

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

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 36-2406

2 JANUARY 2013



Personnel

**OFFICER AND ENLISTED EVALUATION
SYSTEMS**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

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

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasable restrictions on this publication.

OPR: HQ AFPC/DPSID

Certified by: HQ AF/A1P (Maj Gen
Sharon Dunbar)

Supersedes: AFI 36-2406, 15 April 2005;
AFI 36-2401, 20 February
2004

Pages: 286

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).

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 (USAFR) activities, officers, and enlisted. While the philosophy and intent of the OES/EES pertain to the ANG and USAFR, 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 5400.7-4, *DOD Freedom of Information Act Program*). Title 10, United States Code, Section 8013 and Executive Order 9397, 22 November 1943, 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*, is available at <http://privacy.defense.gov/notices/usaf/>. 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, *Privacy Act 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 in accordance with AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located at <https://www.my.af.mil/gcss-af61/afrims/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, Randolph AFB 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/DPSIDE approval before publication. Send published copies of approved supplements to HQ USAF/A1PPP, HQ AFPC/DPSIDE, and HQ ARPC/DPB. Field agencies must get HQ AFPC/DPSIDE and AFDPO/PPP approval before using locally created versions of the AF Forms prescribed by this instruction.

Vigilance must be taken to protect Personally Identifiable Information (PII) when submitting or sending nominations, applications or other documents to 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 3 is a quick reference subject guide. 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 document has been substantially revised and must be completely reviewed. Major changes include, updates to organization and office symbols; introduces updated versions of AF Forms 707, *Officer Performance Report*, 910, *Enlisted Performance Report*, 911, *Senior Enlisted Performance Report*, 724, *Officer Performance Feedback Worksheet*, 931, *Airman Performance Feedback Worksheet*, 932, *NCO Performance Feedback Worksheet*, 77, *Letter of Evaluation*, and 475, *Education/Training Report*. These changes incorporate numerous revised policies and procedural changes involving performance feedback and evaluation reports that have been implemented since the last revision, 1 July 2000. These changes clarify existing policies and procedures and includes procedures for the electronic forms and digital signatures; the Enlisted Training Reports; the deployed commander Letter of Evaluation (LOE); and evaluation procedures for 365-day extended deployments. The contingency and wartime provisions have been updated to provide guidance for current contingency operations. This publication incorporated AFI 36-2401, *Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Reports*, 20 February 2004, which will be rescinded on the effective date of this publication. Users of this publication are strongly advised to read this publication in detail and refer to it frequently to ensure full compliance is maintained.

Chapter 1—GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS	7
1.1. Purpose.	7
1.2. Forms Used--Purpose and Their Use.	7
1.3. General Guidelines.	9
1.4. Preparing and Processing Evaluations.	10
1.5. Evaluator Requirements.	18
1.6. Responsibilities.	23
1.7. Rating Chain Deviations and Evaluator Changes.	31
1.8. Evaluator Accountability.	34
1.9. Disagreements.	37
1.10. Referral Evaluations.	38
1.11. Mandatory Comments.	45
1.12. Prohibited Evaluator Considerations and Comments.	47
1.13. Policy Deviations, Extensions and Waiver Requests.	59
1.14. Missing, Late and Removed Performance Evaluations.	61
1.15. Administrative Examination for Appropriateness of Evaluations.	62
Table 1.1. Mailing Addresses for Correspondence.	63
Table 1.2. Missing and Late Enlisted Evaluations (See Notes 1 and 2).	65
Figure 1.1. Enlisted Referral Memorandum.	66
Chapter 2—PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK PROCESS	69
2.1. Purpose.	69
2.2. Responsibilities.	69
2.3. Who Requires a Performance Feedback.	70
2.4. Guidance for Conducting Feedback Sessions.	70
2.5. When to Hold Documented Feedback Sessions.	70
2.6. The Performance Feedback Notice.	71
2.7. Which PFW Form to Use.	71
2.8. Preparing the PFW.	71
2.9. Disposition and Access.	72
2.10. Failure of Rater to Conduct or Document a Feedback Session.	72
2.11. End-of-Reporting Period Feedback.	73

Table 2.1. Performance Feedback Requirements. 73

Chapter 3—OFFICER/ENLISTED PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS (OPRS/EPRS) 75

3.1. General Guidelines. 75

3.2. When to Submit an Officer Performance Report (OPR) or Enlisted Performance Report (EPR). 88

3.3. Who Requires Performance Evaluations. 88

3.4. Who Does Not Require Performance Evaluations. 89

Table 3.3. When to Prepare OPRs for Officers on the EAD and ANG Officers. 133

Table 3.4. When to Prepare OPRs on USAFR Officers (Lieutenant thru Colonel). 135

Table 3.5. Routing of OPRs for ANG and USAFR Officers not on EAD. 137

Table 3.6. Office of Record and Distribution Required for OPRs (See Note 1). 138

Table 3.7. When to Submit EPRs on Airmen on AD including ANG AGR’s. 139

Chapter 4—AF FORM 77, LETTER OF EVALUATION 148

4.1. Purpose. 148

4.2. Types of Letters of Evaluation (LOE). 148

4.3. Who Will Prepare. 151

4.4. Administrative Practices. 151

4.5. Completing AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation. 152

4.6. Routing, Updating and Disposition Responsibilities. 152

4.7. CSS/HR Specialist/MPS/PERSCO Responsibilities: 153

Table 4.1. Instructions for Completing the AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation. 153

Table 4.2. When to submit a Letter of Evaluation. 160

Chapter 5—CONTINGENCY AND WARTIME PROVISIONS 163

5.1. Purpose. 163

5.2. General Guidance. 163

5.3. LOEs During Contingency Operations. 163

5.4. Deployed Commander Letter of Evaluations (LOEs). 164

5.5. 365-day Extended Deployment Officer/Enlisted Performance Reports (OPRs/EPRs). 168

5.6. 365-day extended deployment Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRFs). 172

5.7. Force Shaping Boards. 173

5.8. National Emergency or Wartime Provisions. 173

Chapter 6—AF FORM 475, EDUCATION/TRAINING REPORT 177

6.1.	When to Use Training Reports (TR).	177
6.2.	Who Prepares Training Reports.	179
6.3.	Referral Training Reports.	179
6.4.	Routing and Responsibilities.	179
Table 6.2.	When to Prepare AF Form 475, Training Report.	184
Table 6.3.	Updating Training Reports Pending System Change.	186

Chapter 7—GENERAL OFFICER EVALUATIONS 188

7.1.	Overview.	188
7.2.	Forms Used.	188
7.3.	Reasons for Reports.	188
7.4.	General Instructions.	188
7.5.	Processing and Mailing General Officer Evaluations.	190
Table 7.1.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 78.	191
Table 7.2.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 77 for General Officers.	194

Chapter 8—PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION AND MANAGEMENT LEVEL REVIEW PROCESS 196

8.1.	AF Form 709 (for Active Duty List [ADL] officers).	196
8.1.4.	Responsibilities:	197
8.2.	AF Form 709 (for Reserve Active Status List officers).	203
8.3.	MLRs (ADL Lieutenant Colonel and Below).	206
8.4.	Special Provisions (applies to ADL officers only).	219
8.5.	Correction of Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRF) (ADL Officers) (Stop File process).	223
8.6.	Promotion Recommendations for Colonels.	224
8.7.	Supplemental Management Level Reviews (SMLRs) for Recommendation Upgrade (POST-CSB), (For ADL Only).	226
Table 8.1.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 709, Performance Recommendation Forms.	228
Table 8.2.	What to Enter in Section VI (Group Size) on the PRF (ADL Lt Col and below only).	234
Table 8.3.	Senior Rater “Definitely Promote” Allocation Rate Table - ADL Officers, see Note.	235

Chapter 9—AF FORM 3538, RETENTION RECOMMENDATION FORM 238

9.1.	When to Use the AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).	238
------	--	-----

	9.2.	Responsibilities.	238
	9.3.	RRF Submission.	239
	9.4.	Air Force Advisor Examination.	239
	9.5.	Correction of Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).	239
Figure	9.1.	Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB).	240
Table	9.1.	Instructions for Completing AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).	240

Chapter 10—CORRECTING OFFICER AND ENLISTED EVALUATIONS 243

	10.1.	Purpose.	243
	10.2.	Program Elements.	243
	10.3.	Correcting Evaluations.	246
	10.4.	Responsibilities.	247
	10.5.	Meeting Time Limits and Expedited Requests.	250
	10.6.	Using Classified, Privacy Act, and Restricted Release Information:	251
	10.7.	Requesting Special Selection Board (SSB) or Supplemental Promotion Consideration:	251
	10.8.	Resubmitting an Appeal:	252
Table	10.1.	How to Submit Requests for Correction.	252
Table	10.2.	Correcting Minor Errors on Evaluations.	253
Table	10.3.	Minor Corrections – Offices Authorized to Make Corrections and Disposition. ..	255
Table	10.4.	Board Directed Corrections - Correcting and Disposition of Documents.	256
Table	10.5.	Correcting AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Forms.	258
Table	10.6.	Instructions For Completing AF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports.	259
Figure	10.1.	Sample, AF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports.	262

Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION 263

Attachment 2—APPEAL GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS 277

Attachment 3—SUBJECT MATTER QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE 286

Chapter 1

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1. Purpose. The Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems have varied purposes. The first is to provide meaningful feedback to individuals on what is expected of them, advice on how well they are meeting those expectations, and advice on how to better meet those expectations. The second is to provide a reliable, long-term, cumulative record of performance and potential based on that performance. The third is to provide officer Central Selection Boards (CSB), senior NCO evaluation boards, the Weighted Airman Promotion System (WAPS) and other personnel managers' sound information to assist in identifying the best qualified officers and enlisted personnel 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. Performance is most important for successful mission accomplishment. It is also important for development of skills and leadership abilities and in determining who will be selected for 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, for officers, 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. OES/EES training was implemented in May 96 to help supervisors fulfill their evaluation responsibilities. Unit commanders are responsible for ensuring all first-time supervisors receive mandatory OES/EES training (as appropriate for their position) within 60 days of being appointed as a rater. Additionally, Air Force members should receive annual recurring OES/EES training. How and when this training is conducted is at the discretion of the unit commander. To assist commanders, EES/OES Training Guides are located on the AFPC Website.

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

1.2. Forms Used--Purpose and Their Use.

1.2.1. Performance Evaluation Forms Used:

1.2.1.1. AF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation (LOE)*, is a multipurpose evaluation form (see Chapter 4 for details).

1.2.1.2. 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).

1.2.1.3. AF Form 475, *Education/Training Report (TR)*, used to document periods when Airmen are in education or formal training (see Chapter 6 for details).

1.2.1.4. AF Form 707, *Officer Performance Report (Lt through Col) (OPR)*; AF Form 910, *Enlisted Performance Report (AB through TSgt) (EPR)*; or AF Form 911, *Senior*

Enlisted Performance Report (MSgt through CMSgt) (EPR), are used to document performance and potential over the long term. Use ratee's grade on close-out date to determine which form to use (see Chapter 3 for details).

1.2.1.5. 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 (see Chapter 8 for details).

1.2.1.6. AF Form 724, *Officer Performance Feedback Worksheet (Lt through Col)*, AF Form 931, *Performance Feedback Worksheet (AB through TSgt) (PFW)*, and AF Form 932, *Performance Feedback Worksheet (MSgt through CMSgt) (PFW)*, (see Chapter 2 for details).

1.2.1.7. AF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation Form (RRF)*, is used in conjunction with this AFI and HQ AFPC Retirements and Separations Branch guidelines, to document performance-based differentiation and retention recommendations, to assist in involuntary separation and/or retirement boards (Force Shaping, Reduction in Force [RIF], or Selective Early Retirement [SERB] boards). This form is only used at the discretion of the Secretary of the Air Force. See chapter 9 and AFI 36-3603, *Service Retirements*, for details.

1.2.1.8. AF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation*, is used by Active Duty, 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 Guard and Reserve (vPC/GR) 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.

1.2.2. Purpose and Their Use:

1.2.2.1. Performance Feedback Worksheet (PFW). Performance Feedback Worksheets include the AF Form 724, AF Form 931, and AF Form 932, and are used to document private communication regarding performance and professional development feedback between raters and ratees (see Chapter 2 for details).

1.2.2.2. Performance Evaluations. Performance Evaluations include the AF Form 707 (OPR); AF Forms 910/911 (EPR); AF Form 77 (LOE), AF Form 475, (TR), AF Forms 78 and 709 (PRF) and the AF Form 3538 (RRF). These forms are used to document performance and potential, and provide information for making promotion recommendation, selection, or propriety actions, selective continuation, involuntary separation, selective early retirement, assignment, school nomination and selection, and other management decisions.

1.2.2.3. Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRF). Use PRFs for promotion purposes only, and include the AF Form 78 and AF Form 709. 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.

1.2.2.4. Retention Recommendation Forms (RRF). Use RRFs (AF Form 3538) for involuntary separation/retirement board (Force Shaping, Reduction in Force [RIF], or Selective Early Retirement [SERB] boards) only. RRFs are removed from the Officer Selection Record (OSR) following the board which they were accomplished for, and are stored electronically. These RRFs will be used for historical, legal, and appeal purposes only.

1.3. General Guidelines.

1.3.1. Access to Evaluations. Evaluations are For Official Use Only and are subject to the Privacy Act. They are exempt from public disclosure under DoD Regulation 5400.7/Air Force Supplement (AFSUPDODR 5400-7), *DoD Freedom of Information Act Program* and AFI 33-332, *Privacy Act Program*. Only persons within the agency who have a proper need to know may read the evaluations. The office with custodial responsibility is responsible for determining if a person's official duties require access. Only the rater and ratee will review the Performance Feedback Worksheets (PFWs) except as outlined in Chapter 2.

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 PAS code alone is unclassified, however it will only be entered on the ratee. 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 minimum of one line and a maximum two lines per bullet and white space is authorized. Main bullets begin at the left margin and will have one space after the "-". If unfamiliar with the proper bullet format, refer to "The Bullet Background Paper" in AFH 33-337, *The Tongue and Quill*. Although the *Tongue and Quill* allows three lines per bullet, evaluations will not have more than two lines per bullet.

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 (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.

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 may use computerized versions with proportional spacing, provided a 12-pitch font is used.

1.3.6.4. Handwritten Evaluations.

1.3.6.4.1. Evaluations may be handwritten, only when authorized by HQ AFPC/DPSIDE or ARPC/DPB, 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/DPSIDE or HQ ARPC/DPB 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, Pat for Patrick/Patricia, 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 remarks section of the applicable form. **Note:** The newer versions of the AF Forms 707, 910, and 911 have been revised to allow the evaluator's to explain acronyms in the Remarks (AF Form 707) and in Other Comments (AF Form 910/911) section of the form; when used they must be listed in the order used.

1.3.7.2.2. When used, first spell out and follow with the acronym; i.e. 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 first.

1.3.8. Optional Notes and Stamps. "*Wet Signature Evaluation Only.*" When used enter optional notes at base level such as "MilPDS/System Processed," administrative review initials, date stamps, etc., only in the top margin. AFPC or ARPC level optional notes will be placed only in the bottom margin.

1.3.9. Send requests for deviations or waivers through the wing commander or the comparative level to HQ AFPC/DPSIDE (or appropriate ANG/AFR office stated in paragraph 1.15) who in turn will forward the request to appropriate office of primary responsibility (OPR) listed in Table 1.1.

1.4. Preparing and Processing Evaluations.

1.4.1. OPR/EPR Notices:

1.4.1.1. Be sure that OPR/EPR notices, any LOEs that closed during the period of the evaluation, and/or any referral documents, accompany the evaluation through the rating chain.

1.4.1.2. 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 senior NCOs, the brief may be used as an aid in determining endorsement level.

1.4.1.3. The Human Resource (HR) Specialist (local procedures will dictate) forwards the notice to the rater. The rater will coordinate with Military Personnel Section (MPS) personnel to resolve incorrect entries. A copy of the OPR/EPR notice is forwarded with the evaluation through the rating chain to the MPS.

1.4.2. Suspenses.

1.4.2.1. The MPS will set up a monitoring 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 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 to AFPC/ARPC 60 days after the close out date. **Note:** This does not preclude a draft copy being routed earlier.

1.4.2.3. Completed OPRs/EPRs are due to:

1.4.2.3.1. The MPS no later than 30 days after close-out.

1.4.2.3.2. 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/DPSIR, HQ ARPC/DPBR, HQ AF/DPE, HQ AF/DPO, HQ AF/DPG respectively by the suspense date established in the directing letter or message.

1.4.2.5. Completed evaluations referred to the ratee IAW paragraph 1.10. will be filed in the appropriate record and/or placed into ARMS NLT 70 days for active duty personnel and 90 days for non-EAD personnel, after the close-out date of the evaluation.

1.4.2.6. Performance evaluation suspenses are set such that the evaluation should be closed out prior to evaluators or the ratee departing. It is the unit commander's responsibility to ensure evaluations are completed within the suspense, especially for those separating/retiring or PCSing.

1.4.3. When an Evaluation Becomes a Matter of Record.

1.4.3.1. 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 Officer Selection Record (OSR)/Noncommissioned Officer Selection Record (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.

1.4.3.2. Once transmitted to HQ AFPC or HQ ARPC, an evaluation can no longer be accessed for correction. Corrections must be submitted through the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB) IAW Chapter 10.

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). 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/DPSIDE or HQ ARPC/DPB. 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, and appeal actions; and appropriate assignment actions by AFPC/ARPC/AFRC/RMG 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; AF/DPO for officers on EAD in the grade of colonel; HQ AFPC/DPSID for officers on EAD in the grades of lieutenant colonel and below; or the HQ ARPC/DPBR for ANG officers in the grades of colonel and below, USAFR officers not on EAD, and AGR or Limited Extended Active Duty (LEAD) officers.

1.4.5.1.4. As authorized by AFI 33-332 when requested by the ratee or his or her designated legal representative.

1.4.5.1.5. As required by Table 3.5, Table 3.6, and Table 3.9 or to provide copies for file in ARMS, the OSR/NSR, the OCSR, or Adjutant General (AG) or NGB/OM record file.

1.4.5.1.6. To replace missing or lost documents in the 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 paragraph 1.4.5.2. and table 1.2).

1.4.5.2. Certified True Copies (CTC). A CTC is a certified unchanged copy of the original document. When authorized by HQ AFPC/DPSID or HQ ARPC/DPB, personnel making certified copies will enter the statement "*Certified True Copy*" with the certifying official's grade, name, signature, duty title, unit, and the date, on the front left margin of the evaluation. Printed copies from Automatic Records Management System (ARMS) with all digital signatures included will be considered "Certified True Copies" of the electronic record.

1.4.5.3. Corrected Copies (CC). A CC may be either a copy or an original document which contains changes, from the original document. Corrections authorized by the

AFBCMR or ERAB on “wet signature” evaluations may require a corrected copy. In these cases, the following statement will be entered on the reverse bottom margin: “*CC, HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP or HQ ARPC/DPB, XX XXX XX., certifying official’s signature.*” (CC is “corrected copy”, office doing correction, date correction made, and signature of person making the correction.)

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

1.4.5.5. 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; OPRs/EPRs Chapter 3; Performance Feedback Worksheets Chapter 2; Training Reports Chapter 6; Letters of Evaluation Chapter 4; Promotion Recommendation Forms Chapter 8; Retention Recommendation Forms Chapter 9 and/or the current program guidance.

1.4.6. Evaluation Notifications. Review evaluation notices when applicable for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect on the evaluation notification, notify the Military Personnel Section (MPS) to ensure the correct data is updated. Abbreviations on the evaluation notification may be expanded for clarity on the evaluation.

1.4.7. Organization. Enter ratee’s organizational information as of the close-out date using the guidance below.

1.4.7.1. Enter the organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable) and location, followed by the component (ANG/USAFR only) as of the close-out date of the evaluation. For active duty and reserve personnel on active duty orders do not enter the component. If classified, refer to AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.3.2. **Example:** 190th Air Refueling Group (AMC), Forbes Field, Topeka, Kansas, KS ANG (ARG).

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 (active duty and reserve), enter organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable) and location as of the close-out date of the evaluation. **Example:** 341st Force Support Squadron (AFSPC), Malmstrom AFB MT .

1.4.7.4. On EAD (active duty and reserve) 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 (AFSPC), 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.

1.4.7.5. An AGR Program member under Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 8033, 10211, 10305, 12310 and 12402 or Title 32, U.S.C., Section 708 (Property and Fiscal Officers), enter organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable), state affiliation and location. **Example:** 190th Air Refueling Group (AMC), Forbes Field, Topeka, Kansas, KS ANG (AGR).

1.4.7.6. A Non-EAD ANG member, enter organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable), state affiliation, location, and component. **Example:** 190th Air Refueling Group (AMC), Forbes Field, Topeka, Kansas, KS ANG (Non-EAD).

1.4.7.7. A Non-EAD USAFR member, enter organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable), location, and (if applicable) organization and location of attachment, followed by the component. **Example:** 9019th ARS (ARPC), 6760 East Irvington Place, Denver CO 80280 w/Atch unit at 12 FTW, Randolph AFB TX (Non-EAD).

1.4.7.8. A Limited EAD program member on EAD under Title 10, U.S.C. Section 12301(d), enter organizational designation, MAJCOM (if applicable), location, and (if applicable) organization and location of attachment, followed by the component. **Example:** 9019th ARS (ARPC), 6760 East Irvington Place, Denver CO 80280 w/Atch unit at 12 FTW, Randolph AFB TX (LEAD).

1.4.8. Duty Air Force Specialty Code (DAFSC). The DAFSC is based on the unit manning document (UMD) authorization or the unit personnel management roster (UMPR) position.

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 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, MPS personnel must change the DAFSC on the evaluation to match the DAFSC approved in the personnel data system (and should advise the unit of the change).

1.4.8.2. Enlisted: Use the DAFSC the enlisted member is assigned against as of the close-out (“Thru”) date of the evaluation. It should be reflected on the evaluation notice. This is not to be confused with the PAFSC, CAFSC, or 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 ensure the correct information is reflected and/or updated in the system.

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. Grade Data.

1.4.9.1. The grade must be the grade 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 grade, regardless of the billet being filled.

1.4.9.2. Use the drop down menu to select the appropriate grade entry.

1.4.9.3. For ANG/AFR the component will be added in Block 7 for officers, and in Block 5 for enlisted personnel.

1.4.10. Fitness Data.

1.4.10.1. General Fitness Information.

1.4.10.1.1. The fitness status, IAW AFI 36-2905, *Fitness Program* as of the close-out date will be recorded on the evaluation form.

1.4.10.1.2. While comments regarding performance outside of the reporting period are normally not allowed, the rater should consider the score of the most recent fitness assessment when determining if member meets fitness standards, even if that fitness assessment occurred prior to the reporting period. **Example:** Member has a CRO report for the period of 1 Apr – 30 Oct, rater will consider a fitness assessment conducted 15 Feb if that is the most recent, current test.

1.4.10.1.3. “Meets Standards” is defined as having a passing and current fitness score as defined IAW AFI 36-2905.

1.4.10.1.4. “Does Not Meet Standards” is defined as having less than a passing fitness score, or noncurrent as defined IAW AFI 36-2905. Place an “X” in the “Does Not Meet Standards” block in Section III and for Physical Fitness in Section IX (OPR); or Section III, Block 3 (EPR). A score of less than passing, or an expired fitness test without a valid exemption, requires the evaluation to be referred. Evaluators must comment (Section IV, OPR and Section III, EPR) on a ratee who does not meet standards. Only in this case is the evaluator authorized to comment on the ratee’s fitness score and progress in the Fitness Improvement Program. In the case of an expired fitness test, the rater will comment that the member failed to remain current on their fitness test. **Note:** Comments on a medical condition or a diagnosis are prohibited.

1.4.10.1.5. Comments regarding unit fitness achievements are authorized for Airmen who have a key role in the success of unit PT programs. This may include PTLs, UFPMs, First Sergeants, Superintendents, Section Commanders, Flight Chiefs, Commanders, and other members deemed integral to a particular organization's successful Fitness Program. Example of authorized comment: "Implemented rigorous squadron PT program; drove unit pass rate from 75% to 100%" or "Ensured accountability-98% readiness rate, zero overdue/expired tests." Note: Comments on an evaluation regarding an Airman's individual fitness score or fitness category remain prohibited.

1.4.10.1.6. Unit commanders may request close-out date extensions of up to 59 days to ensure resolution of any administrative, or other significant issues. See paragraph 1.13 for details.

1.4.10.2. Prohibited Fitness Comments.

1.4.10.2.1. 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. This does not prevent an evaluator from documenting referral comments in other areas outside of the fitness area when a member continues to display a negative attitude or has not demonstrated fitness improvement. In those cases, referral comments should focus on the reasons or behavior and will not document the score.

1.4.10.2.2. Comments on fitness are prohibited on the AF Form 709.

1.4.10.2.3. Do not comment on any reason for exemption.

1.4.10.3. Fitness Exemptions. The “Exempt” block will only be marked if a ratee is exempt from all components of the Air Force Fitness Program IAW AFI 36-2905 on the close-out date.

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. Sign on or after the close-out date.

1.4.11.1.2. Do not sign before previous evaluators. **Exception:** When a rater or subsequent evaluator is across the international dateline or in cases where paragraph 1.4.11.1.7. apply.

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

1.4.11.1.4. Do not use “auto-signature” pens or delegated “CAC” signatures.

1.4.11.1.5. Do not delay signing an evaluation due to pending personnel changes, promotions, approval of a more prestigious duty title, and so forth.

1.4.11.1.6. 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 don’t 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.

1.4.11.1.7. If the Squadron Commander/Civilian Director is junior in grade to the Rater/Additional Rater/Reviewer, they will sign prior to the Rater/Additional Rater/Reviewer.

1.4.11.1.8. 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 blocks the examiner and the advisor block.

1.4.11.1.9. Do not sign as “Select” unless authorized by paragraph 1.4.11.5.

1.4.11.2. Digital Signatures and Dates.

1.4.11.2.1. Forms must be digitally signed with a Common Access Card (CAC).

1.4.11.2.2. Digital signatures must be used by all evaluators and reviewers, unless one or more of the following applies:

1.4.11.2.2.1. The evaluation is a referral evaluation. Digital signatures are not authorized on referral evaluations.

1.4.11.2.2.2. In the few instances where CACs or CAC reader access is not available. **Example:**

1.4.11.2.2.2.1. At least one evaluator does not have a CAC. If one evaluator or reviewer is unable to access digital signature, all evaluators and reviewers must “wet” sign and date the evaluation.

1.4.11.2.2.2.2. At least one evaluator does not have access to a CAC enabled computer. If one evaluator or reviewer is unable to access digital signature, all evaluators and reviewers must “wet” sign and date the evaluation.

1.4.11.2.2.2.3. They will be printed and signed with “wet” signatures (handwritten) 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.

1.4.11.2.4. 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, or the reviewer cannot sign before the additional rater due to security features associated with digital signature capability.

1.4.11.2.4.1. 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; or the additional rater’s digital signature will unlock the digital signature feature in the reviewer’s block.

1.4.11.2.4.2. The AF Advisor/Functional Examiner and unit commander/civilian director/other authorized reviewer digital signature capabilities are independent of evaluator signatures and may be signed at any point.

1.4.11.2.5. Once transmitted to HQ AFPC through the Case Management System (CMS), a digitally signed form can no longer be accessed for correction. Corrections must be submitted through the Evaluation Reports Appeal Board (ERAB) IAW Chapter 10. See paragraph 10.3.

1.4.11.3. Handwritten “Wet” Signatures and Dates. (Dates may be handwritten, stamped or typed).

1.4.11.3.1. Must be payroll signature.

1.4.11.3.2. Must be in reproducible blue or black ink.

1.4.11.4. Signature Blocks. Use the following guidelines when entering identification data:

1.4.11.4.1. Enter only the last four digits of the SSN. If the evaluator is a civilian or a member of a foreign service entry is OPTIONAL.

1.4.11.4.2. When the evaluator is an Air Reserve Technician (ART) or ANG Military Technician use the military grade and duty title.

1.4.11.5. General Officer (GO) Signature Blocks. The CSAF approved a standardized signature block for GOs to eliminate confusion for those generals performing duties at the higher level. 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.

1.4.11.5.1. For Brig Gen:

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

1.4.11.5.1.2. Frocked: For all evaluations sign as “Brig Gen.”

1.4.11.5.1.3. Upon Senate confirmation of selection to Brigadier General of a Colonel who is already the designated senior rater for the Lieutenants through Majors in an organization, the ML must realign their SRIDs and re-designate the selectee as the SR for the Lieutenant Colonels of the organization.

1.4.11.5.2. For Maj Gen:

1.4.11.5.2.1. Selects: Upon Senate confirmation, selects may sign all evaluations as “Maj Gen (Sel).”

1.4.11.5.2.2. Frocked: For all evaluations sign as “Maj Gen.”

1.4.11.5.3. All Others:

1.4.11.5.3.1. Single Evaluator. An evaluator must be an O-6 or a GS-15, YC-03 (or equivalent) and designated as a SR appointed by the Management Level to close out an evaluation as a single evaluator. If the rater is a SR, the evaluation must close out at this level unless it is a referral evaluation. Also see definition of final evaluator.

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

1.4.11.5.4. Senior Executive Services (SES)/General Officer (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 by 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. 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.

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/senior rater.

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 MSgt through CMSgt, no more than three evaluators (the rater, additional rater, and reviewer) will evaluate the ratee's performance.

1.5.1.2.2. For AB through TSgt, no more than two evaluators (rater and additional rater) will evaluate the ratee's performance.

1.5.1.3. AF Form 78 and AF Form 3538 forms require two evaluators.

1.5.1.4. PRFs and TRs only require one evaluator. **Exceptions:** 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 performance feedback and initiate performance evaluations. Usually 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 NCO of the United States or a foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee.

1.5.2.1.1.2.1. The rater must be at a minimum, in the grade of E-5 or higher.

1.5.2.1.1.2.2. Active duty SrA (E-4) may serve as raters only if they have completed Airmen Leadership School.

1.5.2.1.1.2.3. Only non-active duty USAFR members in the grade of SSgt (E-5) or above may serve as raters.

1.5.2.1.2. Civilian Raters.

1.5.2.1.2.1. For Officers.

1.5.2.1.2.1.1. Under the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) Pay Schedules/Pay Bands, civilian raters must be serving in a position higher in the rating chain than the ratee and, as a minimum, be in Pay Band 2 of pay schedules YC, YF, YJ, YN, YA, YD, YH, YG, YK and Pay Band 3 of YL pay.

1.5.2.1.2.1.2. Under the General Schedule (GS) system raters must be a civilian serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee.

1.5.2.1.2.2. For Enlisted.

1.5.2.1.2.2.1. A civilian rater must be at least a GS-5/Pay Band 1 or a comparable grade or higher and must be in a position higher than the ratee in the rating chain.

1.5.2.1.2.2.2. For MSgt – CMSgt. A civilian rater must be at least a GS-12 or

Pay Band 2 of Pay Schedule YC, YF, YJ, YN, YA, YD, YH, YG, YK or equivalent or Pay Band 3 of Pay Schedule YB, YE, YI, YL or equivalent.

1.5.2.1.3. For 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 management. IMAs will not rate Active Duty personnel, under any circumstances.

1.5.2.1.4. Management may appoint 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.

1.5.2.2. Additional Rater (*Rater's Rater*).

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

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. 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.

1.5.2.2.3.2.1. When the rater's rater does not meet this requirement, the additional rater will be the next evaluator in the rating (supervisory) chain that meets the requirement.

1.5.2.2.3.2.2. The additional rater will also be considered the final evaluator unless:

1.5.2.2.3.2.2.1. The rater qualifies as a single evaluator.

1.5.2.2.3.2.2.2. The additional rater refers the evaluation.

1.5.2.2.3.2.2.3. The ratee is TIG eligible and the report is forwarded for a senior rater endorsement.

1.5.2.2.3.2.3. For AB through 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.

1.5.2.2.3.2.4. For MSgt through CMSgt (AF Form 911). The additional rater must be 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.

1.5.2.2.4.1.1. Under the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) Pay Schedules/Pay Bands, civilian additional raters must as a minimum, be in Pay Band 2 of pay schedules YC, YF, YJ, YN, YA, YD, YH, YG, YK and Pay Band 3 of YL pay.

1.5.2.2.4.1.2. Under the General Schedule (GS) system 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 Pay Band 1 of Pay Schedule YC, YF, YJ, YL, OR YN, OR Pay Band 2 of any nonsupervisory Pay Schedule or equivalent.

1.5.2.2.4.2.2. For MSgt – CMSgt. A civilian additional rater must be at least a GS-12 or Pay Band 2 of Pay Schedule YC, YF, YJ, YN, YA, YD, YH, YG, YK or equivalent or Pay Band 3 of Pay Schedule YB, YE, YI, YL or equivalent.

1.5.2.2.5. For ANG/USAFR AGR personnel AB through TSgt. The additional rater will be the full-time supervisor of the rater. The additional rater for AB through TSgt will be of the United States or a foreign military service serving in the grade of MSgt (E-7) or above or civilian equivalent. The additional rater for MSgt through CMSgt must be at least a Captain (O-3) or civilian equivalent of the United States or a foreign military service.

1.5.2.2.6. For EAD officers and all IMAs. The additional rater is defined in the paragraphs above *and* must be in the active duty rating chain.

1.5.2.3. Reviewer/Senior Rater/Final Evaluator. All senior raters must be the person holding the senior rater position designated by the Management Level (ML) for the ratee's assigned organizational Personnel Accounting Symbol (PAS) (see paragraphs 8.1.4.3.1 and 8.1.4.3.2).

1.5.2.3.1. Senior Raters/Reviewer/Final Evaluator. **Note:** The Head of a Management Level (normally MAJCOM/CC) must designate all SR positions. Appointment of command (G-Series orders) does not authorize Senior Rater status.

1.5.2.3.1.1. For officers. The reviewer must be the ratee's senior rater and will be the final evaluator on the OPR. **Exceptions:** When the rater or additional rater is also the senior rater, the OPR will close-out at this level (see Table 3.1). Also, when a senior rater refers the evaluation, the officer named in the referral memorandum becomes the final evaluator, unless he/she refers the evaluation again (see paragraph 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 senior rater 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 senior rater, 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 Adjutant General 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 USAFR unit assigned Majors and below.

1.5.2.3.1.2. For enlisted.

1.5.2.3.1.2.1. MSgt through CMSgt. The reviewer/final evaluator must be, at a minimum, an officer serving in the grade of O-4, civilian equivalent, (GS-12/ Supervisory Pay Band 2), or higher, but no higher in organization than the senior rater. For ANG AGR enlisted personnel, the final endorser must be the full-time unit commander. If there is no full-time unit commander, the final endorser will be the senior full-time officer. **Exception:** The CMSAF or a CMSgt serving as the Vice Commandant of the College of Enlisted Professional Military Education (PME) may endorse EPRs as a senior rater's deputy and may also be the reviewer/final evaluator.

1.5.2.3.1.2.2. 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.

1.5.2.3.1.2.3. If the member is time-in-grade (TIG) eligible for a senior rater endorsement see paragraph 3.1.11 and Table 3.10.

1.5.2.3.2. Civilian Raters

1.5.2.3.2.1. For officers.

1.5.2.3.2.1.1. 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 Management Level and at least a GS-15, or Pay Band 3 of Pay Schedule YC, YF, YJ, YN, YA, YD, YH, YG, YK or Pay Band 4 of Pay Schedule YL.

1.5.2.3.2.1.2. 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 Management Level.

1.5.2.3.2.2. For enlisted.

1.5.2.3.2.2.1. For MSgt – CMSgt. A civilian final reviewer must be at least a GS-12 or Pay Band 2 of Pay Schedule YC, YF, YJ, YN, YA, YD, YH, YG, YK or equivalent or Pay Band 3 of Pay Schedule YB, YE, YI, YL or equivalent.

1.5.2.3.2.2.2. For MSgt – CMSgt. 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, or Pay Band 3 of Pay YC, YF, YJ, YN, YA, YD, YH, YG, YK, or Pay Band 4 of Pay Schedule YL if closing out an evaluation.

1.6. Responsibilities.

1.6.1. 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:

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

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

1.6.1.3. Spelling accuracy and proper bullet structure.

1.6.1.4. Evaluations do not contain inappropriate comments or recommendations.

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

1.6.1.6. Evaluations are properly referred, when necessary.

1.6.1.7. Evaluations are accomplished IAW this AFI.

1.6.2. Rater.

1.6.2.1. Must have a minimum number of days supervision; see the applicable Table for the type of evaluation to be prepared.

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

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

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

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

1.6.2.6. Gets 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. For Reservists, they should provide information to the supervisor to assist in the preparation of the evaluation. This may include end-of-tour evaluations.

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

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

1.6.2.9. Although some evaluators may not know any other ratee serving in a particular grade and Air Force Specialty Code (AFSC), they may rate according to their opinions and impressions of the general level of performance of Air Force personnel in the various grades.

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

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

1.6.3. Additional Rater.

1.6.3.1. There is no minimum number of days supervision required. **Exception:** See paragraph 1.7.2.

1.6.3.2. 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.

1.6.3.3. Completes Section V of the OPR or Section VI of the EPR by concurring or nonconcurring with the rater and making comments.

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

1.6.3.5. See paragraph 1.7. if the additional rater changes after the close out date of the evaluation.

1.6.4. Reviewer/Senior Rater/Final Evaluator. See paragraph 1.5.2.3.

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 Unfavorable Information File (UIF) and/or Personal Information File (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. Obtains additional information, if necessary, from competent sources such as the ratee's second and third line supervisor, etc.

- 1.6.4.4. When appropriate, nonconcur with previous evaluators and makes comments.
- 1.6.4.5. Approves (SR) unit mission descriptions for the PRF.
- 1.6.4.6. Directs the additional rater to assume rater's responsibilities when paragraph 1.7. applies.
- 1.6.4.7. Completes performance evaluations as required. See applicable chapters and/or references cited in paragraph 1.2.1.
- 1.6.5. First Sergeant or Designated SNCO.
 - 1.6.5.1. Will not assume rater/additional rater responsibilities. **Exception:** There is absolutely no one else available.
 - 1.6.5.2. 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.
 - 1.6.5.3. Will review all enlisted evaluations before the commander's review and advise the commander of any quality force indicators. Not applicable for ANG.
- 1.6.6. Unit Commander, Civilian Director or Other Senior Official Designated in Writing.
 - 1.6.6.1. Conducts the commander's review on EPRs (see Table 3.2.).
 - 1.6.6.2. Must be aware of the contents of any Unfavorable Information File (UIF) and/or Personal Information File (PIF), if applicable, and returns the evaluation to the rater for reconsideration, if appropriate, to ensure an accurate, unbiased, and an uninflated evaluation.
 - 1.6.6.3. The review will be conducted only by the administrative commander/civilian directors/other authorized reviewers. **Example:** Civilians who lead units in a squadron commander position, commanders/squadron section commanders, or in their absence, an officer so designated on G-series orders having administrative jurisdiction(i.e., control roster action, Article 15 jurisdiction, etc.) of the ratee's assigned organization. See Attachment 1 for definitions.
 - 1.6.6.4. Flight commanders do not qualify. See paragraph 1.7.1.2.
 - 1.6.6.5. Commandants for SNCOA/NCOA designated in writing by the commander may perform the commander's review on EPRs.
 - 1.6.6.6. Manages the performance evaluation program for the organization.
 - 1.6.6.7. Ensures all evaluations accurately describe performance and make realistic recommendations for advancement.
 - 1.6.6.8. Prepares and maintains the unit mission description for the PRF.
 - 1.6.6.9. Determines the rating chain for assigned personnel based on Air Force and ML policy.
 - 1.6.6.9.1. The ratee's parent ML must approve rating chains that involve evaluators from other MLs.

1.6.6.9.2. The following applies to flight commander and flight chief rating chains and applies to both the operational and functional communities. 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.

1.6.6.9.3. NAFs: Support functions (i.e., protocol, comptroller, public affairs, and historian) and Director of Staff positions not be placed in NAFs. Support functions will be obtained from the host wing (i.e., authorizations are within the host wing with assigned personnel working for the wing as well as supporting the NAF) and that Director of Staff positions are limited to MAJCOM Headquarters. The rating chain/Senior Rater for the individuals filling these support billets originates and resides in the wings, not the NAF.

1.6.6.9.4. For rating chain deviations see paragraph 1.7.

1.6.6.10. Ensures first-time supervisors receive specific, mandatory training within 60 days of being assigned supervisory duties and ensures all unit members receive general OES/EES training on a recurring basis. To assist commanders in fulfilling this responsibility, the OES/EES Training Guides were developed and are available on the Evaluations Web site through the HQ AFPC Web Page.

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

1.6.6.12. Ensures the first sergeant (or designated senior NCO) conducts a quality force review on all EPRs before conducting the commander's review.

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

1.6.7.1. Functional/Acquisition Examiner/Air Force Advisor Block

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

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

1.6.7.1.3. 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.

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

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

1.6.7.1.6. 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.

1.6.7.1.7. 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.

1.6.7.2. Air Force Advisor Program.

1.6.7.2.1. 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. **Exception:** *When the ratee is a Non-EAD ANG officer.*

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

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

1.6.7.2.1.1.2. For senior NCOs, the advisor will be serving in the grade of major or above.

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

1.6.7.2.1.1.4. For IMAs and participating IRR members, the advisor is the person appointed by the ML for the active force.

1.6.7.2.1.2. Where 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.

1.6.7.2.1.3. If the commander or other senior official designated in writing by the commander who completes the "commander's review" on an EPR is senior 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 the grade requirement in paragraph 1.6.6.3 the commander doesn't need to complete an advisor statement.

1.6.7.2.2. The advisor will sign after the final evaluator regardless of rank.

1.6.7.2.3. 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 senior rater (officers) or final evaluator (enlisted). Additionally, an O-6 cannot sign on another O-6.

1.6.7.2.4. If the last evaluator, the Air Force Advisor sends the performance evaluation to the rater to finalize the evaluation.

1.6.7.3. 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).

1.6.7.4. Acquisition Examiner.

1.6.7.4.1. 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).

1.6.7.4.2. 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.

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

1.6.7.4.4. 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:

1.6.7.4.4.1. O-6 or civilian equivalent on a Critical Acquisition Position (for officers).

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

1.6.7.4.5. The Acquisition Examiner accomplishes the acquisition examination after the entire rating chain has completed the performance evaluation and reflects the examination in Section VII of the AF Form 707 and AF Form 910, and in Section X of the AF Form 911.

1.6.7.4.6. Comments are not mandatory, but if desired for *clarification* about *acquisition-related* considerations, the examiner prepares an AF Form 77 according to Table 4.1. 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.

1.6.8. Ratee.

1.6.8.1. The ratee is equally responsible for ensuring they know their rating chain and that they receive feedback IAW Chapter 2.

1.6.8.2. For OPR/EPR responsibilities see Chapter 3.

1.6.8.3. For PRF responsibilities see Chapter 8.

1.6.8.4. For appeals see Chapter 10.

1.6.8.5. Ratee Review. Some evaluations require the evaluation to 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. However, if the data is administratively accurate and it is just a matter where the ratee disagrees 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, rather they are acknowledging that the rater has performed a feedback session in conjunction with presenting them with the evaluation and they have reviewed the evaluation for administrative errors. If the ratee disagrees with the content (comments and/or ratings) they may file an appeal IAW Chapter 10, after the evaluation becomes a matter of record. **Note:** A PFW is not required at this time; the OPR/EPR is the official documentation of the feedback.

1.6.9. Base Level Military Personnel Section.

1.6.9.1. The MPS will administer the base Officer/Enlisted Evaluations System (OES/EES) for units and Geographically Separated Units (GSUs) under their control. This includes reviewing all evaluations for administrative accuracy and policy compliance prior to forwarding the evaluation to AFPC/ARPC. **Exception:** USAFR/ANG MPSs process evaluations IAW PSD Handbook.

1.6.9.2. Send performance evaluation notices to the rater and, when applicable, attach any Letters of Evaluation (LOEs) for the reporting period to the notices.

1.6.9.3. Provide technical assistance to the commander and evaluators.

1.6.9.4. When applicable, update data into the appropriate system according to the PSD handbook.

1.6.9.5. When applicable, evaluations will be routed within the unit and MPS through final processing and then forwarded to AFPC or ARPC as appropriate, via the CMS evaluation application or the vPC-GR for digitally signed evaluations. Wet signature evaluations headed to AFPC will be hand carried or mailed. Wet signature evaluations headed to ARPC will be scanned via vPC-GR or CMS with certified true statement.

1.6.9.6. When applicable, ensure all hard copy evaluations (previous edition and current edition) are updated in the appropriate system and distributed in accordance with Table 3.5., Table 3.6., and Table 3.9.

1.6.10. Major Commands (MAJCOM). Unless specifically stated elsewhere in this AFI the MAJCOM has limited responsibilities.

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

- 1.6.11.1. Designate senior rater positions and determine civilian equivalency for senior rater designations. **Note:** If CV is assuming CC responsibilities and the ML wants them to have senior rater responsibilities, the ML must appoint the CV senior rater responsibilities.
- 1.6.11.2. Manage the performance evaluation program for their activity, and at their option, quality review OPRs and return them for correction, when necessary.
- 1.6.11.3. Print copies of digitally signed evaluations from the Automated Records Management System (ARMS). **Exception:** See Table 3.5., Table 3.6., and Table 3.9.
- 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. United States Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower, Personnel and Services (USAF/A1). Establishes and approves policy regarding the Air Force Officer/Enlisted Evaluations System (OES/EES).
- 1.6.13. Headquarters Air Force Personnel Center Evaluation Programs Section (HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP).
- 1.6.13.1. Manages the Air Force Officer/Enlisted Evaluations System (OES/EES) program Air Force-wide.
- 1.6.13.2. Receives all active duty digitally signed evaluations via CMS, and wet signed evaluations via mail.
- 1.6.13.3. Reviews all referral evaluations on officers (lieutenant through lieutenant colonel), SNCOs and a random selection of all other evaluations for compliance with policy directives and this instruction. When necessary, returns them for correction.
- 1.6.13.4. Forwards all Active Duty evaluations to ARMS.
- 1.6.13.5. File the OPR in the HQ USAF OSR and file the EPR (MSgts through SMSgts) in the NSR. Colonels/CMSgt evaluations will be filed with AF/DPO and DPE.
- 1.6.14. Headquarters Air Force Reserve Personnel Center (HQ ARPC).
- 1.6.14.1. Manages the performance evaluation program for Active Guard/Reserve (AGR), LEAD members, Non-EAD officers, and enlisted members Air Force-wide. NGB/A1P will provide guidance on the performance evaluation program for enlisted personnel.
- 1.6.14.2. Receives all evaluations for Active Guard/Reserve (AGR), LEAD members, Non-EAD officers/enlisted members.
- 1.6.14.3. Reviews all referral evaluations on officers (lieutenant through colonel), SNCOs and a random selection for AGR, LEAD members, non-EAD officers/enlisted members and return them for correction, if necessary.

1.6.14.4. Updates all evaluations into MILPDS.

1.6.14.5. Forwards evaluations to ARMS at ARPC.

1.6.14.6. Files evaluation in the OSR at HQ ARPC.

1.6.15. Joint Forces Headquarters Human Resources Office (HQ/HRO). Joint Forces Headquarters, Human Resource Office, in coordination with each assigned wing, will be responsible for effectively managing the performance evaluation program for applicable AGR enlisted personnel.

1.7. Rating Chain Deviations and Evaluator Changes. 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, Separated or Retired will still accomplish the evaluations they are 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. The ratee's parent ML must approve rating chains that involve evaluators from other MLs. **Note:** 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. 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 senior rater) the opportunity to endorse or comment in an evaluation.

1.7.1.1.1. 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/senior rater to finalize the evaluation/endorsement. This allows for maximum operational integration and reporting accuracy while still meeting administrative (PAS code driven) requirements. **NOTE:** When the above rating chain scheme is used, all other evaluation policies/procedures still apply (i.e. only one senior rater and one general officer on a report, etc).

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. Assigned to the Air Force Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance Agency (AFISR): The evaluations of the NSA field site directors at NSA/CSS/HR Specialist/HR Specialist Texas, Misawa Cryptologic Group, and Menwith Hill Station will have

DIRNSA as the additional rater. The reviewer for these evaluations will be AFISR/CC. This will result in the reviewer being lower in rank than the additional rater. In this case, enter the applicable mandatory statement IAW paragraph 1.11.5.1. in the feedback comment section of the evaluation.

1.7.1.4. ISR 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 senior rater/reviewer. Management Level will be the respective supported MAJCOM commander. AFISRA/CC will endorse each officer's report in the Functional Examiner/Air Force Advisor block. This policy will apply to current and future ISR groups and 480 IW with the same configuration. This exception to policy applies only to ISR Group Commanders. All other ISR personnel will follow their normal rating chains IAW this instruction.

1.7.1.5. Senior Defense Official/Defense Attaché (SDO/DATT) Program in PACOM Area of Responsibility.

1.7.1.5.1. SDO/DATT personnel will be rated by Director, DIA.

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

1.7.1.5.3. For individuals owned by COCOM, normal processing procedures apply. Reviewer statement will read IAW paragraph 1.11.3. PRFs in these cases, will be accomplished by COCOM.

1.7.1.5.4. For individuals owned by DIA, reviewer statement will read IAW paragraph 1.11.3. and comments will still be allowed in the additional rater block by COCOM.

1.7.1.5.5. Enter the required statement IAW paragraph 1.11.5.1. on all evaluations.

1.7.1.6. If the grade of the home station senior rater 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 IAW paragraph 1.11.5.2.

1.7.1.7. Currently paragraph 1.4.11.5.3.2., prohibits multiple general officer from serving as evaluators on performance evaluations. However, for those personnel filling an authorized 365-day deployment billet multiple general officers is authorized. When applicable, enter the required statement IAW paragraph 1.11.5.1.

1.7.1.8. The senior rater is normally the ranking evaluator on the evaluation. However, for personnel filling an authorized 365-day extended deployment billet, this may not always be the case. Therefore when applicable, enter the required statement IAW paragraph 1.11.5.2. in the feedback section of the evaluation.

1.7.1.9. In cases where the rater is a general officer (single evaluator) on an evaluation written on an individual filling an authorized 365-day deployment billet, enter the statement required IAW paragraph 1.11.3.

1.7.1.10. General Officers signing referral reports. If the senior rater is a general officer, and is the evaluator who refers the evaluation, the referral document will be the senior rater's rater regardless of rank. Enter the required statement IAW paragraph 1.11.5.1.

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 senior rater. 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/senior rater (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/feedback dates of the original rater. When this occurs, a statement explaining why the rater did not prepare the evaluation must be included in the feedback portion of the evaluation, Section VI (OPR) or Section V (EPR).

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 MPS/CSS/HR Specialist to the Senior Rater for approval.

1.7.2.4. If unusual circumstances dictate sufficient knowledge cannot be obtained, HQ AFPC/DPSIDE, AF/DPO, AF/DPE, AF/DPG, the HQ ARPC/DPBR, NGB/A1P, NGB/OM or NGB-GO (for ANG general officers including brigadier general selects, not on EAD) 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 senior rater, he or she completes the Additional Rater's Comments section of the applicable form and closes the evaluation.

1.8. Evaluator Accountability. Raters ensure personnel they supervise receive performance feedback to improve performance and contributions to mission accomplishment. In deciding whether to record adverse information on the performance evaluation, evaluators must consider the following: The vast majority of Air Force personnel 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 personnel competing for promotion. Additionally, evaluators must consider items listed below when assessing performance and potential, and specifically mention them in evaluations when appropriate:

1.8.1. Adverse Information. If a member has been convicted by a court-martial, comments relating to the ratee's behavior are mandatory on the ratee's next OPR, EPR or TR and the evaluation becomes a referral. However, comments on individuals who have been found guilty, pled guilty or *nolo contendere* (no contest), of a reportable civilian offense as described below are strongly encouraged.

1.8.1.1. Self-reporting of Civilian Offenses. To assist supervisors in preparing evaluations, all Airmen above the pay grade of E-6 are required to report information about civilian offenses to their supervisors (Ref: National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2006, Public Law 109-163, §554, 119 Statue 3136, 3264-65). For guidance on interpreting this paragraph and sub-paragraphs, supervisors and commanders should consult the servicing staff judge advocate.

1.8.1.1.1. All commissioned officers, and enlisted members above the pay grade of E-6 (E-7 and above), who are on active duty or in an active status in a Reserve Component, shall report in writing any conviction of such member for a violation of a criminal law of the United States—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 first-line military supervisor or summary court-martial convening authority, or in the case of a member of the individual ready reserve, standby reserve, or ANG to the Air Reserve Personnel Center or Air National Guard Bureau, whichever is applicable, in accordance with the requirements below.

1.8.1.1.2. 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.

1.8.1.1.3. 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.

1.8.1.1.4. Active duty members shall submit reports under this policy within 15 days 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.

1.8.1.1.5. 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.

1.8.1.1.6. 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 memorandum. 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 court-martial convening authority may provide information of a conviction covered under this policy.

1.8.1.2. For PRFs, if a member has been convicted by a court-martial, comments relating to the ratee's behavior are mandatory on the ratee's next PRF. However, comments on individuals who have been found guilty, pled guilty or *nolo contendere* (no contest), of a reportable civilian offense as described above are strongly encouraged.

1.8.1.3. When making the decision to record adverse information in evaluations, evaluators must consider the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.8.1.4. 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.”

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

1.8.3. Fitness Testing and Education and Intervention Programs. All personnel must meet established standards IAW AFI 36-2905. Failure to meet fitness requirements or minimum fitness scores will result in a referral evaluation, unless exempt from fitness, see paragraph 1.4.10.3. Additionally, failure to progress satisfactorily in the Education and Intervention Programs reflects poorly on the Air Force and the Airman. Unsatisfactory progress in the FIT program should be considered and should be documented on any evaluation by providing specific comments on the behavior that led to the unsatisfactory progress and/or failure, with compatible ratings on OPRs/EPRs.

1.8.4. 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, *Manager’s Internal Control Program Procedures*, provides specifics of the Management Control Program.

1.8.5. 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 AFI 38-401, *The Air Force Innovative Development Through Employee Awareness (IDEA) Program* fall in this category.

1.8.6. Occupational Safety and Health. Consider how commanders, managers, and supervisors discharge their responsibilities under AFI 91-301, *Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health (AFOSH) Program*.

1.8.7. 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.

1.8.8. 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.

1.8.9. 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.

1.8.10. 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.

1.8.11. 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 Jones 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 Military Personnel Data System. When an evaluation contains two different ratings due to an unresolved disagreement, the final evaluator's (including the commander) rating will be updated in the military data system. For example: On an enlisted evaluation the rater gives the ratee an overall "5" rating, but the additional rater disagrees and downgrades the rating to an overall "4" rating, the overall "4" rating will be updated in the military personnel data system. Likewise, if the rater gives the ratee an overall "4" rating and the additional rater agrees, but the commander disagrees and upgrades the rating to an overall "5" rating, the overall "5" rating is updated in the military personnel data system. **Note:** Two different evaluators can observe the same performance, but assess it differently. The explanation should state specifically what the difference(s) are. Unless the evaluation is a referral, limit comments to the space provided.

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 White's potential is limited." They do not fully explain the incident or behavior, nor do they justify how and why their potential is limited, see paragraph 1.12.7.3.2. for examples of acceptable statements. When doubt arises as to whether a comment is a referral comment or not, refer the evaluation. Also see paragraph 1.12.7. **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. Referral evaluations will not be processed electronically, but will be accomplished, printed and contain "wet" (handwritten) signatures only. Dates will be handwritten, stamped or typed. As a referral evaluation could be detrimental to an individual, face-to-face interaction is required.

1.10.2.4. If a subsequent evaluator whose comments initially causes an evaluation to become a referral evaluation, 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 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 VI of the 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 an AF Form 77 (each evaluator uses a separate form). Comments are limited to the space on the front of the form and each evaluator will use only 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.

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. See paragraph 1.4.2.5. for routing procedures.

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

1.10.2.12. 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. The key here is to keep the evaluation in the ratee’s rating chain.

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. 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, a “Does Not Meet Standards” fitness assessment, unsatisfactory progress in the Fitness Education and

Intervention Programs, confirmed incidents of discrimination or mistreatment, illegal use or possession of drugs, AWOL, Article 15 action, and conviction by courts-martial.

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.

1.10.3.3. An evaluator marks "Does Not Meet Standards" in Section III of the EPR.

1.10.3.4. An evaluator marks an overall "1" (Poor) or "2" (Needs Improvement) in Section V of the EPR.

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, see paragraph 1.10.5.4.1.

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 evaluator immediately preceding the commander's review refers the evaluation, the commander completes the review and may comment on the evaluation, using an AF Form 77. However, the additional rater or the reviewer, as applicable, is the individual named in the referral document and will review the ratee's comments. If the commander is normally the next evaluator on the evaluation (i.e., the additional rater or reviewer), place comments in the appropriate section of the EPR and only use an AF Form 77 if additional space is needed.

1.10.4.5.1. When the commander's review is performed *before* the additional rater or reviewer makes comments and the *commander* refers the evaluation, the additional rater or the reviewer, as applicable, is the individual named in the referral document.

1.10.4.5.2. When the commander's review occurs *after* all evaluators have made comments and the commander refers the evaluation, the *commander's rater* is the individual named in the referral document.

1.10.4.5.3. When the commander's review is performed by an ADCON commander and has occurred after all evaluators have made comments and the commander refers the evaluation, the individual named in the referral document must be the next evaluator in the ratee's rating chain who is of equal grade or higher than the ADCON commander. **Example:** A FSS commander and the wing staff; and an AF unit commander in a Joint environment.

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. and Table 3.2. (Enlisted), Table 3.1. (Officers), paragraph 1.10.6.4. (Training Reports) or Table 4.1. (Letter of Evaluations), whichever is applicable. **Note:** The date the rater signs the evaluation and the date of the referral memo 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, 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. If content changes are made to the evaluation before the evaluation becomes a matter of record, this referral procedure must be re-accomplished.

1.10.5.1.5. 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), 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. The 10-single side page restriction is necessary due to storage limitations.

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.

1.10.5.2.5. ANG AGR personnel will forward the rebuttal comments and any attachments through their full-time chain of command to the Adjutant General.

1.10.5.2.6. ANG statutory tour personnel will forward the rebuttal comments and any attachments through their chain of command to NGB/CF.

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 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 have passed, even if the ratee has indicated that he/she will not submit comments.

1.10.5.3.2. After 3 duty days 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. Return rebuttal documents that are more than 10 pages (5 pages front and back).

1.10.5.3.2.3. Prepare the endorsement with the applicable mandatory statement:

1.10.5.3.2.3.1. 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.

1.10.5.3.2.3.2. 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. There must be a minimum of two bullets. Evaluators are required to comment on the ratee's duty performance, in addition to one of the above mandatory statements. **Exception:** Those evaluators who normally do not comment on the evaluation; only use one of the mandatory comments above.

1.10.5.3.4. Ensure the date referenced (paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.3.1.) is the date of the referral document (either the form or the memorandum) and not the evaluation close-out date or the date of the ratee's rebuttal.

1.10.5.3.5. Forward the evaluation with all attachments to the next evaluator. If this evaluator 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. Enter identification data required by Table 4.1.

1.10.5.4.5. If the evaluator on the AF Form 77 is other than an Air Force officer, Air Force NCO, or Department of the Air Force (DAF) civilian, obtain an Air Force Advisor review.

1.10.5.4.6. An additional rater or reviewer who decides to refer an evaluation due to a 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.

1.10.5.4.7. If, after referral, a subsequent evaluator upgrades the ratings and/or invalidates the referral comments so the conditions defined in paragraphs 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.

1.10.5.4.8. If, after referral, a subsequent evaluator upgrades ratings or comments but the conditions defined in paragraphs 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.

1.10.5.4.9. 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 the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) does not concur with the comments or ratings of the previous evaluator, the endorsement will so state. When the disagreement pertains to one or more of the previous evaluator's ratings in Section III and IX, Performance Factors (OPR) or Sections III or V (EPR), he or she initials the block(s) deemed more appropriate or, if the block already contains initials or an "X", initials to the immediate right of the block.

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 memo 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. **Note:** The referral evaluation must be accomplished in "wet signature."

1.10.5.6. MPS's. The MPS coordinates referral reports with appropriate work centers in the MPS to ensure MilPDS updates are accomplished.

1.10.6. Referral Procedures.

1.10.6.1. Referral OPRs. The 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 IAW Figure 1.1.

1.10.6.3. Referral Letter of Evaluations (LOEs).

1.10.6.3.1. Deployed Commander LOEs. Complete the AF Form 77 IAW Table 4.1. and paragraph 5.4. for Deployed CC LOE procedures. The referral process is accomplished on the form itself.

1.10.6.3.2. All Other LOEs.

1.10.6.3.2.1. Designated Rater. If an LOE prepared by the officially designated rater would contain referral comments, the rater prepares an OPR/EPR IAW paragraph 1.10.6.1 or 1.10.6.2., whichever is applicable. 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 4.1. 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 Training Report 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 1.10.5.3.2.3.1. or paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.3.2., and endorses the Training Report 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 (**Example:** See paragraph 1.11.3.) and should be entered on the evaluation exactly as shown. Acceptability of comments that deviate slightly from the AFI will be handled on a case-by-case basis. Entries deviating greatly are not acceptable.

1.11.1. For a referral LOE, EPR/OPR, or TR, the evaluator named in the referral document (Referral Reviewer) must comment as required by paragraph 1.10.5.3.2.3.

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, 910, and 911, see paragraph 1.7.2.2.

1.11.3. If the OPR rater is also the reviewer, leave Section V, *Additional Rater's Overall Assessment*, blank and place the following statement in Section VI, *the 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 comments in Section V, *Additional Rater Overall Assessment*, and place the following statement in Section VI, *the Reviewer's comments* block: "*THE ADDITIONAL RATER IS ALSO THE REVIEWER.*" The additional rater signs both the additional rater and the reviewer block.

1.11.4. When an EPR rater qualifies as a single evaluator or as the reviewer, enter the statement "*THIS SECTION NOT USED*" in the comment area of Section VI, *Additional Rater's Comments* (AF Forms 910 and 911), and Section VII, *Reviewer's Comments* (AF Form 911) of the EPR. Also enter "*THIS SECTION NOT USED*" in Section VII, *Reviewer's Comments* (AF Form 911), when the additional rater is also the senior rater/reviewer, or qualifies as a final evaluator and closes out the evaluation. The evaluator will digitally sign the blocks with his/her comments. Signature elements are optional for blocks containing statement "*THIS SECTION NOT USED.*"

1.11.5. Mandatory Comments for Authorized Exceptions. When authorized IAW paragraph 1.7., place the following applicable statement(s) in the feedback comments section of AF Forms 707, 910 and 911:

1.11.5.1. When applicable enter the statement: "*Two GOs auth IAW AFI 36-2406, para 1.7.*"

1.11.5.2. When applicable enter the statement: "*Reviewer's rank is lower than additional rater.*"

1.11.6. See paragraph 1.9. for significant disagreements.

1.11.7. 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 senior rater. Senior raters 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., Note 5).

1.11.8. If a member has been convicted by a court-martial, comments relating to the ratee's behavior are mandatory on the ratee's next OPR, EPR, TR or PRF. However, comments on individuals who have been found guilty, pled guilty or *nolo contendere* (no contest), of a reportable civilian offense are strongly encouraged, (see paragraph 1.8.1).

1.11.9. If performance feedback was not accomplished, state the reason why it was not accomplished. Rationale must be placed in the Performance Feedback Certification block,

and it must be honest, plausible and specific, such as “Midterm feedback not conducted due to only 58 days supervision between initial feedback and the evaluation close-out date,” or “Rater did not conduct feedback.” Non-receipt of a feedback notice, and “administrative oversight,” etc., are *not* acceptable reasons.

1.11.10. See paragraph 1.10.5.3.2 for the mandatory comments required on referral evaluations.

1.11.11. See paragraph 1.8.1 for comments on adverse actions.

1.11.12. See paragraph 1.9 for comments required for disagreements.

1.12. 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 the following paragraphs, do not consider, refer to, or include comments regarding:

1.12.1. Inappropriate Stratification and Broad Statements.

1.12.1.1. Stratification statements, when authorized are not mandatory. The omission of stratification does not constitute an error or injustice.

1.12.1.2. 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.

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

1.12.1.3.1. The Communications Squadron Commander, as the Communications Functional on a base, cannot compare Information Management (IM) personnel assigned to other units on the base.

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

1.12.1.3.3. A MAJCOM/A1 cannot compare someone on his/her staff to all personnel officers in the command.

1.12.1.3.3.1. “The best civil engineer in the business” (outside his/her scope of responsibility, because he or she does not have knowledge of *all* civil engineers).

1.12.1.3.3.2. Similarly, phrases such as “top 5% officer” or “clearly a top 1% SNCO” are inappropriate because the evaluator does not have first-hand knowledge of *all* Air Force officers or SNCOs.

1.12.1.3.4. An evaluator cannot use the stratification of a higher level evaluator or quote a higher level evaluator. Exception is that the use of a Senior Rater stratification may be quoted if the Senior Rater is a signator 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:

1.12.1.3.4.1. “#2 of 72 Majors in the group” (out of squadron/cc’s scope of responsibility).

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

1.12.1.4. Officer Evaluations.

1.12.1.4.1. (**Applicable to officer evaluations only**) . An evaluator (must be a signator) may stratify at a level below, as long as it is within his/her scope of responsibility. For instance

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

1.12.1.4.1.2. The MSG commander can state: “#2 of 6 MSG Cpts,” or “1/4 Lt’s 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.

1.12.1.4.1.3. A squadron commander can only stratify within the squadron, or down (flight); not up (group or wing). Exception is that the use of a Senior Rater stratification may be quoted if the Senior Rater is a signator on the Officer Evaluation.

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

1.12.1.4.1.4.1. 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:** Stratification that is vague or lacks a qualified peer reference group is prohibited (Example, although not all inclusive, would be: “#1/5”; “#X of XX officers”; “#1/50 officers” or #1/200 personnel” as these do not identify a specific peer group).

1.12.1.4.1.4.2. Stratification within a rater’s authority: Senior raters may 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 (MAJCOM/A1 may not stratify an officer as “#1/75 38F FGOs in this MAJCOM.”) Exception: Quoting authorized stratification from deployed LOEs.

1.12.1.4.1.4.3. Stratification quotes from Senior Leaders: May quote stratification by senior leaders in the chain of command provided the Senior Leader is a signator on the evaluation and does not provide comments (Sq/CC or Gp/CC could say “Wg/CC’s #1 of 50 Majors”). Note: Stratification quotes outside the ratee’s chain of command will remain prohibited (MSG/CC may

not state “OG/CC lauds as #1 LRO in my Group.” EXCEPTION: quoting from deployed LOEs). If a Gp/CC is not a signatory on the OPR, a Gp/CC stratification is not authorized (unless supported by an award, “CGO Qtr”).

1.12.1.4.1.4.4. Stratification in optional Deployed Letter of Evaluations (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. Note: As long as the stratification is not previously documented in the permanent record.

1.12.1.4.2. 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 1.12.3.

1.12.1.5. Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRFs).

1.12.1.5.1. On PRFs, stratification remarks may be quoted or attributed from OPRs provided that they are also quantified. **Example:** A statement on an OPR that says “Top 1% of all officers I have supervised” is an appropriately quantified stratification quote and may be included in PRFs.

1.12.1.5.2. However, 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.

1.12.1.6. Enlisted Evaluations.

1.12.1.6.1. Stratification statements will only be used on enlisted evaluations for MSgts and SMSgts who are Time-In-Grade (TIG) eligible for senior rater endorsement. **Note:** Eligibility does not apply to ANG/USAFR. Stratification and senior rater endorsements, (see paragraph 3.1.11), are not mandatory. The omission of a stratification statement and/or a senior rater endorsement does not constitute an error or injustice.

1.12.1.6.2. All Other EPRs. Stratification on all other EPRs, including CMSgt evaluations, are prohibited.

1.12.1.6.3. Stratification statements based on percentage, career field, or functional community are prohibited. For example, it is not appropriate to use “#1 SNCO,” or “#1 First Sergeant.”

1.12.1.6.4. Stratification statements must be based on the number of peers (same grade as the ratee, regardless of branch of service) assigned within the evaluator’s rating scheme (i.e., unit commander cannot state #1 of 189 MSgts in the group).

1.12.1.6.5. While all subordinate units/personnel are part of the senior rater’s chain of command, they are not necessarily part of the rating chain.

1.12.1.6.5.1. If the wing cc/director chooses to stratify an eligible MSgt/SMSgt,

the stratification must include all ratee peers in the wing cc/director's scope (at the wing cc/director's level).

1.12.1.6.5.2. In addition, it is not appropriate for a senior rater's stratification to include only personnel from a lower level (i.e., subordinate groups/units or to include personnel in other rating chains as part of the stratification denominator).

1.12.1.6.5.3. Additionally, evaluators will only stratify within their scope (at the evaluators level), not up or down. A group commander can only stratify within the group, not within one of the squadrons owned, nor up to the wing. For example:

1.12.1.6.5.3.1. A wing commander/director can state: "#3 of 27 MSgts in wing/directorate;" however, he/she cannot say "#3 of 27 MSgts in the MAJCOM/group/squadron."

1.12.1.6.5.3.2. A group cc can state: "2/6 MSgts in the group;" however, he/she cannot state "1/6 MSgts in the wing/squadron."

1.12.1.6.6. If the rater includes a stratification statement, it must be placed in the "Other Comments" block. If subsequent evaluators use stratification statements, they will be placed in their respective comment block.

1.12.1.6.7. Finally, stratification will not be based on awards (i.e., "1/50 SNCO of the quarter) as this would be inconsistent with keeping stratification limited to the members peer group (i.e., same grade).

1.12.1.7. Stratification on Letters of Evaluation (LOEs). Stratification on all LOEs is prohibited.

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

1.12.2.1. Officer Evaluations.

1.12.2.1.1. Promotion statements on officer evaluations are prohibited. **Exception:** Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRFs), see paragraph 1.12.2.2.

1.12.2.1.2. Evaluators will not make comments on officer evaluations such as "picked over higher ranking officers" or (on a major's evaluation) "filling a Lt Col billet." These types of comments are implied promotion statements and are therefore prohibited on officer evaluations. 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, see paragraph 1.12.3.

1.12.2.1.3. 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 Lt Cols being promoted to Colonel.

1.12.2.1.3.1. 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.

1.12.2.1.3.2. Referring to a major as the “Senior Chaplain” is authorized; however, referring to a major as “Performing senior leadership duties” is prohibited.

1.12.2.1.4. Statements acknowledging an officer’s *selection* for promotion during the reporting period are acceptable (**Example:** Maj Doe’s recent BPZ selection to Lt Col is right on target).

1.12.2.2. Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRFs). Promotion statements are reserved for the senior rater and will only be made on the Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF).

1.12.2.2.1. 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.

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

1.12.2.2.2.1. “Maj Doe is senior officer material.” (The term “Senior” is a euphemism for Colonel and above, therefore not authorized).

1.12.2.2.2.2. “Capt Doe has excelled in a major’s billet.” (Refers to a rank higher than the one the individual currently holds).

1.12.2.2.2.3. “Major Doe should be a group commander now.” (Recommends the individual for a position two grades higher than the ratee—not normal progression).

1.12.2.2.2.4. “Capt Doe is ready for our toughest field grade jobs.” (Compares a company grade officer with higher ranking (Field Grade) officers).

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

1.12.2.3. Enlisted Evaluations. Since promotion statements are allowed on enlisted evaluations, evaluators may make comments on enlisted evaluations that refer to the enlisted ratee’s next higher grade; however, comments are limited to one grade above the grade the ratee is currently holding. For example,

1.12.2.3.1. On a TSgt, “promote to MSgt, then select for First Sergeant Duty.” (Appropriate because it could be the next eligible grade/assignment for a TSgt).

1.12.2.3.2. However, the same statement would be inappropriate for a SSgt, because they must obtain the rank of TSgt before becoming eligible for a MSgt position and/or grade (even if the individual is a TSgt select).

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

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

1.12.3.2. Separation or retirement status. Comments referring to separation, retirement or transfer to reserve status are prohibited. However, comments may be warranted when an individual displays a reluctance to accept responsibility, a negative attitude toward the job, or exhibits a decrease in performance that can be reasonably attributed to a pending separation or retirement.

1.12.3.3. 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.

1.12.3.4. 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.

1.12.3.4.1. Evaluators may make one or more assignment recommendations in officer evaluations 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. A rated major, for instance, can be recommended for a job as the commander of a flying squadron if he has completed a tour or is currently in the position of squadron operations officer. Also, a Lt Col can be recommended for the position of group commander once they have served as a deputy group commander or are in such an assignment position that group commander is the next command step. **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.

1.12.3.4.2. 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.

1.12.3.4.3. 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).

1.12.3.4.3.1. 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 "PDE" SOS is the method for completion). **Example:**

1.12.3.4.3.1.1. For Lieutenant through Captain, a Primary Developmental Education (PDE) recommendation is appropriate until the officer has completed PDE in-residence.

1.12.3.4.3.1.2. For a Captain, once he or she completes PDE in-residence, an Intermediate Developmental Education (IDE) recommendation is appropriate.

1.12.3.4.3.1.3. 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.

1.12.3.4.4. 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 on the AF Form 3849, *PME/AFT/RTFB/Officer Worksheet*.

1.12.3.4.5. 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 his/her professional development.

1.12.3.4.5.1. Acceptable examples:

1.12.3.4.5.1.1. “*Make Capt Jones an MPS Chief.*” (Appropriate next level of progression).

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

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

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

1.12.3.4.5.1.5. 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.*”

1.12.3.4.5.1.6. 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.*”

1.12.3.4.5.2. Prohibited examples:

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

1.12.3.4.5.2.2. “*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).

1.12.3.4.5.2.3. “*SDE in 2008, Group Commander in 2009, and Wing Commander in 2011.*” (Goes beyond the scope of the next assignment).

1.12.3.4.5.2.4. “*Capt Phelps is ready to be a flying Sq/CC*” and “*Make Maj Brown a group commander.*” (In both cases, the recommendations are clearly beyond the officer’s next assignment and are viewed as veiled promotion)

statements).

1.12.3.4.6. Developmental Education (in residence or non-residence) and Advanced Academic Degree (AAD) education for officers.

1.12.3.4.6.1. Comments on OPRs regarding selection for, attendance at, or completion of an AAD are prohibited. When preparing OPRs, evaluators will not comment on selection status on the schools list, selection for, completion of, or enrollment in DE or AAD. Evaluators are limited to “PDE, IDE or SDE” terminology only and will not comment on specific schools, (i.e. ACSC, AWC, Joint, etc.). NOTE: An assignment recommendation for AFIT MS/Masters or PhD program is authorized.

1.12.3.4.6.2. When preparing Promotion Recommendations Forms (PRFs) and Retention Recommendation Forms (RRFs), senior raters may consider and comment on selection for, attendance at, or completion of an AAD on PRFs/RRFs. Officers designated to attend DE may receive comments such as: “On the way to IDE/SDE” or “Following IDE/SDE make him/her a (fill in with the appropriate job recommendation)” only on the PRF/RRF that closes out just prior to departure for DE. Evaluators are limited to “PDE, IDE or SDE” terminology only and will not comment on specific schools, (i.e. ACSC, AWC, Joint, etc.). The AF Form 3849, *PME, AFIT, RTFB Officer Worksheet*, is the proper venue for specific school recommendations.

1.12.3.4.6.3. When preparing OPRs and PRFs, evaluators may comment on Air War College non-residential program Outstanding Graduates. Unlike resident students, non-resident students do not receive a Training Report to document this achievement.

1.12.3.4.7. Enlisted PME Comments in EPRs.

1.12.3.4.7.1. The only permissible PME comments in EPRs will be those referencing selections for an official PME award (i.e., John Levitow Award, Academic Achievement Award, Distinguished Graduate, Commandant Award and Leadership Award) or completion of Senior Enlisted Joint Professional Military Education (SEJPME) courses (web based course). (See paragraph 1.12.3.3.7.2.3.2.)

1.12.3.4.7.1.1. 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 irrelevant and prohibited.

1.12.3.4.7.1.2. 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.

1.12.3.4.7.1.3. SEJPME.

1.12.3.4.7.1.3.1. SEJPME courses were created to provide SNCOs selected for joint assignments information to quickly assimilate and effectively contribute in the Joint environment. Many Airmen have been selected or

taken the initiative to complete these courses to prepare for the deployed environment. Additionally, many Airmen have completed the course to broaden their perspective even though they are not projected into a joint assignment.

1.12.3.4.7.1.3.2. Comments on completion of SEJPME courses are allowed for TSgts and above (except the SNCOA sister service equivalents (i.e., Navy SNCOA); however, completing these courses should not be used in an effort to square fill for evaluation board purposes. 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.

1.12.3.4.7.1.3.3. SEJPME courses is 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.

1.12.3.4.7.1.4. Comments referencing non-completion of CCAF or SNCOA as the reason for absence of a senior rater endorsement are prohibited.

1.12.4. Sensitive Information.

1.12.4.1. Classified Information. Do not enter classified information in any section of the form. See paragraph 1.3.2. for guidance.

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

1.12.4.3. 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

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

1.12.4.5. Temporary or Permanent Disqualification under AFI 36-2104, *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.

1.12.4.6. 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. See paragraph 1.4.10. for more details regarding fitness.

1.12.4.7. Medical Information. Only authorized medical officials are in a position to make comments on medical conditions; in extremely rare cases, this is authorized on performance evaluations and only if the evaluator is a medical professional. It is

important for evaluators to focus evaluation comments on the *behavior* and *duty performance* of the individual. The medical condition or diagnosis is prohibited.

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

1.12.5. Potential Discriminatory Factors and/or Information.

1.12.5.1. 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.

1.12.5.2. 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.

1.12.5.3. General Open Mess Membership. Comments regarding a ratee’s Open Mess Membership are prohibited.

1.12.5.4. Meeting Financial Goals for Combined Federal Campaign. 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, subparagraph (g) which prohibits “Using as a factor in a supervisor’s performance appraisal the results of the solicitation in the supervisor’s unit or organization.

1.12.5.5. Court-Martial Panel Membership. Do not consider performance as a member of a court-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.

1.12.6. Performance Outside the Reporting Period.

1.12.6.1. 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 1.12.6.5. and 1.12.7.1. However, since performance in past jobs is relevant in the preparation of PRFs, raters may include it on PRFs.

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

1.12.6.3. Performance Feedback. Evaluators do not refer to performance feedback sessions in any area of the performance evaluation except in the Performance Feedback Certification Block.

1.12.6.4. Events That Occur After the Close-Out Date.

1.12.6.4.1. 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 1.13. 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.

1.12.6.4.2. 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.

1.12.6.5. 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 court-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 senior raters 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, or 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.

1.12.7. Derogatory Information and Disciplinary Actions.

1.12.7.1. Conduct Based on Unreliable Information.

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

1.12.7.1.2. The rater should consult with the servicing staff judge advocate whenever any question exists whether this standard has been met.

1.12.7.1.3. 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.

1.12.7.1.4. 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, court-martial conviction, etc.

1.12.7.1.5. 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 1.13.2.2.

1.12.7.2. Acquittals or Similar Results.

1.12.7.2.1. 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.”

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

1.12.7.2.3. A determination as to the appropriateness of doing so should be made only after consultation with the servicing staff judge advocate.

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

1.12.7.2.5. 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.

1.12.7.3. 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.).

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

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

1.12.7.4. Disciplinary Actions.

1.12.7.4.1. When referencing Article 15 actions, civil or court-martial convictions or any other punitive or administrative actions, comments must emphasize the underlying conduct, or behavior, that led to the action.

1.12.7.4.2. They 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.

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

1.12.7.4.4. 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 Smith drove while under the influence, for which he received an Article 15."

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

1.12.8. Other Prohibited Comments.

1.12.8.1. A Recommendation for Decoration.

1.12.8.1.1. 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.

1.12.8.1.2. You may mention other awards, or nominations, for honors and awards such as "Outstanding Maintenance Officer" or "Twelve Outstanding Airmen of the Year."

1.12.8.2. Weighted Airmen Promotion System (WAPS) Data. Score data on the WAPS score notice or senior NCO promotion score notice, board scores, test scores, relative standings among peers etc. are prohibited.

1.12.8.3. Matrices, fact sheets, background sheets or other documents unless specifically authorized in this instruction (see paragraphs 1.4.1.1 and 1.4.1.2). 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 (see paragraph 8.2.3.1.2 for PRFs).

1.13. Policy Deviations, Extensions and Waiver Requests. See Table 1.1. for mailing addresses for the Offices of Primary Responsibilities/Point of Contacts (OPR/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/DPSIDE (or appropriate ANG/AFR office stated in paragraph 1.15) who in turn will forward the request to appropriate office of primary responsibility (OPR) listed in Table 1.1.

1.13.1.2. Requests will be in Memorandum format with all the appropriate endorsements. All requests must include at a minimum, the requested policy deviation or waiver and justification and/or reason for the request. 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 senior ratership issues require coordination through the respective Management Levels (ML) and must be signed by the head of the ML.

1.13.1.4. Signed requests will be mailed to the HQ AFPC/DPSID (or appropriate ANG/AFR office stated in Table 1.1.), or may be sent by scanning the signed document and emailing it to: AFPC.DPSID-WORKFLOW@US.AF.MIL.

1.13.2. Extensions.

1.13.2.1. The authority to extend a close-out date for lieutenant colonel and below is retained by HQ AFPC/DPSIDE; HQ AFRC/A1 for USAFR. The authority to extend close-out dates for ANG personnel is the Adjutant General (TAG) in the state/territory to which they are assigned or NGB/OM for Statutory Tour personnel. (This waiver authority will not be delegated, there are no exceptions). AF/DPG (for EAD general officers) an NGB-GO (for non-EAD ANG general officers) retains similar authority on AF Form 78. AF/DPO retains authority on OPRs for colonels.

1.13.2.2. Events that occur after the close-out date. Extensions are only granted to allow evaluators to document negative behavior, i.e. court-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. Also see paragraph 1.13.2.5.

1.13.2.2.1. 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/EPR 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.

1.13.2.3. Send requests for extension, to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP (or appropriate ANG/AFR office stated in paragraph 1.15. with a copy to the servicing personnel office, who in turn will forward the request to appropriate office of primary responsibility (OPR) 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, fitness score AFFMS printout, whether or not the ratee is on a profile and dates of profile(s), the ratee's Fitness Assessment (FA) history, any AF Fm 422s during the reporting period, and deployment dates (if applicable). Incomplete requests will be returned without action.

1.13.2.4. Approved extensions must be documented by placing the following statement in the feedback section of the AF Forms 707, 910 and 911: “Close-out date was extended IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.13.2.”

1.13.2.5. 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 3.4. and Table 3.8. for USAFR.

1.14. Missing, Late and Removed Performance Evaluations. (See Table 1.2.)

1.14.1. Tracking Late and/or Missing Evaluations.

1.14.1.1. Missing Evaluations on an Active Duty Officers and SNCOs. The CSS/MPS/AFPC/ARPC initiates action to try and locate the missing report.

1.14.1.1.1. If the report is located, 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/DPSIRR for file in the Automated Records Management System (ARMS). If required, update the system in accordance with Personnel Services Delivery (PSD) Training Handbook.

1.14.1.1.2. If the report is not located, or cannot be justly re-accomplished, the HR specialist (CSS/MPS/AFPC/ARPC agency) who identified the discrepancy will prepare an AF Form 77 according to Table 4.1., Note 5, and inserts the original into the OSR/NSR, or sends the original to AF/DPO for colonel and colonel selects, AF/DPE for CMSgts and CMSgt selects, and forwards a copy to HQ AFPC/DPSIRR for file in ARMS. Make sure to update the system in accordance with Personnel Services Delivery (PSD) Handbook.

1.14.1.2. Missing Evaluations on Active Duty Enlisted TSgts and Below. The Military Personnel Section (MPS), initiates action to try and locate the missing report.

1.14.1.2.1. If the report is located, forward the original evaluation to HQ AFPC/DPSIRR for file in ARMS and if required, update the system in accordance with Personnel Services Delivery (PSD) Handbook.

1.14.1.2.2. If a report is not located or cannot be justly re-accomplished, the MPS prepares an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 4.1., Note 5, and forwards AF Form 77 to HQ AFPC/DPSIRR for file in ARMS. Make sure to update the system in accordance with Personnel Services Delivery (PSD) Handbook.

1.14.1.3. Missing Evaluations For ResAF. The Officer Selection Record (OSR) custodian, the HQ ARPC commander, or offices as prescribed by the commander concerned, initiates action to try and locate the missing report.

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

1.14.1.3.2. If the report is not located or cannot be justly re-accomplished, the MPS prepares an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 4.1., Note 5, and forwards AF

Form 77 to HQ ARPC/DPS for filing in ARMS. Make sure to update the system in accordance with Personnel Services Delivery (PSD) Training Handbook.

1.14.1.4. Missing Evaluations For ANG only. The Adjutant General or designee will initiate action to locate missing reports for AGR personnel and NGB/OM for Statutory Tour personnel.

1.14.1.4.1. If tracer action is successful, the Adjutant General or designee will forward the evaluation to the OSR/NSR custodian who will file the original in the OSR/NSR; forwards a copy to HQ AFPC/DPSIRR for file in ARMS; and if required, updates the system in accordance with the Personnel Delivery System (PSD) Handbook.

1.14.1.4.2. If the report is not located and cannot be justly re-accomplished, the Adjutant General or designee will contact the OSR/NSR custodian to prepare an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 4.1., Note 5. The OSR/NSR custodian will file the original in the MPerRGp and sends a copy to HQ AFPC/DPSIRR for file in ARMS. Make sure to update the system in accordance with the PSD Handbook.

1.14.1.5. 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., etc.

1.14.2. Evaluations Removed From Records Under Chapter 10, *Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Reports*, or under AFIs 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records*. Prepare an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 4.1., Note 6. Make sure to update the system in accordance with the PSD Handbook.

1.14.3. Documenting Unrated Periods. Prepare an AF Form 77 in accordance with Table 4.1., Note 5. Make sure to update the system in accordance with the PSD Handbook.

1.15. Administrative Examination for Appropriateness of Evaluations. If you believe an evaluation should not be filed in an individual's record, send it to the appropriate authority listed below for examination:

1.15.1. If the ratee is on EAD, the member's MPS/CSS/HR Specialist, or HQ AFPC/DPSIDE examines the evaluation.

1.15.2. If the ratee is an ANG officer or ANG AGR enlisted member not on EAD, the State Adjutant General and HQ ARPC/DPBR examine the evaluation, except for ANGUS general officers.

1.15.3. If the ratee is a non-EAD USAFR officer and assigned to an Air Force Reserve category A or B unit, HQ ARPC/DPBR examines the evaluation.

1.15.4. If the ratee is a non-EAD USAFR officer and assigned to a MAJCOM IMA position, the MAJCOM of assignment and HQ ARPC/DPBR examine the evaluation.

1.15.5. HQ ARPC/DPBR conducts this examination if the ratee is a USAFR officer other than above and serviced by HQ ARPC/DPBR.

1.15.6. For ANG Statutory personnel NGB/OM will examine the evaluation.

Table 1.1. Mailing Addresses for Correspondence.

LINE	A Address	B OPR Responsibility
1	HQ AFPC/DPSIDE 550 C Street West, Suite 7 Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709	Evaluation Programs Section. Manages the OES/EES for all active duty (AD) Airman Basics through Lieutenant Colonels following policy provided by HQ USAF/A1PPP.
2	HQ AFPC/DPSIDE B 550 C Street West, Suite 7 Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709	Manages the student Management Level Review (MLR) and all PRF actions.
3	HQ AFPC/DPSIDE P 550 C Street West, Suite 7 Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709	Evaluation Policy & Appeals. Provides AF OES/EES policy and guidance with coordination with HQ USAF/A1PPP. Administers the Evaluation Report Appeals Board (ERAB). Note: All “wet signature” evaluations on AD Officer (Lieutenant Colonel and below), and SMSgts and MSgts are sent to this office, see Note 1.
4	AF/DPG 1040 Air Force Pentagon, Room 5C238 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 on AD GOs are sent to this address, see Note 1.
5	HQ USAF/REG 1150 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1150	Air Force Reserve General Officer Matters Office. Manages OES for Reserve GOs (and Brigadier General selects). Note: All “wet signature” evaluations on Reserve GOs are sent to this office, see Note 1.
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 AD 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 AD CMSgts and CMSgt selects. Note: All “wet signature” evaluations AD CMSgts are sent to this address, see Note 1.
8	HQ ARPC/DPBR	Records and Board Support Division. Manages the

	6760 East Irvington Place #2000 Denver CO 80280-2000	OES for ResAF officers not on the active duty list and the EES for ResAF enlisted personnel following policy provided by HQ USAF/RE and NGB. Note: All “wet signature” evaluations on Reserve personnel are sent to this office, except general officers.
9	HQ AFPC/DPSIR 550 C Street West, Suite 21 Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709	(Active Duty ARMS) Maintains the Automated Records Management System on all AD personnel. Note: All “wet signature” evaluations on AD TSgt’s and below are sent to this office, see Note 1.
10	HQ ARPC/DPQA 6760 E. Irvington Place Denver CO 80280-2000	(Reserve/Guard ARMS) Maintains the Automated Records Management System on all Reserve/Guard personnel.
11	HQ USAF/RE 1150 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC 20330-1150	Provides USAFR OES/EES policy.
12	HQ AFPC/DPAM 550 C Street West Suite 25 Randolph AFB TX 78150-4727	Medical Service Officer Management. Provides advice on reporting policy for officers within the health professions, in conjunction with HQ USAF/SG1, Medical Force Development Directorate, Office of the Surgeon General, HQ USAF/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: A1 is approval authority for evaluation close-out date extensions for all Reserve members.
14	AFRC/A1KP 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 HQ USAF/A1PPP or USAF/RE. A1KP also processes close-out date extensions to A1 for approval/ disapproval for Lt Cols and below.
15	AFRC/A1L 155 Richard Bay Blvd Robins AFB GA 31098-5000	Senior Leader (Colonel) Management Division for AFRC.
16	NGB-GO 1411 Jefferson Davis Highway Suite 12600 Arlington VA 22202-3231	
17	NGB/A1P 1411 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington VA 22202-3231	Manages the OES for ANG officers, including ANGUS general Officers not on EAD.
18	AFDW/DPJ	

	20 MacDill Blvd, Suite 400 Bolling AFB DC 20332-5100	
19	HQ USAF/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 must be pushed through the Case Management System (CMS).		

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

R	A	B	C
U L E	Tracer action or re- accomplishment was successful: (See Note 3)	and the system contains the overall rating and close-out date:	Then:
1	No	Yes	When authorized by AFPC/ARPC the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist or The Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/OM who discovers the discrepancy prepares AF Form 77, see Table 4.1., Note 5k.
2		No (See Note 2)	When authorized by AFPC/ARPC the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist prepares AF Form 77, see Table 4.1., Note 5k.
3	Yes (Tracer Only)		file the evaluation according to Table 3.5. or Table 3.6. (OPRs) or Table 3.9. (EPRs) and update the system, if appropriate.
Notes: 1. The gaining MPS/CSS/HR Specialist, The Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/OM tracks missing or late evaluations resulting from CSS/HR Specialist or PCAs. The losing MPS/CSS/HR Specialist, HQ ARPC/DPBR, the Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/OM gives the gaining MPS/CSS/HR Specialist, HQ ARPC/DPBR, The Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resource Office) or NGB/OM a copy of AF Form 330, <i>Records Transmittal/Request</i> , when appropriate. Do not redo evaluations more than 18 months old. AF Forms 77 are prepared by the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist.			

2. When all attempts to find the missing evaluation fail, the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist sends an inquiry to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP or HQ ARPC/DPBR (Officers/SNCOs), requesting that HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP or HQ ARPC/DPS search the history files for the EPR rating. Include in the request:

a. All known information that may assist in identifying the missing evaluation.
 b. An account of all actions taken to find the missing EPR. For personnel with prior service, do not send a request to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP or HQ ARPC/DPBR for missing evaluations earlier than 120 calendar days after the date the ratee reentered to duty. The MPS/CSS/HR Specialist provides this information when requesting a search for missing APRs or EPRs on personnel with prior service:

- (1) Name.
- (2) Grade.
- (3) SSN.
- (4) Grade at separation.
- (5) Date of separation.
- (6) Whether an AF Form 1613, *Statement of Service*, might exist.

Note: If HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP or HQ ARPC/DPS finds the rating in the history files, complete an AF Form 77 according to Table 4.1., Note 5k. When more than one evaluation is involved, the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist may prepare one AF Form 77 according to Table 4.1., Note 5k, 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, it 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 4.1., Note 5k.

3. Do not re-accomplish a lost or missing report that is more than 18 months past the close-out date.

Figure 1.1. Enlisted Referral Memorandum.

 (Date)

MEMORANDUM FOR A1C KYLE JONES (*Ratee's Rank & Name*)

123 SFS/SFOL-C (*Ratee's Functional Address Symbol {FAS}*)

FROM: 123 SFS/SFOL

1122 Main Street

Anybase AFB ST 77777-7777

(*FAS and complete address of referring evaluator*)

SUBJECT: Referral Enlisted Performance Reports

(*Indicate Enlisted or Officer Performance Report or Education/Training Report*)

1. I am referring the attached (*indicate Enlisted/Officer Performance Report or Education/Training Report*) to you according to AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.10. It contains comment(s)/rating(s) that make(s) the evaluation a referral as defined in AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.10. Specifically, (*state why the evaluation is being referred, i.e., "Specifically, my rating of Does Not Meet Standards and my comments in section III, items 2 and 3, pertaining to your failure to meet and enforce both fitness and dress and appearance standards in yourself and your subordinates, cause this evaluation to be referred."*).
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 a copy. You may submit comments to rebut the evaluation. Send your comments to reach (name and address of next evaluator) not later than 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-EAD members) from the date you receive this memo. 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 will remain attached to the evaluation for filing in your 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 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)

JOHN SMITH, TSgt, USAF
NCOIC, C Flight

Attachment:

AF Form 910, 14 Nov 06

(AF Form 707, 910, 911, or 475, as appropriate, close-out)

cc: 123 SFS/CC

(Name of next evaluator)

1st Ind, A1C JONES, KYLE

(Ratee's Grade/Name)

MEMORANDUM FOR 123 SFS/CC (LT COL BROWN)
(FAS and Name of next evaluator)

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

(Signature of ratee)

KYLE JONES, A1C, USAF *(Ratee)*

Chapter 2

PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK PROCESS

2.1. Purpose. Performance feedback is a private, formal communication a rater uses to tell a ratee what is expected regarding duty performance and how well the ratee is meeting those expectations. Raters document performance feedback on the Performance Feedback Worksheet (PFW), and use the PFW format as a guide, for conducting feedback sessions where they discuss objectives, standards, behavior, and performance with the ratee. Providing this information helps an individual contribute to positive communication, improve performance, and grow professionally.

2.2. Responsibilities.

2.2.1. The ratee will:

2.2.1.1. Know when feedback sessions are due.

2.2.1.2. Request a feedback session, if needed.

2.2.1.3. Notify the rater and, if necessary, the rater's rater, when required or requested feedback did not take place. Lack of counseling or feedback, by itself, is not a sufficient reason to challenge the accuracy or injustice of an evaluation.

2.2.1.4. Sign the PFW and rater's copy of the feedback notice indicating the date the supervisor conducted the feedback session, see paragraph 2.6.5.

2.2.2. The rater will:

2.2.2.1. Prepare for, schedule, and conduct feedback sessions according to Table 2.1. regardless of whether the rater received a feedback notice. Conflicts such as being geographically separated, TDY, leave, etc., are not excuses not to perform feedback sessions. (See paragraph 2.4.)

2.2.2.2. Stay aware of standards and expectations and consider them when providing feedback to personnel.

2.2.2.3. Provide realistic feedback to help the ratee improve performance. Realistic feedback includes discussion with the ratee, and written comments on the PFW, not just marks on the form.

2.2.2.4. Provide the original completed and signed PFW to the ratee.

2.2.2.5. Maintain a copy of the signed and dated feedback notice.

2.2.2.6. Document behavior that may result in further administrative or judicial action on other than a PFW (**Example:** An AF Form 174, *Record of Individual Counseling*). **Note:** Since a PFW may only be introduced into a personnel action when paragraph 2.9.3. applies, it is important that behavior representing a significant departure from expected standards is recorded in other forms of documentation.

2.2.3. The rater's rater will:

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

2.2.3.2. Conduct performance feedback sessions when:

2.2.3.2.1. A lower-level rater is not available due to unusual circumstances, see paragraph 1.6.3.4.

2.2.3.2.2. Officially assuming the subordinate rater's responsibilities, see paragraph 1.6.3.4.

2.2.4. The unit commander will:

2.2.4.1. Administer the performance feedback program. Unit commanders may establish procedures beyond those provided for in this chapter to check performance feedback compliance, provided those procedures do not violate the privacy of PFW communications as specified in paragraph 2.9.3.

2.2.4.2. Monitor raters and ratees to ensure feedback sessions are conducted properly and in a timely manner.

2.2.4.3. Develop a training program and use the OES/EES training material to establish a performance feedback training session.

2.2.4.4. Know if personnel are being trained in a timely manner on performance feedback, and if first-time supervisors are getting the help they need before attempting to carry out their supervisory duties.

2.2.4.5. Select the right people to conduct the OES/EES education training.

2.2.4.6. Visit the work places and asking personnel questions about their jobs and the feedback they are receiving.

2.2.4.7. Hold supervisors accountable for not conducting feedback sessions. Consider disciplinary action and removal from supervisory positions those raters who fail to conduct documented performance feedback sessions.

2.2.5. The Military Personnel Section (MPS) will provide feedback notices to raters and ratees.

2.3. Who Requires a Performance Feedback. Feedback is mandatory for all officers, Second Lieutenant through Colonel, and all enlisted personnel. If an individual requests a feedback session, the rater will provide one within 30 days of receipt of the request, provided 60 days have passed (at the rater's discretion) since the last feedback session. Do not prepare a PFW when a ratee is a captive, patient, prisoner, absent without leave (AWOL), etc. For students receiving AF Forms 475, performance feedback is not required, but may be given if the ratee's performance/conduct warrants it.

2.4. Guidance for Conducting Feedback Sessions. Feedback 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 original PFW to the ratee within 10 calendar days after the session. *Conflicts such as being geographically separated, TDY, leave, etc., are not excuses not to perform feedback sessions.*

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

2.6. The Performance Feedback Notice.

2.6.1. The rater *should* receive a computer-generated performance feedback notice 30 days after supervision begins (when initial or end-of-reporting period feedback is required) and again halfway between the time supervision began and the projected performance evaluation close-out date (when midterm feedback is required). This notice serves to remind raters that a feedback session is due; however, failure to receive a feedback notice *does not* justify failing to hold a required session.

2.6.2. Since the ratee shares the responsibility to ensure feedback sessions occur, a feedback 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).

2.6.3. For Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMA), the feedback notice is sent to the supervisor's active duty MPS for forwarding to the supervisor. IMAs receive their copies through the mail.

2.6.4. The performance feedback notice must be signed and dated by the rater and ratee and then maintained by the supervisor. **Note:** Signing the PFW does not constitute concurrence; it is merely to acknowledge that the feedback was performed.

2.7. Which PFW Form to Use.

2.7.1. For Lieutenant through Colonel, use AF Form 724.

2.7.2. For a senior NCO, use AF Form 932.

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

2.8. Preparing the PFW. The PFW should, as thoroughly as possible, outline the issues discussed during the feedback session; however, it is primarily a guide for conducting the feedback session, not a transcript. Therefore, omission of an issue from the form does not, by itself, constitute proof that the issue was not discussed. Lack of counseling or feedback, by itself, is not sufficient justification to challenge the accuracy or injustice of an evaluation.

2.8.1. The PFW may be handwritten or typed by the rater providing the feedback.

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

2.8.3. Section II, Types of Feedback. In the appropriate box, indicate whether the feedback is initial, midterm, ratee requested or rater directed.

2.8.4. Section III, Primary Duties, is a fill-in-the-blank area where the rater outlines specific duties (specialty and assignment). These entries include the most important duties and correspond to the job description reflected on the OPR/EPR.

2.8.5. Section IV, Performance Feedback, covers those qualities and skills required of all personnel. The PFW has five blocks to select from for each performance factor. The rater places a mark in the appropriate block which indicates the ratee's level of performance.

2.8.5.1. Since the primary purpose of the initial feedback session is to establish expectations for the upcoming rating period, a rater is not expected to have already developed a clear-cut opinion of an individual's performance by the time the session is conducted. Therefore, raters will mark the Initial Feedback block under each standard of performance and provide comments on their expectations.

2.8.5.2. For all other feedback types, the rater will indicate how the ratee is meeting the established expectations by marking either “Does Not Meet”, “Meets”, “Above Average”, or “Clearly Exceeds”. These markings do not directly translate to a rating on the evaluation, but provide an indication of how the ratee is meeting the expectations set forth by the rater and provides the basis for the feedback session discussion. Use the following definitions of performance assessment ratings when filling out PFWs:

2.8.5.2.1. Does Not Meet: Performs below established standards, requires improvement. Disciplinary action is not required, however, the evaluation will be referral.

2.8.5.2.2. Meets: Meets established standards.

2.8.5.2.3. Above Average: Performs beyond established standards and expectations.

2.8.5.2.4. Clearly Exceeds: Performs at a higher level than most of their peers, far exceeds standards and expectations, unique performer. **Note:** Fitness will be rated at “Does Not Meet,” “Meets,” or “Exempt.” Apply the same rules as the OPR/EPR.

2.8.5.3. Space is provided for factual, helpful performance feedback so ratees can improve their duty performance or define their professional development goals. Comments on performance should relate to placement of the marks in section IV.

2.8.6. The reverse side of the form (*Strengths, Suggested Goals, Professional Development, Additional Comments, etc.*) provides space to continue feedback or to help individuals understand their strengths and possible plans for the future. Also, use it to continue the comments from the front of the form.

2.9. Disposition and Access.

2.9.1. The rater gives the completed PFW to the ratee and keeps a copy for personal reference. The PFW *will not* be made an official part of *any* personnel record, nor used in any personnel action unless paragraph 2.9.3. applies.

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

2.9.3. The PFW may not be reviewed by anyone other than the rater and ratee, or introduced in any personnel action unless the ratee first introduces it, or alleges either he or she did not receive required feedback sessions or that sessions were inadequate. **Exceptions:**

2.9.3.1. For SNCOs, the squadron commander is authorized access to PFW.

2.9.3.2. For TSgts and below, the additional rater, rater’s rater (when the additional rater is not also the rater’s rater), first sergeant, and squadron commander are authorized access to the PFW.

2.9.4. Temporary Duty (TDY) supervisors *may* conduct feedback and complete PFWs; however, they do not send these PFWs to the rater. **Exception:** If the TDY rater has been officially designated as the ratee’s reporting official, feedback is required.

2.10. Failure of Rater to Conduct or Document a Feedback Session. While documented feedback sessions are required, they do not replace informal day-to-day feedback. A rater’s failure to conduct a required or requested feedback session, or document the session on a PFW,

will not, by itself, invalidate any subsequent performance evaluations, or (for officers) PRFs. See paragraph 1.11.9, Table 3.1, line 17, and Table 3.2, line 38.

2.11. End-of-Reporting Period Feedback.

2.11.1. Raters are required to conduct a feedback session with the ratee after all evaluators have signed the evaluation.

2.11.2. Use the evaluation form when conducting the feedback. A PFW may be used but is not required when conducting this feedback.

2.11.3. The date of the End-of-Reporting Feedback will not to be used as the “Date last feedback was accomplished.”

2.11.4. Raters should review the evaluation content with the ratee and discuss why the ratings were given, and what can be done to improve performance during the upcoming evaluation period.

2.11.5. During this session, ratees should review all personal information on the evaluation for accuracy, in addition to reviewing the content of the evaluation.

2.11.6. The ratee may recommend changes, (i.e. informing the rater he/she forgot an award, that the report contains inaccurate information or typographical errors); however, the rater is under no obligation to make any changes, unless the evaluation contains errors or prohibited information. Content/rating changes suggested by the ratee are not required to be made by the rater. However, corrections to personal identifying information will be made prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record.

2.11.7. The ratee acknowledges this review by completing the ratee acknowledgement portion of the block. When the ratee is unavailable or declines to sign, the End-of-Reporting Period Feedback is still required.

Table 2.1. Performance Feedback 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 for non-EAD USAFR)
2	a MSgt or SMSgt, Major or Lieutenant Colonel.	Initial (See Note 1; Note 4 for non-EAD USAFR) Midterm (See Note 2; Note 4 for non-EAD USAFR)
3	an AB, Amn or A1C (who has already	Initial

	received an EPR), a SrA through TSgt, a Lieutenant through Captain. (see notes 6 and 7)	(See Note 1) Midterm (See Note 2) End-of-reporting period (See Note 3)
4	an AB, Amn or A1C (with less than 20 months TAFMS)	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 EPR/OPR.
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 EPR/OPR. The second purpose is to establish expectations for the new reporting period. **Note:** 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. A PFW is not required if action is pending under AFI 36-3209, *Separation Procedures for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Members*.
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. 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.

Chapter 3

OFFICER/ENLISTED PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS (OPRS/EPRS)

3.1. General Guidelines.

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

3.1.2. Although there are no established quotas on ratings or rating expectations, evaluators at all levels must use caution to prevent over inflation. Evaluation ratings are used to determine selections for promotions, job and school recommendations, career job reservations, reenlistments and assignments. It is important to differentiate performance and it is a disservice to all Airmen when OPR/EPR ratings are over 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.

3.1.4. “FROM” Dates.

3.1.4.1. Officers. 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:

3.1.4.1.1. 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.

3.1.4.1.2. 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. (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*.)

3.1.4.1.3. 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.)

3.1.4.1.4. 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).

3.1.4.1.5. A USAFR officer not on EAD and it is an initial evaluation, use the date of assignment to the USAFR status held as of the close-out date. (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.)

3.1.4.1.6. A USAFR officer not on EAD and has been reassigned or attached to a unit from ARPC, use the effective date of attachment or change of strength

accountability or transfer effective date (TED) of reassignment. This applies only to the first evaluation in non-EAD status. (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.)

3.1.4.1.7. A USAFR 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.)

3.1.4.1.8. An USAFR officer not on EAD but previously on AD as RegAF and did not accept a USAFR 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.

3.1.4.2. Enlisted. Use the "FROM" date on the EPR notice, but if different or incorrect, use the information below to establish the "FROM" date if the member is:

3.1.4.2.1. Has a previous evaluation on file, use the day following the close-out date of the previous evaluation.

3.1.4.2.2. On AD but has not had a previous evaluation on current AD tour, use the day of entry/reentry on AD (the EAD date in the MilPDS).

3.1.4.2.3. Non-AD and has not had a previous evaluation, use the date of assignment to the Reserve or the date when a SrA has 20 months in service (from DIEMS), whichever is later.

3.1.5. "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, unless the change causes the number of days of supervision to meet or exceed the specifications in Table 3.7. and Table 3.8. Evaluations prepared and have been made a matter of record under the CRO rule remain valid even if the condition is later canceled. Use the information below to establish the "THRU" date. If the reason for the evaluation is:

3.1.5.1. Enlisted Initial Reports.

3.1.5.1.1. The close-out date will be 20 months from the ratee's Total Active Federal Military Service (TAFMS) date. For example, the ratee's TAFMS date is 15 Jun 07, then the close-out date will be 15 Feb 09.

3.1.5.1.2. If after the ratee reaches 20 months, and the rater does not have required number of days supervision required by Tables 3.7 and 3.8, adjust the close-out to the date on which the rater achieves the required number of days supervision.

3.1.5.2. Annual/Biennial Reports.

3.1.5.2.1. An officer's first report. The close-out date is 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.

3.1.5.2.2. All subsequent reports, officer and enlisted, the close-out date will be one year from the close-out date of the last evaluation.

3.1.5.2.3. If needed, adjust the close-out to the date on which the rater achieves the required number of days of supervision, or points required by Tables 3.7 and 3.8.

3.1.5.2.4. If the member is non-EAD enlisted USAFR; biennial, use the date two years from the close-out of previous evaluation, or: who has not had a previous evaluation, and the "FROM" date is the member's DOR to SSgt, the thru date will be two years from the DOR to SSgt (i.e., DOR and "FROM" date is 1 May 2006, then "THRU" date will be 30 Apr 2008) provided the ratee has earned at least 16 active/inactive duty points.

3.1.5.2.5. If a rater change occurs after the original annual date passed, but before the rater completed 120 days supervision, the evaluation is closed out the day prior to the rater change, providing at least 60 days of supervision have occurred. If the 60 days has not been met, then the first rater who obtains 60 days supervision will write the report. The evaluation reason is still "Annual."

3.1.5.2.6. For USAFR. If a rater change occurs after the original biennial date, but before the rater completed 120 days supervision, the evaluation is closed out the day prior to the rater change, providing at least 60 days of supervision has occurred. The evaluation reason is still "Biennial".

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

3.1.5.3.1. Use the day before the effective date of the change.

3.1.5.3.2. 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:

3.1.5.3.2.1. 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 days 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.

3.1.5.3.2.2. 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.

3.1.5.3.2.3. 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.

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

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

3.1.5.3.2.3.3. MIA/Captured/Detained. Use the date the ratee was placed in missing-in-action (MIA), captured, or detained in captive status.

3.1.5.3.3. 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.

3.1.5.3.4. 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. This is not applicable to the ANG.

3.1.5.3.5. Otherwise Directed. Use the date as otherwise directed by the commander, see Table 3.7.

3.1.5.4. **Extensions.**

3.1.5.4.1. Use the date approved by the appropriate waiver authority per a request for an extension of the close-out date. See paragraph 1.13. for extensions of the close-out (“THRU”) date.

3.1.5.4.2. For USAFR, if needed, adjust the close-out date on which the rater achieves the required number of days of supervision and points required by Table 3.8.

3.1.6. Number of Days Supervision. Enter the number of days the rater supervised the ratee during the reporting period.

3.1.6.1. 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.

3.1.6.2. Do **NOT** deduct any periods of leave, TDY, absences or periods loaned out to other organizations.

3.1.6.3. On EAD an OPR/EPR 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.

3.1.6.4. A Non-EAD ANG officer and 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.

3.1.6.5. A Non-EAD USAFR 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.

3.1.7. Performance Factors (Section III and IX) and Rater/Additional Rater Overall Assessment, (Sections IV and V) – AF Form 707, *Officer Performance Report (OPR)*. **Note:** Commanders are held responsible for the overall readiness of their unit and are ultimately accountable for its performance. As such, overall unit readiness and performance should be a major contributing factor when assessing a commander's performance.

3.1.7.1. The rater completes Section III and if applicable Section IX (Performance Factors); however, the additional evaluators will review evaluations to ensure ratings accurately describe performance and comments are compatible with and support the ratings. 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).

3.1.7.2. The rater completes Section III (Performance Factors) by placing an "X" in the "Meets Standards" or "Does Not Meet Standards" box. This is the ratee's overall performance. One of these blocks must be marked. Additionally, if the ratee has a valid fitness exemption, the "Fitness Exemption" box must also be marked "Yes" (see paragraph 1.4.10.3).

3.1.7.2.1. If an officer fails to meet standards in any one of the listed performance factors in Section IX (Performance Factors), the overall evaluation is then a "Does Not Meet Standards" evaluation, and the "Does Not Meet Standards" block in Section III (Performance Factors) will be marked and the evaluation becomes a referral OPR.

3.1.7.2.2. If an evaluator makes derogatory comments, with or without marking a performance factor as "Does Not Meet Standards," the overall evaluation is then a "Does Not Meet Standards" and the "Does Not Meet Standards" block in Section III (Performance Factors) will be marked and the evaluation becomes a referral OPR.

3.1.7.2.3. The referring evaluator must include all applicable mandatory and appropriate comments in the referring evaluator's assessment, (Section IV - Rater, Section V - Additional Rater, or Section VI - Reviewer's Assessment blocks, respectively). See paragraph 1.10., for referral procedures. Utilize the referral memo located on the reverse of the form.

3.1.7.3. The Additional Rater will place an "X" in the concur or non-concur block and enters the appropriate comments in Section V, (Additional Rater Overall Assessment). See paragraph 1.9 for disagreements.

3.1.7.4. Do not make prohibited and/or inappropriate comments. See paragraph 1.12. for prohibited comments.

3.1.7.5. Limit comments to the space provided unless referred or evaluator does not concur with the evaluation.

3.1.8. Performance Assessments (Section III), AF Forms 910/911 – *Enlisted Performance Reports (EPR)*.

3.1.8.1. The rater completes this section; however, the additional evaluators will review evaluations to ensure ratings accurately describe performance and comments are compatible with/support the ratings. 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). Use the following as a **guide** when determining the rating to apply to each performance assessment:

3.1.8.1.1. Does Not Meet: Performs below established standards, requires improvement. Disciplinary action is not required, however, evaluation will be a referral.

3.1.8.1.2. Meets: Meets established standards.

3.1.8.1.3. Above Average: Performs beyond established standards and expectations.

3.1.8.1.4. Clearly Exceeds: Performs at a higher level than peers, far exceeds standards and expectations, unique performer.

3.1.8.2. The evaluation becomes a referral evaluation and must be referred IAW paragraph 1.10 if:

3.1.8.2.1. The ratee fails to meet standards in any one of the listed performance assessment factors in Section III, Performance Assessment. **Note:** A referral EPR may not have an overall assessment of “5”.

3.1.8.2.2. The ratee received a rating of “Poor (1)” or “Needs Improvement (2),” in Section V, Overall Performance Assessment.

3.1.8.2.3. The evaluation contains any derogatory comments.

3.1.8.3. Use bullet statements to provide information about ratee’s performance. Limit bullet length to two lines. Must have at least one bullet in each section (except for fitness). White space is authorized.

3.1.8.4. Be specific. When referring to adverse actions, state the behavior and results, i.e., “SSgt Jones drove under the influence for which he received an Article 15.”

3.1.8.5. Comments on awards are authorized. Comment on “John Levitow,” “Distinguished Graduate,” “Academic Achievement” or “Commandant’s Award” from PME are authorized. Comments from other training courses are also appropriate and may be made by any evaluator on the evaluation. See paragraph 1.12. for prohibited comments.

3.1.8.6. Base comments on overall performance and performance-based potential as compared to others in the same grade known by the evaluator.

3.1.8.7. Uncommon acronyms must be spelled out. If space is limited, define the acronyms in Section III, Other Comments.

3.1.8.8. Limit comments to the space provided unless referred. See paragraph 1.11., for mandatory comments. See paragraph 1.10. for referral procedures.

3.1.8.9. Digital signature cannot be applied to additional rater/final reviewer block until the previous rater signs the form and unlocks the next rater's signature block on the form.
Note: Does not apply to referral evaluations, see paragraph 1.10 for referral procedures.

3.1.9. Fitness will be rated at "Does Not Meet," "Meets," or "Exempt." See paragraph 1.4.10. and Table 3.2. for additional information on fitness.

3.1.10. Overall Performance Assessments (Section V), AF Forms 910/911 – *Enlisted Performance Reports (EPR)*.

3.1.10.1. EPR Overall Performance Ratings Definitions. The below definitions should be used as a guideline; however the overall performance rating is at the discretion of the evaluator.

3.1.10.1.1. *Poor (1)*: Performs at an unacceptable level. Disciplinary action is not required, however, the evaluation will be a referral.

3.1.10.1.2. *Needs Improvement (2)*: Meets some, but not all, performance standards. Disciplinary action is not required, however, the evaluation will be a referral.

3.1.10.1.3. *Average (3)*: Meets standards/expectations, performs in the median when compared to peers; does what is expected, no less or no more.

3.1.10.1.4. *Above Average (4)*: Performs beyond established standards and expectations, performs at higher level than many of their peers. A ratee's performance assessments on the front of the AF Form 910 or AF Form 911 may, or may not, all be marked "Clearly Exceeds" with a fitness assessment of "Meets" or "Exempt" and still receive this rating.

3.1.10.1.5. *Truly Among the Best (5)*: Performs at a level above their peer group, elite performer who goes above and beyond. To earn this rating, the fitness assessment must be marked either "Meets" or "Exempt," and the report must not be a referral. If the report is a referral, the overall assessment must not be "Truly Among the Best" (5).

3.1.10.2. In Section V, Overall Performance Assessment, the rater/additional rater are making an overall assessment of the ratee's performance. Although this is no longer a promotion recommendation, there is no change in the point value applied towards WAPS. Senior Enlisted Promotion boards will continue to review a 10 year history of performance evaluations. (Not applicable to ANG/USAFR).

3.1.10.3. WAPS uses EPRs to score the ratee's performance and promotion potential. Raters must not rate people with strong potential and performance records the same as average or weak performers. (Not applicable to ANG/USAFR).

3.1.10.4. The overall rating is a performance assessment rating. The Airman should be evaluated in comparison to his/her peers. Because overall ratings influence promotions, assignments, career job reservations and retraining, potential for increased responsibility and promotion potential must be considered.

3.1.10.5. The rating updated into MilPDS is the rating rendered by the final evaluator.

3.1.10.6. If the rater and additional rater disagree, see paragraph 1.9.

3.1.11. Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Senior Rater Eligibility. TIG does not apply to ANG and USAFR Airmen and will reflect as N/A. Exception: LEAD Recallees.

3.1.11.1. TIG/Senior Rater Eligibility. For a senior rater 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 3.1.11.2):

3.1.11.1.1. In the grade of MSgt/SMSgt.

3.1.11.1.2. Meet the TIG eligibility requirements outlined in paragraph 3.1.11.5. and Table 3.10.

3.1.11.1.3. Successfully completed the SNCO Academy (correspondence or in-residence).

3.1.11.1.3.1. The SNCOA requirement is defined as successful completion of the SNCOA in-residence or by correspondence.

3.1.11.1.3.2. Completion of the SEJPME does not fulfill this requirement.

3.1.11.1.4. Successfully met all the Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) degree requirements as of the closeout date of the evaluation.

3.1.11.1.4.1. The CCAF requirement is defined as having successfully met all the Community College of the Air Force (CCAF) degree requirements, as validated by the local education office and the CCAF registrar's office.

3.1.11.1.4.2. To ensure proper CCAF credit is given to Airmen, the Education Services Office (ESO) in conjunction with the CCAF registrar's office can validate completed CCAF degree requirements. CCAF requirements are considered met when the degree is conferred/awarded. Completing the last required course/CLEP/DANTES etc is not sufficient.

3.1.11.1.4.3. 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.).

3.1.11.1.5. Comments referencing non-completion of CCAF or SNCOA as the reason for absence of a senior rater endorsement are prohibited.

3.1.11.2. A senior rater will endorse a non-TIG eligible evaluation *only* when one of the following apply:

3.1.11.2.1. When the rater or additional rater does not meet the minimum grade requirement outlined in paragraph 1.5.2.

3.1.11.2.2. When the senior rater is the rater whether or not the ratee is TIG Eligible or has completed the minimum requirements for senior rater endorsement.

3.1.11.2.3. When the senior rater is the additional rater and the rater does not meet the minimum grade requirement to close-out the report whether or not the ratee is TIG Eligible or has completed the minimum requirements for senior rater endorsement.

3.1.11.2.4. When the senior rater is the evaluator named in a referral memorandum.

3.1.11.2.5. When the senior rater's deputy (B-level evaluator) does not qualify as a single evaluator.

3.1.11.3. If the member is time-in-grade (TIG) eligible for a senior rater endorsement, a senior rater endorsement is not automatic or mandatory. TIG eligibility, SNCOA and CCAF are only the minimum established requirements for endorsement consideration, and does not entitle, or guarantee an automatic endorsement. The initial decision to forward the evaluation to the senior rater is up to the evaluator who is eligible to close-out the evaluation; and each level thereafter, without necessarily going to the senior rater. For example:

3.1.11.3.1. The squadron commander who meets the grade requirements to close-out the report, determines if the ratee is deserving of a senior rater endorsement and forwards the report to the group commander. The group commander may determine the report does not warrant senior rater endorsement. The group commander may then close out the evaluation at his/her level, without forwarding the evaluation to the senior rater.

3.1.11.3.2. If both the squadron and group commanders feel the ratee is deserving of a senior rater endorsement, the evaluation is forwarded to the senior rater. If the senior rater determines a senior rater endorsement is not warranted, the senior rater does not have to endorse the report (unless required by paragraph 3.1.11.4) and thus sends the report back to the first senior rater's deputy in the ratee's chain of command to close out the report. See Attachment 1 for definition of senior rater's deputy.

3.1.11.4. If the member is not TIG eligible for a senior rater endorsement, the evaluation must be endorsed by, and the final evaluator will be, either the senior rater's deputy (*first* B-level evaluator in the rating chain), or a lower level evaluator who meets the minimum grade requirement, (except as authorized by paragraph 3.1.11.2). **Note:** Does not apply to ANG personnel.

3.1.11.5. Determine eligibility for senior rater endorsement using the formulas below. Also, you can utilize the TIG Eligibility Chart, see Table 3.10. **Note:** The EPR notice alone should not be used to determine TIG eligibility.

3.1.11.5.1. For MSgt ratees (AD only).

3.1.11.5.1.1. If close-out date is less than or equal to 30 September of current year, determine number of months TIG from Date of Rank (DOR) to 1 March 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."

3.1.11.5.1.2. If close-out date is greater than 30 September of current year, determine the number of months TIG from DOR to 1 Mar 2Y (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.

3.1.11.5.2. For SMSgt ratees (AD only).

3.1.11.5.2.1. If close-out date is less than or equal to 31 July of current year, determine number of months TIG from DOR to 1 December of current year. If less than 21 months, then TIG Eligible is "NO." If greater than or equal to 21 months, then TIG Eligible is "YES."

3.1.11.5.2.2. If close-out date is greater than 31 July of current year, determine number of months TIG from DOR to 1 December of next year following the evaluation close-out date. If less than 21 months, TIG Eligible is "NO". If greater than or equal to 21 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.

3.1.11.5.3. For SMSgt promotion selects, TIG eligibility is based upon the close-out date of the EPR. If the close-out date falls on the same day as, (or a day after), the promotion public release date, individuals on the selectee list are *not* eligible for senior rater endorsement on that evaluation; they were selectees *on the close-out date*. Conversely, if the EPR closed out *prior* to the promotion public release date, but was not signed by one or more evaluators until after the release date, the member *is* eligible for senior rater endorsement because as of the close-out date, they were not officially promotion selectees.

3.1.11.5.4. CMSgt and CMSgt selects. TIG eligibility does not apply to CMSgt or CMSgt selects. The Senior Rater may endorse any CMSgt or CMSgt selects EPR and mark "N/A."

3.1.11.5.5. The rater will fill in the TIG block.

3.1.11.6. Final Evaluator's Position, (Section VIII, AF Form 911).

3.1.11.6.1. For minimum grade requirements on the AF Form 911, see paragraph 1.5.2.3.1.2.1.

3.1.11.6.2. Use the following definitions to determine the final evaluator's position.

3.1.11.6.2.1. *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/Supervisory Pay Band 3), or higher, serving as a wing commander or equivalent and designated by the Management Level.

3.1.11.6.2.2. *Senior Rater's Deputy*. An individual who works directly for and whom the senior rater evaluates (**Example:** Vice wing commander, group commanders, division chiefs in headquarters above wing level, the Vice Commandant of the College of Enlisted PME).

3.1.11.6.2.3. *Intermediate Level*. An individual who works directly for a senior rater's deputy (**Example:** Unit commanders and wing division chiefs).

3.1.11.6.2.4. *Lower Level*. All others meeting minimum grade requirements.

3.1.11.6.3. The rater will fill in the final evaluator's position. If a change needs to be made to the final evaluator's position after the rater digitally signs the form, see paragraph 1.4.11.

3.1.11.7. Only one B-level evaluator will sign an evaluation and that endorsement must be completed by the *first* B-level evaluator in the rating chain; for example, the group commander will not be skipped in order to obtain vice wing commander endorsement, nor can *both* those individuals sign the evaluation. **Note:** Does not apply to ANG personnel. **Exception:** An evaluation may contain two B-level endorsements *only* in the following circumstances:

3.1.11.7.1. When a member is not TIG eligible for a senior rater endorsement and a B-level rater does not qualify as a single evaluator or a B-level additional rater does not qualify as a final evaluator (see paragraph 1.5.2.3.2).

3.1.11.7.2. When a member is TIG eligible for a senior rater endorsement, but the senior rater chooses not to endorse the evaluation, and either the B-level rater does not qualify as a single evaluator or the B-level additional rater does not qualify as a final evaluator.

3.1.12. Feedback.

3.1.12.1. Feedback will be accomplished IAW Chapter 2.

3.1.12.2. In Section IV (OPRs) and Section V (EPRs), rater certifies performance feedback in this area by entering an “X” to indicate whether feedback was provided during the rating period, this includes midterm feedback or any subsequent feedback requested by the ratee. If feedback was not performed, an explanation must be provided. If feedback was not required, enter “N/A”. Either a date or “NA” with comments must be entered or the rater will not be able to digitally sign the form.

3.1.12.3. See paragraph 1.6.8. and paragraph 3.1.15. for ratee’s responsibilities.

3.1.13. Reviewer Comments on OPRs.

3.1.13.1. Reviewer/Final Evaluator/Senior Rater. The Reviewer/Senior Rater/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/Supervisory Pay Band 3), or higher, serving as a wing commander or equivalent and designated by the Management Level.

3.1.13.2. 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.

3.1.13.3. Reviewers may comment *only under the following circumstances:*

3.1.13.3.1. 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. for disagreements.

3.1.13.3.2. The evaluation is referral, and the reviewer is the evaluator named in Section XI of the OPR, or in the referral memorandum for EPRs, or the reviewer refers the evaluation. See paragraph 1.10. for referral evaluations.

3.1.13.3.3. 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 nonconcurring with the evaluation. Promotion recommendations and other comments are *not* allowed.

3.1.13.3.4. If the reviewer is also the rater or additional rater, see paragraph 1.11, mandatory comments.

3.1.14. Unit Commander/Civilian Director/Other Authorized Reviewer, (Section VII, AF Form 910 and Section X, AF Form 911).

3.1.14.1. The review is performed by the unit or squadron commander of the unit (PAS) to which the ratee is assigned as a permanent party member. An individual on G-Series orders may complete the commander's review in the unit commander's absence, or the unit commander may designate in writing a senior official within the unit commander's jurisdiction, using their approved duty title, not commander. A civilian equivalent, assigned to the position of unit commander, may also sign the evaluation. **Exception:** For those on 365-day extended deployments, rater and additional rater signatures (regardless of grade) will be accomplished in theater prior to sending the evaluation to the home station for unit commander review.

3.1.14.2. 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).

3.1.14.3. The commander will mark the "concur" or "non-concur" block. See paragraph 1.9. for disagreements.

3.1.14.4. If the unit commander/civilian director/other authorized reviewer is junior in grade to an evaluator (other than rater), they review the evaluation before the senior ranking evaluator signs it.

3.1.14.5. Commanders who are also part of the rating chain will fill out and sign both the Commander's Review section and the appropriate evaluator's section, meaning they will sign the evaluation twice. The two signatures serve separate purposes, one as an evaluator regarding duty performance, and one as a commander regarding quality review.

3.1.15. Ratee's Acknowledgement.

3.1.15.1. The rater is required to conduct face-to-face (End-of-Reporting Period) feedback in conjunction with presenting the evaluation to the ratee. The OPR/EPR serves as the feedback form. A Performance Feedback Worksheet PFW 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.

3.1.15.2. 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.

3.1.15.3. Feedback will occur and 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, the feedback and ratee acknowledgment will occur after the advisor or examiner review.

3.1.15.4. The ratee must acknowledge receipt of the evaluation prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record. 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 vice concurrence. If a rater does 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.

3.1.15.5. The rater will suspend the ratee three (3) duty days (30 calendar days for ANG/USAFR), after feedback in conjunction with the evaluation is provided, to sign the evaluation.

3.1.15.6. In cases where the ratee refuses to sign, the evaluator will select "Member declined to sign" from the drop down menu in the ratee's acknowledgment and CAC sign the evaluation in the Ratee's Acknowledgement block. The rater or any higher evaluator in the rating chain can validate in the absence of the ratee on the form if all attempts have been made and the evaluation has not busted the 60 day suspense.

3.1.15.7. In cases where the ratee is unable to sign, the evaluator will select "Member unable to sign" from the drop down menu in the ratee's acknowledgment block and CAC sign the evaluation in the Ratee's Acknowledgement block. The rater or any higher evaluator in the rating chain can validate in the absence of the ratee on the form if all attempts have been made and the evaluation has not exceeded the 60 day suspense.

3.1.15.8. 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, in AWOL or deserter status, etc.).

3.1.15.9. Upon receiving the ratee's endorsement or expiration of the suspense to receive the signed evaluation, the rater (or ratee for USAFR) will place the evaluation in official channels.

3.1.15.10. "Wet Signature Only." Evaluators can type, handwrite or use the drop down option to annotate the evaluation when the ratee is unable or declines to sign.

3.2. When to Submit an Officer Performance Report (OPR) or Enlisted Performance Report (EPR).

3.2.1. AF Form 707 (OPRs) for EAD Air National Guard (ANG) officers, see Table 3.3.

3.2.2. AF Form 707 (OPRs) for USAF Reserve (USAFR) officers not on EAD, see Table 3.4.

3.2.3. AF Form 78, see Chapter 7.

3.2.4. AF Forms 910 (E1-E6) and 911 (E7-E9) (EPRs) for Airmen on Active Duty, see Table 3.7.

3.2.5. AF Forms 910 (E1-E6) and 911 (E7-E9), (EPRs) for USAFR Airmen not on Active Duty, see Table 3.8.

3.3. Who Requires Performance Evaluations.

3.3.1. All officers in the grade of colonel and below (except brigadier general selects), not being evaluated using AF Form 475 paragraph 6.2, except as specified in paragraph 3.4. See Table 3.3. and Table 3.4.

3.3.2. All enlisted personnel in the grade of Airman Basic through CMSgt who have at least 20 months Total Active Federal Military Service (TAFMS) or as directed by Table 3.7. All USAFR enlisted personnel in the grade of Senior Airman through CMSgt who have at least 20 months in service from Date Initially Entered Military Service (DIEMS or as directed by Table 3.8. See paragraph 3.4. for exceptions.

3.3.3. Any individual being released from active duty to the ANG or USAFR (participating or non-participating) who has 120 days of supervision prior to separating. See paragraph 4.2.1.2.4. if less than 120 days.

3.3.4. A1C who enlisted under the National Call to Service (NCS) program will receive their initial evaluation upon completion of 16 months TAFMS minus 1 day. (Not applicable for ANG/USAFR)

3.3.5. All enlisted ANG AGR/Statutory Tour personnel in the grades of Amn through CMSgt, or as directed by Table 3.7. and Table 3.8. See paragraph 3.4. for exceptions. This will also include Title 32 ANG enlisted members on Active Duty in excess of 120 days.

3.3.6. Personnel filling an authorized 365-day extended deployment billet who have at least 120 days of supervision prior to departing TDY. See paragraph 5.5.

3.3.7. Upon placement in prisoner status, appellate leave, or who are AWOL. The "From" date will be 1 day after the close-out date of the last evaluation (EAD/TAFMSD if no prior evaluations) and the "Thru" date will be 1 day before the departure or confinement date. No minimum confinement time or number of days supervision are required. See paragraph 4.2.4.3.2. when returned to duty.

3.3.8. Separation. Prepare an evaluation when mandated for separation by AFI 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officer*, AFI 36-3207, *Separating Commissioned Officers*, AFI 36-3208, *Administrative Separations of Airmen*, AFI 36-3205, *Applying for the Palace Chase and Palace Front Programs*, and AFI 36-3209. (See paragraph 3.3.3.)

3.3.9. Separation/Retirement is withdrawn. An evaluation is due if the member'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 supervision. The reason for the evaluation is "annual/biennial."

3.4. Who Does Not Require Performance Evaluations. Performance evaluations will not be accomplished on the following:

3.4.1. Those Deployed Commander's being evaluated using the AF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation*, see paragraph 4.2.1.2.1. and paragraph 5.4.

3.4.2. Brigadier General selects, see Chapter 7.

3.4.3. USAFR officers in a non-pay status (PAS S7XXXXX).

3.4.4. AD personnel in the grade of A1C and below with less than 20 months TAFMS or **Non-EAD USAFR personnel in the grade of SrA and below with less than 20 months in service (from DIEMS date).**

3.4.5. Individuals who are in full-time student (functional category "L") or patient status. **Exception:** AF Gold Bar program or if a student ratee is otherwise eligible under the Weighted Airman Promotion System (WAPS) and needs an EPR to be weighable (see AFI 36-2502, *Airman Promotion/Demotion Programs*), then the EPR is closed out on the promotion eligibility cut-off date and the period of supervision must be at least 60 days. See Chapter 4.

3.4.6. Individuals in the Wounded Warrior Program, (paragraph 4.2.1.2.2), or the Air Force Educational Leave of Absence Program, (paragraph 4.2.4.3.4).

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 3.4.9. (retirement) or 3.4.10. (separation) are met, a 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 write an optional evaluation, the evaluation is written (regardless of whether the ratee wants the evaluation to be written or not). Should the rater not want to write an evaluation requested by the ratee, the unit commander (for an enlisted ratee) or the senior rater (for an officer ratee) decides whether an evaluation will be written. If the commander is the rater (for an enlisted ratee) and does not want to write an evaluation requested by the ratee, the senior rater will decide whether an evaluation will be written. If neither the rater or ratee want an evaluation written, the commander/senior rater (as applicable) may direct an evaluation be written.

3.4.9. Personnel 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 09 and if the close-out date is 1 Jun 08 or later, no evaluation is required. However, if the close-out date is 31 May 08 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 09, and the retirement application was approved on 1 Jun 09 or earlier, no evaluation is required. However, if the retirement application was not approved until 2 Jun 09 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.

3.4.9.4. The enlisted member will not be considered for promotion before the retirement date. If the ratee will still be on active duty on the promotion release date and is eligible for promotion consideration, an evaluation will be required.

3.4.10. Personnel 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 active duty 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 active duty in lieu of action under AFI 36-3206, or court-martial. (**Note:** The evaluation is mandatory following court-martial conviction.)

3.4.10.3. The officer is involuntarily discharged or released from active duty under AFI 36-3206 *and* AFI 36-3207, Chapter 3; unless transferring to the ANG/USAFR, i.e., Force Management.

3.4.10.4. The enlisted member's approved separation is *not* a result of discharge action under AFI 36-3208, *paragraph 6.4*, and the Date of Separation (DOS) is within one year of the projected annual close-out date, the separation was approved *prior* to the projected annual close-out date, *and* the ratee is *not* being released from active duty to the Reserves (AD or non-AD) or another service. **Example:** DOS is 1 Jun 09; if the close-out date is 1 Jun 08 or later, no evaluation is required. If the close-out date is 31 May 08 or earlier, then an evaluation is required. **Note:** Evaluations *are mandatory* for anyone being released from active duty to the ANG or Reserves.

3.4.11. Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force. 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.

3.4.12. Traditional ANG enlisted members, ANG enlisted Military Technicians, and ANG enlisted members on Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) missions.

3.4.13. An A1C eligible and being considered for SrA Below-the-Zone (BTZ) consideration and has not had an evaluation; an AF Form 1206, will be accomplished.

**Table 3.1. Instructions for Preparing AF Form 707, Officer Performance Report.
See Chapter 1 for General Information.**

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.	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 3.3. or 3.4.	Annual, CRO, Directed by HQ HAF, Directed by Commander, Directed by NGB
6	PAS Code	Enter PAS code of ratee's unit of assignment as of the close-out date. Those assigned to an 365-day extended deployment billet, use the home station PAS Code. For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, use unit of attachment's PAS code.	TE1CFYRZ
7	Organization, Command, Location, (Component ANG/USAFR 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 USAFR and ANG only. 365-day extended deployments will use the home station unit, "with duty at . . ." For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that	964th Airborne Air Control Squadron (ACC), Tinker AFB OK 124th Airborne Air Control Squadron (ACC), Tinker AFB OK (Non-EAD) or (AGR) 341st Security Forces Group (AFSPC), Malmstrom AFB MT, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq (LEAD)

		of unit of attachment. See paragraph 1.4.7.	
--	--	--	--

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 3.1.4. THRU Date: Use the date on the OPR Notice or see paragraph 3.1.5. to determine the close-out date.	12 Jan 2007 thru 11 Jan 2008
9	Number Days Supervision	Enter number of days ratee was supervised by rater during the reporting period. See paragraph 3.1.6.	365
10	SRID	Enter the Senior Rater ID (SRID) for the ratee's unit of assignment as of the close-out date. For centrally managed 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. 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	A	B	C
T			
E			
M	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. Commander's job description will include the total force (Active Duty, Guard and Reserve) assigned.</p> <p>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>	<p><i>Example</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commands, directs and leads 50 AWACS aircrew members. - Responsible for ... - Supervises 9 NCOs ... - 89 Active Duty, 65 Air National Guard and 55 Reserves.
13	Job Knowledge, Leadership Skills, Professional Qualities, Organizational Skills,	<p>Enter an "X" in the appropriate box.</p> <p>All seven performance factors are consolidated in this block. Specific</p>	

	Judgment & Decisions, Communication Skills, Physical Fitness	performance factors are listed on the reverse side of the form. See paragraphs 3.1.7. and 1.4.10.	
--	--	---	--

SECTION III. PERFORMANCE FACTORS See paragraph 3.1.8., paragraph 1.8., paragraph 1.9. and paragraph 1.10.			
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 regardless of fitness exemption. See paragraph 1.4.10. and paragraph 3.1.7.2.	
15	Fitness Exemption	Drop down menu choices are either blank or “Yes.” Select “Yes” only for those who are exempt from all four components of the fitness assessment or have a valid exemption IAW paragraph 1.4.10.	

SECTION IV. RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
16	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 “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 USAFR Colonels in GO billets, include a mandatory statement that	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capt Smith..... - Performed..... - Led.....

		<p>the officer continues in or leave the general officer position. See Chapter 1, paragraph 3.1.7. and paragraph 1.4.10. for additional information. See paragraph 1.9. for Disagreements. See paragraph 1.10. for Referrals.</p>	
<p>17</p>	<p>Last Performance Feedback Date</p>	<p>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 paragraph 3.1.12. and Chapter 2.</p>	<p>15 Jan 2006</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Feedback was not accomplished due to</p>

SECTION IV. RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT Continued			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
18	Rater's Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter Rater's signature block as of the close-out date. See paragraphs 1.4.11.	NANCY J. SMITH, Lt Col, USAF 20th Mission Support Squadron (ACC) Shaw AFB SC MERLE C. BUSCH, YC-02, DAF 50th Space Wing (AFSPC) Schriever AFB CO
19	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case letters as of the close out date of the OPR.	Commander
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 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 V. ADDITIONAL RATER OVERALL ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
21	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	5959
22	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.	
23	Additional Rater Overall Assessment	<p>Comments are mandatory. Must contain at least 1 bullet, a maximum of 4 lines. Must be in bullet format. 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. See Chapter 1 and paragraph 3.1.7. for additional information. See paragraph 1.9. for Disagreements. See paragraph 1.10. for Referrals.</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
24	Additional Rater Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	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. Multiple general officers serving as evaluators are prohibited, see paragraph 1.7.1.7. for exceptions.	WILLIAM R. REED, JR., Col, USAF 20th Mission Support Group (ACC) Shaw AFB SC JAYMES E. JONES, YC-02, DAF 35th Maintenance Squadron (PACAF) Misawa AB, Japan
25	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case letters as of the close-out date of the OPR.	Commander

26	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. 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>Additional Rater assessment block will be locked and reviewer signature capability unlocked with the additional rater's digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.</p>	
27	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.4.1	1234
28	Concur/ Non-Concur	<p>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.</p>	

<p>29</p>	<p>Reviewer Comments</p>	<p>The reviewer is the primary quality control level and guards against inaccuracy and exaggeration.</p> <p>See paragraph 3.1.13.3. 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 memo of (date)”</p> <p>“Comments from the ratee were requested but were not received within the required period”</p>
<p>30</p>	<p>Reviewer’s Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>JOHN H. BROWN, Col, USAF 20th Fighter Wing (ACC) Shaw AFB SC</p>

SECTION VI. REVIEWER Continued			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
31	Duty Title	Enter the duty title in upper/lower case letters as of the close-out date of the OPR.	Commander
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 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. Reviewer's assessment block will be locked with reviewer digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
33	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.4.1.	2345
34	Functional Examiner or AF Advisor	When applicable, place an "X" in the appropriate box. See paragraph 1.6.7.	
35	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. HALLIGAN, 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
36	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.	
37	Duty Title	Enter Advisor/Examiner's duty title.	Command Financial Manager
38	SSN	Enter Advisor/Examiner's last four. See paragraph 1.4.11.4.1.	1122

SECTION VIII. RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
39	Ratee Acknowledgement. <i>I understand my signature does not constitute agreement or disagreement. I have verified my personal information in Section I and II.</i>	After reviewing evaluation, the ratee will read the acknowledgement statement and digitally sign in Section VII.	

SECTION VIII. RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
40	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.</p> <p>Select appropriate choice from drop down menu:</p> <p>Blank – member concurs and digitally signs evaluation</p> <p>“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.</p> <p>“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.</p> <p>See paragraph 3.1.15.</p>	

SECTION IX: PERFORMANCE FACTORS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
41	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. See paragraph 3.1.7.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.</p>	

SECTION IX: PERFORMANCE FACTORS Continued.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	<i>Example</i>
42	Leadership 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 Leadership Skills. See paragraphs 3.1.7. and 1.10.	
43	Professional Qualities	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 Professional Qualities. See paragraphs 3.1. and 1.10.	
44	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 paragraphs 3.1.7. and 1.10.	
45	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 paragraphs 3.1.7. and 1.10.	
46	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 paragraphs 3.1.7. and 1.10.	

SECTION IX: PERFORMANCE FACTORS Continued.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
47	Physical Fitness	If ratee is passing or if ratee is exempt from fitness testing, leave blank. If ratee's composite score is less than passing, place an "X" in the "Does Not Meet Standards" block for Physical Fitness. See paragraphs 3.1.7., 1.4.10. and 1.10.	

SECTION X: REMARKS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
48	Acronyms	Due to limited space on the front of the form, evaluators may spell out acronyms in this block.	Personnel Support for Contingency Operations (PERSCO); Manpower and Personnel System-Base Level (MANPER-B)
49	Approved Close-Out Extensions	If the commander has obtained an approved extension of the close-out date IAW paragraph 1.13., enter the following statement: "Close-out date was extended IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.13."	"Close-out date was extended IAW AFI 36-2406, paragraph 1.13."
50	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 . . .

SECTION X: REMARKS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
51	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/DPSIDEP for clarification.	i.e. Paragraph 1.7., when rater died, MIA, POW, incapacitated, formally relieved from duty, the additional rater becomes the rater.

SECTION XI: REFERRAL EVALUATIONS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
52	Referral Report	Complete this section for referral evaluations only. (See paragraph 3.1.7.) (Referrals see paragraph 1.10.)	Specifically..... Or “See Attached” See paragraph 1.10.

Table 3.2. Instructions for Preparing AF Forms 910/911, Enlisted Performance Reports. See Chapter 1 for General Information.

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	Grade	Enter appropriate grade. See paragraph 1.4.9.	A1C, SRA, SSGT, TSGT, MSGT, SMSGT, CMSGT
4	DAFSC	Enter 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.	3S071
5	Organization, Command and Location	Enter information as of close-out 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 ...” For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. See paragraph 1.4.7.	366th Mission Support Squadron (ACC), Mountain Home AFB ID 902nd Security Forces Squadron (AETC), Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq (Non-EAD) or (AGR) 802nd Force Support Squadron (AETC), Joint Base San Antonio – Lackland TX HQ Air Combat Command, Joint Base Langley-Eustis VA

SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
6	PAS Code	Enter PAS code for ratee's unit of assignment as of the close-out date. For those assigned to 365-day extended deployment billet, use the home station PAS Code. For centrally managed 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 (PAS Code) as of close-out date. SRID is not applicable to ANG enlisted personnel. For those assigned to an 365-day extended deployment, use the home station SRID. For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Cat E, SRID is that of unit of attachment.	1S341
8	Period of Report	FROM DATE: Enter the day following the last evaluation's close-out date. See paragraph 3.1.4.	1 Dec 2007
9		THRU DATE: Use the date on the EPR notice. See paragraph 3.1.5.	30 Nov 2008
10	Number of Days Supervision	Enter number of days ratee was supervised by rater during the reporting period. See paragraph 3.1.6.	365
11	Reason for Report	Enter reason for evaluation from the EPR notice and as determined by Tables 3.7 or 3.8.	Annual, CRO, Directed By HAF, Directed By Commander, Directed by NGB, Biennial, Initial, Initial (CRO)

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 close-out date. Limit text to two lines. If the duty title on the notice is abbreviated and entries are not clear, spell them out. If wrong, enter correct duty title and take appropriate action to update the system. Corrective actions should be initiated upon receipt of the EPR notice. Ensure the duty title is commensurate with the ratee's grade, AFSC, and responsibility. Refer to AFI 36-2108 for guidance pertaining to duty titles.</p> <p>For personnel on a 365-day extended deployment, use the deployed duty title.</p>	NCOIC, Career Enhancements
13	Significant Additional Duty(s)	Enter any significant additional duties the ratee may hold. Limit text to two lines. If no significant additional duties, enter "N/A".	Team Randolph Honor Guard Member

SECTION II. JOB DESCRIPTION			
I	A	B	C
T			
E			
M	Heading	Instructions	Example
14	Key Duties, Tasks And Responsibilities	<p>Comment in bullet format is 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 during the reporting period only if it impacts the evaluation.</p> <p>365-day extended deployments will use the TDY job description.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supervises 3 NCOs ... - Authors guidance on performance evaluations ... - Prepares lesson plans for ALS curriculum ...

SECTION III. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT See paragraphs 3.1.8., 1.8., 1.9. and 1.10.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
15	Primary/ Additional Duties (AF Form 910)	Place an “X” in the block that accurately describes the ratee’s performance in his/her primary/additional duties. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to six lines.	- Developed data base to track ... - Conducted monthly training ...
16	Primary Duties (AF Form 911)	Place an “X” in the block that accurately describes the ratee’s performance in his/her primary duties. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to four lines.	- Authored guidance ... - Implemented policy ...
17	Standards, Conduct, Character, & Military Bearing (AF Form 910)	Place an “X” in the block that accurately describes how well the ratee meets Air Force standards. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to one lines. These bullets should demonstrate how the ratee adhered to the standards.	- Maintained composure during IFE; quick thinking saved the lives of 76 passengers - Hand-picked to escort AMC/CC at CORONA ...
18	Standards: Enforcement & Personal Adherence, Conduct, Character, Military Bearing & Customs & Courtesies (AF Form 911)	Place an “X” in the block that accurately describes how well the ratee meets Air Force standards. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to two lines. These bullets should demonstrate how the ratee adhered to the standards.	

SECTION III. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT See paragraphs 3.1.8., 1.8., 1.9. and 1.10.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
	19	Fitness (AF Forms 910 and 911)	Indicate whether the ratee “Does Not Meet”, “Meets” or is “Exempt” on the fitness standard. Mark “Exempt” only for those who are exempt from all four components of the fitness assessment or have a valid fitness exemption. If member “Does Not Meet” standards, the rater must make a comment--can mention the score, the behavior that led to not meeting the standard, or progress in the Fitness Improvement Program. If the ratee is meeting the standard, mark the “Meets” box and leave the comment area blank (passing score not authorized to be documented). See paragraphs 1.4.10. and 3.1.9.
20	Training Requirements (AF Form 910)	Place an “X” in the block that accurately describes how well the ratee meets training requirements. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to two lines. The rater may consider PME completion; however, the rater cannot make comments unless the ratee received an award (John Levitow, Commandant/Leadership Award, Distinguished Graduate or Academic Achievement Award). It is acceptable to document Career Development Course (CDC) test results; these are not considered under WAPS. It is prohibited to document any type of WAPS test scores or board results.	- Completed CDCs ...

SECTION III. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT Continued. See paragraphs 3.1.8., 1.8., 1.9. and 1.10.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
21	Resource Management And Decision Making (AF Form 911)	Place an "X" in the block that accurately describes how well the ratee makes decisions and manages resources. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to two lines.	- Managed \$35K budget ...
22	Teamwork/ Followership (AF Form 910)	Place an "X" in the block that accurately describes how well the ratee works with others. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to one lines.	- Spearheaded ...
23	Training, Education, Off-Duty Education, PME, Professional Enhancement & Communication (AF Form 911)	Place an "X" in the block that accurately describes how well the ratee meets training requirements. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to two lines. The rater may consider PME completion; however, the rater cannot make comments unless the ratee received an award (John Levitow, Commandant/Leadership Award, Distinguished Graduate or Academic Achievement Award). It is acceptable to document Career Development Course (CDC) test results; these are not considered under WAPS. It is prohibited to document any type of WAPS test scores or board results.	- Completed 6 semester hours ...

SECTION III. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT Continued. See paragraphs 3.1.8., 1.8., 1.9. and 1.10.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
24	Other Comments (AF Form 910)	Comments are optional; however if used, bullet format is mandatory. Comments are limited to two lines. This section may also be used to spell out uncommon acronyms. Note: Stratification is prohibited for AB – TSgt.	- Ready for Instructor Duty
25	Leadership/ Team Building/ Followership/ Mentorship (AF Form 911)	Place an “X” in the block that accurately describes how well the ratee works with others. Comments are mandatory, must be in bullet format, must support the rating, and are limited to two lines.	- Developed cohesive team ...
26	Other Comments (AF Form 911)	Comments are optional; however if used, bullet format is mandatory. Comments are limited to two lines. Stratification for MSgts and SMSgts that are TIG eligible can be placed in this area. Stratification is prohibited for MSgts and SMSgts that are not TIG and also prohibited for CMSgts and CMSgt selectees. (This section may also be used to spell out uncommon acronyms.) TIG eligibility does not apply to ANG and USAFR.	- #1 of 5 MSgts in Group Note: This example of a stratification statement is only authorized if the MSgt is TIG eligible and the comment is from the Group Commander. See paragraph 1.12.1.6.

SECTION IV. RATER INFORMATION See paragraph 1.4.11.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
27	Rater's Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter Rater's information as of the close-out date.	NANCY J. SMITH, CMSgt, USAF 20th Mission Support Squadron (ACC) Shaw AFB SC MERLE C. BUSCH, YC-02, DAF 50th Space Wing (AFSPC) Schriever AFB CO
28	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 or date stamp 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's digital signature.	
29	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case letters as of the close-out date of the EPR.	Superintendent, Enlisted Promotions
30	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number.	6543

SECTION V. OVERALL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	
31	Ratee Name	Enter the Ratee's last name, first name, & MI. This block auto-populates from the name entered in Section I.	SHAW, MARY E.
32	Ratings	Enter the appropriate ratings prior to rater digitally signing evaluation. See paragraph 3.1.10.	
33	Poor (1)	Mark when ratee performs at an unacceptable level. Disciplinary action is not required however, the evaluation will be referral.	
34	Needs Improvement (2)	Mark when ratee meets some, but not all, performance standards. Disciplinary action is not required but, the evaluation will be referral.	
35	Average (3)	Mark when ratee meets standards/expectations, performs in the median when compared to peers.	
36	Above Average (4)	Mark when ratee performs beyond established standards and expectations, performs at higher level than many of their peers.	
37	Truly Among The Best (5)	Mark only when ratee performs at a level above their peer group, elite performer who goes above and beyond. Every Airman does not warrant this rating.	

SECTION V. OVERALL PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	
38	Last Performance Feedback	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. If feedback was not required, enter "N/A." Complete prior to Rater digitally signing form. See paragraph 3.1.12. Do not use the date feedback was provided in conjunction with completion of the evaluation.	30 Mar 2006 Or Feedback was not accomplished due to ...

SECTION VI. ADDITIONAL RATER'S COMMENTS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
39	Additional Rater's Comments	<p>Comments mandatory; at least 1 bullet and limited to 3 lines.</p> <p>The additional rater marks the concur or non-concur box and makes appropriate comments.</p> <p>If the additional rater non-concurs with the rater see paragraph 1.9. for documenting disagreements.</p> <p>If the additional rater is also the reviewer, see paragraph 1.11. for mandatory comments.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.12. for prohibited comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outstanding leader ... - Orchestrated Dining Out

SECTION VI. ADDITIONAL RATER'S IDENTIFICATION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
40	Additional Rater's Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter Additional Rater's information. For 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. Multiple GOs serving as evaluators are prohibited unless authorized. See paragraph 1.7.1.7.	KATIE L. MCGILL, CMSgt, USAF 366th FSS (ACC) Shaw AFB SC MERLE C. BUSCH, YC-02, DAF 50th Space Wing (AFSPC) Schriever AFB CO
41	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 or date stamp 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 with additional rater digital signature. On AF Form 911, the reviewer's block will also be unlocked with the additional rater's digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
42	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case as of the close-out date of the EPR.	Superintendent, Enlisted Promotions

SECTION VI. ADDITIONAL RATER'S COMMENTS			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
	43	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.

SECTION VII (AF FORM 910) AND SECTION X (AF FORM 911) FUNCTIONAL EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR, see paragraph 1.6.7.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
	44	Functional Examiner or AF Advisor	When applicable, place an "X" in the appropriate box.
45	Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter Advisor/Examiner's information as of the close-out date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	JACK C. HALLIGAN, Col, USAF 20th Fighter Wing (ACC) Shaw AFB SC
46	Date & Signature	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. Digital signatures will auto date. Non-digital: Handwrite or date stamp the date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
47	Duty Title	Enter Advisor/Examiner's duty title.	Command Financial Manager
48	SSN	Enter Advisor/Examiner's last four. See paragraph 1.4.11.	1111

	SECTION VIII (AF FORM 910) AND SECTION XI (AF FORM 911) UNIT COMMANDER/CIVILIAN DIRECTOR/OTHER AUTHORIZED REVIEWER (AF Form 910), see paragraph 1.6.6.		
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	<i>Example</i>
	49	Unit Commander/ Civilian Director/ Other Authorized Reviewer	In this review, the unit or squadron section commander influences evaluation quality, removes exaggerations, identifies inflated ratings, and provides information to evaluators for finalizing evaluations. If the commander agrees with the evaluation, mark “concur” block and sign in the space provided. Do not provide comments unless the commander disagrees with a previous evaluator, refers the evaluation or is named as the evaluator in the referral memorandum. If the commander disagrees with the evaluation, provide reasons for disagreement on AF Form 77, see paragraph 1.9. Send the EPR to MPS/CSS/HR Specialist or to the next evaluator in rating chain when making the review before the evaluator who is senior in grade signs it. Enlisted personnel authorized to perform the commander’s review must include the words “Commander,” “Commandant,” or “Detachment/Flight Chief” in the signature block. In addition, an individual on G-Series orders or civilian equivalent filling a squadron commander’s billet, may complete Commander’s Review in the Unit Commander’s absence.

SECTION VIII (AF FORM 910) AND SECTION XI (AF FORM 911) UNIT COMMANDER/CIVILIAN DIRECTOR/OTHER AUTHORIZED REVIEWER (AF Form 910), see paragraph 1.6.6.			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
50	Unit Commander/ Civilian Director/ Other Authorized Reviewer	The Commander/Director may be assigned after close-out. Enter identification data as of signature date. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
51	Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location	Enter signature block as of the close-out date.	PAUL K. NEWMAN, Lt Col, USAF 366th FSS (ACC) Shaw AFB SC MERLE C. BUSCH, YC-02, DAF 50th Services Division (AFSPC) Schriever AFB CO
52	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. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
53	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case as of the close-out date of the EPR.	Commander Director
54	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.4.1	1234

SECTION VII (AF FORM 911) REVIEWER'S COMMENTS			
I	A	B	C
T	Heading	Instructions	Example
E			
M			
55	<p>Reviewer's Comments</p> <p>(AF Form 911)</p>	<p>Comments mandatory (At least 1 bullet) This area is limited to 3 lines.</p> <p>The reviewer marks the concur or non-concur box and makes appropriate comments.</p> <p>If the reviewer non-concurs with the any of previous evaluators see paragraph 1.9. for documenting disagreements.</p> <p>If the reviewer is also the rater/additional rater, see paragraph 1.11. for mandatory comments.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.10. for referrals.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.12. for prohibited comments.</p> <p>Senior Rater Endorsement Requirements: E-7 (Sel) thru E-8, TIG eligible, completed SNCOA and CCAF. See paragraph 3.1.11.</p>	<p>- Spearheaded ...</p>

SECTION VII (AF FORM 911) REVIEWER'S IDENTIFICATION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
56	Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command & Location (AF Form 911)	Enter Reviewer's signature block. For 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 general officers serving as evaluators are prohibited. See paragraph 1.7.1.7.	KATIE L. MCGILL, Col, USAF 366th FSS (ACC) Shaw AFB SC MERLE C. BUSCH, YC-03, DAF HQ AF Materiel Command (AFMC) Wright-Patterson AFB OH
57	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 or date stamp the date. Do not sign blank forms that do not contain ratings. Do not sign before the close-out date (only on or after). Do not date before the date the previous evaluator signed it or earlier than the date of the ratee's endorsement to a referral letter. Reviewer's assessment block will be locked with their digital signature. See paragraph 1.4.11.	
58	Duty Title	Enter duty title in upper/lower case as of the close-out date of the EPR.	Commander
59	SSN	Enter the last four digits of the social security number. See paragraph 1.4.11.	1111

SECTION VIII (AF FORM 911) FINAL EVALUATORS POSITION			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
60	Final Evaluator's Position (AF Form 911)	The final evaluator completes this section by placing an "X" in the appropriate block for the level of endorsement. See paragraph 3.1.11.6. for explanation of positions.	

SECTION IX (AF FORM 911). TIME-IN-GRADE ELIGIBLE			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
61	Time-In-Grade Eligibility (AF Form 911)	This pertains to TIG eligibility for senior rater endorsement (<i>not</i> the ratee's actual promotion eligibility <i>as of the close-out date</i>). The rater completes this section before forwarding for additional endorsement using information extracted from the EPR notice. Does not apply to CMSgt and CMSgt select ratees, Reservists or ANG. SMSgt selectees are not eligible for senior rater endorsement since they will not be TIG eligible for the next promotion cycle. The rater will complete this area and lock in with digital signature, if using digital capability. See paragraph 1.4.11.	

SECTION VIII (AF FORM 910) AND SECTION XII (AF FORM 911) RATEE'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT			
I T E M	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
62	Ratee's Signature / Acknowledgement	<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.</p> <p>Non-digital: Handwrite or date stamp the date. Sign on or after the close-out date.</p> <p>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 in the rating chain (digitally) signs. “Member declined to sign” – use when member refuses to sign the form; rater or any higher evaluator in the rating chain (digitally) signs.</p> <p>See paragraph 1.4.11.</p>	

Table 3.3. When to Prepare OPRs for Officers on the EAD and ANG Officers.

R	A	B	C	D
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

U L E	If the ratee is	And	and supervision period was	Then write evaluation and enter reason as
1	A Lieutenant thru Colonel See Notes 1, 2, and 3.	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	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, 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	Change of Rating Official (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 (Chief NGB; Office of Adjutant General; MAJCOM; wing, group, squadron, etc.) 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, Chief NG, etc.
7		a referral LOE has been written or an LOE would contain referral comments, if written. See Note 13	60 calendar days	
8		is placed into record status 6, deserter status.	60 calendar days See Note 1	Directed by the 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 court-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 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 MPS/CSS/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 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 have been obtained. The reason for the evaluation remains "Annual."

5. Do not confuse change of rater 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 1.6.3.

c. The home station and TDY unit commanders have approved the change [The Management Levels (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 an 365-day extended deployment billet a Change of Rater (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 3.4.13. applies.

10. For officers on the EAD and ANG officers, this includes placement on or removal from the control roster.

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/DPSIDE.

12. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE, HQ AFPC/DPSOO, 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.

15. The commander may direct an evaluation for significant duty improvement only if the previous evaluation was referred due to substandard duty performance.

Table 3.4. When to Prepare OPRs on USAFR Officers (Lieutenant thru Colonel).

R	A	B	C
U		and	Then write evaluation and enter reason as (See Notes 12, 13 & 14)
L		supervision	
E	If	period covers at least	

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 HAF or Directed by MAJCOM; wing, group, squadron, etc.) commander
5	the ratee has died, declared missing in action (MIA), captured, or detained in captive status	See Note 7.	Directed by HAF
6	a special evaluation is directed by HQ USAF. See Note 8.	as directed	Directed by HAF
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 HAF or Directed by MAJCOM, wing, group, squadron, etc.) commander
8	the ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status.	No minimum number of days required. See Note 10	Directed by the 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 court-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 rate is selected to fill an 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/DPSIDE or HQ ARPC/DPBR.
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/DPBR furnishes ratee names to the MAJCOMs 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 (excluding those centrally managed), the unit of assignment is responsible for completing the OPR. For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Category E, the unit of attachment 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/DPBR may extend the close-out to meet the requirement.

Table 3.5. Routing of OPRs for ANG and USAFR Officers not on EAD.

R	A	B	C	D
R U L E	If the ratee is	then the senior rater sends the evaluation	and MPS, Reserve MPS or State ANG sends evaluation to	and command personnel record group custodian sends evaluation to office of record shown in table
1	ANG (Colonel and below)	through channels to State ANG	HQ ARPC/DPBR See Note 3.	Table 3.6.
2	USAFR unit assigned	to senior rater's MPS or	HQ ARPC/DPBR	

		collocated MPS	See Notes 1, 2 and 3.
3	USAFR IMAs, PIRR, LEAD, & AGR	to the MPS servicing the rater	HQ ARPC/DPBR See Note 4.
4	USAFR HQ Assigned AGRs		HQ ARPC/DPBR See Note 3.
5	USAFR Colonel in a GO position		HQ ARPC/DPBR See Notes 1 and 3.
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For colonels, send copy to HQ AFRC/A1L. 2. Applies only to Air Reserve Technicians (ART) in grades Lieutenant Colonel and below. 3. Reports will be digitally routed through virtual Personnel Center-Guard Reserve (vPC-GR) to ARPC. 4. Reports will digitally routed through Case Management System (CMS). 			

Table 3.6. Office of Record and Distribution Required for OPRs (See Note 1).

R	A	B	C
U L E	If the ratee is	and the document to be filed is	Send evaluation to the following office of record:
1	on ADL and is a Colonel or Colonel select. (See Note 2)	original	HQ AF/DPC HQ AF/DPO (Brig Gen selects)
2		copy (See Note 3)	Headquarters having custodial responsibility for the officer's Officer Command Selection Records Group (OCSRG).
3	ANG not on EAD and is a colonel or colonel select. See Note 2.	original	HQ ARPC/DPBR for qualitative review and inclusion in Master Personnel Records Group (MPerRGp). HQ AF/DPO (Brig Gen selects)
4		copy	State ANG for file in OCSRG.
5			State ANG for file in State ANG Records file.
6			MPS for file in Unit Personnel Records Group (UPRG). See Notes 4 and 5.
7	USAFR officer not on ADL	original	HQ ARPC/DPBR

8		copy	MAJCOM of assignment having custodial responsibility of the OCSRG. See Note 6.
9	USAFR on EAD and not on the ADL	original	HQ ARPC/DPBR
10	on ADL and not covered under Rules 1 and 2, see Note 2.	original	HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP
11		copy See Notes 3 and 7.	Headquarters having custodial responsibility of the officer's OCSRG See Notes 2 and 7.
12			UPRG

Notes:

1. Transmit all “wet” signed ADL OPRs in a sealed envelope clearly marked OPR DATA--TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY.
 - a. Send OPRs through channels to the reviewer for completion (Table 3.1.). The reviewer ensures the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist receives evaluations for review no later than 30 calendar days after the close-out date. MPS/CSS/HR Specialist forward evaluations to the office of record by 45 calendar days after close-out for receipt and Officer Selection Record (OSR) by 60 calendar days after close-out through CMS/vPC-GR. **Exception:** Complete OPRs referred to the individual according to paragraph 1.10. and forward them for file in the ratee's OSR no later than 70 calendar days after the close-out date of the evaluation.
 - b. MPS/CSS/HR Specialist personnel may request OPRs no earlier than 30 calendar days after close-out in order to perform a quality review and update the system. The due date allows evaluators and the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist enough time for administrative work. Raters will not be required to complete an OPR any earlier than five duty days after the evaluation close-out.
2. Send OPRs for officers assigned to the Air Force Elements Command (AFELM), Code 3V, to 11 WG/DPJ for processing. This office will make distribution.
3. For ANG officers (except Statutory Tour), the MPS sends an additional copy, with appropriate attachments, to the State AG. For ANG Statutory Tour officers, NGB/OM sends to the custodian having responsibility of the officer's OCSRG. For USAFR AGR/LEAD officers, the MPS sends an additional copy with appropriate attachments to HQ USAF/REPS.
4. NGB/OM will retain a copy for file.
5. Not required for those officers for whom an OCSR is not maintained (AFI 36-2608, Table 1.2).
6. For judge advocate officers (AFSC 51JX), the MPS/CSS/HR Specialist sends an additional copy, with appropriate attachments, to HQ USAF/JAX. The OCSRG is not maintained on lieutenants or non-promotion-eligible captains.

Table 3.7. When to Submit EPRs on Airmen on AD including ANG AGR's.

See Notes 1 and 2.

R	A	B	C
U		and the period of	

L E	If	supervision has been at least	then the reason for the evaluation is
1	The ratee is an A1C or below, has 20 or more months TAFMS, and has not had an evaluation. See Note 3.	120 calendar days See Notes 4 and 5.	Initial
2	The ratee is a SrA or above and has not had an evaluation for at least one year.	120 calendar days See Notes 5, 6, and 20	Annual
3	The ratee is an A1C or below, has 20 or more months TAFMS, has had an initial evaluation, and has not had an evaluation for at least one year.		
4	The member requires an EPR because of placement on, or removal from, the control roster according to AFI 36-2907. See Notes 3 and 7.	60 calendar days	Directed by commander (Dir by CC)
5	An evaluation is necessary to document unsatisfactory or marginal duty performance or conduct. See Note 3.	120 days See Note 5.	
6	An evaluation is prepared to document significant improvement in duty performance. See Notes 3 and 8.	120 calendar days	
7	The ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status.	60 calendar days See Note 9.	
8	The member needs an evaluation in conjunction with AFI 36-3208 discharge action. See Notes 3 and 10.	60 calendar days	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
9	Authorities place the ratee in evaluating identifier 9A100 or 9A000. See Note 7.	120 calendar days See Notes 5 and 11.	
10	Personnel have declared the ratee missing in action, captured, or interned. See Notes 3 and 12.	as directed	
11	HQ USAF directs a special evaluation See Note 13.		
12	Ratee/rater departs TDY, other than formal training or contingency operations. See Notes 3 and 19.	120 calendar days See Notes 5 and 18.	Change of Reporting Official (CRO)
13	365-day extended deployments	120 calendar days See Notes 5 and 18.	
14	The ratee returns from TDY (other than for formal training or contingency operations) of 120 calendar days or more. See Notes 3 and 19.	120 calendar days See Notes 5 and 21.	Change of Reporting Official (CRO)
15	The rater changes as a result of a PCS or	120 calendar days See	

	PCA or an approved change of designated rater. See Notes 3, 16, and 22.	Notes 5 and 21.	
16	The ratee is separating, being released from active duty, to the active Reserves or ANG.	120 calendar days See Notes 5.	
17	The ratee is an ANG enlisted AGR member (Airman through CMSgt) and has not had an evaluation.	120 calendar days	Initial
18	The ratee is an ANG enlisted AGR member (Airman through CMSgt) and has not had an evaluation for at least one year. See Notes 5 and 6.	120 calendar days	Annual
19	The member needs an evaluation in conjunction with involuntary removal from ANG AGR or Statutory Tour.	60 calendar days	Directed by Full-time unit commander, TAG or NGB/CF
20	ANG Unit Commander, Adjutant General (TAG) or NGB/CF directs a special evaluation.	As directed	
21	A1C who enlisted under the National Call to Service (NCS) program. See Note 23.	120 days	Initial
22	Any sentence of confinement as the result of a courts-martial. See Note 3.	No minimum number of days required	Dir by CC

Notes:

1. If the EPR is already a matter of record and the event or circumstance that brought about the evaluation changes or no longer exists, take no action. The EPR is a valid evaluation and remains in the ratee's master personnel record. **Exception:** MPSs update referral EPRs into the PDS which were prepared as a result of a projected PCS and forward them to be include in the ratee's master personnel record, regardless of whether or not the evaluation was a matter of record at the time authorities canceled or delayed an assignment.
2. AGR/LEAD/ANG Statutory Tour personnel on EAD follow the same rules as for active duty personnel.
3. A1C and below with less than 20 months TAFMS do not receive an EPR.
4. The close-out date is the day the airman has 20 months TAFMS or has 120 calendar days of supervision. **Exception:** If the ratee has 20 or more months TAFMS and a change of rating official occurs before the end of the 120-day supervision period, the evaluation is closed out the day prior to the rater change (or the day prior to departure date if the change is due to the rater's PCS/PCA), provided the rater has obtained at least 60 days of supervision. The evaluation is "Initial (CRO)." Not applicable to ANG AGR personnel.
5. The period of required supervision is reduced to 60 or more calendar days for referral evaluations.
6. The close-out date is one year from the previous EPR's close-out date or when 120 calendar days of supervision have passed. If a rater change occurs after the original annual date passed, but before the rater completed 120 days of supervision, the evaluation is closed out the day prior to the rater change, providing at least 60 days of supervision have occurred. Evaluation reason is still "Annual."
7. Evaluations in accordance with 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. The close-out of the evaluation prepared when removing a member from the control roster is the day before the date of removal.

8. The commander may direct an evaluation for significant duty improvement only if the previous evaluation was a referral or the overall rating was "2" or "1."

9. The close-out date of the evaluation is the effective date the ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter.

10. An evaluator prepares an EPR when the commander implements a discharge and will close out the evaluation one day before the commander's written notice of the proposed action to the airman. The first EPR an evaluator prepares when placing a member on probation and rehabilitation (P and R) closes out 90 days after entering the P and R period. Subsequent EPRs close out 90 days after the previous EPR's close-out date.

11. The evaluation's close-out is the day before the date that authorities place the ratee in reporting identifier 9A100 or 9A000.

12. 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/DPSIDE directs.

13. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE (or HQ AFPC/DPSOE) if the evaluation is necessary for promotion consideration) directs evaluations under this rule.

14. Close-out date will be no later than the 15th day of the 1st processing month for each quarter (Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct) or upon 60 days supervision.

15. Evaluations prepared under this rule replace the requirement for an "Initial Evaluation." Project members for an "Annual Evaluation" based on the close-out date of the "directed by HQ USAF" evaluation.

16. If the ratee is also a rater, authorities assign a new rater for those individuals the departing rater rates. This rule does not apply if the rater and ratee depart together and no change of designated rater occurs.

17. The TDY requires no EPR if:

- a. The ratee is attending formal school due to retraining requirements,
- b. The ratee is already performing duty in the retraining AFSC, or
- c. Authorities expect no change in the rater before the ratee returns to the home station.

18. The evaluation's close-out is the day before the ratee departs.

19. Prepare a CRO EPR under this rule *only* if:

- a. Someone at the TDY location can perform normal rater duties,
- b. The commander at the TDY location agrees the new rater can perform the necessary duties,
- c. The home station commander decides to change the rater to someone at the TDY station,
- d. The ratee's servicing MPS updates the PDS to reflect the rater at the TDY station, and
- e. The commander assigns a new rater when the TDY ends.

The commander assigned to the ratee's home station PAS code must perform the commander's review. Also, on senior NCO evaluations, only the senior rater matched to the ratee's home station PAS code may provide an A-level endorsement.

20. The period of required supervision is reduced to 60 days if more than a year has passed since the ratee's last EPR. The close-out is the day before the rater changes or departs.

21. See Table 3.2. to determine the close-out for CRO EPRs.

22. Prepare an EPR under this rule if the Air Force is releasing the ratee from active duty to the

ANG or Reserve (AD or non-AD).
 23. See paragraph 3.3.4, A1Cs who enlisted under the National Call to Service (NCS) program will receive their initial evaluation upon completion of 16 months TAFMS minus 1 day.
 24. For prior service enlistee's with constructive credit on TAFMS, project for initial evaluation one year from EAD. **Exception:** For A1Cs, if the ratee does not have at least 20 months TAFMS, then close out the evaluation when the ratee has completed 20 months TAFMS, provided 120 days supervision have been obtained. Not applicable to ANG AGR personnel.

Table 3.8. When to Submit EPRs on USAFR/ANG Airmen Not on AD. See Notes 1 and 2.

R U L E	A	B	C
	If	and the supervision period covers at least	then the reason for the evaluation is
1	The ratee is a SrA, has 20 or more months time in service (from DIEMS date), and has not had a report. See Notes 3 and 8.	16 points and 120 calendar days	Initial
2	The ratee is a SSgt or above and has not had a report for at least two years. See Notes 3 and 8.		
3	The ratee is a SrA, has 20 or more months time in service (from DIEMS date), had an initial report, and has not had a report for at least two years. See Notes 3 and 8.	16 points and 120 calendar days	Biennial
4	The rater changes as a result of PCS, PCA, retirement, or separation. See Notes 6 and 7.	16 points and 120 calendar days	Change of Rating Official (CRO)
5	The commander directs an evaluation. See Notes 5, 6, 12, and 13.		
6	The member requires an EPR because of placement on or removal from the control roster IAW AFI 36-2907. See Note 6.		
7	An evaluation is necessary to document unsatisfactory or marginal duty performance or conduct. See Note 6.	No minimum points or supervision	Directed by the Commander (Dir by CC)
8	An evaluation is prepared to document significant improvement in duty performance. See Notes 5, 6 and 12.		
9	The ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status. See Note 13.		
10	HQ USAF directs a special evaluation.	No minimum points or	

	See Notes 4 and 6.	supervision	Directed by HQ USAF (DBH)
11	The ratee needs an evaluation in conjunction with discharge.		
12	The ratee is declared missing in action, captured, or interned. See Note 11.		
13	The ratee or rater departs for an AD tour of at least 60 calendar days duration. See Notes 9 and 10.	16 points and 120 calendar days	CRO

Table 3.9. Office of Record and Distribution of EPRs for Total Force.

See Notes 1 through 6.

	A	B	C
R U L E	The document is	and the ratee is a	Send evaluation to the following office of record
1	Digitally signed electronic evaluation	All CMSgt or below	HQ AFPC (Active Duty) HQ ARPC (ANG/USAFR)
2	an original “wet” signature	CMSgt or select	HQ AF/DPE
3		SMSgt or selects, MSgt or selects	HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP
4		TSgt or below	HQ AFPC/DPSIR (ARMS)
5		ANG enlisted AGR/Statutory (AGR) Tour member; all USAFR	HQ ARPC
6	a copy	CMSgt	HQ AFPC/DPSIR (ARMS)
7		ANG enlisted AGR member	Joint Forces Headquarters (Human Resources Office) for State File
8		ANG Statutory Tour member	NGB/OM File

Notes:

1. See paragraph 1.4.5., Reproducing Evaluations.
2. Referral EPRs. Complete EPRs referred to the individual according to paragraph 1.10. and forward them for filing in the ratee's ARMS/SNCO Selection Record (SNSR) no later than 70

- calendar days (90 calendar days for non-EAD) after the close-out date of the evaluation.
3. For AD. “Wet Signature” and Referral Evaluations. Once the evaluators complete the appropriate sections of the EPR, personnel should hand-carry or transmit it in a securely sealed envelope marked EPR DATA--TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY.
- a. Send EPRs through channels to the unit commander for review (Table 3.2.). The unit commander ensures the MPS receives evaluations for review no later than 30 calendar days after the close-out date. MPSs forward evaluations to the office of record no later than 45 calendar days after close-out for receipt and SNSR no later than 60 calendar days after close-out.
Exception: Referral EPRs see Note 2.
- b. MPS personnel may request EPRs no earlier than 30 calendar days after close-out in order to perform a quality review and update the system. The due date allows evaluators and the MPS enough time for administrative work. Raters will not be required to complete an EPR any earlier than five duty days after the evaluation close-out.
4. For ANG/USAFR. Once the evaluators complete the appropriate sections of the EPR, transmit it to HQ ARPC/DPBR via vPC-GR/CMS. For wet signature/copy must have “certified true” statement prior to submission.
- a. For HQ AFRC units, the evaluator sends the EPR through the unit commander to HQ ARPC/DPBR via vPC-GR.
- b. For IMAs and Cat E participants, the evaluator sends the EPR through the active duty MPS to HQ ARPC/DPBR.
5. File the original EPR on all Reserve airmen on EAD under Title 10 U.S.C. 672 or 12310 in the ratee's UPRG if still maintained.
6. Whenever possible, complete and file EPRs closed out for reassignment reasons according to Table 3.2. and forward to ARMS (TSgt and below) or AFPC/DPSIDEP (SNCOs).

**Table 3.10. Time-in-Grade (TIG) Senior Rater Eligibility Chart.
MSGT CHART**

If ratee is:	and EPR c/o date is:	and DOR is:	TIG Eligibility
MSgt	1 Jan 06 - 30 Sep 06	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 05	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 06 - 30 Sep 06	after 1 Jul 05	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 06 - 31 Dec 06	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 06	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 06 - 31 Dec 06	after 1 Jul 06	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 07 - 30 Sep 07	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 06	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 07 - 30 Sep 07	after 1 Jul 06	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 07 - 31 Dec 07	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 07	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 07 - 31 Dec 07	after 1 Jul 07	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 08 - 30 Sep 08	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 07	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 08 - 30 Sep 08	after 1 Jul 07	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 08 - 31 Dec 08	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 08	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 08 - 31 Dec 08	after 1 Jul 08	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 09 - 30 Sep 09	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 08	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 09 - 30 Sep 09	after 1 Jul 08	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 09 - 31 Dec 09	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 09	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 09 - 31 Dec 09	after 1 Jul 09	NO

MSgt	1 Jan 10 - 30 Sep 10	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 09	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 10 - 30 Sep 10	after 1 Jul 09	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 10 - 31 Dec 10	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 10	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 10 - 31 Dec 10	after 1 Jul 10	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 11 - 30 Sep 11	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 10	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 11 - 30 Sep 11	after 1 Jul 10	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 11 - 31 Dec 11	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 11	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 11 - 31 Dec 11	after 1 Jul 11	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 12 - 30 Sep 12	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 11	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 12 - 30 Sep 12	after 1 Jul 11	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 12 - 31 Dec 12	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 12	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 12 - 31 Dec 12	after 1 Jul 12	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 13 - 30 Sep 13	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 12	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 13 - 30 Sep 13	after 1 Jul 12	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 13 - 31 Dec 13	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 13	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 13 - 31 Dec 13	after 1 Jul 13	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 14 - 30 Sep 14	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 13	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 14 - 30 Sep 14	after 1 Jul 13	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 14 - 31 Dec 14	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 14	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 14 - 31 Dec 14	after 1 Jul 14	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 15 - 30 Sep 15	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 14	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 15 - 30 Sep 15	after 1 Jul 14	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 15 - 31 Dec 15	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 15	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 15 - 31 Dec 15	after 1 Jul 15	NO

SMSGT CHART

If rate is:	and EPR c/o date is:	and DOR is:	TIG Eligibility
SMSGt	1 Jan 06 - 31 Jul 06	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 05	YES
SMSGt	1 Jan 06 - 31 Jul 06	after 1 Mar 05	NO
SMSGt	1 Aug 06 - 31 Dec 06	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 06	YES
SMSGt	1 Aug 06 - 31 Dec 06	after 1 Mar 06	NO
SMSGt	1 Jan 07 - 31 Jul 07	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 06	YES
SMSGt	1 Jan 07 - 31 Jul 07	after 1 Mar 06	NO
SMSGt	1 Aug 07 - 31 Dec 07	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 07	YES
SMSGt	1 Aug 07 - 31 Dec 07	after 1 Mar 07	NO
SMSGt	1 Jan 08 - 31 Jul 08	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 07	YES
SMSGt	1 Jan 08 - 31 Jul 08	after 1 Mar 07	NO
SMSGt	1 Aug 08 - 31 Dec 08	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 08	YES
SMSGt	1 Aug 08 - 31 Dec 08	after 1 Mar 08	NO
SMSGt	1 Jan 09 - 31 Jul 09	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 08	YES
SMSGt	1 Jan 09 - 31 Jul 09	after 1 Mar 08	NO
SMSGt	1 Aug 09 - 31 Dec 09	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 09	YES
SMSGt	1 Aug 09 - 31 Dec 09	after 1 Mar 09	NO
SMSGt	1 Jan 10 - 31 Jul 10	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 09	YES
SMSGt	1 Jan 10 - 31 Jul 10	after 1 Mar 09	NO

SMSgt	1 Aug 10 - 31 Dec 10	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 10	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 10 - 31 Dec 10	after 1 Mar 10	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 11 - 31 Jul 11	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 10	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 11 - 31 Jul 11	after 1 Mar 10	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 11 - 31 Dec 11	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 11	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 11 - 31 Dec 11	after 1 Mar 11	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 12 - 31 Jul 12	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 11	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 12 - 31 Jul 12	after 1 Mar 11	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 12 - 31 Dec 12	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 12	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 12 - 31 Dec 12	after 1 Mar 12	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 13 - 31 Jul 13	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 12	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 13 - 31 Jul 13	after 1 Mar 12	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 13 - 31 Dec 13	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 13	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 13 - 31 Dec 13	after 1 Mar 13	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 14 - 31 Jul 14	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 13	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 14 - 31 Jul 14	after 1 Mar 13	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 14 - 31 Dec 14	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 14	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 14 - 31 Dec 14	after 1 Mar 14	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 15 - 31 Jul 15	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 14	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 15 - 31 Jul 15	after 1 Mar 14	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 15 - 31 Dec 15	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 15	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 15 - 31 Dec 15	after 1 Mar 15	NO

Chapter 4

AF FORM 77, LETTER OF EVALUATION

4.1. 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 anytime; however, unless the LOE is mandatory, the LOE is optional and only a courtesy. Evaluators preparing an EPR/OPR or TR using an LOE may quote or paraphrase information contained in LOEs; however if stratification is used it must be quoted.

4.2. Types of Letters of Evaluation (LOE). There are four types of LOEs:

4.2.1. **Formal Letters of Evaluation.**

4.2.1.1. 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).

4.2.1.2. As of this printing the only formal LOEs are the Deployed Commander LOE; the Wounded Warrior LOE, and when required for separation. Note: When applicable, administrative and supplemental LOEs will also be placed in the MPerRGp.

4.2.1.2.1. Deployed Commander LOEs, (Mandatory). A formal LOE that is used to document performance for those officers deployed to fill squadron, group, and wing commander positions. Accomplishment is mandatory. See Table 4.2. and paragraph 5.4.

4.2.1.2.2. Wounded Warrior LOEs, (Mandatory). A formal LOE that is used to document performance for those under the Wounded Warrior Program. Accomplishment is mandatory.

4.2.1.2.2.1. AFPC Evaluations Section (AFPC/DPSIDE) manages AF Form 77 for AFW2s. Formal LOEs will be completed annually on those AFW2s with a minimum of 60 days from the initial date awarded RI 9W200 / 92W1. The start date on the LOE will be the day following the close-out date of the last evaluation completed. If there are enough days of supervision for an EPR or OPR to be accomplished prior to identification as a wounded warrior then an EPR/OPR will be accomplished with a close-out date one day prior to identification as a wounded warrior.

4.2.1.2.2.2. The LOE will contain the mandatory comment "Member under the Wounded Warrior Program." If the AFW2 has performed duties or served in ways that go beyond the self-care expected of a patient, comments may be entered to address that performance. These LOEs will be signed by the individual's unit commander. **Note:** In the event the unit commander does not provide the completed LOE by 60 days after annual close-out date, AFPC/DPSIDE will

complete the LOE with the mandatory statement and this LOE will be placed in the member's permanent record.

4.2.1.2.3. 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, paragraph 6.4.

4.2.1.2.4. Palace Chase/Front or Transfer to another Service. If the ratee is separating to go into the ANG, USAFR or transferring to another branch of service, an OPR/EPR is required. If there is less than 120 days supervision, an LOE is required. If less than 60 days, no OPR/EPR, or LOE is required. However, if required, the gaining reserve/guard unit will prepare an AF Form 77 IAW AFI 36-2608 to cover any gaps there may be in the record.

4.2.2. Informal Letters of Evaluation (LOE).

4.2.2.1. 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).

4.2.2.1.1. Informal LOEs may be mandated; however only formal LOEs will be filed in the MPerRGp, see Table 4.2.

4.2.2.1.2. 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.

4.2.2.1.3. Informal LOEs are not attached to the completed evaluations when the evaluations are made a matter of record.

4.2.2.2. Informal Letters of Evaluation are used to:

4.2.2.2.1. Document periods when someone other than the designated rater supervises the ratee, (optional, but highly encouraged).

4.2.2.2.2. 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 EPR/OPR; i.e. PCS, PCA, CRO, (mandatory).

4.2.2.2.3. Document duty performance for periods of time when the ratee is under other than the designated rater; i.e. loan out to another section, (optional, but highly encouraged).

4.2.2.2.4. Document duty performance of deployed personnel not assigned to a deployed commander's billet, (mandatory).

4.2.2.2.5. Document duty performance for deployed personnel not assigned to an 365-day extended deployment billet, (mandatory).

4.2.2.2.6. Document personnel participation in the World Class Athlete Program (WCAP), (mandatory).

4.2.2.2.7. Document performance for other purposes when directed by HQ USAF, (may be mandatory or optional).

4.2.3. Supplemental Letters of Evaluation.

4.2.3.1. Supplemental Letters of Evaluation are LOEs that are required to be made a matter of record and will be placed in the Master Personnel Record Group (MPerRGp) attached to the evaluation they are supplementing.

4.2.3.2. Types of Supplemental LOEs include:

4.2.3.2.1. Continuation Sheets for Referral Evaluations. See paragraph 1.10.

4.2.3.2.2. Continuation Sheets for Evaluator Disagreements. See paragraph 1.9.

4.2.3.2.3. Continuation Sheets for the Air Force Advisor. See paragraph 1.6.7.

4.2.3.2.4. Continuation Sheet for the Functional/Acquisition Examiner. See paragraph 1.6.7.

4.2.3.2.5. Continuation Sheet for the commander's review comments. See paragraph 1.9.

4.2.4. Administrative Letters of Evaluation.

4.2.4.1. Administrative Letters of Evaluation are LOEs that are required to be made a matter of record and will be placed in the Master Personnel Record Group (MPerRGp) to document missing/voided evaluations or unrated periods in performance records.

4.2.4.2. Administrative LOEs are not derogatory in nature.

4.2.4.3. Administrative LOEs are used to justify legitimate gaps or unrated periods between evaluations such as:

4.2.4.3.1. To document a break in service, see Table 4.1., Note 5b(4)c.

4.2.4.3.2. To document extended periods of lost time; including military and/or civilian confinement, prisoner status and appellate leave. Upon release an AF Form 77 will be accomplished by the servicing MPS. 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 4.1., Note 5e.

4.2.4.3.3. To document an Educational Leave of Absences; i.e. Bootstrap and/or Educational Leave to a civilian institution, see Table 4.1., Note 5g.

4.2.4.3.4. To document an unrated period when the ratee was on the Temporary Disability Retired List (TDRL); then removed and returned to AD, see Table 4.1., Note 5h.

4.2.4.4. Administrative LOEs are use to substitute lost, missing or removed evaluations such as those:

4.2.4.4.1. Ordered removed by the AFBCMR, in accordance with AFI 36-2603, see Table 4.1., Note 5i.

- 4.2.4.4.2. Ordered removed by the ERAB, in accordance with Chapter 10, see Table 4.1., Note 5j.
- 4.2.4.4.3. Lost and/or missing evaluations in which all tracer actions have failed. See paragraph 1.14. for procedures on tracer actions and Table 4.1, Note 5k for preparation of AF Form 77.
- 4.2.4.5. The use of Administrative LOEs must be approved by HQ AFPC or HQ ARPC prior to placing them into the MPerRGp. Active Duty requests may be made by emailing: evalpolicy@randolph.af.mil.
- 4.2.5. Other Purposes.
 - 4.2.5.1. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE may use the AF Form 77 to document when a board specific PRF is not required or available as stated below:
 - 4.2.5.1.1. For officers who are on appellate leave or in prisoner status.
 - 4.2.5.1.2. For officers who entered active duty directly into Air Force-level training or officers who had a break in service and reentered directly into Air Force-level training.
 - 4.2.6. When directed by HQ USAF.

4.3. Who Will Prepare.

- 4.3.1. Raters, when there is a CRO with less than 120 days of supervision but more than 30 days of supervision.
 - 4.3.1.1. Refer to paragraph 1.7. when the rater has been relieved from their rating responsibilities.
 - 4.3.1.2. Do not skip evaluators who are temporarily unavailable or to afford a higher level evaluator the opportunity to endorse or comment on the LOE.
- 4.3.2. Personnel responsible for observing a ratee's performance when the ratee is not under the direct supervision of the designated rater.
- 4.3.3. Records custodians responsible for maintaining the MPerRGp, OSR, OCSR and NSR.
- 4.3.4. Personnel directed to do so by the AFBCMR or ERAB.
- 4.3.5. MPS CSS/HR Specialist personnel as authorized.

4.4. Administrative Practices.

- 4.4.1. 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.
- 4.4.2. Type the AF Form 77 when possible; legibly hand-write or print as a last resort.
- 4.4.3. 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.
- 4.4.4. 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.

- 4.4.5. Prepare LOEs in one copy.
- 4.4.6. Prepare LOEs using bullet format only.
- 4.4.7. Prohibited Comments. See paragraph 1.12. for prohibited comments.
- 4.4.8. Raters may show an AF Form 77 to the ratee.

4.5. Completing AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation.

- 4.5.1. See Table 4.1. for step-by-step procedures on completing all LOEs.
- 4.5.2. Deployed Commander LOEs, also see paragraph 5.4.
- 4.5.3. Referral Procedures, also see paragraph 1.10.6.3.
- 4.5.4. General Officer Letters of Evaluation. For GOs and GO selects see Chapter 7, paragraph 7.2.2.

4.6. Routing, Updating and Disposition Responsibilities.

4.6.1. Formal LOEs. Formal LOEs, formerly known as the mandatory LOE, are required to be made a matter of record and will be placed in the Master Personnel Record Group (MPerRGp) and a copy forwarded to ARMS. Perform any updates as required.

4.6.1.1. Deployed Commander's LOE.

4.6.1.1.1. 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.

4.6.1.1.2. PERSCO: Upon verification of eligibility, the PERSCO team forwards the completed LOE to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP within 60 calendar days after close-out date (paragraph 5.4.5.4).

4.6.1.1.3. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP will update all the deployed commander LOE in MilPDS as an "embedded" evaluation, forward the original LOE to the OSR for Lt Col and below, or AF/DPO for Colonels and a copy is forwarded to ARMS.

4.6.1.2. Separation. If an LOE is mandated for separation, it will be placed in the rates MPerRGp. Prepare when required by AFI 36-3206, AFI 36-3207, , AFI 36-3208, AFI 36-3205, and AFI 36-3209.

4.6.1.3. Wounded Warrior. See paragraph 4.2.1.2.2.

4.6.2. Informal Letters of Evaluation (LOE). 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 MPS/CSS/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 EPR/OPR/TR is prepared.

4.6.3. Supplemental Letters of Evaluation (LOE). 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.

4.6.4. Administrative Letters of Evaluation (LOE). 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.

4.6.5. All other LOEs not listed above. For LOEs not covered above, you may contact AFPC/DPSIDE or ARPC/DPB for procedures and/or further guidance.

4.7. CSS/HR Specialist/MPS/PERSCO Responsibilities:

4.7.1. Quality review LOEs and take corrective action if appropriate.

4.7.2. When applicable, make appropriate updates and place the LOE into a suspense file pending the next evaluation.

4.7.3. 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.

4.7.4. 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.

4.7.5. 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.

Table 4.1. Instructions for Completing the AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation.

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. Grade	Drop Down Menu. Select the appropriate grade. 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	<p>Drop Down Menu. Select either Supplemental Sheet, Letter of Evaluation, or Acquisition Examiner/Functional Examiner/AF Advisor.</p> <p>For Formal/Informal LOEs, enter: Letter of Evaluation;</p> <p>For Supplemental Sheets, enter: Supplemental Sheet;</p> <p>For Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor, enter: Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor</p> <p>For Administrative LOEs, leave blank.</p>
--------------------------------	---

SECTION II – GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	
Item/Description	Instructions
PART B	
1. From Thru (See Note 2)	<p>From Date: Enter the date supervision began</p> <p>Thru Date: Enter the date supervision ended</p>
2. Report Is	Drop Down Menu. Select either Mandatory or Optional. (See Table 4.2.)
3. Level of Deployed Commander Duties Performed	Deployed CC LOEs Only. Drop Down Menu. Select either Squadron CC, Group CC, or Wing CC.

SECTION II – GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	
Item/Description	Instructions
PART B	
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 Date of Order	<p>Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the G-Series Order Number.</p> <p>Deployed CC LOEs Only. Enter the date of the G-Series Order.</p>

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	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 1.10.6.3. for referral procedures.
SECTION V – RATER IDENTIFICATION DATA (See Note 3)	
Item/Description	Instructions
Name, Grade 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 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 VI – ADDITIONAL RATER (<i>Deployed CC LOEs Only</i>)	
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 1.10.5.3.2.3.
Name, Grade 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.
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)	
Item/Description	Instructions
I am referring. . .Specifically	State specifically what comments make the LOE a referral.
Send Comments to	Enter the Grade and Name of the Referring Evaluator’s deployed rater.
Name, Grade, Br of Svc of Referring Evaluator	Enter evaluator identification as of close-out. (See Note 3)
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.
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)	
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, Grade, 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	

Item/Description	Instructions
Acquisition Examiner Box	Place an "X" in the applicable box
Functional Examiner Box	
Air Force Advisor Box	(See Note 4)
Name, Grade, 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 handwriting, 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 USAFR 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".
 - d. 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. 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. 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, Maj General officer position, frocked or not.

d. 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. 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 1.6.7. to determine when an Acquisition/Functional Examiner/AF Advisor is required.

5. Gaps and Unrated Periods between Evaluations. See AFI 36-2608, paragraph 2.4. and paragraph 2.22.

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 officer 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 Career Enhancement element 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/DPBR 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/Career Enhancement element 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 "through" 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*, provided the rater has had 120 days of supervision or 60 days for referrals. **Exception:** A Directed by HQ USAF (DBH) evaluation is required for promotion consideration. For USAFR, less than 20 months DIEMS.

(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, see Table 3.5, Table 3.6, and Table 3.9, for routing and distribution.

(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*, provided the rater has had 120 days of supervision or 60 days for referrals. **Exception:** A Directed by HQ USAF (DBH) evaluation is required for promotion consideration.

(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 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/DPSIDE will prepare the AF Form 77. Enter the statement: "*No evaluation available for the period (date) through (date). Officer restored to 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. Temporary Disability Retired List (TDRL) removal and return to AD is prepared by HQ AFPC/DPSDD. 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 on tracer actions. For lost and/or missing evaluations in which all tracer 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.

l. When an AF Form 77 is used for other than performance evaluations, the HR specialist enters signature block and sign in Section IV.

Table 4.2. 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 Note 2 and 8	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.	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No	X	
5	Enlisted USAFR personnel when the rater departs PCS.	Informal (not filed in the permanent	No	X	

		record)			
6	Enlisted USAFR personnel not on EAD and did not participate during the reporting period. See Note 7.	Formal	Yes	X	
7	Enlisted ANG AGR/Statutory Tour personnel when deployed in support of contingency operations. See Note 4.	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No	X	
8	Active duty officer and enlisted personnel when deployed in support of contingency operations. See Note 2.	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No	X	
9	Supplemental LOE. See Note 5	Supplemental	Yes	X	
10	Administrative LOE. See Note 6	Administrative	Yes	X	
11	All LOEs, (Lt Col and below), not covered above are optional; however they are highly encouraged. See Note 2.	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No		X
12	Wounded Warrior LOEs. See paragraph 4.2.1.2.2.	Formal	Yes	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 36-3206, AFI 36-3207, AFI 36-3208, AFI 36-3205, *Applying for the Palace Chase and Palace Front Programs*, and AFI 36-3209.
4. An LOE will not be completed on enlisted Traditional ANG members or ANG Military Technicians.
5. Supplemental LOEs are required to be attached to the document they are supplementing and will be file in the MPerRGp with that document.
6. Administrative LOEs are filed in the MPerRGp for informational purposes, to explain gaps in records, missing evaluations, breaks in service, etc.
7. If the ratee did not participate during the period of evaluation, a formal AF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation (LOE)* is mandatory, and must state this information. If a rater has limited

knowledge of the ratee's performance during the entire rating period, the rater, as a minimum, attempts to get information about the ratee through whatever means is available; i.e. the first sergeant, second/third line supervisors and the commander.

8. 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 include in the ratee's initial evaluation.

Chapter 5

CONTINGENCY AND WARTIME PROVISIONS

5.1. Purpose. The USAF has been participating continuously in contingency operations since the early 1990's and has recognized the need to document this performance. As a result there have been two Chief of Staff of the Air Force initiatives that have already been adopted, the Deployed Commander LOE and the Extended Deployment OPR/EPR procedures.

5.2. General Guidance. This chapter will provide guidance for those deployed in support of contingency operations; procedures for the deployed commander LOEs and performance evaluations for extended deployments; and provide guidance for national emergency or wartime provisions.

5.3. LOEs During Contingency Operations.

5.3.1. 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.

5.3.2. 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.

5.3.3. 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.

5.3.4. 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.

5.3.5. When the deployed rater is not the home station rater an informal LOE is required.

5.3.5.1. Minimum number of days supervision is 60 days, however deployed raters may write LOEs for periods of less than 60 days.

5.3.5.2. 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.

5.3.5.3. 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.

5.3.5.4. Deployed raters prepare LOEs and provide a copy to the individual and forward the original to the servicing PERSCO team.

5.3.6. 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.

5.3.7. PERSCO teams will forward the original LOE to the member's servicing MPS or CSS/HR Specialist who will in turn place the LOE in a suspense file to be attached to the member's next OPR/EPR shell. Although highly encouraged, home station raters may or may not use the information when preparing the next evaluation.

5.3.8. 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.

5.4. Deployed Commander Letter of Evaluations (LOEs).

5.4.1. Definition. The Deployed Commander Letter of Evaluation is a formal LOE that when completed will be made a matter of record and placed in the Master Personnel Record Group (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.

5.4.2. Eligibility. All deployed officers (Active Duty, Guard, and Reserve) through the grade of Colonel, serving as commanders for 45 days or more in support of named operations.

5.4.2.1. 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.

5.4.2.2. 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.

5.4.2.3. For those officers filling 365-day extended deployment positions as the SQ, GP, or WG commander, a deployed commander's LOE is not appropriate. Those officers will receive an OPR IAW paragraph 5.5.

5.4.3. Effective Date and Implementation. In Oct 04, this CSAF initiative required the performance of all commanders, who were on G-series orders, filling a squadron, group or wing commander position in the deployed environment be documented and included in the officer's permanent record. This policy 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.

5.4.4. Deployed Commander LOE Processing Specifics.

5.4.4.1. See Table 4.1 for instruction on how to complete AF Forms 77, *Letter of Evaluations (LOEs)* for deployed commanders.

5.4.4.2. 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 optional 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.

5.4.4.3. 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, see paragraph 5.4.4.10.3. 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.

5.4.4.4. 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), see paragraph 5.4.4.8. **Exception:** If the rater is a General Officer, then the rater is considered a single evaluator (see paragraph 1.7.1.) and an additional rater is not required (unless referral).

5.4.4.5. 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.

5.4.4.6. 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.

5.4.4.7. Section IV, Comments/Impact on Mission Accomplishment. 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.

5.4.4.8. Section VI, Additional Rater. Used only for Deployed CC LOEs. The additional rater places an “X” in the concur or non-concur box. No comments are made unless the additional rater non-concurs, or the report is a referral, see paragraph 5.4.4.11.

5.4.4.9. Section VII, Ratee’s Acknowledgement. The ratee’s signature is an acknowledgement only and does not constitute agreement or disagreement. The ratee signs acknowledging receipt. Use digital signature unless the report is a referral, or the capability is unavailable. If the ratee is unavailable or refuses to sign there is a drop down menu which includes: “Ratee Unavailable to Sign” and “Ratee Declined to Sign,”

select whichever is applicable. In this case the rater or additional rater in the rating chain may sign for the ratee.

5.4.4.10. Section VIII, Referral Report. This section is for Deployed CC LOEs only. All other referral LOEs must use the same procedures as outline in chapter 4. The AF Form 77 is designed to include the Referral Memorandum directly on the form.

5.4.4.10.1. To complete Section VIII, enter the comments that specifically make the report a referral. Additionally, enter the grade and name of the person to whom the ratee must submit comments to (the referral reviewer's name).

5.4.4.10.2. The ratee has 3 duty days (30 calendar days for ANG/USAFR) to submit comments and the rebuttal. All supporting documentation is limited to a total of 10 pages, (5 pages front and back).

5.4.4.10.3. If the evaluator named in the in Section VIII, is the additional rater, Section VI, will be completed IAW paragraph 1.10.5.3.

5.4.4.11. Section IX, Referral Reviewer. Used only if the additional rater referred the evaluation or as authorized by HQ AFPC/DPSIDE. When used place an "X" in two of the applicable boxes and provide comments.

5.4.4.12. Section X. Acquisition or Functional Examiner/Air Force Advisor Review. Used only as applicable. Comments are for clarification only of Air Force policy only. Do not use for additional comments. When the evaluator on a deployed commander LOE is not an AF officer or DAF official, an AF Advisor (O-6 or above) will be designated by the MAJCOM or Combatant/Component Command. Comments are not mandatory and only required to provide clarification and ensure the report is written in accordance with AF standards, not to list additional accomplishments/voice disagreement. If clarification comments are provided, the comments are limited to five lines. The AF Advisor will then forward the completed LOE to the PERSCO Team.

5.4.4.13. 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.

5.4.5. Deployed Responsibilities.

5.4.5.1. COMAFFOR: Determines the rating chain and ensures compliance with policy at the deployed location. (**Note:** Normally the TACON determines the rating chain.)

5.4.5.2. 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 Table & Rule: T 33 - 44 R 02.00.

5.4.5.3. 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/DPSIDE. (**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.)

5.4.5.4. PERSCO Teams:

5.4.5.4.1. 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 4.6.1.1.3. for transmission of completed LOEs.

5.4.5.4.2. Provide the deployed rating chain the G-Series Order # and Date for LOE preparation.

5.4.5.4.3. Upon receipt of final LOE from deployed rating chain, verify if AF Advisor is required and forward to AF Advisor if required.

5.4.5.4.4. Final disposition of completed deployed CC LOEs.

5.4.5.4.4.1. Digitally signed LOEs: Upload the completed LOE into the Case Management System 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.

5.4.5.4.4.2. Wet signed LOEs: Mails the completed LOEs (AD, Guard, Reserve) to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP. In cases where the servicing PERSCO team is not collocated with the rater, the rater forwards the report to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP (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/DPSIDEP. 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/DPSIDEP. Upon arrival back to home station, the carrier will then simply drop the completed evaluation in the mail. The address for HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP is: HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Randolph AFB TX 78150. See paragraph 4.6.1.1.3. for transmission of completed LOEs.

5.4.5.5. Rater: The immediate next-level commander in the rating chain who is equal in grade or higher than the ratee. The rater evaluates the ratee and provides assessment on AF Form 77 upon ratee's relinquishment of command and forwards to additional rater. The rater completes Section IV IAW paragraph 5.4.4.7.

5.4.5.6. Additional Rater: The additional rater is the rater's rater at the deployed location. The additional rater completes Section VI, IAW paragraph 5.4.4.8. (COMMENTS ARE ONLY MADE WHEN REPORT IS A REFERRAL OR WHEN A "NONCONCUR" ASSESSMENT IS MADE), see paragraph 5.4.4.11. for referral procedures.

5.4.5.7. Ratee: The ratee completes Section VII, paragraph 5.4.4.9. and when applicable Section VIII, paragraph 5.4.4.10.

5.4.5.8. Acquisition or Functional Examiner/Air Force Advisor: When applicable, complete Section X, IAW paragraph 5.4.4.12. The AF Advisor will then forward the completed LOE to the PERSCO Team.

5.4.6. Additional Processing Responsibilities.

5.4.6.1. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP.

5.4.6.1.1. Upon receipt of AF 77, HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP will validate the form and update MilPDS for AD officers and send to ARMS.

5.4.6.1.2. 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.

5.4.6.1.3. For active duty officers, AFPC/DPSIDEP 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.

5.4.6.1.4. For Guard and Reserve officers, HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP forwards the original to HQ ARPC/DPBR, who will then be responsible for distribution and/or update to applicable organizations, depending on component/status, see paragraph 4.6.1.1.3.

5.4.6.2. HQ ARPC/DPBR // AF/DPO:

5.4.6.2.1. Will coordinate with HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP to identify officers meeting upcoming promotion boards.

5.4.6.2.2. Will conduct a quality control review of all deployed CC LOEs, process through ARMS, and file the LOE in the officer's selection record.

5.4.6.3. ARMS: Once a deployed CC LOE is received, ARMS will transfer to permanent storage.

5.4.6.4. 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.

5.4.6.5. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE: Functional OPR. Responsible for ensuring operational instructions and guidance, in conjunction with AF/A1PPP policy, is developed and disseminated to the field.

5.5. 365-day Extended Deployment Officer/Enlisted Performance Reports (OPRs/EPRs). **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.

5.5.1. Home Station Rating Chain Responsibilities:

5.5.1.1. Prior To Departure:

5.5.1.1.1. If there has been at least 120 days supervision, the home station CSS/HR Specialist will generate a Change of Rating Official (CRO) evaluation.

5.5.1.1.2. If there has been less than 120 days supervision, an informal LOE is required and home station CSS/HR Specialist will send the LOE 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.

5.5.1.1.3. 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.

5.5.1.1.4. 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.

5.5.1.2. Upon Arrival in the AOR: The home-station CSS/HR Specialist will coordinate with the deployed PERSCO 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.

5.5.1.2.1. 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."

5.5.1.2.2. When updating the DAFSC, use the required AFSC and skill level of the deployment tasking if different from the individual's current DAFSC skill level. If the DAFSC skill-level rejects (i.e. individual is assigned to a 5-skill level position number but filling a 7-level deployment requirement), reassign the individual to a position number that matches the skill level of the deployment and then update the DAFSC. If no positions exist in the unit, change the job AFSC to the deployed AFSC and skill level and save the record (do not assign to a position number), then update the DAFSC.

5.5.1.2.3. 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 ULN (and will typically have TACON) will determine the rating chain. 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.

5.5.1.3. Upon Return from the AOR:

5.5.1.3.1. 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.

5.5.1.3.2. 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.

5.5.1.4. Senior Rater Responsibilities: The senior rater matched to the ratee's home station PASCODE must perform senior rater duties. Home-station senior raters will prepare a Promotion Recommendation Form (PRF) for promotion-eligible officers (officers will be on the home station senior rater's master eligibility list and will meet respective management level review).

5.5.1.5. Interrogators TR : Officer and enlisted members who attend the Interrogator training program will receive a training report upon graduation from the course. The 314 TRS/CC will sign all TR . 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.

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

5.5.1.6.1. 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 would be extended out to where there would be 120 days supervision. Multiple evaluations may result and are authorized under these circumstances. 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 time member departs, an informal LOE will be prepared.

5.5.1.6.2. 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.

5.5.1.7. 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.

5.5.2. PERSCO Teams: The owning PERSCO Team will be responsible for tracking the evaluations on all deployed personnel filling Extended Deployment TDY billets.

5.5.3. Deployed Rating Chain Responsibilities.

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

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

5.5.3.3. Evaluations: The deployed rater (and additional rater[s]) will render an evaluation (Officer: OPR, AF Form 707) or (Enlisted: EPR, AF Form 910/911) versus a LOE (AF Form 77), under the following circumstances:

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

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

5.5.3.3.3. Upon completion of the extended deployment.

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

5.5.3.3.5. 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.)

5.5.3.3.6. 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.

5.5.3.4. Evaluation Form: For instructions on completing AF Forms 707, 910 and 911 see Table 3.1. (OPRs) and Table 3.2 (EPRs).

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

5.5.3.4.1.1. AF Form 707: Sections I through V.

5.5.3.4.1.2. AF Form 910: Sections I through VI.

5.5.3.4.1.3. AF Form 911: Sections I through VI.

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

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

5.5.3.4.3.1. AF Form 707: Sections VI through VIII.

5.5.3.4.3.2. AF Form 910: Sections VII through IX.

5.5.3.4.3.3. AF Form 911: Sections VII through XII.

5.5.3.5. Two GOs in rating chain: Currently Table 3.1. and Table 3.2. prohibits multiple GOs from serving as evaluators on performance evaluations. However, see paragraph 1.7.1. for the exceptions.

5.5.3.5.1. 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. Enter the applicable mandatory statement IAW paragraph 1.11.5.

5.5.3.5.2. Deployed GO Additional Raters:

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

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

5.5.3.5.3. Home-station Rating Chain: If one of the following situations apply, enter the applicable mandatory statement in the feedback comment section of the evaluation, see paragraph 1.11.9.

5.5.3.5.3.1. Evaluations signed by a Deployed GO and the Home Station Senior Rater is a GO, see paragraph 1.11.5.1.

5.5.3.5.3.2. Evaluations Signed by a Deployed Officer who out ranks the Home Station Senior Rater, see paragraph 1.11.5.2.

5.6. 365-day extended deployment Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRFs).

5.6.1. Senior Rater Responsibilities: 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 and will meet respective management level review).

5.6.2. PRF: Follow the procedures in Table 8.1., when accomplishing the AF Form 709 and the following:

5.6.2.1. DAFSC: Use the DAFSC the ratee is assigned to at the deployed location.

5.6.2.2. Organization, Command, Location: Use the home-station organization, with duty at...(Example: 341st Space Wing (AFSPC), Malmstrom AFB MT, with duty at 447 AEG, Baghdad International Airport (USAFCENT), Iraq). For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR & PIRR Cat E, use attached home-station PAS code.

5.6.2.3. PAS Code: Use the home-station PAS Code. For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR & PIRR Cat E, use attached home-station PAS code.

5.6.2.4. Mission Description: Use the deployed unit mission description approved by the applicable Air Component A1. (Example: AFCENT/A1). Home-stations can obtain the deployed mission description from the ratee's deployed PERSCO team. PERSCO Teams should work with their servicing A1 to ensure they have the approved Unit Mission Description for their location.

5.6.2.5. Duty Title and Key Duties, Tasks, Responsibilities: Use the deployed location.

5.6.3. Home-stations can obtain the deployed data from the ratee's servicing PERSCO team. PERSCO Teams should work with their servicing A1 to ensure they have the approved Unit Mission Description for their location.

5.7. Force Shaping Boards.

5.7.1. For officers on Extended Deployments as of the Retention Recommendation Form (RRF) Accounting Date for Force Shaping Board purposes, the first O-6/GS-15 in the deployed chain of command will serve as the first evaluator on the officer's AF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*. The senior rater remains their home station senior rater. Home station MPSs are responsible for providing copies of the Duty Qualification History Brief (DQHB), Record of Performance (ROP) and UIF if applicable, to the deployed location so that first evaluators may prepare comments and recommendations.

5.7.2. Deployed commanders should be aware of the potential effects on officers who are deployed when results of a Force Shaping Board are announced. Officers who are not selected for retention by a Force Shaping Board should be returned NLT 30 days prior to the mandatory DOS for separation processing unless mission needs require otherwise. If an officer is needed to remain in the deployed location for longer, the commander should submit an exception to policy to AFPC/DPPRS requesting a later DOS NLT 30 days past the member's projected return using AF Form 780, *Officer Separation Actions*. An officer may not be extended to a DOS that puts him/her past the FSB separation authority.

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

5.8.1. 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/DPSIDE, 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.

5.8.2. In implementing wartime provisions, HQ AFPC/DPSIDE will provide specific instructions regarding completion of evaluations, routing evaluations once completed, and any other appropriate actions. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE B or HQ ARPC/DPB will announce officer promotion recommendation form (PRF) procedures (see Chapter 8). HQ USAF/A1PPP and HQ AFPC/DPSIDE 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/DPSIDE directs.

5.8.3. When to Submit Performance Evaluations. (when implemented, supersedes the requirements of chapter 3).

5.8.3.1. Evaluations due prior to deployment:

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

5.8.3.1.2. 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.

5.8.3.2. Evaluations required during deployments:

5.8.3.2.1. Raters *will* submit annual evaluations when one year has passed (for USAFR, 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 3.3, Table 3.4., Table 3.7. and Table 3.8.

5.8.3.2.2. Raters will submit initial evaluations for A1Cs and below who have 20 months TAFMS, or a USAFR SrA or below with less than 20 months from DIEMS [16 months for airmen who enlisted under the National Call to Service (NCS) program] and the period of supervision has been at least 120 calendar days, (see Table 3.7). Not applicable to the ANG.

5.8.3.2.3. ANG and USAFR 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 active duty list provisions in this instruction.

5.8.3.3. Evaluations rendered in the Combat Zone. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE may suspend all provisions of this instruction in the combat zone except as follows:

5.8.3.3.1. Supervisors must prepare LOEs to document periods of time spent in the combat zone (unless paragraph 5.8.3.3.2 applies); however, supervisors will not prepare the AF Form 77 until outside the combat zone.

5.8.3.3.2. When the ratee's performance does not meet minimum standards, and/or evaluators determine a referral evaluation is appropriate, evaluators prepare and process an LOE according to paragraph 1.10. instead of preparing an LOE.

5.8.3.3.3. MPSs will continue to provide evaluators with technical assistance, help ratees with referral rebuttals, and control access to performance evaluations or LOEs, if written.

5.8.3.4. Evaluations rendered in the Communications Zone. All provisions of this instruction remain in effect, *except*:

5.8.3.4.1. 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.

5.8.3.4.2. IMAs or those who are members of USAFR mobilized units receive EPRs as required for other airmen on active duty according to Table 3.7.

5.8.3.5. Evaluations rendered at noncombat ports and MPSs. The procedures are the same as for paragraph 5.8.3.4.

5.8.4. Evaluator Requirements and Procedures for EPRs and OPRs.

5.8.4.1. Minimum Grade Requirements for Senior Raters and Reviewers remain unchanged. See paragraph 1.5.

5.8.4.2. Rater, Additional Rater and Final Evaluator requirements remain unchanged. See paragraph 1.5.

5.8.4.3. The rater cannot be substituted for any reason other than those outlined in paragraph 1.7.

5.8.4.4. “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 VII (OPRs) and section VI (EPRs) 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.

5.8.4.4.1. 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.

5.8.4.4.2. For SNCOs, time-in-grade (TIG) eligibility provisions still apply. (Not applicable for the ANG/USAFR).

5.8.4.5. For deployed senior raters. Vice wing commanders may assume the responsibilities of the senior rater/wing commander for OES/EES forms only when placed on “G” series orders and designated by the management level (ML) as the senior rater.

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

5.8.5. 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 not 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.

5.8.6. Routing Evaluations. Route evaluations according to Chapter 1. Distribute evaluations per Table 3.5., Table 3.6., and Table 3.9. except:

5.8.6.1. 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.

5.8.6.2. Forward evaluations directed under Table 3.3., Rule 4, and Table 3.7., Rule 9, for CSB use, to arrive at HQ AFPC or HQ ARPCR (as appropriate) by the suspense date provided in the directing letter.

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

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

5.8.7. 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.

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

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. Officers. 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] and COT). USAFR Air Reserve Technicians (ART) and ANG Military Technicians attending formal training or education in civilian status receive 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.

6.1.1.2. Enlisted. Upon completion or interruption of, or elimination from, training or education when the scheduled course length is 20 weeks (140 days) or more. This excludes Airmen completing initial pipeline qualification training. The TR will be a mandatory evaluation documenting performance for the period of the course. The start date of the follow on EPR will be the day after the close out date of the TR (day after course completion date). In-place policy will be used for WAPS calculations (EPR points). The TR will be considered a nonrated period unless the TR is a referral report. Referral TRs will be processed IAW paragraph 1.10.6.4.

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 FLEP or ELP ends after the officer's summer internship training.

6.1.1.5. Officer and Enlisted. For personnel participating in the 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 and Enlisted. 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 of 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 and Enlisted. 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, Note 6.

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), 20 weeks (enlisted) or longer unless specifically waived.

6.1.4. Officer and Enlisted. AFIT Master Degree Students and Other Long School Students. AFIT Master Degree student and other long school students will receive one final TR upon a course completion of 18 months or less, with the exception of above the promotion zone (APZ) officers and enlisted time-in-grade eligible students who 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, officer and enlisted Directed by Commander referral TR should be considered if student does not meet standards in an area other than training progress.

6.1.5. Enlisted Prior Service Airmen.

6.1.5.1. Retrainees completing initial skills courses lasting more than 20 weeks will receive a TR (AF Form 475) upon completion of the course.

6.1.5.2. Prior service Airmen completing initial skills training lasting more than 20 weeks will receive a TR. However, in the current environment, there are only a very few AFSCs where the AF is accessing prior service Airmen to complete lengthy technical training courses. In the vast majority of instances, Airmen who are fully qualified are being recruited, they then complete a two week "blueing" course prior to being sent to their initial assignment.

6.1.6. Guard and Reserve.

6.1.6.1. Students completing initial skills training courses will not receive a TR. It is a total force policy and same consistent rules apply.

6.1.6.2. Students completing training (not initial training) courses 20 weeks or longer in duration will receive a TR.

6.1.6.3. Students taking advanced or supplemental courses longer than 20 weeks will receive a TR.

6.1.6.4. There are no special or unique distribution instructions for Guard or Reserve members on TR. The same procedures used to process EPRs/OPRs 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 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 Ph.D. 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, notes 6 and 7, 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/DPBR (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/DPBR 60 days after the close-out date.

6.4.1.3. TRs on non-EAD officers are due to HQ ARPC/DPBR 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 Training Report to HQ ARPC/DPBR 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.

6.4.5. For enlisted personnel attending school (course length greater than 20 weeks, excluding those with less than 20 months TAFMS) in PCS status:

6.4.5.1. The school prepares the TR and forwards the original to the school's servicing MPS.

6.4.5.2. The MPS quality reviews the TR and forwards the original Training Report to the ratee's servicing MPS. It is the responsibility of the ratee's servicing MPS to forward the evaluation to HQ AFPC/DPSIRR. **Note:** When the ratee is a MSgt(s) through CMSgt, forward the original TR to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP IAW Table 3.9.

6.4.5.3. TRs are due to the ratee's servicing MPS 30 calendar days after evaluation close-out date, HQ AFPC 60 calendar days after evaluation close-out (120 calendar days for AFIT/civilian institution programs).

6.4.5.4. The MPS will ensure all TRs are updated in the MilPDS, see Table 6.3.

Table 6.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 475, Training Report. See Notes 1 and 9.

SECTION I		
L	A	B
I	Item To Complete	Instructions
N		
E		
1		The evaluator is responsible for accuracy. If adverse information

		is maintained at the training location, all TR evaluators are required to review the member's UIF if applicable, before accomplishing the TR.
2	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.
3	SSN	Enter SSN. Do not use suffix.
4	Grade	Enter grade. See Table 3.1. or Table 3.2., line 4, and related notes for differences based on status (officers on EAD, Non-EAD ANG and USAFR officers, AGR officers).
5	DAFSC	Enter DAFSC held as of the "THRU" date of the TR. Include prefix and suffix.
6	Organization	Enter organization data. See Table 3.1. or Table 3.2., line 9 and related notes for differences on EAD, Non-EAD ANG and Non-EAD USAFR officers.
7	Period of Report	See Table 6.2. (notes 1, 2, 5 and 9).
8	Course Length	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).
9	Reason for Report	Place an "X" in the appropriate box (see note 4).
10	School Info	Enter required information (see note 5).
11	Course Title	Enter title of major subject or problems presented or discussed.

SECTION I I		
L	A	B
I N E	Item To Complete	Instructions
12	Evaluation Report Data	Complete only the applicable items in this section; leave non-applicable items blank.
13	AFSC Award	Enter AFSC, aeronautical rating, or degree awarded.
14	Completion	Place an "X" in the box, if applicable.
15	DG Program	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.
16	Award/Non-completion	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 I I I		
L	A	B
I N E	Item To Complete	Instructions
17	Comments	Comments are mandatory concerning general attitude, military bearing and appearance, conduct and fitness. Place these comments in the "Professional Qualities" section. 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 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 paragraph 1.12. and notes 7 and 8).
18	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 <i>on the close-out date of the evaluation</i> . 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. For TRs prepared under paragraph 6.2.2., enter "N/A" in the "FROM" and "THRU" areas.

3. For USAFR 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 USAFR officers not on EAD, or NGB for ANG officers not on EAD. Evaluations prepared under paragraph 6.2.2. will reflect "Directed."

5. For USAFR 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.

b. Withdrawn for humanitarian reasons.

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 USAFR 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 under paragraph 6.2.2.

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.

R	A	B	C
U L E	If the member is attending	and education or training is	then the IMT is
1	A degree granting academic education program through AFIT, (Officers and Enlisted).	any length. (See Notes 1 and 2)	filed in OCSRG, NSRG and MPerRGp. (See Note 3)
2	Developmental Education, In-Residence, PDE, IDE, SDE. (Officers only).	8 weeks or more, but less than 20 weeks. (See Notes 4 and 5)	
3		20 weeks or more. (See Note 1)	
4	Formal Training or Education Program, (Enlisted).	20 weeks or more. (See note 1)	
5	The final semester or final year TDY under AFI 36-2306, <i>The Education Services Program</i> (Officers only).	any length. (See note 1)	
6	The National Security Seminar for all Selective Service USAFR officers not on EAD, (USAFR Officers only).		
7	A course or series of courses considered initial training in an utilization field, (Officers only). (See note 6)	8 weeks or more, but less than 20 weeks. (See notes 5 and 9)	
8		20 weeks or more. (See notes 1 and 9)	
9	A direct commissioning program, such as Commissioned Officer Training, (Officers only). (See Note 7)	8 weeks or less	
10	The World Class Athlete Program, (Officer and Enlisted). (See note 12)	any length. (See Note 1)	
11	The Air Force Intern Program, (Officers only). (See note 8)	20 weeks or more. (See Note 1)	
12	The Reserve Chaplains Program, (USAFR Officers only).	10 days or more. (See note 9)	filed in the OSR at HQ ARPC/DPBR

13	The Chaplain Candidate Program, (USAFR Officers only).	active duty tour of 10 days or more. (See Notes 1 and 10)	
14		8 weeks or less	
15	Training or education not covered above, (Officers only). (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)
16		20 weeks or more (See Notes 1 and 9)	
17	Interrogator Duty Training (Enlisted and Officers)	23 weeks or more (See Note 13)	

Notes:

1. Evaluations prepared under this rule begin the day following the “THRU” date of the student’s last OPR/EPR 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 USAFR students not on EAD, the date of the last assignment to the Ready Reserve position presently held. The “THRU” date is the date of completion, interruption, or elimination from formal training or education training. **Example:** A student has an OPR/EPR that closed out on 1 July 1995 and attends a course beginning on 6 August 1995. The course graduated on 5 August 1996. The period of evaluation should be 2 July 1995 to 5 August 1996. USAFR 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.
2. Do not accomplish Training Reports on student in the Education Leave of Absence Program (ELAP) in TDY status unless course length is 26 weeks or more.
3. The OCSRG is not maintained on lieutenants or non-promotion eligible captains on the ADL.
4. ASBC graduates will receive AF Form 475 regardless of course length.
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 1995 and attends a course from 1 January 1996 to 1 Apr 1996. The AF Form 475 covers the period from 1 January 1996 to 1 Apr 1996. The officer’s next OPR will have a “FROM” date of 2 November 1995 and the time the officer is absent will be subtracted from the period of supervision on the next OPR. USAFR 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.
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 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/DPP, 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 masters 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. For interns who opt to complete the masters degree, final TRs will be completed by HQ USAF/DPPE.
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. HQ ARPC/DPBR 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 Training Reports Pending System Change.

Rule	MilPDS Data Element	Enlisted Input	Officer Input
1	Type	EPR (See Note 1)	TR (See Note 2)

2	Status	Clos	Clos
3	Reason	Annual	Annual/Final/DBH
4	Rating	N	N/A
5	Start Date	Date following the close out of the last evaluation	20 weeks or more: Date following the close out of the last evaluation. Less than 20 week: Class start date.
6	Close Date	Date ratee completes training or graduation date	Date ratee completes training, graduation date, or date eliminated from training.
7	Performance Indicator	N/A	T (Meet Standards) N (Does Not Meet Standards)
8	History Control OPR	N/A	F (19 weeks or less) E (20 weeks or more)
9	OPR Grade	N/A	Applicable Grade
10	OPR DAFSC	N/A	Applicable DAFSC
11	Course Length	N/A	Scheduled Course Length. See Table 6.1. Line 8.

Note:

1. A MilPDS system change is pending to add TR as an option.
2. 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.

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. 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. GOs/selectees that are serving in a TDY status for more than 180 days receive an AF Form 78 (see table 7.2).

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 closeout 31 May; 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).

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 NGB Reports. NGB-GO may direct GO reports at any time, regardless of the days of supervision.

7.3.5. Officers Selected for Brigadier General. 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.

7.4. 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.

7.4.2. GOs nominated for Lieutenant General. Once a GO is nominated for appointment to Lieutenant General, completion of the report is optional. Remove the GO from the ML control group.

7.4.3. GOs who have applied for retirement. Completion of the report is optional once AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD officers) publicly announces a GO's retirement or, for ANGUS, NGB-GO has received the orders transferring a GO to ARPC, Retired Reserves. Remove the GO from the ML control group, and:

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. 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.

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 and AF/DPG (AF/REG for Non-EAD 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 15) and forwards it to the gaining ML for completion, to include the final endorsement or promotion recommendation.

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 15) 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.

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) or blocks 16 through 19 (officers not promotion-eligible). 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.

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 BG 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 closeout 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; NGB-GO for ANG officers; and AF/REG for Reserve officers.

7.5. Processing and Mailing General Officer Evaluations. Mark envelopes containing GO evaluations with "To Be Opened By Addressee Only--Contains General Officer Evaluation Reports".

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 prepares forms for appropriate raters, reviewing officials, and MLs approximately 30 days prior to the report close-out date.

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. 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 request copies of reports 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 folder.

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.

7.5.8. AFIs 37-138 and 36-2608 govern the management and disposition of all reports.

Table 7.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 78.

A	B	C
To Complete		Instructions
Block	Item	
1	Name	Self-explanatory.
2	SSN	
3	Grade	Enter the appropriate grade and include the status if the ratee is a selectee or is frocked. For example Maj Gen, Brig Gen (Sel) or Brig Gen (Frocked). See Table 7.2. <i>Notes</i> .
4	Duty Title	Self-explanatory.
5	Organization	
6	TAFSCD/ 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 (see paragraphs 7.4.8.2 and 7.4.8.3). Subsequent general officer reports will open the day following the close-out date of the previous report.
	"THRU" Date	USAF and USAFR EAD 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 or NGB 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.

A	B	C
To Complete		Instructions
Block	Item	
11	Comments	Type comments in Times New Roman, 12 pitch. Limit comments to 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. 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 Table 7.2 <i>Notes</i> . Do not date or sign prior to the "TO" date.
13	Signature	Self explanatory
14	Date	Date of signature

A	B	C
To Complete		Instructions
Block	Item	
15a	Promotion Recommendation	<p>ALL: Check "Eligible For Promotion This Cycle" Complete this block only if the officer is eligible for promotion as defined in AFI 36-2501, Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation, and the evaluation serves as the annual report as defined in paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of this AFI. otherwise enter "N/A" in each box of block 16. Active duty officers are ranked by grade and competitive category. USAFR does not rank by competitive category. Otherwise check Use Promote in the Future" and "Not Eligible For Promotion This Cycle No Recommendation" blocks to leave open the possibility for future consideration. Only use the "Retain in Grade" block if the officer should not be promoted in the future under any circumstances. Use the or "Retirement" block if the ratee's retirement is approved has applied for retirement. FOR MAJOR GENERALS: The major general ML control group contains all major generals, including selects and those serving in a frocked status. DO NOT provide "Promote Now" numerical rankings for those in the major general ML control group. You may comment on future potential to serve in a higher grade in block 1112, "Rater Comments," or in block 16, "Endorser's Comments" (if applicable). FOR BRIGADIER GENERALS: For officers receiving a " Eligible For Promotion This Cycle" recommendation, show their ranking in block 15b among all who receive " Eligible For Promotion This Cycle Promote Now" in the brigadier general ML control group and the total number of promotion eligible's within the control group. For example, if the control group has 10 promotion eligible officers, and two of those have " Eligible For Promotion This Cycle Promote Now" recommendations, they would be ranked "1 of 10" and "2 of 10." If a ratee does not receive a " Eligible For Promotion This Cycle Promote Now" recommendation, do not assign a numerical ranking. All promotion eligible brigadier generals will receive a promotion recommendation when the report serves as the annual report as defined in paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4.</p>
15b	Numerical Rank	Complete this block for Brigadier Generals only if "Eligible For Promotion This Cycle" is checked in block 15a.
16	Comments	See instructions for block 11 (this table). If the rater is also the ML, use block 12 to enter comments or type "The rater is also the endorsing official" in block 16.
17	Endorser's ID (name, grade, and duty title)	Self-explanatory. Do not sign or date prior to the "TO" date.
18	Signature	
19	Date	

Table 7.2. Instructions for Completing AF Form 77 for General Officers.

A	B	C
To Complete		
Sec	Block	Instructions
I	Name	Self-explanatory.
	SSN	Self-explanatory.
	Grade	Enter the appropriate grade, and include the status if the ratee is a selectee or is frocked. For example, Maj Gen, Brig Gen (Sel) or Brig Gen (Frocked). See <i>Notes</i> .
	DAFSC	Enter "90G0."
	Duty Title	Self-explanatory.
II A	Type of Report	Mark box entitled, "Supplemental Sheet" If a TDY rating official is rendering a report resulting from the ratee's TDY of 90 days or more, mark the box entitled "Letter of Evaluation."
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..."	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.
	Reason for Report	If the AF Form 77 is being rendered by a TDY rating official as a result of the ratee's TDY of 60 days or more, mark the block entitled, "TDY 60 or more days supervision." For all others, mark the block entitled, "Other - Explain in section III."
III	Comments	Hand-write comments in dark blue or black ink. Limit comments to space provided. Include comments concerning his or her personal and professional characteristics with emphasis on potential to assume a higher grade or increased responsibilities. 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.
IV	Evaluator Data	Information will be as of the "THRU" date of the report. Sign original on or after "THRU" date. Once the Senate confirms the promotion, Major General selectees may sign the AF Form 77 as a selectee. See <i>Notes</i> . Remaining blocks are self-explanatory.

NOTES:

Major General & Brigadier General "(Sel)"/"Frocked" signing OES forms:

A	B	C
To Complete		
Sec	Block	Instructions
		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c. Frocked GOs are authorized to sign all OES forms in their frocked grade without designating their “Frocked” status (i.e. Major General vice Major General “Frocked”).</p> <p>d. Once Senate confirmed, all GO selects assigned to joint billets or unified commands may sign all OES forms as “(Sel)”.</p>

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 USAFR 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 officers who are 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, date of rank or promotion selection status, due to the possibilities of their continual long term training status. See paragraph 8.1.5.6.

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 means the strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential warrants promotion.

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 means the ratee does not warrant promotion and should not be promoted 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.

8.1.3. 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. If promotion opportunity is 100%, regular PRFs are not required. This includes individuals competing for in and above the zone; any eligibles below the zone will still

require a PRF to be completed. **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, court-martial, referral-evaluation, LOR, etc) filed in their OSR.

8.1.3.2. 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" recommendation 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" the allocation rate will be applied which is announced approx. 60 days prior to the CSB.

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 Unfavorable Information File (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 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. 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 closeout 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 the Air Force Promotion System (AFPROMS), (formerly known as Promotion Recommendation-In-Board Support Management [PRISM]) information system 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 to senior raters. (**Note:** for officer's not located w/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 OCSRGps 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 kept on file until public release.)

8.1.4.2.9. Evaluates any potential adds or deletions to their senior raters and ML. (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, distributes 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 accordingly 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/DPSIDEB 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 OCSRG will serve as the "Benchmark" records in support of supplemental MLR (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 HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB MLR as needed.

8.1.4.3.13. Monitors AFPROMS Audit Transactions at least twice a week to identify any board adds, deletions, SRID changes, PCS/PCA/DAS actions.

8.1.4.3.14. Coordinates with senior raters, MPSs, and HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB as needed.

8.1.4.3.15. Monitors AFPROMS news daily.

8.1.4.4. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB MLR.

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 he/she has not received a copy of his/her PRF NLT 15 days prior to CSB. Prior to the CSB, must contact the senior rater to discuss any inaccuracies, omissions or errors pertaining to his/her PRF.

8.1.4.5.2. Ensures his/her record is current and accurate.

8.1.4.5.3. May correspond by letter with his/her 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/DPSIDEB, 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/DPSIDEB, 550 C Street West Suite 7, Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709, with the "Overall Recommendation" left blank, to arrive NLT 35 days prior to the CSB.

8.1.5.5. HQ AFPC/PBSE ensures the removal of the PRFs from the OSR immediately following the CSB and forwards them to HQ AFPC/DPSIR to be placed on optical disk. DPSIR 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 narrative-only PRFs to the MPS for officers in patient or Missing in Action (MIA)/Prisoner of War (POW) status to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB. 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/DPSIDEB. 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/DPSIDEB.

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/DPSIDEB maintains N-O PRFs until officers leave student, patient, or MIA/POW status. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB destroys narrative-only PRFs when the officer no longer competes as a student. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB maintains the N-O PRFs until distributed as specified below:

8.1.5.6.6.1. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB forwards the N-O PRF and R-O PRF to HQ AFPC/PBSE for inclusion in the OSR and provides copies to

ratees via the ratees servicing MPS.

8.1.5.6.6.2. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB 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/PBSE removes the PRFs from the OSR and forwards them to HQ AFPC/DPSIR 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. USAFR will use AF Form 709 for Position Vacancy promotion nomination to all grades. HQ ARPC/DPB 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 means the strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential warrants promotion.

8.2.1.3. A "Promote" ("P") recommendation means the ratee is qualified for promotion.

8.2.1.4. A "Do Not Promote This Board" ("DNP") recommendation means the ratee does not warrant promotion and should not be promoted at this time. A senior rater must make specific comments to support the DNP recommendation in Section IV of the PRF.

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. May consider other reliable information about duty performance and conduct except as outlined in paragraph 1.12, *Prohibited Evaluator Considerations and Comments*, 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 closeout 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/DPB (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. See paragraph 8.2.5.

8.2.3.2.7. Provides senior raters a listing of newly assigned eligible officers.

8.2.3.3. HQ ARPC/DPB. 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 APRC/DPB removes PRFs from the OSR immediately following a CSB, and forwards them to HQ ARPC/DPS for placement on optical disk. PRFs placed on optical disk have limited access.

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/USAFR, 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/DPB (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 (PRISM) User's Guide). Ensure senior raters certify a review of all gained eligibles.

8.2.5.3.2. Provide the senior rater a ROP and 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/DPB when a change is made.

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 USAFR transfer; USAFR 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. For 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. For 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/DPBR 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 (see paragraph 1.6.7. 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 USAFR 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.

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. For example, a 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 senior rater ID 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/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB. 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/DPSIDE as an exception. In addition, no changes in the ML’s allocations are authorized in cases where a Brig Gen (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/DPSIDE 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 (PRISM) 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). **Note:** 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, Note 2.

8.3.1.5.3. MLs receive separate allocations for in-utilization permanent party students, see paragraph 8.3.5.1.

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 ML reviews for award. For BPZ eligibles, they distribute carry-over allocations directly to SRs or through the ML review 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:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 1 \text{ eligible} \times 65\% = 0.65 \\
 + 1 \text{ eligible} \times 65\% = 0.65 \\
 \text{ML total} \quad \quad = 1.30
 \end{array}$$

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 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 ask for inputs from senior raters, but may make all final decisions on DPs awarded, can convene MLRs and allow the MLRs to score records determining the DPs awarded,

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/DPSIDEB.

8.3.1.11.3. Allocation rates applied to non-line I/APZ officers within competitive categories may be different from those applied to line officers. BPZ allocation rates

are the same for both line and non-line competitive categories. 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 Management Level Review for non-line officers, subject to the limits established by HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB.

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 (an Air Force line officer), those SR 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 when evaluating Lieutenant Colonels or at least a Colonel 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 SR 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 when evaluating Lt Cols or at least a Colonel 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 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.

8.3.2.5.1.2.2. 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 OCSRGS, 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 OCSRGS, 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 he or she prepares (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 OCSRGS 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 OCSRGS 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 OCSRGS 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:

Aggregation Phase

1 eligible x 45% = 0.45
 + 1 eligible x 45% = 0.45
 ML total = 0.90

Carry-Over Phase

3 eligibles x 45% = 1.35 (.35 left over)
 + 4 eligibles x 45% = 1.80 (.80 left over)
 ML Total = 3.15 (2 “DPs” are awarded by SRs)

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. SR 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 master eligible lists to the personnel activity responsible for updating the 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/DPSIDEB 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 rateses. This MLR will also review all PRFs completed by sole SRs. Sole SR are defined as when the ML authority is the only SR with eligibles within the entire ML (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, he or she forwards 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 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.

8.3.3.3.4.2.1. 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 programs, attaché/designate training, Medical Corps/Dental Corps 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/DPSIDEB 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 ML Review discussed in paragraph 8.3.5.2.2. 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 in patient, 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 and 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 Management Level Review (MLR).

8.3.5.3.1. Air Force-level students eligible for promotion may write a letter to the Air Force Student MLR. Ensure you:

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/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB. 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/DPSIDEB 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 Line of the Air Force Judge Advocate. Non-line officers (HC, MC, DC, NC, BSC, MSC) and Line of the Air Force Judge Advocate (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", "P", or "DNP" 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/DPSIDEB).

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/DP, 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/DPSIDEB 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 MLR for each competitive category.

8.3.6.4.4. ML Review 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 senior rater 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/DPSIDEB. 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/DPSIDEB 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 AFPRIMS.

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/DPSIDEB will:

8.4.1.10.1. Update all “DP” and “DNP” recommendations awarded by gaining SRs upon Stop File notification 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.

8.4.1.10.3. Update inter-command SRID changes upon receipt of STOP File requests.

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/DPSIDEB through the ML to have these officers removed from the SR MEL unless the status is after the PRF accounting date. HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB 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, court-martial, referral evaluation, LOR, etc.) filed in their OSRs. Exceptions to this rule can be addressed to HQ AFPC/DPSIDE. SRs will annotate the MEL with either a "P" (for "promote") or "N" (for "do not promote this board") and forward the 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 to arrive at HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEB.

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 Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRF) (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/DPB 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 USAFR GO CSB or an ANGUS Federal Recognition Board.

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., EAD 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, or on ANGUS Colonels being considered for certificates of eligibility to the grade of Brigadier General. When preparing PRFs on promotion-eligible Colonels, MLs may consider, in addition to the OCSRGp, other reliable sources of information., to include the 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.

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 (USAFR 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. Send completed PRFs on all USAFR Colonels to HQ USAF/REPS no later than 30 calendar days prior to the CSB convening date.

8.6.1.1.6. 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 USAFR Colonels.

8.6.1.5. National Guard Bureau ANG General Officer Management Office (NGB-GO/AF). 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.

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 USAFR 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/AF 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-P 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 AFCMO 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. 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 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 USAFR Colonels.

8.6.3.8.3. NGB-GO/AF 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 10.4.4.1.2. In addition, a copy of the letter and PRF must be forwarded to HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB. 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/DPSIDEB.

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*, Chapter 4, 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 instructions 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)

(Typed name, grade, branch of service)

Attachment:
AF Form 709

Table 8.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 709, Performance Recommendation Forms.

L I N E	A	B	C
	To Complete		Instructions (See Note 1 and Note 4; 365-day extended deployment see Note 11 and paragraph 5.6)
	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/DPBR 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	See Table 3.1., for EAD, Non-EAD ANG and USAFR, and AGR officers.
5		DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC to include prefix and suffix as of the date the PRF notice is generated. See Note 2. See also Note 3 <i>For Recommendation-Only PRFs</i> .
6		Organization	Enter organization, command, and location of assignment (with attachment if applicable). See also Note 3 for recommendation-only PRFs. For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization.
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 RMG/DPME (IMAs). For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. See Note 3 for recommendation-only 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: <i>For R-O PRFs</i> , 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 recommendation-only PRFs, enter “Student, type of school” (i.e., Student, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, etc.) For USAFR PV, see Note 10. For those assigned to an 365-day extended deployment billet, see Table 3.1., Item 11.
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 <i>For R-O PRFs, leave blank.</i>

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 <i>N-O PRFs and RASL</i> officers, comments on <i>all</i> PRFs are mandatory. Comments are mandatory for in the promotion zone (IPZ) and one time deferred (passed over) above the promotions zone (APZ) eligible officers. Comments are optional for Below the promotion zone (BPZ) eligible officers; and two or more times deferred (passed over) above the promotion zone (APZ) eligible officers; and for promotion to the grade of Brigadier General (Brig Gen) 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 DNP PRFs, refer to paragraph 1.12.27. For ADL <i>Recommendation-Only PRFs</i>, this section is blank. See Note 6 for expanded guidance on PRFs for ADL Colonels being considered for Brig Gen selection. Comments are limited to nine lines on all PRFs. AF/A1P may limit comments on the PRFs competing at the Captain's Central Selection Board to ensure equity and a level playing field for all eligible officers.</p>
13	V	Promotion Zone	<p>Place an "X" in the BPZ block for ADL BPZ officers. For ADL IPZ/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 Brig Gen selection. For ResAF officers, leave blank. For ANGUS Colonels nominated for Brig Gen, enter "N/A." <i>For N-O PRFs</i>, leave blank.</p>

14	VI	Group Size	For ADL officers, see Table 8.2. Type or hand-write the entry. <i>For N-O PRFs</i> , leave blank. See Note 6 for instructions pertaining to Colonels being considered for Brig Gen 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 Brig Gen, enter “N/A.”
15	VII	Board ID	Enter the CSB for which the senior rater prepared the PRF (Example: P0408A indicates the Calendar Year 08 Major board, and A0409A indicates the Fiscal Year 09 ANG major board). The PRF notice includes the board ID. <i>For N-O PRFs</i> , enter the date signed in this section. For RASL N-O PRFs, leave blank. For ANGUS Colonels nominated for Brig Gen, enter “N/A.”
16	VIII	Senior Rater ID	The five-character code used to identify the position of the SR. Enter this code as shown on the PRF notice. For centrally managed IMAs, PIRR or PIRR Cat E, use attached organization. <i>For N-O PRFs</i> , and PRFs on Colonels being considered for Brigadier General, leave blank. For ANGUS Colonels nominated for Brig Gen, 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 <i>N-O PRFs</i> , Non-Line and aggregate PRFs. For RASL, do not mark a recommendation for Position Vacancy or N-O PRFs. Nominees for ANG Colonel and Brigadier General are exempt.
18	X	SR Data	See instructions at Note 8 for Lieutenant Colonels and below, Note 9 for ADL Colonels.

Notes:

1. SRs complete PRFs no earlier than 60 days before the CSB (the PRF cutoff date). For USAFR, 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 USAFR 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 Recommendation-Only 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, developmental education (DE), and next assignment (*limit comments to the next higher grade*).

c. Evaluators may neither consider nor comment on candidacy, selection, completion of, or enrollment in 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. If stratification is used on the PRF then it is either quoted or attributed. 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). (**Note:** Stratification cannot be used from a previous evaluation not in an officer official record. 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 court-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.
- l. 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". 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 GP. 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 "No Overall Recommendation" in the top of this section. *For Non-Line of the AF officers:* MC and DC promotion to Major and Lt Col; LAF, NC, MSC, BSC, and HC promotion to captain--only "P" or "DNP" recommendations are used on the PRF (applies when the promotion opportunity is 100 percent). 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 Management Level (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 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-P 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/DPB. 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/DPB.

11. PRFs for 365-day extended deployments, see paragraph 5.6.

Table 8.2. What to Enter in (Group Size) on the PRF (ADL Lt Col and below only).

R	A	B	C
U L E	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:
 - a. APZ eligibles do not generate "Definitely Promote" allocations; therefore, they do not apply when determining the entry for section VI on the PRF.
 - b. If there are only APZ eligibles in an ML, a single "Definitely Promote" 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 "Definitely Promote" recommendation, and all APZ officers in the ML

receive a "0" in section VI on the PRF.

c. 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.

d. 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.

Number of IPZ or BPZ Eligibles	Allocation Rates (Percentages)																			
	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	0
2	0	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	2
4	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	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	4
6	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	5
7	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6	6
8	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	6	7	7	7
9	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	8
10	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	9
11	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10	10
12	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	10	11	11
13	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	10	11	11	12
14	0	1	2	2	3	4	4	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	10	11	11	12	12
15	0	1	2	3	3	4	5	6	6	7	8	9	9	10	10	11	11	12	12	13
16	0	1	2	3	4	4	5	6	7	8	8	9	10	10	11	11	12	12	13	13
17	0	1	2	3	4	5	5	6	7	8	9	10	10	11	11	12	12	13	13	14
18	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	9	10	10	11	11	12	12	13	13	14

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	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
23	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
24	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	0	1
25	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	20	1	2
26	1	2	3	5	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	0	2	3
27	1	2	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	0	1	2	4
28	1	2	4	5	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	1	2	3
29	1	2	4	5	7	8	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	0	1	3	4	6
30	1	3	4	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	1	2	4	5
31	1	3	4	6	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	0	1	3	4	5
32	1	3	4	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	0	2	4	5	7
33	1	3	4	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	1	3	4	6
34	1	3	5	6	8	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	1	3	4	6	8
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	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	1	2	4	6	8
36	1	3	5	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	1	3	5	7	8
37	1	3	5	7	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	9	1	2	4	5	7

38	1	3	5	7	9	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	36
						1	3	5	7	9	0	2	4	6	8	0	2	4	
39	1	3	5	7	9	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	37
						1	3	5	7	9	1	3	5	7	9	1	3	5	
40	2	4	6	8	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	38
					0	2	4	6	8	0	2	4	6	8	0	2	4	6	
41	2	4	6	8	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	38
					0	2	4	6	8	0	2	4	6	8	0	2	4	6	
42	2	4	6	8	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	39
					0	2	4	6	8	1	3	5	7	9	1	3	5	7	
43	2	4	6	8	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	40
					0	2	5	7	9	1	3	5	7	0	2	4	6	8	
44	2	4	6	8	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	41
					1	3	5	7	9	2	4	6	8	0	3	5	7	9	
45	2	4	6	9	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	42
					1	3	5	8	0	2	4	7	9	1	3	6	8	0	
46	2	4	6	9	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	43
					1	3	6	8	0	3	5	7	9	2	4	6	9	1	
47	2	4	7	9	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	44
					1	4	6	8	1	3	5	8	0	2	5	7	9	2	
48	2	4	7	9	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	45
					2	4	6	9	1	4	6	8	1	3	6	8	0	3	
49	2	4	7	9	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	46
					2	4	7	9	2	4	6	9	1	4	6	9	1	4	
50	2	5	7	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	47
				0	2	5	7	0	2	5	7	0	2	5	7	0	2	5	

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 X 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). Table 8.3 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 8.1.4., 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 1.6.7. 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 of Section V or Section VIII, 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: (SR'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 Board.

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 instructions as to what is permissible in a memorandum to the Central Selection Board. If you require further information concerning your right to submit a memorandum to the board, the MPS is available to assist you.

(Signature)
(Typed name, grade, branch of service)

Attachment:
AF Form 3538

Table 9.1. Instructions for Completing AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form (RRF).

L I N E	A	B	C
	To Complete		Instructions (see note 1)
	Sec	Item	
1	I	Ratee	See RRF notice for ratee identification data. If any data is

		Identification Data	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 or a combination of upper and lower case.
		SSN	Enter SSN.
		Grade	Enter appropriate grade.
		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	Unit Mission Description	Enter the Unit Mission Description. See Table 3.1., Item 53.
	III	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. See AFMAN 36-2622 for further guidance on duty title construction. For students, enter the student duty title. See Note 2.
		Key Duties	As in Table 3.1., Item 54.
	IV	First Evaluator Recommendation	Place an X in the appropriate block.
	V	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.
	VI	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.
	VII	Second Evaluator	The second evaluator indicates concurrence or nonconcurrence with the first evaluator's recommendation by placing an "X" in the appropriate box.
	VIII	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 court-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., *Correcting Minor Errors on Evaluations*, an applicant's first avenue of relief for correcting an evaluation is through the ERAB, which is accessible via the vMPF/vPC-GR, (see the PSD Handbook 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 Air Force Pamphlet 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 on AD or EAD personnel. 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 non-EAD and ANG/USAFR 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/DPSIDE and HQ ARPC/DPB) manages the appeals process and executes board decisions.

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 MilPDS 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 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. For example,

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 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/DPSIDEP 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 to evalpolicy@randolph.af.mil would suffice; or when the "YE" is not updated in MilPDS. 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 (EPRs, OPRs, PRFs, RRFs, TRs, Formal LOEs) 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. Performance Feedback Worksheets (PFW) 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. Certifying Copies of Digitally Signed Documents. See paragraph 1.4.5.2. or .1.4.5.3.

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 Handbook.

10.4.1.1.2. Detailed training packages are also available under PSD Training Tools.

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-GR. 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 Handbook 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-GR website.

10.4.2.2. The HR Specialist may be asked to provide HQ AFPC/DPSIDE or HQ ARPC/DPB 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 Handbook 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/DPSIDE 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. Active Duty:

HQ AFPC/DPSIDEP
Attn: ERAB
550 C Street West, Suite 7
Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709

10.4.3.2.4.2. Reserves/Guard (USAFR/ANG):

HQ ARPC/DPB
Attn: ERAB
6760 E. Irvington Place #2000
Denver, CO 80280-2000

10.4.3.2.5. Assist applicants in completing the on-line application through the vMPF/vPC-GR. If applicant is other than the ratee, the TFSC refers the applicant to the MPS or HR Specialist who will initiate a CMS case. If the applicant does not have access to the vMPF/vPC-GR, the TFSC will refer the applicant to the MPS or 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, *Privacy Act 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 10.4. and Attachment 2, paragraph A2.4. Advise member that it takes approximately 30-90 days (AD) or 90-120 days (ANG/USAFR) 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/DPSIDEP no later than 45 days before the board convening date, (not applicable for ANG/USAFR). **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 Training Handbook for guidance. All requests are submitted thru the vMPF/vPC/CMS unless authority is granted otherwise (see para 10.4.4.1.2).

10.4.4.1.1. If applicant does not have access to the vMPF/vPC-GR, he/she should contact the servicing MPS or HR Specialist who will open a CMS/vPC-GR 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/DPSIDEP 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 ANG/USAFR).

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, paragraph A2.2.

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/DPSIDEP, Attn: ERAB, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4709, (not applicable for ANG/USAFR).

10.4.4.3.3. The applicant can obtain copies of the contested evaluations and or documents required for their appeal through the ARMS access in vMPF/vPC-GR.

10.4.4.4. Make sure that no rule in this instruction prohibits their request, see paragraph 10.2.4., *Prohibited Request*, and Attachment 2, *Appeal Guidance for Applicants*.

10.4.4.5. Applicant’s may contact the TFSC for guidance and application procedures.

10.4.4.6. CTC and 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 or HR Specialist to initiate a CMS/vPC-GR case, or have the ratee to take corrective action on his/her own behalf via the vMPF/vPC-GR.

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/DPSIDE and HQ ARPC/DPB.

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 MilPDS; and forward the corrected evaluations to the appropriate offices.

10.4.6.5. Notify applicant of results via the vMPF/vPC-GR or email.

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.

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/DPSIDE or ARPC/DPB

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/DPSIDE (Active Duty) or HQ ARPC/DPB (USAFR/ANG) no later than 90 days before the specific date or event.

10.5.2.2. See the PSD Handbook 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/DPSIDE 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/DPSIDE or ARPC/DPB 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. Active duty officers can, in conjunction with their appeal, request SSB consideration for promotion, Regular Air Force appointment, In-resident PME, Selective Early Retirement, or Reduction-in-Force separation boards. You should review AFI 36-2501, Chapter 6, for additional information on SSBs.

10.7.2. Reserve of the Air Force 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*, Chapter 10, for additional information on SSBs.

10.7.3. Active duty 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	A	B	C	D
U L E	If you are	the desired action is	then submit the request	then forward to
1	the ratee is serving on Active Duty	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/DPSIDEP 550 C Street West Suite 7 (Bldg 499), Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709.
2	the ratee is a participating USAF Reserves or Air National Guard enlisted or officer		on AF Form 948, <i>Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports</i> , via vPC-GR . see paragraph 10.4.4.. (See Notes 1 and 3)	ARPC/DPB, Attn: ERAB 6760 East Irvington #2000, Denver CO 80280-2000.
3	the ratee is a non-participating reservist, retired, discharged,	not allowed under this instruction. (See paragraph	on DD Form 149, <i>Application for Correction of Military Record Under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section</i>	Air Force Review Boards Office (SAF/MRBR), 550 C Street West

	separated, dismissed, or dropped from rolls; or request is not allowed.	10.1.4.)	1552, IAW AFI 36-2603 (See Note 3)	Suite 40 (Bldg 499), Randolph AFB 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.
3. 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-GR.</p> <p>The error is consider minor if the request is to correct an error in:</p>
L	
E	
1	<p>The ratee identification data: Name, grade, Social Security Number (SSN), (component, ANG/USAFR only), or organizational element, or the identification data of an evaluator who signed the evaluation. Name, grade, SSN, duty title, organizational element, date of signature, or final evaluator's position.</p> <p>(See notes 1, 2, and 3.) Go to Table 10.3.</p>
2	<p>Enlisted: The ratee's Duty Air Force Specialty Code (DAFSC), duty title, or level of duty. 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-GR. 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	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.
4	The marking of a concur or non-concur box, or to add a missing rating. (See notes 1 and 7.) Go to Table 10.3.
5	Spelling, punctuation or heading in an evaluator's comments. (See notes 1, 9, and 10.) Go to Table 10.3.
6	The ratee's name or grade in an evaluator's comments. (See notes 1 and 9.) Go to Table 10.3.

Notes:

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, *Enlisted Performance Report, MSgt thru CMSgt*) 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 SSB, Supplemental Promotion Board, 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, you must submit a request according to Table 10.1.
7. **Caution:** Take extreme care when adding missing ratings or correcting concur/nonconcur boxes. Submit an application IAW Table 10.1. anytime the rater's or endorser's rating(s) are

missing and the nonconcur box is also marked, or neither box is marked. However, you can correct an unmarked or mismarked concur or nonconcur 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	A	B
U L E	If the correction is authorized IAW Table 10.2 and the ratee is a:	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-GR. The agency authorized to make the minor correction is the:
1	All enlisted grades (AD) – AB - CMSgt	AFPC (See Notes 1 through 6)
2	2Lts through Lt Cols (ADL)	AF/DPE Chiefs Group
3	CMSgts selectees and CMSgts (AD)	
4	Colonel selects and Colonels (ADL)	Colonels Group USAF/DPO 2221 South Clarke Street Crystal Plaza 6, Suite 500 Arlington VA 22202 (See Notes 1 through 6)
5	All general officers and brigadier general selectees	General Officers Group AF/DPG 1040 AF Pentagon, Room 5C238 Washington DC 20330-1040 (See Notes 1 through 6)
6	All ANG or USAFR officers and enlisted personnel in the grade of colonel and below	HQ ARPC/DPB Attn: ERAB 6760 E. Irvington Place #2000 Denver CO 80280-2000

		(See Notes 1 through 6)
<p>Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 under this Table, the office that maintains the original evaluation will make the correction to the original and forward copies to the appropriate offices. 4. If the request is valid, correct and annotate the original evaluation according to Table 10.4. The person certifying the correction must be a SSgt, GS-4 or above, or Pay Band 1. 5. The ERAB and the AFBCMR has the authority to correct or direct correction and distribution of all evaluations. 6. Disposition. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. TSgt and below: Original – AFPC/DPSIR(ARMS) b. MSgt selects and above Original – AFPC/DPSIDEP and officers: Copy – AFPC/DPSIR (ARMS) c. All ANG Original – HQ ARPC/DPB, AFPC/DPSIR (ARMS) USAFR AB through Col 		

Table 10.4. Board Directed Corrections - Correcting and Disposition of Documents.

R	A	B	C	D	E
U L E	If the action is a correction	that	then the agency authorized to make the correction is	who will	and
1	directed by the ERAB and ratee is in the grade of E-7 select or higher	changes an evaluation	HQ AFPC/DPSIDE ARPC/DPB AF/DPG AF/DPO	correct and initiate correction of the evaluation. (See Notes 2 and 3)	distributes copies of the corrected evaluation, AF Form 77, <i>Letter of Evaluation</i> , or other documents to
2				prepares an AF Form 77	records custodians with appropriate

				(See Note 4)	instructions. (See Note 9)
3				annotates the document (See Note 7)	
4	directed by the ERAB and ratee is in grade E6 or below		MPS Evaluations Element (See Note 1)	correct the evaluation (See Notes 2 and 3)	
5				prepare an AF Form 77 (See Note 4)	
6				annotate the document (See Note 7)	
7	directed by the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)		HQ AFPC/DPSIDE ARPC/ DPB AF/DPG AF/DPO	correct and initiate correction of the evaluation as directed by the AFBCMR (See Note 8)	

Notes:

1. Do not correct or remove evaluations until either HQ AFPC/DPSIDE or ARPC/- DPB provides written instructions. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE and ARPC/ DPB also has authority to correct these evaluations.
2. 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/DPSIDEP...) Align authenticator data in margin to allow adequate space for punched holes. The person signing the annotation must be a SSgt, GS-4 equivalent or above or Pay Band 1.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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 (see paragraph 1.4.5.2.) or a replacement TR and request it be included through the ERAB.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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."

9. Disposition.

a. TSgt and below: Original – AFPC/DPSIDEP, processing to AFPC/DPSIR (ARMS)

b. MSgt selects and above: Original – AFPC/DPSIDEP, processing to AFPC/DPSIR (ARMS) and officers

c. All ANG and USAFR AB to Colonel Original –/ ARPC/DPB, processing to AFPC/DPSIR (ARMS)

Table 10.5. Correcting AF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Forms.

R	A	B	C	D
U L E	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/DPSIDEP, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4709 or HQ ARPC/DPB, 6760 E. Irvington Pl, #2000, Denver, CO 80280-2000
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/DPSIDEB//ARPC/DPB) 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/DPSIDEP. 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.

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	- List all evaluations being appealed by type of evaluation (i.e. EPR, OPR, Training Report, LOE, or PRF).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify EPR/OPR/Training Reports/LOEs by their THRU (close-out) date. - Identify PRFs by the BOARD ID (Found in Section VII on the AF Form 709).
<p>9</p>	<p>SSB/Supplemental Promotion consideration for officers and active duty enlisted personnel</p>	<p>Applies only to: Enlisted: Active Duty Only Officers: Active Duty, Extended Active Duty, 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 10.4.2. for expedited processing requirements</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Commander’s certification</p>	<p>Enlisted Only. CC must recommend approval/disapproval for SSB consideration, by placing an “X” in the appropriate box and signing/dating this section.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Action Requested</p>	<p>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</p>

		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	<p>List all attachments in chronological order and identify each.</p> <p>Example:</p> <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 <p>If you need more room, continue on plain bond paper. If you have numerous attachments, use tabs to make the case easier to review.</p>
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)			
PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT			
<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)			
<p>- Request 8 Jun 10 EPR be substituted with attached reaccomplished EPR</p> <p>- Items listed in Sec III Block 5 were not accomplished by the member</p>			
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			
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.)			
14. SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT <i>John A. Brown</i>			DATE 2 Aug 10

AF IMT 948, 20051001, V1

PREVIOUS EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (When filled in)

DARRELL D. JONES, Lt General, USAF
DCS, Manpower, Personnel, and Services

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

- AFPD 36-24, *Military Evaluations*, 11 June 1993
- Title 10, United States Code, *Armed Forces*
- Title 32, United States Code, *National Guard*
- Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)*
- AFMAN 10-3902, *Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Program*, 13 November 2006
- AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008
- AFI 33-322, *Records Management Program*, 4 June 2012
- AFI 33-322, *Records Management Program, AFPC Supplement*, 16 July 2010
- AFI 33-360, *Publications Management Program*, 18 May 2006
- AFI 33-364, *Records Disposition Procedures and Responsibilities*, 22 December 2006
- AFI 36-2306, *The Education Services Program*, 16 October 2000
- AFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, 16 June 2004
- 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*, 1 March 1996
- AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*, 30 August 2006
- AFI 36-2706, *Military Equal Opportunity and Treatment (MEO) Program*, 5 October 2010
- AFI 36-2907, *Unfavorable Information File (UIF) Program*, 17 June 2005
- AFI 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers*, 9 June 2004
- AFI 36-3207, *Separating Commissioned Officers*, 9 June 2004
- AFI 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, 9 July 2004
- AFI 36-3209, *Separation Procedures for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Members*, 14 April 2005
- AFI 33-332, *Privacy Act Program*, 16 May 2011
- AFI 65-201, *Managers' Internal Control Program Procedures*, 12 October 2006
- AFI 51-903, *Dissident and Protest Activities*, 1 February 1998
- AFI 91-204, *Safety Investigations and Reports*, 24 September 2008
- AFI 91-301, *Air Force Occupational and Environmental Safety, Fire Protection, and Health (AFOSH) Program*, 1 June 1996

AFRIMS, *Air Force Records Information Management System*, <https://www.my.af.mil/gcss-af61a/afrims/afrims/>

AFSUPDODR5400-7, *Freedom of Information Act Program*, 1 July 1999

Executive Order 9397, 22 November 1943

NGR (AF) 36-1, *Federal Recognition of General Officer Appointment and Promotion in the Air National Guard of the United States and as a Reserve of the Air Force*

Public Law 93-579, *Privacy Act of 1974*, Title 5, United States Code, Sections 552a and 553

System of Records Notice F 036 AF PC A, *Effectiveness/Performance Reporting Systems*

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 through Col)*

AF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation*

AF Form 724, *Officer Performance Feedback Worksheet (Lt through Col)*

AF Form 910, *Enlisted Performance Report (AB through TSgt)*

AF Form 911, *Enlisted Performance Report (MSgt through CMSgt)*

AF Form 931, *Performance Feedback Worksheet (AB through TSgt)*

AF Form 932, *Performance Feedback Worksheet (MSgt through CMSgt)*

AF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation*

Adopted Forms

AF Form 174, *Record of Individual Counseling*

AF Form 330, *Records Transmittal/Request*

AF Form 780, *Officer Separation Actions*

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 3538, *Retention Recommendation Form*

AF Form 3849, *PME/AFT/RTFB/Officer Worksheet*

DD Form 149, *Application for Correction of Military Records*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAD—Advanced Academic Degree

A1C—Airman First Class

AB—Airman Basic

AD—Active Duty

ADL—Active Duty List

AFBCMR—Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records

AFGOMO—Air Force General Officer Matters Office (SAF/DPG)

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFISR—Air Force Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance Agency

AFIT—Air Force Institute of Technology

AFPC—Air Force Personnel Center

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFPROMS—Air Force Promotions System (formerly PRISM)

AFR—Air Force Regulation

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFSC—Air Force Specialty Code

AFW2—Air Force Wounded Warrior

AG—Adjutant General

AGR—Active Guard/Reserve

ALS—Airman Leadership School

AML—Above the Management Level

ANG—Air National Guard

ANGUS—Air National Guard of the United States

APR—Airman Performance Report

APZ—Above-the-Promotion Zone

ARMS—Automated Records Management System

ARPC—Air Reserve Personnel Center

ART—Air Reserve Technician

AWOL—Absent without leave

BPZ—Below-the-Promotion Zone

Brig Gen—Brigadier General

BSC—Biomedical Sciences Corps

BTZ—Below-the-Zone (SrA)

CAC—Common Access Card
CJCS—Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
CMS—Case Management System
CMTS—Case Management Tracking System
CMSgt—Chief Master Sergeant
CRO—Change of Reporting Official (change of rater)
CSAF—Chief of Staff, United States Air Force
CSB—Central Selection Board
CSS/HR Specialist—Commander Support Staff/Human Resource Specialist
DP—Definitely Promote
DAF—Department of the Air Force
DAFSC—Duty Air Force Specialty Code
DBH—Directed by HAF
DC—Dental Corps
DCS—Deputy Chief of Staff
DE—Developmental Education
DG—Distinguished Graduate
DNP—Do Not Promote
DoD—Department of Defense
DOR—Date of Rank
DQHB—Duty Qualification History Brief
EAD—Extended Active Duty
EES—Enlisted Evaluation System
ELP—Excess Leave Program
ERAB—Evaluation Reports Appeal Board
EPR—Enlisted Performance Report
ETCA—Air Force Education and Training Course Announcement
FLEP—Funded Legal Education Program
GM—General manager
GO—General officer
GS—General Schedule
HAF—Headquarters Air Force

HC—Chaplain Corps

HQ—Headquarters

IAW—In Accordance With

IDE—Intermediate Developmental Education

IMA—Individual Mobilization Augmentee

IPZ—In-the-promotion zone

I/APZ—In-or-above-the-promotion zone

JA—Judge Advocate

JPME—Joint Professional Military Education

LAF—Line of the Air Force

LEAD—Limited Extended Active Duty

LOE—Letter of Evaluation

MAJCOM—Major Air Command

MC—Medical Corps

MEL—Master Eligibility List

MIA—Missing-in-Action

MilPDS—Military Personnel Data System

ML—Management Level

MLR—Management Level Review

MPerRGp—Master Personnel Record Group

MPS—Military Personnel Section (formerly Military Personnel Flight [MPF])

MSC—Medical Service Corps

MSgt—Master Sergeant

NC—Nurse Corps

NCO—Noncommissioned officer

NCOIC—Noncommissioned officer-in-charge

NGB—National Guard Bureau

NMI—No Middle Initial

NSR—Senior NCO Selection Record

OCSRGP—Officer Command Selection Record Group

OCSR—Officer Command Selection Record

OER—Officer Effectiveness Report

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
PFW—Performance Feedback Worksheet
PME—Professional Military Education
PPA—Personnel Processing Application
PRF—Promotion Recommendation Form
PRISM—Promotion Recommendation-In-Board Support Management (See AFPROMS)
PSD—Personnel Services Delivery
POW—Prisoner of War
RASL—Reserve Active Status List
RDS—Air Force Records Disposition Schedule
RegAF—Regular Air Force
ResAF—Reserve of the Air Force
RIP—Report on Individual Personnel
ROP—Record of Performance
SAF—Secretary of the Air Force
SDE—Senior Developmental Educations
SEJPME—Senior Enlisted Joint Professional Military Education
SecAF—Secretary of the Air Force
SECDEF—Secretary of Defense
SJA—Staff Judge Advocate
SrA—Senior Airman
SSgt—Staff Sergeant
SMSgt—Senior Master Sergeant
SNCO—Senior Noncommissioned Officer

SOS—Squadron Officer School
SORN—System of Record Notice
SOUIF—Senior Officer Unfavorable Information File
SRID—Senior Rater Identification Code
SSB—Special Selection Board
SSN—Social Security Number
SUNT—Student Undergraduate Navigator Training
SURF—Single Uniform Request Format
TAFMS—Total Active Federal Military Service
TDY—Temporary Duty
TED—Transfer Effective Date
TFSC—Total Force Service Center (formerly the Air Force Contact Center)
TSgt—Technical Sergeant
UCMJ—Uniform Code of Military Justice
UIF—Unfavorable Information File
UPRG—Unit Personnel Record Group
USAF—United States Air Force
USAFR—United States Air Force Reserve
U.S.C.—United States Code
UST—Undergraduate Space Training
vMPF—Virtual Military Personnel Flight
vPC—GR-Virtual Personnel Center-Guard and Reserve
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 1.6.7). 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 USAFR officer on voluntary EAD 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 1.6.3. for restrictions, requirements and exceptions.

Advisor—An Air Force designated representative who provides a special review of evaluations in activities outside the DAF (paragraph 1.6.7.) 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 (paragraph 8.3.1.10).

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 (paragraph 8.3.5).

Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (AF RDS)—Located within Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS).

Annual Cycle Closeout 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.

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 SRs (rounded down) based on each SR's population (including those SRs whose population is aggregated) (paragraph 8.3.1.9).

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" (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" (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 USAFR or to a specific Reserve program (participating or nonparticipating).

Evaluations—A general reference to the PFW (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 GO promotion recommendation (AF Form 78), and EPR (AF Forms 910 and 911).

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 SR will be the final evaluator (Exception: See paragraph 1.6.4.). (*Enlisted*)—For MSGts through CMSgts, the last officer to endorse the AF Form 911 will be the final evaluator. When the rater is a Colonel or above or a civilian (GS-15 or above), they qualify as a single evaluator and may close the evaluation at their level, unless they refer the evaluation. When the rater is a colonel or civilian (GS-15 or above) who works directly for the SR, and the ratee is *not* TIG eligible for SR endorsement, the EPR *will* be closed out by the rater. When the rater is a SR or the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, the EPR *will* close out at their level.

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 active duty 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. While serving on this tour, the member is ineligible to retire, or pin-on a higher grade, if selected for promotion.

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/SR determines equivalency for raters and additional raters. The ML determines equivalency for reviewer/SR designations.

b. For MSgt through CMSgt (AF Form 911): The unit commander determines equivalency for all evaluators (except for the reviewer when the reviewer is also the SR—the ML determines SR).

c. For AB through TSgt (AF Form 910): The unit commander determines equivalency for raters. Additional raters *must* meet the grade requirements in paragraph 1.6.3.

ML—DoD organizations (i.e., major command) where the senior official evaluations directly to the SECDEF, SecAF, CJCS, CSAF, or State Adjutant General or Governor. Only the CSAF may approve exceptions; however, the HQ USAF/A1, may exercise similar authority in cases involving the MLs of GOs. 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 review as a separate category. Training is within the eligible officer’s utilization field.

MPerRGp—Consists of Officer Selection Record Group, Senior NCO 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 ResAF members.

Noncombat Ports and MPSs—All ports and MPSs not falling within either the combat zone or communications zone.

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 may designate in writing a senior official within his/her unit to perform the commander's review. Personnel such as Officer/Enlisted/Civilian detachment chiefs and PME commandants in the grade of MSgt and above may sign the Commander's Review block if the unit commander is not serving in the same duty location and delegates this authority in writing.

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.

"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.

PRF Accounting Date—The date that determines the SR responsible for PRF preparation. The SR of the unit the eligible officer is assigned on this date is the SR for the promotion cycle. For officers in grades Lieutenant Colonel and below, it is approximately 150 days prior to the CSB convening date. For Colonels, it is 60 days prior to the CSB convening date.

PRF Allocation Date—66 days before a selection board, when "Definitely Promote" allocations are final (does not apply to ResAF).

PRF Cutoff Date—60 days prior to the selection board, when final PRF processing begins. PRFs cannot be completed prior to this date (does not apply to ResAF).

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-5 or a comparable grade or higher. Active-duty members in the grade of SrA may serve as raters *only* if they have completed ALS. Only non-active-duty USAFR 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 1.6.3. 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 reviewer (AF Form 911, section VII) 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 SR who signs the evaluation does not have to be the rater's rater, but must be the SR designated for the ratee's grade and assigned PAS (only one SR may sign an evaluation).

Recommendation-Only PRF—Refer to paragraph 8.1.2.2 (does not apply to ResAF).

Record of Performance (OPR)—Consists of the following AF Forms (when filed in the OSR): AF Forms 707, *Officer Performance Report*; AF Forms 707A and AF Forms 707B, *Field Grade and Company Grade Officer Performance Report*; AF Forms 709, *Promotion Recommendation*; Air Force Forms 475, *Education/Training Report*; 77, *Letter of Evaluation*, and Duty Qualification History Brief. 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 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. 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, a fitness score of less than 75, unsatisfactory progress in Fitness Education and Intervention Programs, confirmed incidents of discrimination or mistreatment, illegal use or possession of drugs, AWOL, Article 15 action, and conviction by court—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.
- c. An evaluator marks "Does Not Meet Standards" in Section III of the EPR.
- d. An evaluator marks an overall "1" (Poor) or "2" (Needs Improvement) in Section V of the EPR.
- e. When doubt arises as to whether a comment is a referral comment or not, refer the evaluation. **Example:** 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. See paragraph 10.1. for Referral Procedures.

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. Further judicial, nonjudicial, or administrative actions do not have to fit this definition.

Reserve Active Status List (RASL)—A list of all ResAF 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 ANG 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 ResAF.

Reviewer—The third evaluator on an OPR and on a SNCO EPR (see paragraph 1.6.4.).

Reviewing Official—Any intermediate-level supervisor above the rater, but below the ML.

Senior Rater (Officer)—The evaluator designated by the ML who completes the Performance Recommendation form (paragraph 8.1.4.1) and also serves as reviewer on the OPR/EPRs. SRs 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 SR normally evaluates all officers in an organization in a particular grade and promotion zone. For all Majors and below, the SR must be at least a Colonel (or equivalent) serving as a wing commander or equivalent. For all Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels, the SR must be a GO (or equivalent) and will be the first GO in the rating chain (Brigadier General selectees may serve as SRs if so designated). HQ AFPC/DPSIDEB (ADL) or HQ AFRC/A1 (USAFR unit) must approve exceptions. (*Enlisted*)—Position that the MAJCOM, field operating agency, direct reporting unit, and other organizations with Air Force enlisted personnel designate to be the highest level endorser in the ratee's rating chain. For AD members, SRs must be at least a Colonel or civilian equivalent (GS-15 or higher), serving as a wing commander or equivalent. For non-AD members, a Lieutenant Colonel serving as a wing or group commander may be the SR.

Senior Rater Identification Code—A five-character code identifying a SR 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 section V; or any statement anywhere in an OPR that indicates obvious disagreement with the previous evaluator.

Single Evaluator—An individual (Colonel or equivalent) who may close out an EPR with a single signature (also see the definition of "final evaluator").

Single Senior Rater—The single SR is not the head of the ML, but is the only SR who has I/APZ and/or Non-line BPZ eligibles. The ML review process must review PRFs

Sole Senior Rater—The sole SR is the head of the ML and is the only SR who has I/APZ and/or Non-line BPZ eligibles for a specific board. The sole SR awards all PRF recommendations; however, the HQ USAF MLR must review all PRF ratings.

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).

Total Force Service Center (TFSC)—Formerly known as the Air Force Contact Center (AFCC). When referenced, use the applicable components TFSC; i.e., AD would use the AFCC at AFPC and the ANG/USAFR would use the AFCC at ARPC.

Whole Person 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, Randolph AFB 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 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 60 or 120 days is not a sufficient time to evaluate a ratee. However, Air Force standards establish that normally 120 (and in certain situations, as little as 60) 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 the 120 days 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 (See paragraph 10.2.4.7.). 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 AFPC/DPSIDE 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)*. (See Table 10.5.) (**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/DPSIDEB 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/DPSIDEP or ARPC/DPB 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/DPSIDE, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Randolph AFB TX 78150-4709 to obtain a MMEL 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, 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/DPSIDE for processing. HQ AFPC/DPSIDE 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

SUBJECT MATTER QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

L I N E	C H A P	A	B	C	D
		Subject Matter	Paragraphs	Figures	Tables
	1	General Considerations			
	2	Performance Feedback Process			
	3	Performance Evaluations			
	4	AF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation			
	5	Contingency and Wartime Provisions			
	6	AF Form 475, Education/Training Report			
	7	General Officer Evaluations			
	8	Promotion Recommendation Process			
	9	AF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation Form			
	10	Correcting Officer/Enlisted Evaluations			