attachment" and attach your full statement.
13	List of Attachments	List all attachments in chronological order and identify each. EXAMPLE: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TDY Travel Voucher 12 Mar 95 2. Contested EPR C/O 14 May 95 3. Substitute 14 May 95 EPR 4. Statement MSgt Smith 13 Sep 95 If you need more room, continue on plain bond paper. If you have numerous attachments, use tabs to make the case easier to review.
14	Signature/Date	Applicant will sign and date application. In cases where application is submitted by someone other than the ratee, refer to paragraph 10.4.5.

Figure 10.1. Sample, AF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports.

APPLICATION FOR CORRECTION/REMOVAL OF EVALUATION REPORTS (THIS FORM IS SUBJECT TO THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974)			
<p align="center">PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT</p> <p>AUTHORITY: 10 U.S.C. 8013. PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: To apply for correction of evaluation reports. Use of SSN is necessary to make identification of the individual and records. ROUTINE USES: None. DISCLOSURE IS VOLUNTARY: If information is not furnished, applicant may be denied relief sought.</p>			
<p>INSTRUCTIONS: Route your application per AFI 36-2401. Attach additional sheets of paper if more space is needed. When using additional sheets, list item continuation numbers.</p>			
1. NAME (Print Last, First, Middle Initial) BROWN, JOHN A.	2. GRADE MSGT	3. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER 123-45-6789	
4. RETURN ADDRESS (address the appeal should be returned to) 1234 ANDERSON DRIVE SWEETWATER, TX 1234	5. OFFICE PHONE (DSN and Extension) 555-5555	6. CURRENT MILITARY STATUS	
		ACTIVE DUTY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		RESERVE <input type="checkbox"/>	
GUARD <input type="checkbox"/>			
7. EMAIL ADDRESS (enter a working email address to contact you in case of an issue) JOHN.BROWN@US.AF.MIL			
8. LIST TYPE OF REPORT BEING APPEALED AND THE THRU DATE: APR, EPR, LOE, OER, OPR, PRF OR TR		9. SSB/Supplemental Promotion Consideration (See AFI 36-2401, AFI 36-2501, and AFI 36-2502.) Note: Enlisted Personnel must have CC approval in block 10 Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (Complete below information) <input type="checkbox"/>	
TYPE OF REPORT EPR	THRU DATE (For PRF enter Board ID) 8 JUN 10	ENTER ALL APPLICABLE CYCLE/BOARD INFORMATION (ie P0504B or 04E5)	
10. COMMANDER'S CERTIFICATION FOR ENLISTED SUPPLEMENTAL PROMOTION CONSIDERATION			
RECOMMEND APPROVAL <input type="checkbox"/>	NAME AND GRADE OF COMMANDER	SIGNATURE	DATE
RECOMMEND DISAPPROVAL <input type="checkbox"/>			
11. ACTION REQUESTED (Choose option) Void report <input type="checkbox"/> Substitute Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Duty Information <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/>			
12. REASONS TO SUPPORT REQUESTED ACTION (Be brief and specific) - Request 8 Jun 10 EPR be substituted with attached reaccomplished EPR - Items listed in Sec III Block 5 were not accomplished by the member			
13. NUMERICAL LIST OF ATTACHMENTS (List each supporting document in the order attached.) 1. Reaccomplished EPR with all original evaluators' signatures 2. Letters from evaluators providing detailed justification for the situation			
<p>I make the foregoing statements as a part of my application with full knowledge of the penalties involved for willfully making a false official statement. (U.S. Code, Title 18, sec 287, 1001, provides a penalty as follows: A maximum fine of \$10,000 or maximum imprisonment of 5 years or both.)</p>			
14. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT <i>John A. Brown</i>			DATE 24 Aug 10

AF IMT 948, 20051001, V1

PREVIOUS EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (When filed in)

GABRIEL O. CAMARILLO
 Assistant Secretary of the AF
 (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

Title 10, United States Code, *Armed Forces*

Title 32, United States Code, *National Guard Uniform Code of Military Justice* (UCMJ)

Executive Order 9397, as amended

AFMAN 13-501, *Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Program (PRP)*, 29 May 2015

AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008

AFPAM 36-2607, *Applicants' Guide to the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, 3 November 1994

AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*, 12 January 2015

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 1 December 2015

AFI 36-2110, *Assignments*

AFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, 16 June 2004

AFI 36-2502, *Enlisted Airman Promotion/Demotion Programs*, 12 December 2014

AFI 36-2504, *Officer Promotion, Continuation and Selective Early Removal in the Reserve of the Air Force*, 9 January 2003

AFI 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records*, 5 March 2012

AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*, 26 October 2015

AFI 36-2618, *The Enlisted Force Structure*, 27 February 2009

AFI 36-2706, *Equal Opportunity Program Military and Civilian*, 5 October 2010

AFI 36-2905, *Fitness Program*, 21 October 2013

AFI 36-2907, *Unfavorable Information File (UIF) Program*, 26 November 2014

AFI 36-3203, *Service Retirements*, 18 Sep 2015

AFI 36-3205, *Applying for the Palace Chase and Palace Front Programs*

AFI 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers*, 9 June 2004

AFI 36-3207, *Separating Commissioned Officers*, 9 July 2004

AFI 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, 9 July 2004

AFI 36-3209, *Separation and Retirement Procedures for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Members*, 14 April 2005

AFI 51-903, *Dissident and Protest Activities*, 30 July 2015

AFI 65-201, *Managers' Internal Control Program Procedures*, 9 February 2016

AFI 91-204, *Safety Investigations and Reports*, 12 February 2014

Prescribed Forms

AF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation*

AF Form 78, *Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation*

AF Form 475, *Education/Training Report*

AF Form 707, *Officer Performance Report (Lt thru Col)*

AF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation*

AF Form 724, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (Lt thru Col)*

AF Form 910, *Enlisted Performance Report (AB thru TSgt)*

AF Form 911, *Enlisted Performance Report (MSgt thru SMSgt)*

AF Form 912, *Enlisted Performance Report (CMSgt)*

AF Form 931, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (AB thru TSgt)*

AF Form 932, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (MSgt thru CMSgt)*

AF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports*

AF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*

AF Form 3538E, *Enlisted Retention Recommendation*

Adopted Forms

DD Form 149, *Application for Correction of Military Records*

AF Form 330, *Records Transmittal/Request*

AF Form 469, *Duty Limiting Condition Report*

AF Form 679, *Air Force Publication Compliance Item Waiver Request/Approval*

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*

AF Form 1206, *Nomination for Award*

AF Form 1613, *Statement of Service*

AF Form 2096, *Classification On the Job Training Action*

AF Form 2098, *Duty Status Change*

AF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*

AETC Form 156, *Student Training Report*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAD—Advanced Academic Degree

ACA—Airman Comprehensive Assessment

AD—Active Duty

ADC—Area Defense Counsel

ADCON—Administrative Control

ADL—Active Duty List

ADP—Automated Data Processing

AFAA—Air Force Audit Agency

AFBCMR—Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records

AFCENT—Air Forces Central Command

AFDW—Air Force District of Washington

AFGSC—Air Force Global Strike Command

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFIT—Air Force Institute of Technology

AFOSH—Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health

AFPC—Air Force Personnel Center

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFPROMS—Air Force Promotion System (formerly PRISM)

AFR—Air Force Reserve

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFRIMS—Air Force Records Information Management System

AFSC—Air Force Specialty Code

AFSFC—Air Force Security Forces Center

AG—Adjutant General

AGR—Active Guard/Reserve

ALS—Airman Leadership School

AMC—Air Mobility Command

AML—Above the Management Level

ANG—Air National Guard

ANGUS—Air National Guard of the United States

API—Airmen Powered by Innovation

APR—Airman Performance Report

APZ—Above-the-Promotion Zone

ARMS—Automated Records Management System

ARPC—Air Reserve Personnel Center

ART—Air Reserve Technician

ASBC—Aerospace Basic Course
AWOL—Absent Without Leave
BPZ—Below-the-Promotion Zone
BSC—Biomedical Sciences Corps
BTZ—Below-the-Zone (SrA)
CAC—Common Access Card
CCAF—Community College of the Air Force
CJCS—Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
CMO—Courts-Martial Order
CMS—Case Management System
CNGB—Chief, National Guard Bureau
COCOM—Combatant Command
COT—Commissioned Officer Training
CRO—Change of Reporting Official
CSAF—Chief of Staff, United States Air Force
CSB—Central Selection Board
CSS/HR—Commander Support Staff/Human Resource Specialist
CTC—Certified True Copy
DAF—Department of the Air Force
DAFSC—Duty Air Force Specialty Code
DANG—Director Air National Guard
DAS—Date Arrived Station
DBC—Directed by Commander
DBH—Directed by HAF
DC—Dental Corps
DCS—Deputy Chief of Staff
DDANG—Deputy Director Air National Guard
DE—Developmental Education
DG—Distinguished Graduate
DIA—Defense Intelligence Agency
DIEUS—Date Initial Entry Uniformed Services
DL—Distance Learning

DNP—Do Not Promote
DoD—Department of Defense
DOR—Date of Rank
DOS—Date of Separation
DP—Definitely Promote
DQHB—Duty Qualification History Brief
DRU—Direct Reporting Unit
DSD—Developmental Special Duty
EAD—Extended Active Duty
EDD—Effective Duty Date
EES—Enlisted Evaluation System
EFDP—Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel
ELP—Excess Leave Program
EOT—Equal Opportunity and Treatment
EPR—Enlisted Performance Report
ERAB—Evaluation Reports Appeal Board
ERRF—Enlisted Retention Recommendation Form
ETCA—Education and Training Course Announcement
FA—Fitness Assessment
FD—Forced Distributor
FDID—Forced Distributor Identification
FIP—Fitness Improvement Program
FLEP—Funded Legal Education Program
FOA—Field Operating Agency
FOUO—For Official Use Only
FRB—Federal Recognition Board
GAO—General Accounting Office
GO—General Officer
GS—General Schedule
GSU—Geographically Separated Unit
HAF—Headquarters Air Force
HBCU—Historically Black Colleges and Universities

HC—Chaplain Corps

HQ—Headquarters

I/APZ—In-or-Above-the-Promotion Zone

IAW—In Accordance With

IDE—Intermediate Developmental Education

IMA—Individual Mobilization Augmentee

IPZ—In-the-Promotion Zone

ISR—Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance

LAF—Line of the Air Force

LOE—Letter of Evaluation

LOR—Letter of Reprimand

MAJCOM—Major Command

MC—Medical Corps

MEL—Master Eligibility List

MIA—Missing-in-Action

MICT—Management Internal Control Toolset

MilPDS—Military Personnel Data System

ML—Management Level

MLR—Management Level Review

MPA—Military Personnel Appropriation

MPerRGp—Master Personnel Records Group

MPS—Military Personnel Section

MSC—Medical Service Corps

NAF—Numbered Air Force

NC—Nurse Corps

NCO—Noncommissioned Officer

NCOIC—Noncommissioned Officer-in-Charge

NCS—National Call to Service

NDAA—National Defense Authorization Act

NET—No Earlier Than

NGB—National Guard Bureau

NMI—No Middle Initial

Non-EAD—Non-Extended Active Duty
NSA—National Security Agency
NSR—Senior Noncommissioned Selection Record
OCSR—Officer Command Selection Record
OCSRGp—Officer Command Selection Record Group
OES—Officer Evaluation System
OPR—Officer Performance Report
OSR—Officer Selection Record
P—Promote
PAS—Personnel Accounting Symbol
PCA—Permanent Change of Assignment
PCS—Permanent Change of Station
PDE—Primary Developmental Education
PDS—Personnel Data System
PIF—Personal Information File
PII—Personally Identifiable Information
PIRR—Participating Individual Ready Reserve
PME—Professional Military Education
POC—Point Of Contact
POW—Prisoner of War
PPA—Personnel Processing Application
PRDA—Personnel Records Display Application
PRF—Promotion Recommendation Form
PRISM—Promotion Recommendation-In-Board Support Management (See AFPROMS)
PSD—Personnel Services Delivery
QFRB—Quality Force Retention Board
RASL—Reserve Active Status List
RDS—Records Disposition Schedule
RegAF—Regular Air Force
ResAF—Reserve of the Air Force
RIF—Reduction in Force
RIP—Report on Individual Personnel

RNT—Right Now Technology
ROP—Record of Performance
RRF—Retention Recommendation Form
SAASS—School of Advance Air and Space Studies
SAF—Secretary of the Air Force
SAPR—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
SAWS—School of Advanced Warfighting Studies
SCOD—Static Close Out Date
SDE—Senior Developmental Education
SecAF—Secretary of the Air Force
SECDEF—Secretary of Defense
SEJPME—Senior Enlisted Joint Professional Military Education
SERB—Selective Early Retirement Board
SES—Senior Executive Services
SJA—Staff Judge Advocate
SMLR—Supplemental Management Level Review
SNCO—Senior Noncommissioned Officer
SORN—System of Records Notice
SOS—Squadron Officer School
SOUIF—Senior Officer Unfavorable Information File
SR—Senior Rater
SRID—Senior Rater Identification
SSB—Special Selection Board
SSN—Social Security Number
STEP—Stripes for Exceptional Performers
SURF—Single Uniform Request Format
TAG—The Adjutant General
TAFMS—Total Active Federal Military Service
TDRL—Temporary Disability Retired List
TDY—Temporary Duty
TED—Transfer Effective Date
TFSC—Total Force Service Center (formerly the Air Force Contact Center)

TR—Training Report
TTMS—Technical Training Management System
UCMJ—Uniform Code of Military Justice
UIF—Unfavorable Information File
ULN—Unit Line Number
UMD—Unit Manpower Document
USAF—United States Air Force
USAFA—United States Air Force Academy
USAFCENT—United States Air Force Central Command
U.S.C—United States Code
VLPAD—Voluntary Limited Period of Active Duty
vMPF—Virtual Military Personnel Flight
vPC—Virtual Personnel Center
WAPS—Weighted Airman Promotion System
WCAP—World Class Athlete Program

Terms

Above the Management Level (AML) Organizations—There are six units that are above the level this AFI defines as management levels (MLs): President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, SecDef, CJSC, SecAF and CSAF. For purposes of the AFI, these units are also known as MLs.

Acquisition Examiner—A person, either within the rating chain or appointed by the ML (minimum colonel/captain (USN) or civilian equivalent for officers; major or Navy lieutenant commander or an equivalent civilian for enlisted) serving in an acquisition position and in the same acquisition career field as the ratee who provides examination of evaluations for individuals serving in certain acquisition positions (paragraph 1.6.8.). The Acquisition Examiner examines evaluations to ensure the evaluation reflects acquisition-related considerations.

Active Duty List (ADL)—Officers on active duty except (per Title 10, U.S.C. 641): Reserve or Guard officers on active duty for training, for administration of reserve components, to pursue special work, for the administration of the Selective Service System, LEAD and AGR officers; warrant officers; retired officers on active duty; students at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. For the purposes of this instruction, The Director of Admissions, Dean and permanent professors at the Air Force Academy are considered to be on the active duty list. The list is arranged by competitive category in the order of the seniority of the grade in which they are serving.

Active Guard/Reserve—An ANG or AFR member serving on active duty in support of the Guard or Reserve mission, under Title 10, U.S.C., Sec. 10211, 10305, 12310, 12402 or 32 U.S.C. 708 (Property and Fiscal Officers).

Additional Rater—The second evaluator in the rating chain, after the rater, to endorse a performance evaluation. See paragraph 1.6.4. for restrictions, requirements and exceptions.

Advisor—An Air Force designated representative who provides a special review of evaluations in activities outside the DAF (paragraph 1.6.8.). The Air Force Advisor advises non-DAF evaluators of Air Force rating policies and procedures and reviews OPRs, EPRs, and PRFs for compliance with the provisions of this instruction.

Aggregation—The process used when the number of eligible officers does not meet the minimum number required for the senior rater to award promotion recommendations.

Air Force Level Student—Receives Training Reports and Narrative-Only PRF. The eligible officer's records meet the Air Force Student Review since Air Force Level Students do not have senior raters. Training is outside the officer's utilization field.

Air National Guard (ANG) Non-AGR—Refers to members of the Air National Guard who are serving in Title 32 status, not on Extended Active Duty (EAD) nor assigned in permanent Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) or Statutory Tour status.

Air National Guard (Drill Status)—Refers to members of the Air National Guard who are serving in Title 32 status, not on active duty nor in Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) status.

Air Reserve Component (ARC)—Refers to members assigned to the Air Force Reserve (AFR) or Air National Guard (ANG). Typically used to address the combination of all members assigned within both AFR and ANG.

Annual Cycle Close-out Date (applies to GOs)—Annual major general and major general selectee evaluations close-out 30 June; annual brigadier general and brigadier general selectee evaluations close-out 31 July.

ARC AGR—Refers to members assigned to the Air Force Reserve (AFR) or Air National Guard (ANG) component who are serving in a full-time AGR status or on a Statutory Tour (ANG only).

Carry-over—For line officers, the difference between the "Definitely Promote" allocations (rounded up) based on the population of an ML, and the sum of "Definitely Promote" allocations authorized senior raters (rounded down) based on each senior rater's population (including those senior raters whose population is aggregated).

Civilian Director—Civilians designated to lead units/organizations (PAS codes[s]), excluding Flight Commanders. Also see Other Authorized Reviewers.

Commander—The commander (or officer so designated) for administrative purposes (that is, control roster action, Article 15 jurisdiction, and so on) of the ratee's assigned organization. Also see Other Authorized Reviewers.

Company Grade—Officers in the grades of second lieutenant through captain.

Combat Zone—That area required by combat forces for the conduct of operations. The territory forward of the Army rear area boundary.

Commander's Review—See Other Authorized Reviewer.

Communications Zone—Rear part of theater of operations (behind but contiguous to the combat zone) which contains the lines of communications, establishments for supply and evacuation, and

other agencies required for the immediate support and maintenance of the field forces. See also combat zone; rear area.

“Definitely Promote (DP)” (lieutenant colonels and below)—Recommendation on AF Form 709 that says the strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential alone warrants promotion; (colonels only)—Recommendation on AF Form 709 which indicates an officer demonstrates the potential for immediate promotion.

“Do Not Promote This Board (DNP)”(colonels and below)—Recommendation on AF Form 709 that says the ratee does not warrant promotion on the Central Selection Board (CSB) for which the PRF is being prepared.

“Duty Qualification History Brief”—A computer product used by senior raters in the Promotion Recommendation Process which includes such whole person factors as DE, advanced academic information, board certification, joint duty and acquisition corps data and award and decoration information.

Effective Date of Change of Strength Accountability—The date an individual is dropped from the strength accountability of one PAS and gained to strength accountability of another PAS. The effective date a member is assigned to or between units of the AFR or to a specific Reserve program (participating or nonparticipating).

Evaluations—A general reference to the ACA (AF Forms 724, 931, and 932), OPR (AF Form 707), PRF (AF Form 709), Education/Training Report (TR, AF Form 475), Letter of Evaluation (AF Form 77), and the general officer promotion recommendation (AF Form 78), and EPR (AF Forms 910, 911 and 912).

Evaluator—Any individual who signs a performance evaluation in a rating capacity.

Field Grade—Officers in the grade of major through colonel.

Final Evaluator—The evaluator in the rating chain who closes out an OPR or EPR (Officer)--The senior rater will be the final evaluator (**EXCEPTION:** See paragraph 1.6.4.). (Enlisted)—For MSgt selects, MSgts, SMSgt selects and SMSgts, the last evaluator to endorse the AF Form 911 will be the final evaluator (Section IX). For CMSgts and CMSgt selects, the senior rater will be the final evaluator (AF Form 912). When the rater is a O-6 or above, or a civilian (GS-15 or above), and qualifies as a single evaluator (see definition of single evaluator) and they may close-out the evaluation at their level as a final evaluator, unless they refer the evaluation. When the rater/additional rater is a O-6 or civilian (GS-15 or above) who works directly for the senior rater, and the ratee is not TIG eligible for senior rater endorsement, the EPR will be closed out by the rater/additional rater [deputy evaluator]. When the rater is a senior rater or the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, the EPR will close-out at their level.

Forced Distributor (FD) (also referred to as FDID authority)—The evaluator designated to complete the Promotion Recommendation section of the AF Form 910. For wing/group/squadron organizational structures, the FD will be the designated unit commander (typically C-prefix) on G-Series orders or civilian director for squadrons (may not be delegated to squadron section commanders), the group commander for group staff assigned personnel only according to the Unit Manpower Document, and the wing vice commander (Director of staff if delegated) for those personnel assigned, according to the Unit Manpower Document, to wing staff agencies only (e.g. JA, PA, HC, CP, EO, etc.). For MAJCOMs, COCOMs, FOAs, DRUs, NAFs and Centers the FD

will be the military or civilian "director" and for MAJCOM/COCOM commanders will be the vice commander. In cases where there is a subordinate organization/unit below the director and the subordinate organization unit commander is on G-Series orders, then the subordinate commander will serve as the FD for that subordinate unit, not the parent organization's "director". There are six positions which are not constrained by the FD allocations: President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, SECDEF, CJCS, SECAF, and CSAF. **NOTE:** If the officer filling one of these roles is from a sister-service they must be an O-5 or higher to serve as an FD.

Forced Distributor Identification (FDID)—A nine digit code (first two digits is the Management ID; the third, fourth and fifth digits are the Senior Rater code; sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth digits are the last four of the unit PAS code) which will provide identification to the PAS codes just as with the Senior Rater IDs.

Inappropriate Items—Items that evaluators must not consider or refer to when recording performance (see paragraph 1.12.).

Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA)—An individual filling a funded authorization identified as augmenting the RegAF components within departments or agencies of the U.S. Government. This is further defined by Joint Publication 1-02 which states, in part: an individual reservist attending drills who receives training and is pre-assigned to an active component organization, or a Selective Service System billet that must be filled on, or shortly after, mobilization.

Last Duty Day—The day before an individual's departure from his/her station for PCS, retirement, separation, terminal leave, leave in conjunction with PCS, or unit PCA.

Limited EAD—RASL member serving on EAD for a specified period of time and in a specified grade to pursue special work. Terms of service are to be spelled out in a contract per 10 U.S.C. 12311 and 12312.

Matter of Record—All digitally signed evaluations are considered a matter of record once they are loaded into ARMS. "Wet" signature evaluations are made a matter of record once they are loaded into ARMS. All evaluations are considered working copies until they are made a matter of record. See paragraph 1.4.3.

Mandatory Comments—Comments evaluators must include in EPRs, OPRs, and TRs (see paragraph 1.11.).

Matter of Record (Officer)—All digitally signed evaluations are considered a matter of record once they are loaded into ARMS. "Wet" signature evaluations on all officers and SNCOs are considered a matter of record once they have been filed in the OSR/NSR. "Wet" signature evaluations on TSgt and below are made a matter of record once they are loaded into ARMS. All evaluations are considered working copies until they are made a matter of record.

Military and Civilian Grade Equivalents—For the purposes of this instruction, it is necessary to equate certain military grades with civilian grades. The appropriate authority, as listed below, determines equivalency based on the responsibilities and location of the civilian position in the rating chain (see AFI 36—3026, Identification Cards for Members of the Uniformed Services, their Eligible Family Members, and Other Eligible Personnel, Table A13.1. for grade comparison chart).

a. For officer grades—The Reviewer/Senior Rater determines equivalency for Raters and Additional Raters. The ML determines equivalency for Reviewer/Senior Rater designations.

b. For CMSgts selects and CMSgts (AF Form 912)—The ML determines equivalency for Senior Rater designations.

Military Director—The military director designated to lead a unit/organization (PAS code[s]). Also see Other Authorized Reviewers.

Military Technician (Dual Status)—Refers to members employed under 10 U.S.C 10216 or 32 U.S.C. 709. Follow ARC/ANG Non-AGR (Drill Status) for OPR/EPR policy. Technicians are considered drill status guardsmen/traditional reservists for reporting and rating purposes under their military rating chain.

ML—DoD organizations (i.e., major command) where the senior official evaluations directly to the SecDef, SecAF, Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, CSAF, or State Adjutant General or Governor. Only the CSAF may approve exceptions; however, the HQ USAF DCS, Personnel, may exercise similar authority in cases involving the MLs of general officers. No individual can serve as the head of two separate MLs for the same board, unless the individual is serving in a dual-hatted capacity. As used in this instruction, ML also refers to the personnel activity that supports the senior official.

ML—DoD organizations (i.e., major command) where the senior official evaluations directly to the SecDef, SecAF, Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, CSAF, or State Adjutant General or Governor. Only the CSAF may approve exceptions; however, the HQ USAF DCS, Personnel, may exercise similar authority in cases involving the MLs of general officers. No individual can serve as the head of two separate MLs for the same board, unless the individual is serving in a dual-hatted capacity. As used in this instruction, ML also refers to the personnel activity that supports the senior official.

ML Control Group (Applies to GOs)—The number of promotion eligible GOs assigned to an ML, subdivided by grade and competitive category.

ML Review (MLR)—A process used in the Promotion Recommendation phase of the OES ([Chapter 8](#)).

ML Student—Receives TRs and normal PRFs. The eligible officers' records meet the respective ML evaluation board as a separate category. Training is within the eligible officer's utilization field.

MPerRGp—Consists of Officer Selection Record Group, SNCO Selection Record (AD only), and Correspondence and Miscellaneous Record Group (officer and airmen). The MPerRGp is maintained at HQ AFPC for AD members, and at HQ ARPC for ARC members.

Noncombat Ports and MPSs—All ports and MPSs not falling within either the combat zone or communications zone.

Non Extended Active Duty (Non-EAD)—An Air Reserve Component member who is assigned to an Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve unit, performs regularly schedule drills (Unit Training Assembly), annual training, and/or Equivalent Training. This includes Drill Status Guardsmen, unit traditional reservist or Individual Reservist while in a Title 10 or Title 32 status. These members are not on an Active Duty tour (ex: Active Guard Reservist (AGR) or Voluntary

Limited Period of Active Duty [VLPAD]), however they may be on long tour such as military personnel appropriation (MPA) or reserve personnel Appropriations (RPA) orders.

Non-Line—As used in this instruction, non-line is a collective general reference to legal officers (AFSC 51JX), chaplains (AFSC 52RX), and health profession officers (AFSC 4XXX).

Offices of Record—The offices which maintain evaluations (original or copies).

Other Authorized Reviewer—The unit commander/military or civilian director may designate in writing a senior official within his/her unit to perform the unit commander's/military or civilian director's review. If a flag officer is an evaluator on the AF Form 911 (*only*), he/she *will* serve as an “*Other Authorized Reviewer*” in Section VIII, *Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer*. AF Form 910 *must* return to the Force Distributor for final endorsement and the AF Form 912 *must* return to the Senior Rater for final endorsement regardless of a flag officer endorsement within the evaluation. In MAJCOM/COCOM organizations the ML may designate in writing a senior Air Force official within subordinate elements of the staff to serve as a “other authorized reviewer” (e.g. Director of Staff, Director of Public Affairs, etc.).

P-Rate—The promotion rate that guarantees the minimum promotion rate for eligible officers receiving a “Promote” recommendation.

Performance Feedback—A progress evaluation from raters to ratees.

Period of Report—The length of time covered by an evaluation.

Period of Supervision—The period of time a member is under the supervision of a rater.

PRF Accounting Date—The date that determines the Senior Rater responsible for PRF preparation. The Senior Rater for the unit the eligible officer is assigned on this date is the Senior Rater for the promotion cycle. For officers in grades lieutenant colonel and below, it is approximately 150 days prior to the CSB convening date. For colonel, it is 60 days prior to the CSB convening date.

PRF Allocation Date—Sixty-six days before a selection board, when “Definitely Promote” allocations are final (does not apply to ARC).

PRF Cutoff Date—Sixty days prior to the selection board, when final PRF processing begins. PRFs cannot be completed prior to this date (does not apply to ARC).

“Promote (P)” (lieutenant colonels and below)—Recommendation on AF Form 709 that says the ratee is qualified for promotion and should compete at the CSB on the basis of performance, performance-based potential, and broader considerations; (*colonels only*)--Recommendation of AF Form 709 which indicates an officer is making a valuable contribution to the mission and has potential for promotion.

Ratee—The individual being rated.

Rater (officer and enlisted)—The official (usually the ratee's immediate supervisor) designated by management to provide a ratee periodic performance feedback and initiate performance evaluations. The rater may be an officer or NCO (for enlisted ratees) of a United States or foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee, or a civilian in a supervisory position that is higher than the ratee in the ratee's rating chain. Management may appoint raters serving in the same grade as ratees without regard to date of rank. (enlisted)--A civilian rater must be at least a GS-7 or a comparable grade or higher. RegAF members in the grade of SrA may serve

as raters only if they have completed the NCO Preparatory Course or the Airman Leadership Course. Only non-active-duty AFR members in the grade of SSgt or above may serve as raters.

Rater's Rater (officer)—The second official in the rating chain, after the rater, serving in a grade equal to or higher than the rater and in a grade higher than the ratee. See paragraph 1.6.4. for other restrictions. *(enlisted)*--The second official in the rating chain, after the rater, serving in a grade equal to or higher than the rater (for TSgts and below, at least the grade of MSgt or civilian equivalent).

Rating Chain—The succession of officials responsible for preparing evaluations. Evaluators other than the rater may be assigned after the close-out date. Commanders set up the rating chain within their organization. The rating chain is normally the same as the supervisory chain.

EXCEPTIONS: An individual in the supervisory chain may not be an EPR evaluator when the ratee is a TSgt or below and the rater's rater does not meet the minimum grade requirement to be the additional rater. When the ratee is a MSgt or higher, the final evaluator (AF Form 911, Section IX) does not have to be the immediate supervisor of the additional rater. Flexibility in this case lets authorities better distinguish between individuals with similar performance records. When the SRID designates more than one position as a senior rater within a common rating chain (**EXAMPLE:** Headquarters Chief of Staff, vice commander, and commander), the senior rater who signs the evaluation does not have to be the rater's rater, but must be the senior rater designated for the ratee's grade and assigned PAS (only one senior rater may sign an evaluation).

Recommendation Only PRF—Refer to paragraph 8.1.5.6. (does not apply to ResAF).

Record of Performance—Consists of the following AF Forms (when filed in the OSR): AF Forms 707; AF Forms 707A and AF Forms 707B; AF Forms 709; Air Force Forms 475; Form 77. Evaluators may also use LOEs filed in the CSS/HR Specialist.

Referral Evaluation—A performance evaluation that contains any of the following is a referral:

a—Comments in any OPR, EPR, LOE or Training Report, regardless of the ratings if applicable, or the attachments to that evaluation, that are derogatory in nature, imply or refer to behavior incompatible with, or not meeting minimum acceptable standards of personal or professional conduct, character, judgment or integrity, and/or refer to disciplinary actions. This includes, but is not limited to, comments regarding omissions or misrepresentation of facts in official statements or documents, financial irresponsibility, mismanagement of personal or government affairs, confirmed incidents of discrimination or mistreatment, illegal use or possession of drugs, AWOL, Article 15 action, and conviction by courts-martial.

b—An officer fails to meet standards in any one of the listed performance factors, in Section III or Section IX of the OPR, the overall evaluation will be a "Does Not Meet Standards" evaluation and the evaluation must be referred.

Relieved From Supervisory Responsibility—For evaluation purposes, this means an individual was removed from supervisory duties due to either personal or professional shortcomings or misconduct that, in the supervisor's view, made the member incapable of handling, or unsuitable for holding, the position. Personnel removed from supervisory responsibility must be notified in writing and acknowledge understanding.

Reserve Active Status List (RASL)—A list of all ARC officers in an active status, not on the ADL, and in the order of seniority of the grade in which they are serving. Officers serving in the

same grade are carried in order of their date of rank to that grade. The RASL for the Air Force shall include officers in the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve. Except as otherwise provided by law, an officer must be on the RASL to be eligible for consideration for selection for promotion, continuation, or selective early removal as a member of the Reserve of the Air Force.

Reviewer—The third evaluator on an Officer Performance Report (see paragraph 1.6.5).

Reviewing Official—Any intermediate-level supervisor above the rater, but below the ML.

Routinely—A repeated inability to meet standards that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below standards.

Senior Rater (Officer)—The evaluator designated by the ML who completes the PRF and also serves as reviewer on the OPR. Senior raters must be in a position to have personal knowledge or access to personal knowledge of the ratee's performance. They must also have the scope of responsibility and breadth of experience to assess performance and its significance as it relates to potential for promotion. The same senior rater normally evaluates all officers in an organization in a particular grade and promotion zone. For all majors and below, the senior rater must be at least a colonel (or equivalent) serving as a wing commander or equivalent. For all lieutenant colonels and colonels, the senior rater must be a general officer (or equivalent) and will be the first general officer in the rating chain AFPC/DP2SPE (ADL) or HQ AFRC/A1 (AFR unit) must approve exceptions.

Senior Rater (Enlisted)—Position that the MAJCOM, field operating agency, direct reporting unit, and other organizations with Air Force enlisted personnel designated to be the highest level endorser in the ratee's rating chain. For RegAF and ARC members, senior raters must be at least a colonel or civilian equivalent (GS-15 or higher), serving as a wing commander or equivalent.

Senior Rater Identification Code—A five-character code identifying a senior rater position as the MAJCOM or ML specifies.

Significant Disagreement—The disagreement by an evaluator with the previous evaluator that results in one of the following: A change of any Performance Factor rating in any of the performance assessments; or any statement anywhere in an OPR that indicates obvious disagreement with the previous evaluator.

Significantly—A single instance where failure to meet standards is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts overall aggregated performance assessment.

Single Evaluator—An individual (O-6 or equivalent) who may close-out an EPR with a single signature (also see the definition of "final evaluator"). Individual must meet both grade requirements and the evaluator requirements for each section of the applicable evaluation form (**EXAMPLE:** must meet both grade requirements as an O-6 [or equivalent/higher grade] and must meet the definition of a "unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer"). An O-6 or equivalent in and of themselves meet the grade requirement to serve as a final [deputy] evaluator on the AF Form 911, and/or as a final [senior rater] evaluator on the AF Form 911 and AF Form 912, provided they are designated as a senior rater by the ML; however they must also meet the necessary requirements as a unit commander/ military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer (see definition of unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer) to sign the entire evaluation as a "single evaluator".

Single Senior Rater—The Single Senior rater is not the head of the ML, but is the only senior rater who has I/APZ and/or Non-line BPZ eligibles. The ML review process must review PRFs.

Sole Senior Rater—The Sole Senior Rater is the head of the ML and is the only senior rater who has I/APZ and/or Non-line BPZ eligibles for a specific board. The Sole Senior Rater awards all PRF recommendations; however, the HQ USAF MLR must review all PRF ratings.

Static Close-Out Date (SCOD)—The date that all enlisted evaluations will close-out for a specific grade. Also the date used to determine the final TIG/TIS eligible pool for senior rater endorsement/stratification and forced distribution allocations.

Stratification—Quantitative comparison of an individual standing among peers within a definable group and within a specific evaluators scope of authority (i.e., direct rating chain).

Statutory Tour—A controlled tour of active duty service. Usually, a precise number of years at a specific location.

Total Force Service Center (TFSC)—Formerly known as the Air Force Contact Center (AFCC). When referenced, use the applicable components TFSC; i.e., RegAF would use the TFSC at AFPC and the ANG AFR would use the TFSC at ARPC.

Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director—The military service member designated as the director of, or in command of, a unit (PAS code[s]). A civilian equivalent, assigned to the position of director, or unit director, responsible for the unit (PAS code [s]). See paragraph 1.6.7.

Whole Airman Factors—Factors included in the whole person assessment include job performance; leadership; professional competence; breadth and depth of experience; job responsibility; academic and professional military education; and specific achievements.

Attachment 2

APPEAL GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS (LOCAL REPRODUCTION AUTHORIZED)

A2.1. Overview. If you intend to file an appeal, you should read this attachment. The Military Personnel Section (MPS), and Commander Support Staff (CSS/HR Specialist) technicians must be familiar with the contents of this attachment. In this attachment, the term "evaluation" encompasses all versions of enlisted and officer performance reports, training reports, letter of evaluations, promotion recommendation forms, retention recommendation forms and any other forms used by SERB and RIF separation boards. Complying with the following guidelines will not guarantee you a favorable decision; however, not complying can cause the board to delay its decision, return your application without action, or not have sufficient information to reach a fair and equitable decision.

A2.2. Documenting Your Appeal. You must provide convincing documentation for your appeal. The willingness of evaluators to change an evaluation is not enough. You must offer clear evidence that the original evaluation was unjust or wrong. Quality, not quantity of documentation is the issue. If the reason you are including a particular item of evidence is not obvious, explain why you have attached it to the application or what it proves. Do not bother to submit general documents (letters of appreciation, character reference statements, nonspecific inspection reports, etc.). If your application has many attachments, use tabs to separate them. Before submitting your appeal, review the documents you have attached and make sure they are:

A2.2.1. Credible - does the support come from a person who is credible; was in a position to have firsthand knowledge of the situation and provide a reasoned evaluation? (Or are they former or subsequent supervisors, peers, friends, onetime customers, etc.?) If you are submitting a document, does it prove what it is supposed to? **EXAMPLE:** Shift schedules, OJT records, and feedback notices do not prove when supervision began.

A2.2.2. Relevant - to the time and issue. Evaluations assess performance over a very specific period of time and your support must relate to that period. Does your documentation stick to the issues (i.e., the basis for your appeal)? **EXAMPLE:** If you are appealing based on a "personality conflict," general character references, job recommendations, or letters of appreciation would do little to support the alleged "conflict" and usually are not relevant.

A2.2.3. Believable - from a common sense standpoint. Look at your evidence dispassionately and ask, "Can I buy this?"

A2.3. Statements. The most effective evidence consists of statements from the actual evaluators who signed the contested evaluation. These statements should:

A2.3.1. Cite important facts or circumstances that were unknown when the evaluators signed the evaluation.

A2.3.2. Detail the error or injustice.

A2.3.3. Explain how and when it was discovered.

A2.3.4. Include the correct information.

A2.3.5. Relate to the contested reporting period.

A2.3.6. Address the allegations and substantially challenge or disprove comments or ratings in the evaluation.

A2.3.7. Contacting Retirees. To contact a retired person, place your memorandum in a stamped envelope.

A2.3.7.1. Address the envelope partially by writing your name and return address, and the retired person's name.

A2.3.7.2. Enclose the partially addressed envelope in a separate envelope to the Worldwide Locator (HQ AFPC/DPDXIDL, 550 C St. West, Suite 50, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4752).

A2.3.7.3. Include the retired person's grade, full name, and SSN, if known.

A2.3.7.4. Include a note explaining about the appeal and asking the Worldwide Locator to forward your memorandum.

A2.4. Time Limit Waivers. The applicant can request a waiver of the 3-year time limit by citing unusual circumstances that prevented filing the appeal in a timely manner. However, ratees are responsible for reviewing their records at least annually for accuracy and the board can consider the due diligence of the applicant to apply for correction. Applications that do not include a waiver will be returned without action. Grounds for a waiver do not include:

A2.4.1. Failing to understand the appeals process.

A2.4.2. Being discouraged from appealing by superiors, peers, or counselors.

A2.4.3. Failing to understand how serious an impact an evaluation could have on your career in later years.

A2.4.4. Not reviewing your records during the intervening years.

A2.5. Common Appeal Reasons and Related Documentation Requirements. Some common reasons for appealing and types of documentation are outlined below. Complying with these guidelines will not ensure approval of a request.

A2.5.1. Impact on Promotion or Career Opportunity. An evaluation is not erroneous or unfair because the applicant believes it contributed to a non-selection for promotion or may impact future promotion or career opportunities. The Board recognizes that non-selection for promotion is, for many, a traumatic event, and the desire to overturn that non-selection is powerful motivation to appeal. However, the Board is careful to keep the promotion and evaluation issues separated, and to focus on the evaluation only. The simple willingness by evaluators to upgrade, rewrite, or void an evaluation is not a valid basis for doing so. **EXAMPLE:** Requests to add optional statements (such as DE/PME, assignment/job/command "push" recommendation, add an omitted award or stratification) to an evaluation or PRF will normally not form the basis for a successful appeal. As these statements are not mandatory for inclusion, their omission does not make the evaluation inaccurate. You must prove the evaluation is erroneous or unjust based on its content.

A2.5.2. Ratings and Comments Inconsistent with Prior or Subsequent Evaluations. Ratings are not erroneous or unjust because they are inconsistent with other ratings you have received. An evaluation documents performance during a specific period and reflects your performance, conduct, and potential at that time, in that position. An ability to function well in one position

at a given time may change in another job at another time. Sometimes an individual can stay in the same job and a change in supervisors will produce a change in performance standards which, depending on how well the individual adapts, could cause a marked change in the next evaluation. The Board will not approve requests to void evaluations simply because they are inconsistent with other evaluation evaluations.

A2.5.3. Comments Inconsistent with Assigned Ratings. Retrospective views of facts and circumstances, months or even years after the evaluation was written, will usually not overcome the Board's presumption that the initial assessment remains valid. You are unlikely to convince the Board simply by comparing an evaluator's comments and ratings.

A2.5.4. Deflationary Rating Programs. Evaluators must accurately assess personnel and control inflation. Therefore, to appeal on this basis, you must clearly establish that the evaluator did not use the Air Force evaluation policy in effect at the time and, as a result, you were not rated fairly in comparison to your peers evaluated at the same time.

A2.5.5. Personality Conflict. In worker-supervisor relationships, some disagreements are likely to occur since a worker must abide by a supervisor's policies and decisions. Personnel who do not perform at expected standards or require close supervision may believe that an evaluator is personally biased; however, the conflict generated by this personal attention is usually professional rather than personal. To convince the Board that an evaluator was unfavorably biased, you must cite specific examples of the conflict or bias. Provide firsthand evidence that clearly shows how the conflict prevented the evaluator from preparing a fair and accurate evaluation. If other evaluators support an appeal because they were unaware of a conflict at the time, they should provide specific information (and cite their sources) which leads them to believe the evaluation is not an objective assessment.

A2.5.6. Coercion by Superiors. The Board seriously and carefully evaluates any allegation of coercion by superiors. The Air Force requires endorsers, reviewers, and commanders to review evaluations for quality and to control inflationary tendencies. These officials must reject poorly prepared evaluations and downgrade or reject inflated evaluations. Evaluators who change their evaluations after talking with a superior have not necessarily been coerced. Clear evidence must exist proving that the superior violated the evaluator's rating rights. Supporting statements must identify the person who did the coercing, list the specific threats that were made, and identify any witnesses who can corroborate the incident.

A2.5.7. Undue Emphasis on Isolated Incidents. Although you may feel that evaluators have over stressed an isolated incident or a short period of substandard performance or conduct, the evaluators are obliged to consider such incidents, their significance, and the frequency with which they occurred in assessing performance and potential. Only the evaluators know how much an incident influenced the evaluation; therefore, the opinions of individuals outside the rating chain are not relevant. Retrospective statements from evaluators prepared several months (or even years) after the incident or following a period of improved performance do not carry as much weight as assessments made when the facts and circumstances were fresh in their minds. To convince the Board, evaluators must provide specific information about the incident and why they now believe it was overly emphasized.

A2.5.8. Lack of Counseling or Feedback. Only the rater can confirm if counseling was provided. While current Air Force policy requires performance feedback for personnel, a direct correlation between information provided during feedback sessions and the assessments on evaluations does not necessarily exist. **EXAMPLE:** If after a positive feedback session, an evaluator discovers serious problems, he or she must record the problems in the evaluation even when it disagrees with the previous feedback. There may be occasions when feedback was not provided during a reporting period, or a specific issue was not addressed; the lack of counseling or feedback, by itself, is not sufficient to challenge the accuracy or validity of an evaluation. Evaluators must confirm they did not provide counseling or feedback, and that this directly resulted in an unfair evaluation. You must also supply specific information about the unfair evaluation so the Board can make a reasoned judgment on the appeal. Finally, every Airman should know the existing standards for indebtedness, weight, fitness, etc. Lack of counseling in these areas provides no valid basis for voiding an evaluation.

A2.5.9. Alleged Discrimination or Unfair Treatment. Air Force members must report any form of discrimination to their supervisors or commander. If you file a complaint late in a reporting period or after an evaluation closes, it may appear that you complained to create doubts about the evaluation's fairness and accuracy. If you believe that you have been the victim of discrimination, your best evidence is an official equal opportunity and treatment (EOT) investigation, reviewed and validated by appropriate officials. As an alternative, you may use statements from officials in the rating chain or other credible sources who have firsthand knowledge of the discrimination. You must prove that an evaluator was biased and that the bias affected the person's objectivity to a point that a fair and accurate evaluation was impossible.

A2.5.10. Evaluation Completed on Wrong Form. The Board does not void an evaluation because it was completed on the wrong form. The evaluation will either be re-accomplished or superimposed on the correct form.

A2.5.11. Administrative Issues. The Board does not normally void evaluations because of administrative errors. To convince the Board, you must prove that the evaluation would have been substantially different without the error. Normal procedure is to correct the administrative error rather than void the evaluation.

A2.5.12. Evaluation Inconsistent with Awards or Decorations Covering the Same Reporting Period. Citations are not specific enough to offset the comments and ratings in an evaluation. Awards and decorations are usually submitted by members of the rating chain who are fully aware of the contested evaluation. Therefore, an approved award or decoration alone does not challenge the accuracy of an evaluation.

A2.5.13. Personal Opinions and Unsupported Allegations. Do not make statements you cannot support with evidence. Your personal opinions will not convince the Board to approve your application. Unsubstantiated conjecture about the motives of your evaluators, or how or why your evaluation turned out as it did, do not contribute to your case. You must provide factual, specific, and substantiated information that is from credible officials and is based on firsthand observation or knowledge. Statements or Memorandum for Records (MFRs) written by yourself on the events which you believe lead to the contested evaluation are not creditable evidence unless supported by another creditable official.

A2.5.14. **Mismarked Ratings.** The instructions governing the Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems clearly require evaluators (and no one else) to mark evaluations, and prohibit them from signing blank or unmarked forms. You will need statements from all evaluators who signed the evaluation. These statements must fully explain how the error occurred and why the evaluators did not notice the error when they signed the evaluation. Sometimes the typist or administrative section is blamed for such errors, in which case a statement from them can help. If the unit has a policy which requires raters to sign blank forms, or prohibits them from marking their ratings, a statement from the unit commander (or other person that imposed and enforced the policy) will be needed. The Board usually directs the evaluation be corrected or re-accomplished rather than voided.

A2.5.15. **Evaluation Not Endorsed by Mandatory Endorser.** An evaluation not endorsed at the required level is normally corrected instead of voided. Identify the proper mandatory endorser and obtain the omitted endorsement. You can have the evaluation re-accomplished or have the endorsement placed in the correct section of a blank form and signed. Include statements from the evaluators explaining the error.

A2.5.16. **Lack of Observation.** Applications based on the fact that you and your evaluators were geographically separated, working on a different shift, or your evaluators were new to the job, require conclusive documentation showing they had no valid basis on which to assess performance. Many individuals have to perform duties without the benefit of direct daily supervision; therefore, separation alone is not a good argument. Finally, endorsing officials have to be in the rating chain only on or after the evaluation's close-out.

A2.5.17. **Evaluation Not Written by Designated Rater.** The Air Force does not require the designated rater to be your immediate supervisor. Inaccurate designations and failures to change raters can occur when personnel are reassigned, work centers reorganized, functional areas or units realigned, etc. To prove your case, you will need statements from both the individuals who signed the evaluation and from the individuals who believe they should have written the evaluation. They should cite the from and thru dates of their supervision and explain what happened. The “erroneous” evaluator must clearly explain why he or she wrote and signed the evaluation when they were not the rater. Likewise the “correct” evaluator must explain why he or she did not write the evaluation even though they were supposed to. Also helpful is a statement from the unit commander, if possible, providing specific information.

A2.5.18. **Insufficient Supervision.** To appeal based on insufficient supervision, you need:

A2.5.18.1. Computer-generated products or other documents that substantiate when supervision began and ended.

A2.5.18.2. Understand that OJT records, feedback notices, and performance feedback worksheets do not document the date supervision began. They document only that an OJT entry was made, a feedback notice produced, or a feedback session took place.

A2.5.18.3. Often, evaluators feel that days of supervision minimums are not sufficient time to evaluate a ratee. However, Air Force standards establish that the minimum days are adequate to be able to provide a valid assessment. This standard applies Air Force-wide and appeals based on the rater's belief that minimums are not enough time are not approved.

A2.5.19. Memorandum of Mitigation. You can get a memorandum of mitigation to attach to an evaluation from an evaluator who signed the original evaluation or from someone in the rating chain at the time of the original evaluation. The memorandum must present information that was not known at the time of the evaluation's preparation and must explain the comments or ratings. You cannot use a memorandum of mitigation simply to add information to an evaluation when there was not enough space on the original evaluation to include it. The memorandum must be no more than a single, typed page. It must not discuss promotion status or potential or any other subject or material if this information was not allowed in the original evaluation. Do not emphasize comments by using bold type, underlines, unusual fonts, etc.

A2.5.20. Lack of Training. You will require supporting statements from rating chain officials who can give specific information about the training problem and its impact on the evaluation. Since failing to provide training and failing to document training are different problems, OJT records, reviews of OJT records, and OJT inspection reports do not prove training was not conducted, only that training was not documented.

A2.5.21. Forged Signature. Allegations of a forged signature on an evaluation must be confirmed by a notarized statement from the actual evaluator or by the results of an investigation.

A2.5.22. Fitness: If you are requesting a change pertaining to the fitness area, you must justify why the fitness area is incorrect and provide relevant, supporting documents (i.e., past fitness history, profiles, medical authority input, etc.). Any request without supporting documents will be returned or not favorably considered.

A2.5.23. Re-accomplishing an evaluation. If you are requesting an evaluation be re-accomplished, you must furnish a substitute evaluation in your appeal case. The substitute evaluation must:

A2.5.23.1. Be signed by all the evaluators who signed the original evaluation (this includes the commander on EPRs). If an evaluator cannot be located, you must submit evidence of all attempts to locate the missing evaluator (i.e. certified mail receipt, emails, postal service, etc). After all attempts have been exhausted, contact HQ AFPC/DP2SPE for guidance.

A2.5.23.2. Be on the correct form not only for your grade, but also for the time the original evaluation was written. **EXAMPLE:** If you are re-accomplishing a Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF) for a CY93 Board, the Aug 88 version of the AF Form 709 must be used, not the Jun 95 edition of the form. Similarly, if you are re-accomplishing an EPR which has a close-out date of Jan 95, the substitute must be on the Jan 93 edition of the AF Form 910/911, not the Jun 95 version.

A2.6. Special Information on Appealing AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF). (NOTE: The MLR process does not apply to the ResAF).

A2.6.1. General Information. A material error in the PRF itself; substantive changes to the record of performance used to assess your performance-based potential; or, a material error in the PRF preparation process, may justify changes to your PRF. Normally, comments and recommendations are required from the senior rater who signed the PRF and the MLR President who reviewed it. If the SR is deceased or retired and not available, the MLR president who originally reviewed the PRF can act instead. When the senior rater is available but the original MLR President is deceased or retired and not available, the current MLR President can act in his or her place. (NOTE: An evaluator is considered not available when they are incapacitated or, after reasonable efforts, cannot be located or contacted. You should include in your application documentation that shows when and how you attempted to contact an evaluator, such as certified mail receipts, and so forth. An evaluator will not be substituted or bypassed simply because they will not support an application, or because you do not believe you will have time to locate or contact them prior to a specific date or event).

A2.6.1.1. Substantive additions, deletions, changes, or corrections to an officer's record of performance include voiding a referral or negative evaluation; adding a previously missing OPR or TR; removing a negative endorsement or adding a positive one; replacing an evaluation with a substantially different one, and so on. The change must, in effect, remove negative information from an officer's record or add positive information which was not previously known. A simple administrative change to an evaluation rarely meets this criteria.

A2.6.1.2. SR and MLR Presidents who provide comments and recommendations must carefully consider what, if any, impact the correction or change may have had on the final PRF content, rating, or the preparation process. They will need to explain the change to the record of performance, its impact on the PRF, and how the requested PRF action relates to the changed record of performance. Appeals based on errors in the preparation process must also be fully explained and substantiated. SRs must weigh the impact of the processing error on the PRF and explain how the error justifies the requested PRF change.

A2.6.1.3. The ML that initially processed the PRF can best route PRF appeals to the appropriate MLR President. Since MLs may have different procedures for processing PRF appeals, contact the appropriate one for instructions. If the ML no longer exists, contact HQ AFPC/DP2SPE for instructions.

A2.6.2. PRF Appeal Requirements. It is impossible to list exact instructions for each type of appeal; so, if necessary, contact HQ AFPC/DP2SPE or ARPC/PB for guidance on appeals not covered in this instruction. The following list describes minimum required documentation for the Board to reach a fair and equitable decision on your appeal:

A2.6.2.1. Voiding a PRF. You must provide substantial evidence proving the PRF does not contain a valid promotion potential assessment, and that it is not possible to correct the form.

A2.6.2.2. Changing the (Promotion Recommendation) requires the concurrence of both the SR and MLR President. The PRF should "provide key performance factors from the officer's entire career." Obviously, the space on the form is limited and it is not usually

possible to describe every achievement in an officer's career. The SR bears the responsibility of selecting what to include in the PRF, and what to leave out; which portions of the officer's career to concentrate on, and which portions to have supported by the record. While he or she may request inputs from subordinate commanders, to do so is not mandatory. To change the promotion recommendation, the SR will need to demonstrate there was a material error in the PRF; a material error in the record of performance which substantially impacted the content of the PRF; or, a material error in the process by which the PRF was crafted. In all instances, the requested change to the promotion recommendation must be related to the documented error. Appeals to rewrite the promotion recommendation simply to include different, but previously known or documented accomplishments will not be approved.

A2.6.2.3. Changing the overall promotion recommendation to a "promote" rating requires the concurrence of both the SR and MLR President. The SR provides detailed information about the circumstances surrounding the requested change and the rationale for the correction. The MLR President reviews the request and recommends for or against the change. The SR and MLR President should not support a requested change to the PRF unless a material error exists.

A2.6.2.4. Changing the overall promotion recommendation to a "DP" rating must be fully justified and requires the concurrence of both the SR and MLR President. In the promotion process, DP ratings are strictly controlled, and awarded after a competitive review of the SR's pool of eligibles identifies the top officers. The MLR validates the SR's decision and conducts a similar competitive review in awarding carry-over or aggregate DPs. In determining whether to seek award of a DP via an appeal, SRs and MLR Presidents must, as much as possible, replicate the original competitive process. SRs and MLRs needing assistance in identifying their original pool of eligibles should contact HQ AFPC/DP2SPE, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4709 to obtain a MEL and copies of records of performance which may be needed for the board in question. The SR details the circumstances surrounding the requested change, the rationale for the correction, and the method (an earned DP allocation, aggregation or carry-over) by which the DP rating would have been awarded originally. As with other PRF appeals, there must be a material error in the PRF, record of performance, or process, and it must be shown how that error resulted in an erroneous rating. In addition:

A2.6.2.4.1. When the SR identifies an "earned DP allocation," he or she certifies that the applicant's corrected record would have been awarded a DP rating in competition with the SR's original pool of eligibles. After reviewing the circumstances of the appeal and the applicant's record, the MLR President recommends whether the DP rating should be confirmed.

A2.6.2.4.2. If the SR believes a DP rating would have been awarded under aggregation or carry-over, the MLR President reviews the request, the circumstances surrounding the error, and its impact on the strength of the applicant's record. The MLR President, after a competitive review (see para 8.7), determines if the corrected record would have been sufficiently strong to have earned a DP at the original MLR, and makes the appropriate recommendation.

A2.6.3. Changing PRFs reviewed by a USAF Student Evaluation Board or a USAF Evaluation Board for Officers in Competitive Categories Other Than Line of the Air Force. The same requirements listed above apply except after meeting the SR's requirement, forward the appeal to HQ AFPC/DP2SPE for processing. HQ AFPC/DP2SPE serves as the ML for these boards and will secure a recommendation from the MLR President.

A2.6.4. Board Review. The Board is extremely careful in considering appeals of PRFs. The decision whether or not to grant or deny the appeal rests with the Board, which has the independent responsibility to make the determination. SR, MLR President, and other inputs and/or recommendations are factors which the Board will consider in making its determination. It is not bound by any of the recommendations. The Board determines the weight it will give to all such inputs.

A2.7. Special Information on Appealing AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).

A2.7.1. The Board carefully evaluates RRF appeals and obtaining the support outlined below does not guarantee approval, but is the minimum required for the Board to reach a fair and equitable decision.

A2.7.2. Voiding an RRF. Evidence requirements are similar to evidence requirements for voiding other evaluation types. You must provide substantiating evidence that the form contains an unjust or inaccurate assessment of your potential for continued service.

A2.7.3. To change the narrative comments, or the retention recommendation, you must have the support of the evaluators who signed the form. The first evaluator is generally the primary person to substantiate the form is inaccurate. He or she details the circumstances surrounding the error and explains why it should be corrected. The second evaluator reviews the circumstances and provides a recommendation. On occasion, the same person may be responsible for the first and second evaluators' portions of the form. If major changes are needed, fill out a new form and attach it to the request for correction.

Attachment 3**NON-RATED PERIOD MEMORANDUM**

EXAMPLE (use appropriate organization
letterhead) (Attachment XX) Non-rated Period(s)
Memorandum

DATE

MEMORANDUM FOR XX SQ/CC

FROM: RANK, LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MI OF REQUESTING MEMBER (LAST 4 of
SSN)

SUBJECT: Non-rated Period(s) on (Enlisted/Officer) Performance Report

1. I am requesting a non-rated period on my next performance report IAW AFI 36-2406 paragraph xxx Non-rated Periods.
2. As a reminder, we met on DD/MM/YYYY and discussed any reasonably foreseeable career impacts with this request.
3. I am requesting a non-rated period to start on DD/MM/YYYY and end on DD/MM/YYYY. (First request will not exceed 80 days; any extensions will require an additional letter and will not exceed 60-day increments)
4. If you have questions, please contact me at (requesting member's contact information).

Requesting Member's Signature Block

1st Ind, XX SQ/CC

MEMORANDUM FOR XX SQ/CSS (Evaluations Monitor)

I have considered (rank/name of requesting member)'s request and approve/recommend
disapproval the non-rated period from DD/MM/YYYY to DD/MM/YYYY.

If recommending disapproval, CC must provide justification for the recommendation and
forward to the requesting member's wing commander/equivalent for final approval/disapproval
(may be delegated no further than vice commander/equivalent). This may be accomplished on
this memo or under a separate attachment.

Once signed, a copy will be provided to the requesting member and wing CVS office.

Unit/CC Signature Block