BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 36-2406

22 AUGUST 2025

Incorporating Change 1, 27 MAY 2026

Personnel

OFFICER AND ENLISTED EVALUATIONS SYSTEMS

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

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

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication

---

OPR: AF/A1PPP

Certified by: SAF/MR

Supersedes: AFI36-2406, 6 August 2024

Pages: 302

This publication implements Department of the Air Force Policy Directive (DAFPD) 36-24, *Military Evaluations.* It provides guidance and procedures for implementing the United States Air Force (USAF) Officer and Enlisted Evaluations Systems. It also describes how to prepare, submit, and manage forms. This instruction has been developed in collaboration between the Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel, and Services (AF/A1); Chief of the Air Force Reserve (AF/RE); and the Director of the Air National Guard (NGB/CF). This publication applies to the Regular Air Force (RegAF), Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard; it does not apply to the United States Space Force (USSF). This instruction requires the collection and or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 5400.11, *DoD Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*. The applicable SORN F036 AF PC A, Effectiveness/Performance Reporting Systems and F036 AFPC T, Officer Performance Report (OPR)/Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) Appeal Case Files are available at **https://dpcld.defense.gov/Privacy/SORNs/**. Ensure all records generated as a result of processes prescribed in this publication adhere to Air Force Instruction (AFI) 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, and are disposed in accordance with the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule, which is located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the office of primary responsibility using the Department of the Air Force (DAF) Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Product*; route DAF Forms 847 from the field through Air Force Personnel Center Promotions, Evaluations and Recognitions Policy Branch (AFPC/DPPSP), 550 C, JBSA-Randolph, TX 78150 or **afpc.dppsp.workflow@us.af.mil**. Field agencies (i.e., major command [MAJCOM], numbered Air Force [NAF], Wing, field operating agency [FOA], etc.) will not publish supplements that change basic policies and procedures or merely duplicate the text of these

instructions. Supplements initiated at the major command (MAJCOM) level or below require Military Force Policy Division (AF/A1PP), and AFPC/DPPSP approval before publication. Send published copies of approved supplements to AF/A1PP, AFPC/DPPSP, and Air Reserve Personnel Center Promotion Board Secretariat (ARPC/PB). Field agencies must get AFPC/DPPSP and Promotions and Evaluations Policy Branch (AF/A1PPP) approval before using a locally created version of the DAF and Air Force (AF) Forms prescribed by this instruction. The authorities to waive wing or unit level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier ("T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3") number following the compliance statement. See Department of the Air Force Manual 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*, for a description of the authorities associated with the tier numbers. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate Tier waiver approval authority; for non-tiered items AFPC/DPPSP is the approval authority with concurrence of AF/A1P (or Air Force Reserve Directorate of Personnel (AF/REP) and National Guard Bureau Force Management Division (NGB/A1P) as applicable).

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This interim change fully implements previously approved guidance from Air Force Guidance Memorandum (AFGM) 2026-01, by requiring the documentation of physical fitness assessment scores on officer and enlisted evaluations. It also (1) prescribes AF Form 717, *Performance Objectives and Feedback Form,* and implements guidance on the updated feedback system; (2) authorizes multiple general officers to sign evaluations; (3) emphasizes aligning objectives with major performance areas and competencies with airman leadership qualities (ALQs); (4) clarifies officer stratification quotes; (5) updates guidance on Joint and DAF SNCO stratifications; (6) changes single evaluator requirements for enlisted members; (7) updates single evaluator authorization for deployed commander letters of evaluation (LOEs); and (8) makes several administrative updates throughout the AFI. A margin bar (|) indicates newly revised material.

Chapter 1—GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS 9

1.1. Purpose. 9
1.2. Forms - Purpose and Utilization. 9
1.3. General Guidelines. 10
1.4. Preparing and Processing Evaluations. 11
1.5. Evaluator Requirements. 20
1.6. Roles and Responsibilities. 22
1.7. Rating Chain Deviations and Evaluator Changes. 29
1.8. Evaluator's Mandatory Considerations. 32
1.9. Mandatory Comments. 35
1.10. Disagreements. 36
1.11. Referral Evaluations. 37
1.12. General Prohibited Evaluator Considerations and Comments. 43

1.13. Policy Deviations and Waiver Requests. 47
1.14. Missing, Late, and Removed Performance Evaluations. 48
1.15. Wartime or National Emergency Provisions. 49
Figure 1.1. Example Referral Memorandum. 51
Figure 1.2. Example Referral Memorandum (Continued). 52
Table 1.1. Mailing Addresses for Correspondence. 53
Table 1.2. Missing and Late Evaluations (See Notes 1, 2, and 3). 57
Chapter 2—PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK PROCESS 58
2.1. Purpose. 58
2.2. Responsibilities. 58
2.3. Who Requires a Performance Feedback Assessment. 60
2.4. Guidance for Conducting Performance Feedback Sessions. 60
2.5. When to Conduct Documented Performance Feedback Sessions. 60
2.6. The Performance Feedback Assessment Notice. 60
2.7. Performance Feedback Assessment Form. 61
2.8. Preparing the Performance Feedback Assessment. 61
2.9. Disposition and Access. 61
2.10. Failure to Conduct or Document a Performance Feedback Assessment. 62
2.11. Tracking Performance Feedback Assessments. 62
Table 2.1. Performance Feedback Assessment Requirements. 63
Table 2.2. Preparing Performance Feedback and Objectives Assessments. 64
Table 2.3. DELETED. 67
Table 2.4. DELETED. 67
Table 2.5. DELETED. 67
Chapter 3—OFFICER PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS/OFFICER ALQ EVALUATIONS 68
3.1. General Guidelines. 68
3.2. Purpose. 68
3.3. Who Requires an Officer ALQ Evaluation. 68
3.4. Who is Not Authorized an Officer ALQ Evaluation. 70
3.5. When to Submit an Officer ALQ Evaluation – Officer Performance Brief (OPB). 70
3.6. Annual Reports. 72

3.7. Change of Reporting Official Reports (including emergencies or no-notice departures). 72
3.8. Directed by HAF, NGB, or Commander (MAJCOM, wing, group, or squadron, as appropriate)..... 72
3.9. 365-day Extended Deployment Officer ALQ Evaluations. 73
3.10. "FROM" Dates. 76
3.11. "THRU" Dates. 77
3.12. Number of Days Rater Supervised. 77
3.13. Performance Feedback Assessment. 77
3.14. Higher Level Reviewer. 77
3.15. Stratifications. 79
3.16. Unauthorized Evaluator Considerations and Comments. 84
3.17. Extensions of Close-out Dates. 88
3.18. Ratee's Acknowledgement. 88
Table 3.1. Instructions for Preparing an Officer ALQ Evaluation (Output Product)..... 90
Table 3.2. When to Prepare Officer Evaluations (Warrant Officer 1 thru Colonel). 104
Table 3.3. Static Close-out Dates (SCODs) and Accounting Dates for Officer ALQ Evaluations..... 105
Table 3.4. Summary of Authorized Stratification Peer Groups. 106

Chapter 4—ENLISTED ALQ EVALUATIONS/ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEFS (EPBS) 109

4.1. General Guidelines. 109
4.2. Enlisted Evaluation Forms. 109
4.3. When to Accomplish an Enlisted Evaluation. 109
4.4. Evaluations not Authorized..... 110
4.5. When to Submit an Enlisted Evaluation. 111
4.6. "FROM" Dates. 111
4.7. "THRU" Dates. 111
4.8. Number of Days Rater Supervised. 114
4.9. Completing Evaluations. 115
4.10. Promotion Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Time-In-Service (TIS) eligibility (AB - TSgt only). 115
4.11. Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Time-In-Service (TIS)/Senior Rater Stratification/Endorsement Eligibility (MSgt – SMSgt only)..... 115

4.12. Higher Level Reviewers and Single Evaluators. 120
4.13. Higher Level Reviewer Responsibilities. 122
4.14. Performance Feedback Assessment. 123
4.15. Authorized Evaluator Considerations and Comments. 123
4.16. Inappropriate Comments Referring to Separation/Retirement, Civilian Employment, and Professional Military Education. 124
4.17. Ratee's Acknowledgement. 124
4.18. {RegAF Only} Forced Distribution (SrA – TSgt only). 125
Table 4.1. Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel Scale. 134
Table 4.2. When to Submit Enlisted Evaluations for RegAF, Active Guard Reserve, and Stat Tour. 135
Table 4.3. When to submit Enlisted Evaluations for ARC Non-AGR. 137
Table 4.4. Static Close-out Date Chart for RegAF, Active Guard Reserve, and Stat Tour. 138
Table 4.5. Static Close-out Date Chart for ARC Non-AGR. 138
Table 4.6. Accounting Dates for Static Close-out Date Evaluations. 138
Table 4.7. {RegAF Only} Forced Distribution Allocation Table (SrA). 139
Table 4.8. {RegAF Only} Forced Distribution Allocation Table (SSgt and TSgt). 140
Table 4.9. Instructions for Preparing an Enlisted ALQ Evaluation (Output Product). 141
Table 4.10. {RegAF and AFR only} MSgt Stratifications. 155
Table 4.11. SMSgt Stratifications (RegAF and AFR only). 157
Table 4.12. Time-in-Grade (TIG) Senior Rater Eligibility Chart. 158
Table 4.13. The United States Air Force Band (3N2X1) and The United States Air Force Academy Band (3N3X1) Direct Reporting from Basic Military Training and Promotion to TSgt. 160

Chapter 5—DAF FORM 77, LETTER OF EVALUATION 161

5.1. Purpose. 161
5.2. Types of LOEs. 161
5.3. Who Can Prepare. 163
5.4. Administrative Practices. 164
5.5. Completing DAF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation. 164
5.6. Routing, Updating and Disposition Responsibilities. 164
5.7. MPF, CSS/HR Specialist, and PERSCO Team Responsibilities. 164
Table 5.1. Instructions for Completing the DAF Form 77, Letter of Evaluation (See Note 5). 167
Table 5.2. When to submit a Letter of Evaluation. 173

Chapter 6—DAF FORM 475, EDUCATION/TRAINING REPORT **175**

6.1. When to Use Training Reports (TRs). 175

6.2. Who Prepares Training Reports. 177

6.3. Referral Training Reports. 177

6.4. Routing and Responsibilities. 177

Table 6.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 475, Education/Training Report (Officers Only). 179

Table 6.2. When to Prepare DAF Form 475, Training Report. 183

Chapter 7—GENERAL OFFICER EVALUATIONS **186**

7.1. Overview. 186

7.2. Forms Used. 186

7.3. Reasons for Reports. 186

7.4. General Instructions. 186

7.5. Processing General Officer Evaluations. 188

7.6. Extensions of Close-out Dates. 189

Table 7.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 78, Department of the Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation. 190

Table 7.2. Instructions for DAF Form 77 for General Officers. 193

Chapter 8—PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION AND MANAGEMENT LEVEL REVIEW (MLR) PROCESS **196**

8.1. DAF Form 709 (for ADL officers). 196

8.2. DAF Form 709 for RASL Officers. 207

8.3. Management Level Reviews (ADL Lieutenant Colonel and Below). 212

8.4. Special Provisions (applies to ADL officers only). 225

8.5. Correction of Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRF) (ADL Officers) (“Stop File” process). 229

8.6. Correction of PRFs (ResAF Officers) (“Stop File” Process). 230

8.7. Promotion Recommendations for Colonels. 230

8.8. Supplemental Management Level Reviews for Recommendation Upgrade Post-Central Selection Board (For ADL Only). 232

Figure 8.1. Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board or ResAF Central Selection Board (see DAFI 36-2501, Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation, or DAFI 36-2504, Officer Promotion, Continuation, and Selective Early Removal in the Reserve of the Air Force, for further guidance). ... 234

Table 8.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Form, (for officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below). 235
Table 8.2. What to Enter in (Group Size) on the PRF (ADL Lt Col and below only). 240
Table 8.3. Senior Rater “Definitely Promote” Allocation Rate Table – Active Duty List Officers. 241
Table 8.4. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation, (for officers in the grade of colonel). 243

Chapter 9—DAF FORM 3538, RETENTION RECOMMENDATION FORM (RRF) 248

9.1. When to Use the DAF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation. 248
9.2. Responsibilities. 248
9.3. Retention Recommendation Form Submission. 249
9.4. Air Force Advisor Examination. 249
9.5. Correction of a Retention Recommendation Form. 249
Figure 9.1. Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB). . 250
Table 9.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 3538, Retention Recommendation. 251

Chapter 10—CORRECTING OFFICER AND ENLISTED EVALUATIONS 254

10.1. Purpose. 254
10.2. Program Elements. 254
10.3. Correcting Evaluations. 257
10.4. Responsibilities. 258
Figure 10.1. AFPC MLR OFFICE. 258
Figure 10.2. ARPC/DPTSE. 259
10.5. Meeting Time Limits and Expedited Requests. 261
10.6. Using Classified, Privacy Act, and Restricted Release Information. 262
10.7. Requesting Special Selection Board (SSB) or Supplemental Promotion Consideration. 262
10.8. Resubmitting an Appeal. 262
Table 10.1. How to Submit Requests for Correction. 264
Table 10.2. Correcting Minor Errors on Evaluations. 265
Table 10.3. Minor Corrections – Offices Authorized to Make Corrections and Disposition. 267
Table 10.4. Board Directed Corrections - Correcting and Disposition of Documents. 268
Table 10.5. Correcting DAF Form 709, Promotion Recommendation Form. 270
Table 10.6. Instructions For DAF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports (see paragraph 10.4.4. before completing). 271

Figure 10.3. Sample, DAF Form 948, Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports. 273

Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION 274

Attachment 2—APPEAL GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS 294

Attachment 3—NON-RATED PERIOD MEMORANDUM 302

Chapter 1

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.1. Purpose. The Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems have varied purposes. The first is to effectively communicate performance standards and expectations and provide meaningful feedback on how those standards and expectations are being upheld. The second is to establish a reliable, long-term, cumulative record of performance and promotion potential based on that performance. The third is to provide sound information to assist in making talent management decisions. These evaluation systems are deliberately aligned with both the Air Force Core Values—Integrity First, Service Before Self, and Excellence in All We Do—and the Air Force's organizational goals, established in AFI 1-2, *Commander Responsibilities*, and DAFI 90-302, *The Inspection System of the Department of the Air Force*, to ensure performance expectations reflect the full spectrum of Air Force priorities.

1.1.1. To accomplish these purposes, the evaluation system focuses on performance. How well a member does his or her job and the qualities the individual brings to his or her organization are of paramount importance to the Air Force (AF). 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, to include the use of Airman Leadership Qualities (ALQ), using periodic performance feedback as the basis for formal evaluations, and through performance-based promotion recommendations.

1.1.2. Unless stated otherwise, the general guidelines outlined in this chapter apply to all officer and enlisted evaluations, training reports (TRs), promotion recommendation forms (PRFs), letters of evaluation (LOEs), enlisted retention recommendation forms (ERRFs), and retention recommendation forms (RRFs).

1.2. Forms - Purpose and Utilization.

1.2.1. DAF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation*, is a multipurpose evaluation form.

1.2.2. DAF Form 78, *Department of the Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation* (GO PRF). Use to document performance and promotion recommendations for general officers.

1.2.3. DAF Form 475, *Education/Training Report*. Use to document performance during education or formal training.

1.2.4. AF Form 715, *Officer Performance Brief (WO/CW 1 thru 5 and O-1 thru O-6)* and AF Form 716, *Enlisted Performance Brief.* Use to document performance as well as provide information for making promotion recommendations and other management decisions. **(T-1) Note:** These forms are the offline version of the officer and enlisted ALQ evaluations; officer and enlisted ALQ evaluations are to be completed in myEvaluation (myEval) to generate an officer performance brief (OPB) or enlisted performance brief (EPB), and AF Forms 715 and 716 are to be used in rare instances and by exception only. See **paragraph 1.13.4**.

1.2.5. DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation.* Use to assess an officer's performance-based potential and to recommend promotion to central selection boards.

1.2.6. AF Form 717, *Performance Objectives and Feedback Form*. Used for all grades to document formal feedback.

1.2.7. DAF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation Form (RRF)*, and DAF Form 3538E, *Enlisted Retention Recommendation Form (ERRF)*. Use to document performance-based differentiation and retention recommendations to assist in involuntary separation and/or retirement boards. Use only at the discretion of the Secretary of the Air Force.

1.2.8. DAF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports*. Use to substitute, correct or remove an evaluation when an applicant does not have access to the Virtual Military Personnel Flight (vMPF) or in myEval.

1.2.9. DELETED.

1.3. General Guidelines.

1.3.1. Access. Evaluations are "Controlled Unclassified Information" forms and must be marked, protected, and accessed accordingly. The office with custodial responsibility is responsible for determining if a requestor's official duties require access. See **Chapter 2** for access to the performance feedback assessment worksheets.

1.3.2. Classified Information and Security Classification. Do not enter classified information in any section of the evaluation; this includes attachments to evaluations, referral documents, and 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. In cases where the evaluator is assigned to a classified organization or location, enter "Data Masked" for organization nomenclature and nothing more.

1.3.3. Format.

1.3.3.1. All evaluations will be completed in myEval. The AF Form 715 and AF Form 716 will be used by exception only. Send exception to policy requests through the wing commander or the comparable level to AFPC/DPPSP for final approval to AF/A1PP. AFPC/DPPSP will coordinate with Air Reserve Personnel Center Evaluations Section (ARPC/DPTSE) for input prior to forwarding for final approval to AF/A1PP. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 1.13.4**.

1.3.3.2. Include at least one performance statement in each section of the evaluation being accomplished. **(T-1)** "THIS SECTION NOT USED," may be used as a performance statement. White space is authorized. A performance statement is a standalone sentence that must include two elements: 1) the behavior or action taken by an Airman; and 2) the impact, results, or outcome of that behavior or action.

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 or publication titles.

1.3.5. Handwritten Evaluations. Handwrite evaluations when no other means are available and authorized by AFPC Promotions, Evaluations and Recognitions Policy Branch (AFPC/DPPSP) or ARPC/DPTSE. The President and Vice President of the United States may handwrite evaluations.

1.3.6. Nicknames and Acronyms.

1.3.6.1. Nicknames that are a form of the ratee's name, to include middle names, are permitted (e.g., Bill/Will for William, Jim for James, Chris for Christopher/Christine). Call signs and code names are not authorized.

1.3.6.2. Limit the use of acronyms and abbreviations. When used, only acronyms and abbreviations on the AF Acronym and Abbreviation List located at **https://www.afpc.af.mil/Career-Management/Acronyms/** are authorized, unless noted by an approved category listed on the website. **(T-1)**

1.3.7. Waivers and Deviations. Send requests for deviations or waivers through the wing commander or the comparable level to their MAJCOM. The requests will then be sent to AFPC/DPPSP for RegAF and to ARPC/DPTSE for ARC who, in turn, will forward the request to the appropriate office of primary responsibility listed in **Table 1.1**. Approved Tier 2, 3 and non-tiered waivers are forwarded to HQ Air Force, Directorate of Force Management Policy (AF/A1P), AFPC/DPPSP and/or ARPC/DPTSE in accordance with DAFMAN 90-161.

1.3.7.1. Waiver Process. Waivers are processed in accordance with DAFMAN 90-161 except as noted below.

1.3.7.1.1. Tier 0 waiver: The appropriate MAJCOM/A1 submits the package to AFPC/DPPSP. AFPC/DPPSP submits the package to AF/A1P for coordination through SAF/MR and/or Secretary of the Air Force (SecAF). Following SAF/MR and/or SecAF coordination, AF/A1P submits the package to the appropriate external agency/non-Air Force authority for approval. Package results will be provided to AFPC/DPPSP and then forwarded to the appropriate MAJCOM/A1.

1.3.7.1.2. Tier 1 waiver: The appropriate MAJCOM/A1 submits the package to AFPC/DPPSP or ARPC/DPTSE for the Air Reserve Component (ARC) as appropriate. AFPC/DPPSP processes/submits the package to AF/A1P and AF/A1 to route for SAF/MR coordination. Completed package coordination will be provided to the appropriate MAJCOM/A1.

1.3.7.1.3. Tier 2/3 waivers: Upon approval the waiver(s) must be sent to AFPC/DPPSP. **(T-1)** AFPC/DPPSP will maintain for historical and appeal purposes. **(T-1)**

1.3.7.2. Waivers and the Managers Internal Control Toolset. The requesting commander/director will ensure appropriate waiver information is entered in the Management Internal Control Toolset within 7 calendar days of waiver approval notification.

1.4. Preparing and Processing Evaluations.

1.4.1. Career Data Briefs. Evaluators are permitted to review a member's career data brief when writing an evaluation except where prohibited in this instruction. See **paragraph 1.12.2.1** for prohibited considerations when preparing an evaluation. For officers, the brief will be used to aid in making recommendations for command, assignments, and developmental education. For enlisted, the brief may be used as an aid in determining senior noncommissioned officer (SNCO) stratification/endorsement level eligibility or junior enlisted forced distribution promotion recommendation. **Note:** The ANG is not required to stratify enlisted members; enlisted stratifications are at the discretion of each The Adjutant General (TAG)/Command equivalent for National Guard Bureau (NGB) staff (see **paragraph 4.11.2.2**.).

1.4.2. Suspenses.

1.4.2.1. The commander's support staff (CSS) and servicing military personnel flight (MPF) work together to manage the evaluation system and monitor suspenses. Established suspenses should allow for the evaluation to be filed in the member's official record no later than 60 calendar days after the close-out date. Evaluations will not be signed prior to the close-out date. **(T-1) Note:** This does not preclude a draft copy being routed earlier.

1.4.2.2. Officer and Enlisted Evaluations.

1.4.2.2.1. Due to the MPF no later than 30 calendar days after close-out. **(T-1)**

1.4.2.2.2. Due to Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC) (for referrals) or office of record no later than 45 calendar days after close-out. **(T-1)**

1.4.2.2.3. Filed in the Automated Records Management System (ARMS) and Personnel Records Display Application (PRDA) no later than 60 calendar days after the close-out. **(T-1)**

1.4.2.3. Evaluations directed by Headquarters United States Air Force (DBH), or the National Guard Bureau (NGB) are due to the respective office by the suspense date established in the directing letter or message. **(T-1)**

1.4.2.4. Complete referral evaluations in accordance with **paragraph 1.11** and file into ARMS/PRDA no later than 60 calendar days for RegAF and Active Guard Reserve (AGR) personnel and 90 calendar days for non-extended active duty (EAD) personnel, after the close-out date of the evaluation.

1.4.2.5. Extensions to static close-out dates (SCOD) are not authorized.

1.4.3. When an Evaluation Becomes a Matter of Record.

1.4.3.1. An evaluation is considered complete when all applicable signature elements are signed or completed. Completed evaluations become a matter of record once they are uploaded into ARMS/PRDA. Evaluations are considered "working copies," including completed evaluations, until they are made a matter of record.

1.4.3.2. Correction requests made after an evaluation becomes a matter of record must be submitted in accordance with **Chapter 10**. **(T-1)**

1.4.4. Attachments to Evaluations. Attachments are part of the evaluation. Authorized attachments are referral memorandums (training reports), rebuttals to referrals (which could include DAF Forms 77 that are not part of the official record) and endorsement memorandums.

1.4.5. Copying and Printing Evaluations.

1.4.5.1. Printing. Do not alter the form, (e.g., reduce or enlarge), other than for authorized administrative corrections, (e.g., white out on a date change for "wet" signed evaluations). **(T-1)** Both sides of the form will be printed whether used or not. **(T-1)**

1.4.5.1.1. Do not reproduce copies for purposes other than those noted below without the approval of AFPC/DPPSP or ARPC/DPTSE:

1.4.5.1.1.1. For official actions such as courts-martial, awards and decoration recommendations, promotion or demotion processing, discharge actions, appeal processing, and appropriate assignment actions by the Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC), Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC), Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC), Individual Reservist Readiness and Integration Organization (RIO), Air Force Colonel Management Office (AF/A1LO), Air Force General Officer Management Office (AF/A1LG), Air Force CMSgt Management Office (AF/A1LE), or Air Force Reserve Senior Leader Management Office (AF/REG). Authorized personnel will provide copies. **(T-1)**

1.4.5.1.1.2. On written authority of AF/A1LG for general officers; AF/A1LO for colonels on EAD; AFPC/DPPSP for lieutenant colonels and below on EAD; or the ARPC/DPTSE for Air National Guard (ANG) colonels and below, Air Force Reserve (AFR) officers not on EAD, and Active Guard Reserve (AGR) or voluntary limited period of active duty (VLPAD) officers. **(T-1)**

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

1.4.5.1.1.4. As required, provide copies for file in ARMS/PRDA, the electronic officer selection record (eOSR) or SNCO selection record, the officer command selection record, or TAG or ANG human resource record file.

1.4.5.1.1.5. To replace missing or lost documents in the Master Personnel Records Group.

1.4.5.2. Corrected Copies. A corrected copy of evaluations may be either a copy or an original document which contains changes from the original document. Corrections authorized by the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR) or Evaluation Report Appeals Board (ERAB) on evaluations may require a corrected copy annotation. In these cases, the following statement will be entered on the reverse bottom margin: "Corrected Copy, AF or ARPC/DPT, XX XXX XX [date correction made], and certifying official's DODID." **(T-1)**

1.4.5.3. Legibility. The CSS and MPF will return copies that are difficult to read or do not comply with **paragraph 1.4.5**. **(T-1)**

1.4.6. Showing and/or Providing Copies to the Ratee. Unless the evaluation is a referral, evaluators are not required to show or provide a copy of the evaluation to the ratee until the "Ratee's Acknowledgement" is ready for completion.

1.4.7. Deactivated Organizations. If a unit deactivates on or after the accounting date for any evaluation SCOD, the deactivated unit will accomplish the evaluations, to include all forced distribution and senior rater endorsement processes. If the unit deactivates before the accounting date, the gaining unit (the unit as of the accounting date) will accomplish all evaluation-related matters. All affected units will coordinate with Air Force Personnel Center Evaluations and Recognition Operations Section (AFPC MLR OFFICE) on all actions associated with deactivating units. **(T-1)**

1.4.8. Duty Air Force Specialty Code (DAFSC). The DAFSC is based on the unit manpower document authorization.

1.4.8.1. {Officers only} Use the DAFSC assigned against and approved by AFPC as of the established SCOD (see **Table 3.3**), as reflected within the Military Personnel Data System (MilPDS); however, if the officer has a permanent change of station (PCS) or permanent change of assignment (PCA), or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the DAFSC as of the established accounting date (see **Table 3.3**.).

1.4.8.2. If an officer's DAFSC is incorrect, initiate corrective action immediately, annotate the correct DAFSC on the evaluation, and attach a copy of the documentation reflecting the correction. MPF/CSS 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 for inclusion into the official record. **(T-1)** If the requested change has not been approved by the date the evaluation is ready to send to AFPC/ARPC, the DAFSC on the evaluation will be changed to match the DAFSC approved by the respective HQ AFPC officer assignment manager in MilPDS. **(T-1)**

1.4.8.3. {Enlisted only} Use the DAFSC as of the established SCOD. If the Airman has a PCS or PCA or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the DAFSC as of the established accounting date. CSS/MPF personnel must ensure the correct information is reflected and/or updated in MilPDS.

1.4.8.4. For a 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 will be the actual grade the ratee will hold as of the established SCOD, unless the ratee has been temporarily promoted or selected to the next higher grade, then use the temporary grade (e.g., Maj (T)) or selected grade (e.g., Lt Col (S), CW4 (S) or TSgt Select). **(T-1)** The use of the temporary grade corresponds with the date the individual is Senate confirmed or the date the member is assigned to the position they are temporarily promoted to, whichever occurs later. The use of the select status for FGO evaluations corresponds to the public release date of promotion to the next higher grade or once an officer's promotion nomination has been transmitted to the White House. The use of the select status for first lieutenants selected to captain corresponds to the date of AFPC or ARPC public release of the promotion list or once SecDef approves the promotion lists. The use of "select" is not utilized for lieutenant and airman first class and below evaluations.

1.4.9.2. Frocking is the practice of authorizing members who are selected for promotion to wear the higher grade before the actual promotion date.

1.4.9.2.1. If a RegAF officer has been frocked, use the member's selected grade (e.g., Col-select) as of the close-out date of the evaluation.

1.4.9.2.2. If a RegAF CMSgt has been frocked, use the select grade (i.e., CMSgt select) as of the close-out date of the evaluation.

1.4.9.3. Temporary Promotions. If a member has been temporarily promoted use the temporary grade (e.g., Col (T)). See **paragraph 1.4.9.1**.

1.4.10. Physical Fitness Assessments (PFAs).

1.4.10.1. The rater will document the ratee's most recent and current official fitness assessment score on all OPBs and EPBs. **(T-0)** This documentation will be included in the mandatory comments section. For officers receiving a DAF Form 475 from a formal education or training course that is 20 weeks or more, fitness will be documented in the "Professional Qualities" block of the form. The comment must reflect the most recent and current, completed fitness assessment on file as of the closeout date of evaluation or TR. The comment will include the score achieved, the fitness category, and any component exemptions using the following format: PFA: [score]; Category; Exemptions: [list any component exemptions]. **Examples: Excellent Score** – PFA: 91.7; Excellent; Exemptions: None. **Satisfactory Score** – PFA: 88.5; Satisfactory; Exemptions: Muscular Strength **Unsatisfactory Score** – PFA: 64.2; Unsatisfactory; Exemptions: None **Passing Score but Failed Component(s)** – PFA: 79.4; Unsatisfactory; Exemptions: None

1.4.10.1.1. Members are required to be current on their official fitness assessment as defined in AFMAN 36-2905, *Air Force Physical Fitness Readiness Program*. Members should not wait until the last day of the test period to complete their fitness test, as failure to complete the test by the due date is considered not current and will be documented using "Required - Not Current." If, as of the closeout date of the evaluation or TR, the member is not current, the rater will document by annotating "Required - Not Current." **Example:** "PFA: Required - Not Current." Evaluators will not postpone signing an evaluation to allow completion of a fitness assessment after the closeout date.

1.4.10.1.2. For Airmen with full exemptions, raters will include the authorized exemption status (paragraphs **1.4.10.1.2.1** and **1.4.10.1.2.2**) in the mandatory comments section. Raters will not include any narrative beyond the exemption status and may not reference any diagnosis, symptoms, treatment, or underlying personal condition. The full exemption status must be limited to the following standard terms:

1.4.10.1.2.1. Not Required. Use this exemption status if the ratee is fully exempt from all components, to include the WHtR due to mission reasons (i.e., deployment), pregnancy and post-partum, or approved military separations/retirements. Do not use this term for any other reasons, such as partial medical exemptions or commander exemptions. **Example:** PFA: Not Required.

1.4.10.1.2.2. Medical Restriction. Use this exemption status if the ratee receives no score due to a medical profile, unless otherwise noted in **paragraph**

1.4.10.1.2.1. **Example:** PFA: Medical Restriction.

1.4.10.1.3. For Airmen authorized to test and complete a PFA with partial exemptions IAW AFMAN 36-2905, the rater will annotate the fitness score as recorded by the fitness management system, followed by a listing of the exempted components. **Example:** "PFA: 96; Excellent; Exemptions: Cardiorespiratory Fitness." Evaluators will refer to components as outlined on the fitness assessment: Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Muscular Strength, Core Endurance, and Waist to Height Ratio.

1.4.10.1.4. Airmen assigned to designated combat-related Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSCs), listed in the terms section, will have both their most recent and current Air Force physical fitness assessment and combat field test (CFT) results documented in the mandatory comments section of their evaluation. The CFT score must reflect the official result recorded in the applicable fitness management system as of the SCOD. The rater will include the score, category, and exemptions for both assessments. **Example:**

1.4.10.1.4.1. "PFA: 99.8; Excellent; Exemptions: None / CFT: 95.2; Excellent; Exemptions: None"

1.4.10.1.4.2. If a valid CFT is not on file due to exemption or authorized non-participation, the evaluator will indicate the reason. **Example:** "CFT: Not Required."

1.4.10.1.5. Fitness assessment scores, categories, and exemption status will only be documented in the mandatory comments section of the OPB and EPB. No fitness-related comments will be included elsewhere in the evaluation unless related to conduct, attitude, or performance impacting readiness or mission execution. In such cases, comments must be specific, objective, and fact-based. **(T-1)**

1.4.10.2. If a member received a "Required - Not Current" rating or received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment, see **paragraph 1.11** for referral procedures. (AFR Only. It is the commander's discretion to document the evaluation as a referral report if a member received a "Required - Not Current" rating or an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the SCOD.)

1.4.10.3. Airmen who received a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the SCOD are not authorized to be considered for stratification, forced distribution, and the following promotion recommendations: "Definitely Promote" for officers; "Must Promote" and "Promote Now" for junior enlisted members. Additionally, ARC officers are not authorized to be considered for promotion vacancy nominations. This restriction applies regardless of performance in other areas. Airmen who are fully or partially exempt from the fitness assessment will be eligible for stratification and promotion consideration, provided they meet all other requirements and have a valid exemption recorded in the official fitness system. Exemption status alone will

not be used to limit consideration. Commanders and evaluators will ensure compliance with this instruction when submitting evaluations for consideration in any process involving promotion, stratification, or force distribution. (ARC only: While the ability to award a "Definitely Promote" promotion recommendation for officers will be tied to the PRF cutoff date, an OPB with a "Required - Not Current" rating or unsatisfactory fitness assessment as of the SCOD will be factored into the overall promotion recommendation.)

1.4.10.4. Comments regarding unit-level fitness contributions are authorized for Airmen who directly supported the success of a unit fitness program during the reporting period. This includes, but is not limited to, physical training leaders, unit fitness program managers, first sergeants, superintendents, section commanders, flight chiefs, and commanders. These comments, if included, will not be documented in the mandatory comments block.

1.4.11. Non-Rated Periods. In particular circumstances, non-rated periods may be authorized. The documentation and/or approval authority required will vary depending on the nature of the circumstances. Likewise, the duration of authorized non-rated periods may also vary depending on the circumstances and other factors. Therefore, non-rated periods must be considered individually as each Airman's circumstance and response are unique. Being on temporary duty (TDY) or deployed is not an example of a non-rated period. **Note:** Non-rated period reason(s) are not to be included on the evaluation. The following areas may warrant a non-rated period:

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

1.4.11.1.1. Unit Commander (or equivalent) Duties and Considerations. The presumption will be in favor of the Airman requesting the non-rated period. Counsel Airmen directly to ensure they are fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable career impacts (and re-accomplish counseling prior to 60-day extensions, if applicable).

1.4.11.1.2. Approval Authority. The unit commander or equivalent is the approval authority. If the approval authority recommends disapproval, they must provide justification and forward the request to the member's wing commander or equivalent (delegable no lower than the deputy wing commander or equivalent) for final approval or disapproval**. (T-1)** This may be accomplished on the AF Form 469 or a separate memorandum.

1.4.11.2. Sexual Assault. The Airman will submit the request using memorandum format (see example in **Attachment 3**) to his or her unit commander/equivalent for approval. The unit commander or director will determine the length of the non-rated period. It is prohibited to include comments on any correspondence relating to or regarding the member's filing of a report of sexual assault, receiving support services, and/or participating in the investigative process and/or judicial proceedings. See **paragraph 1.4.11.1.2** for the approval authority.

1.4.11.3. Military or Civilian Confinement. Non-rated periods of supervision, regardless of the number of days served, may be considered for Airmen in confinement during the reporting period. The ratee's unit commander or equivalent will subtract periods of confinement using the total days documented on DAF Form 2098, *Duty Status Change*, from the total number days of supervision, with the exception of Directed by Commander (DBC) reports. DBC reports accomplished to capture the egregious event(s) that resulted in confinement will not subtract days of confinement from the total number of days supervision.

1.4.11.4. Lengthy Initial Skills and Advanced Training Courses (enlisted only). Non-rated periods are considered only for initial skills or advanced training courses more than 20 continuous weeks. The following training courses do not qualify for use of non-rated: initial skills and advanced training courses that are under 20 continuous weeks; all other 3-, 5-, or 7-level training courses under 20 continuous weeks; or other specific skills-training courses (e.g., field detachment training, flight requalification courses, pre-deployment training) for which the ratee travels TDY.

1.4.11.4.1. Approval Authority. AFPC/DPPSP serves as the approval authority for RegAF members and ARPC/DPTSE serves as the approval authority for ARC members for courses requesting consideration for non-rated periods of supervision. All requests must be signed/submitted by the applicable training course's administrative control (ADCON) wing commander/senior rater. For Air Education and Training Command courses of instruction, requests will be routed through Second Air Force, Manpower, Personnel, and Services Directorate (2 AF/A1), who will review, consolidate, provide a recommendation, and then forward to AFPC/DPPSP for final approval.

1.4.11.4.2. A minimum of one performance statement is required in the rater's and Higher-Level Reviewer's (HLR) comments sections of the enlisted ALQ evaluations. "THIS SECTION NOT USED," may be used as a mandatory performance statement. **Note:** Training squadrons are prohibited from replicating comments for use across multiple enlisted evaluations. Comments must be unique to each trainee's accomplishments and level of performance.

1.4.11.5. Personal Hardships. Commanders may designate periods as non-rated if they determine an Airman is undergoing or has undergone personal hardships during the reporting period.

1.4.11.6. Notification. Once the non-rated period is approved, notify the Airman's rater and annotate the evaluation accordingly. If additional non-rated periods are deemed necessary, notification will follow in the same manner.

1.4.11.7. Reporting. The rater will not consider nor comment on the Airman's performance (to include any misconduct) during a non-rated period, unless requested by the ratee. If the non-rated period covers the entire reporting period, enter the statement: "Airman is not rated for this period: (date) through (date). No comments authorized in accordance with AFI 36-2406" into all major performance areas and HLR comment section on the officer and enlisted ALQ evaluations. **Note:** TSgt and below members who are time-in-grade (TIG)/time-in-service (TIS) eligible will receive a forced distribution promotion recommendation.

1.4.12. Signatures, Signature Elements and Dates.

1.4.12.1. General Signature and Date Guidelines.

1.4.12.1.1. Do not sign or date before the close-out or "Thru" date. Sign on or after. **(T-1)**

1.4.12.1.2. Do not sign blank forms/briefs. **(T-1)**

1.4.12.1.3. Do not use "auto-signature" pens or delegated Common Access Card/digital signatures. **(T-1)**

1.4.12.1.4. Do not delay signing an evaluation due to pending talent management decisions, personnel changes, promotions, or approval of a more prestigious duty title. **(T-1)**

1.4.12.1.5. Do not "back date" the signature. **Exception:** If, after referring an evaluation to the ratee, the evaluation is reprinted for the purpose of including all evaluator comments or for making minor administrative corrections that do not require an additional referral to the ratee, all signature dates, up to and including the referring official(s), should reflect the date it was originally signed. This is necessary to show the dates each referral action actually occurred to ensure the evaluation was properly processed. All evaluators, subsequent to the (last) referring official will use either original signature dates or current signature dates. **(T-1)**

1.4.12.2. Digital Signatures and Dates. Digital signatures are signatures signed by using the common access card (CAC).

1.4.12.2.1. Raters and HLRs will use digital signatures to the maximum extent possible. **(T-1)** However, if unable to utilize digital signature, the rating chain may use a combination of a digital, a "wet" signature, or a typed signature. For the typed signature, the rating chain may use the approved typed signature in the "Signature" block located below the "Duty Title" and "Date" blocks. The approved typed signature must include: two backslashes at the front and two backslashes at the end, the word "signed," the signatory's initials, DoDID number, and date of the typed signature. **(T-1)** The typed signature format is: \\signed, xxx, DoDID #, DD Mmm YY\\. **Note:** When "wet" signed, print AF Forms 715 and 716 head to foot and handwrite or stamp the dates. **Note:** Typed signatures are not authorized on the DAF Form 709.

1.4.12.2.1.1. If a signature cannot be obtained, AFPC MLR OFFICE, following guidance from AFPC/DPPSP, will assist RegAF members and ARPC/DPTSE will assist ARC members in completing the evaluation before the next level evaluator signs and forwards the evaluation to AFPC or ARPC. **(T-2)**

1.4.12.2.1.2. In all instances, the rater is responsible to provide the ratee an opportunity to view the final version of the evaluation even if the ratee is unable to sign the evaluation. **(T-2)**

1.4.12.2.1.3. In the event the mitigations above are unsuccessful, AFPC/DPPSP will assist members in completing the evaluation; ARPC/DPTSE will assist ARC members in completing the evaluation. **(T-2)**

1.4.12.2.2. The Air Force advisor/functional examiner signatures are independent of other evaluator signatures and may sign at any time after the rater but prior to the ratee acknowledgement.

1.4.12.3. For Brigadier General (Brig Gen) and Major General (Maj Gen):

1.4.12.3.1. For Brig Gen Selects and Maj Gen Selects. Upon Senate confirmation, selects may sign all evaluations as "Brig Gen (Sel)" or "Maj Gen (Sel)," only when serving in a senior rater/ HLR position or assigned to an authorized Brig Gen/Maj Gen position.

1.4.12.3.2. Frocked. For all evaluations, sign as "Brig Gen" or "Maj Gen".

1.4.12.3.3. Upon Senate confirmation, for a Brig Gen-select who is already the designated senior rater for the lieutenants through majors in an organization, the management level must realign his or her senior rater identifications (SRIDs) and re-designate the selectee as the senior rater for the colonels and lieutenant colonels of the organization.

1.4.12.3.4. There can only be one senior rater/HLR on a report; see **paragraph 1.7.1.5** and **paragraph 1.7.1.6** for exceptions.

1.4.12.3.4.1. Multiple general officers or equivalent are authorized to sign an evaluation when the rater is a general officer or equivalent but not a senior rater. If the HLR is a general officer referring the evaluation, the referral reviewer will be the HLR's rater regardless of rank or grade.

1.4.12.3.4.2. Senior Executive Service (SES) and General Officer Equivalents. SES employees are typically general officer equivalents and, for some, senior rater positions. There can be two SES employee signatures on an evaluation report if only one of them is designated by the management level as a senior rater. An SES employee is only required to use the term "Senior Executive Service", and the level is optional in the signature element.

1.4.12.4. Evaluators who are temporarily promoted will sign using the grade they are temporarily promoted to (e.g., a lieutenant colonel who has been temporarily promoted to colonel will sign using "Colonel").

1.5. Evaluator Requirements.

1.5.1. Number of Evaluators.

1.5.1.1. An officer performance brief (OPB), enlisted performance brief (EPB), DAF Form 78, DAF Form 3538, and DAF Form 3538E will have two evaluators unless the rater qualifies as a single evaluator, or if additional evaluators are required for referral purposes. **(T-1)**

1.5.1.2. A DAF Form 709 (PRF) will have only one evaluator.

1.5.1.3. A DAF Form 475 (TR) will have only one evaluator unless there is a disagreement (**paragraph 1.10**); or the evaluation is referred, and the commander is not the evaluator named in the referral evaluation as referral reviewer (**paragraph 1.11**); or the reviewer is senior to the commander and refers the evaluation.

1.5.2. Grade Requirement for Raters and Evaluators.

1.5.2.1. Raters.

1.5.2.1.1. For officers. The rater will be an officer of the U.S. or foreign military, or a civilian, of equal or higher rank or grade than the ratee (to include selects). **(T-1) Example:** If a ratee is a major rated by a major, and the ratee is selected for lieutenant colonel but the rater is not, then the rater must be changed to a lieutenant colonel select or above.

1.5.2.1.2. For enlisted. The rater will be an officer, another enlisted member of equal or higher rank or grade than the ratee (to include selects), or a civilian at least GS-5/NH-II/equivalent or higher and in a position higher in the rating chain than the ratee. A senior airman (SrA) must complete Airman Leadership School prior to assuming or being assigned rater responsibilities. **(T-1) Example:** If a ratee is a master sergeant rated by a master sergeant, and the ratee is selected for senior master sergeant but the rater is not, then the rater must be changed to a senior master sergeant select or above.

1.5.2.1.3. Additional Requirements for Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs). The rater will not normally be another IMA. When circumstances require an IMA directly supervise another IMA, the rater will be appointed by the respective unit commander. IMAs or Traditional Reservists may supervise/rate RegAF personnel only if on consecutive active-duty military personnel appropriation orders for a minimum of 120 calendar days. Reserve members on active-duty orders for a minimum of 120 calendar days or members on statutory tours may supervise/rate RegAF members under their command or operational direction. **(T-1)** See DAFI 51-509, *Appointment to and Assumption of Command*.

1.5.3. Senior Rater.

1.5.3.1. Senior raters are assigned to and identified by the senior rater position designated by the management level for the ratee's assigned organizational personnel accounting symbol (PAS) code. **(T-2)** One senior rater may be assigned to two separate senior rater positions at the same time. However, a head of management level may not serve as head of two separate management levels. There may be a separate senior rater for colonels/lieutenant colonels vs. majors and below vs. enlisted members for the same PAS code if designated by the management level.

1.5.3.2. The head of management level, normally the MAJCOM/CC, designates all senior rater positions. Appointment of command (G-series orders) does not automatically authorize senior rater status.

1.5.3.3. AFRC may deviate and assign senior rater levels as appropriate for AFR unit assigned majors and below.

1.5.4. Higher Level Reviewer. The HLR is the final evaluator on the ALQ evaluation. The HLR is a senior leader who has direct knowledge of and visibility on the performance of the ratee within his or her peer group during the evaluation period. The intent is to improve Airmen's experience in receiving meaningful and actionable feedback on performance evaluations reviewed by the designated senior leader. For HLR requirements, see **paragraph 3.14** for officers and **paragraph 4.12** for enlisted.

1.6. Roles and Responsibilities.

1.6.1. Commander.

1.6.1.1. The commander of an organization must review the records of all personnel within 60 days of assumption of command, regardless of grade, assigned/attached under his or her command, to ensure the knowledge of and familiarization of the Airman's history, to include any sex-related offenses, nonjudicial punishment, or other punitive administrative action. Sex-related offenses may include violations or attempted violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), Articles 93a, 120, 120b, 120c, 130, certain offenses under 134, or equivalent state offenses.

1.6.1.2. Commanders will ensure supervisors are properly trained and educated on how to write a performance evaluation.

1.6.1.2.1. All first-time supervisors are required to receive mandatory officer and enlisted evaluations system training (as appropriate for their position) within 60 days of being appointed as a rater.

1.6.1.2.2. All personnel should receive recurring officer and enlisted evaluations system training (i.e., initial and refresher training) at the discretion of the unit commander.

1.6.2. General Evaluator/Higher Level Reviewer (HLR) Responsibilities. All evaluators and HLRs are responsible for performing an administrative review of all evaluations and, if necessary, return them for correction/completion before forwarding to the next level to ensure:

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

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

1.6.2.3. Evaluations do not contain inappropriate comments or recommendations.

1.6.2.4. Evaluations are properly referred, when necessary.

1.6.2.5. When required on the evaluation form, evaluators (except civilian and foreign-service evaluators) must provide the last four numbers of SSN. Use the SSN to verify the identity of the evaluator for research and accountability.

1.6.3. Rater. Raters are responsible for ensuring they understand the officer and enlisted evaluations system and should seek training if needed. All first-time supervisors are required to receive officer and enlisted evaluations system training within 60 days of being appointed as a supervisor. See **paragraph 1.6.1.2.1**.

1.6.3.1. There are no minimum days of supervision to prepare an evaluation. See **Table 3.2.**, **Table 4.2**, and **Table 4.3**. If the rater PCSs/PCAs before the SCOD, the rater will complete a draft evaluation, and the rating chain from ratee's unit as of the accounting date will complete the evaluation.

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

1.6.3.3. Provides a performance feedback assessment in accordance with **Chapter 2**. If geographically separated, assessments can be performed electronically or telephonically.

1.6.3.4. Considers the contents of any unfavorable information file (UIF) and/or personnel information file (PIF), if applicable, before preparing the performance evaluation.

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

1.6.3.6. Receives meaningful information from the ratee and as many sources as possible (e.g., letters of evaluation (LOEs) from those who previously supervised the ratee during the reporting period, the first sergeant, etc.), especially when the rater cannot observe the ratee personally. The ratee is encouraged to provide the rater with inputs on specific accomplishments; however, the ratee will not be directed to write or draft any portion of his or her own performance report.

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

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

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

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

1.6.3.11. To ensure consistency and clarity in performance assessment, raters will apply an integrated framework that captures both what Airmen accomplished (objectives aligned with major performance areas) and how well they accomplished it (competencies aligned with ALQs). This dual-focus approach is designed to guide performance planning, assessment, and feedback. Raters will be expected to provide specific, observable examples that reflect achieved objectives and demonstrated competencies. **Example:** "Airman Illig fulfilled 580 supply orders with 99% accuracy while implementing a new accounting system." This demonstrates mission execution (major performance area) and adaptability (ALQ). Evaluations must meaningfully address both performance outcomes and the leadership qualities exhibited during the rating period.

1.6.3.12. Raters will measure an Airman's performance using a whole person concept relative to the ratee's specific grade, AFSC, level of responsibility, and assigned duties throughout the entire rating period using the four major performance areas. Raters will also assess how well the Airman demonstrated desired ALQs in the execution of their duties. When documenting performance, raters must provide clear examples that illustrate both achieved objectives (what was done) and demonstrated competencies (how it was done).

1.6.3.12.1. Executing the Mission. Raters should consider how well the ratee effectively uses knowledge, initiative, and adaptability to produce timely, high quality/quantity results to positively impact the mission.

1.6.3.12.2. Leading People. Raters should consider how well the ratee fosters cohesive teams, effectively communicates, and uses emotional intelligence to take care of people and accomplish the mission.

1.6.3.12.3. Managing Resources. Raters should consider how well the ratee manages assigned resources effectively and takes responsibility for actions/behaviors to maximize organizational performance.

1.6.3.12.4. Improving the Unit. Raters should consider how well the ratee demonstrates critical thinking and fosters innovation to find creative solutions and improve mission execution.

1.6.4. Higher Level Reviewer.

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

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

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

1.6.4.4. Non-concurs with previous evaluators and makes comments, when applicable.

1.6.4.5. {Senior Rater only} Approves the unit mission descriptions for the PRF.

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

1.6.5. First Sergeant.

1.6.5.1. Will not assume rater responsibilities.

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

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

1.6.5.5. {ANG only} For ANG units without a full-time first sergeant, the full-time SNCO/senior enlisted leader (SEL) in the member's immediate rating chain may complete the quality force review.

1.6.6. Forced Distributor.

1.6.6.1. Reviews all enlisted evaluations.

1.6.6.2. Reviews the content of any UIF and/or PIF, if applicable, and returns the evaluation to the rater for reconsideration, if appropriate, to ensure an accurate, unbiased, and an uninflated evaluation.

1.6.6.3. Flight commanders are not authorized to sign in this area.

1.6.6.4. Commandants for the Senior Noncommissioned Officer Academy (SNCOA). The SNCOA Commandant has been designated as the HLR for SMSgts and below who are within his or her direct rating chain and/or scope of responsibility and are non-promotion eligible, or who will not be endorsed/stratified by the senior rater or receive force distribution as applicable.

1.6.6.5. Manages the performance evaluation program for the organization.

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

1.6.6.7. Determines the rating chain for assigned personnel based on Air Force and management level policy.

1.6.6.7.1. The ratee's parent management level must approve rating chains that involve evaluators from other management levels.

1.6.6.7.2. For rating chain deviations see **paragraph 1.7** and **paragraph 1.13**.

1.6.6.8. Ensures that no one in the rating chain is related to the member.

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

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

1.6.7.1. Functional/Acquisition Examiner or Air Force Advisor Block.

1.6.7.1.1. Functional/acquisition examiners or Air Force advisors may provide comments on the ALQ evaluation (EPB and OPB).

1.6.7.1.2. Comments are not mandatory; however, if used, the intent of these comments are to provide clarification and ensure the evaluation is written in accordance with AF 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 the space available in myEval or on the AF Forms 715 and 716.

1.6.7.1.3. Functional/acquisition examiners or Air Force advisors will not change any statement or rating on the evaluation.

1.6.7.1.4. If the functional/acquisition examiner and the Air Force advisor are the same person, both positions will be indicated; both the functional examiner and Air Force advisor blocks will be marked on the evaluation. For evaluations that do not include the examiner/advisor block (i.e., Training Reports), the examiner/advisor will indicate both positions on the DAF Form 77.

1.6.7.2. 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 or recommendations. If comments are provided, the examiner is limited to the space available in myEval.

1.6.7.3. Acquisition Examiner.

1.6.7.3.1. In accordance with Title 10 United States Code Section 1722(g), *Performance Appraisals*, provide an opportunity 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 nor the HLR are in 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).

1.6.7.3.2. Review by an Acquisition Examiner.

1.6.7.3.2.1. 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 nor the HLR are on a coded position in the same acquisition position category.

1.6.7.3.2.2. {ANG only} Review by a functional/acquisitions examiner is mandatory when there are no acquisition-coded positions, in the same acquisition position category, in the rating chain.

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

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

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

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

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

1.6.7.3.6. Comments are not mandatory, but if desired for clarification about acquisition-related considerations, the examiner prepares them on the evaluation in myEval. The examiner will not change any statement or rating on the evaluation, nor will their comments be used simply to include additional comments, accolades, recommendations, etc. If provided, comments are limited to the space available in myEval.

1.6.7.4. Air Force Advisor Program.

1.6.7.4.1. When the final evaluator on an evaluation 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 evaluations.

1.6.7.4.1.1. The senior Air Force military member on duty with the activity/agency assumes this position. The management level may designate any Air Force member or Air Force official meeting the grade requirement with the activity/agency to serve as advisor.

1.6.7.4.1.1.1. For officers, the advisor will be a colonel or above.

1.6.7.4.1.1.2. For SNCOs, the advisor will be a major or above.

1.6.7.4.1.1.3. For noncommissioned officers (NCOs), the advisor will be a master sergeant or above.

1.6.7.4.1.1.4. For IMAs and Participating Individual Ready Reserve (PIRR) members, the advisor is the person appointed by the management level for the active force (for IMAs this will be unit of assignment; for PIRR members this will be unit of attachment).

1.6.7.4.1.2. When an agency (e.g., DoD departments, non-Department of the Air Force schools/units) has only one Air Force member assigned, the management level for that activity appoints an advisor.

1.6.7.4.1.3. If the commander or designated Air Force officer/senior official who completes the "commander's review" is senior/equal to the last evaluator (or is also the unit's designated advisor) and meets the Air Force advisor grade requirement, the advisor statement does not need to be completed.

1.6.7.4.2. 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 HLR. Additionally, an O-6 cannot sign on another O-6.

1.6.8. Ratee.

1.6.8.1. The ratee is responsible for knowing the rating chain and ensuring they receive a performance feedback assessment in accordance with **Chapter 2**.

1.6.8.2. For officer and enlisted evaluation responsibilities see Chapters **3** and **4**.

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. Ratees will review their evaluation prior to signing. Ratees are encouraged to check for typos, spelling, and inaccurate data and to bring any discrepancies to the rater's attention. **Note:** A performance feedback assessment is not required upon completion of the evaluation. The evaluation serves as official documentation of the feedback provided to the ratee.

1.6.9. Military Personnel Flight (MPF) and Commander's Support Staff (CSS).

1.6.9.1. The MPF and CSS will work together in managing the Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems for organizations under their purview, to include geographically separated units. Managing includes reviewing all evaluations for administrative accuracy and policy compliance and updating the MilPDS.

1.6.9.2. Provide technical assistance to the commander and evaluators.

1.6.9.3. Evaluations will be routed within myEval for digitally signed evaluations; manual/wet signature evaluations will be scanned and loaded into myEval.

1.6.9.4. Coordinate referral reports with appropriate work centers in the MPF to ensure MilPDS updates are accomplished.

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

1.6.9.6. MPFs are responsible for training CSSs who in turn train their unit personnel on the officer and enlisted evaluations system as directed by the unit commander (see paragraphs **1.6.1.2.1** and **1.6.1.2.2.**). For units without a CSS, MPFs will ensure commanders receive appropriate training.

1.6.10. Major Commands (MAJCOMs). The management level and their servicing personnel activity:

1.6.10.1. Designate senior rater positions and determine civilian equivalency for senior rater designations. Senior raters must be at least a colonel (or equivalent) serving as a wing commander or equivalent. **Note:** If the deputy commander is assuming commander responsibilities and the management level wants them to have senior rater responsibilities, the management level must appoint the deputy commander senior rater responsibilities in writing.

1.6.10.1.1. Senior Rater Requirements for PRFs. For all majors and below, the senior rater must be at least a colonel (or equivalent) serving as a wing commander or equivalent. For all lieutenant colonels and colonels, the senior rater must be a general officer (or equivalent) and will be the first general officer in the rating chain.

1.6.10.1.2. For all enlisted grades, senior raters must be at least a colonel or civilian equivalent (GS-15 or higher), serving as a wing commander or equivalent.

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

1.6.10.3. Print copies of digitally signed evaluations from ARMS/PRDA.

1.6.10.4. Approve evaluators to be from a different management level than that of the ratee in accordance with management level policy.

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

1.6.10.6. Appoint acquisition examiners and establish officer evaluation routing procedures when the examination cannot be accomplished within the existing rating chain.

1.6.11. Headquarters Air Force (HAF).

1.6.11.1. AF/A1 develops policy regarding the Air Force Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems.

1.6.11.2. AF/A1P develops plans and programs to implement policy on the Air Force Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems in collaboration with the Air Force Reserve Directorate of Personnel (AF/REP) and NGB Manpower, Personnel, and Services Directorate (NGB/A1) and establishes an annual evaluation systems program review to determine if improvements or changes are needed.

1.6.11.3. AF/A1 approves USAF enlisted forced distribution panel (EFDP) formal board charges annually prior to the convening of the first EFDP panel of the fiscal year.

1.6.12. HQ Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC).

1.6.12.1. AFPC/DPPSP implements and oversees execution of the Air Force Officer and Enlisted ALQ Evaluation Systems program.

1.6.12.1.1. AFPC/DPPSP develops and maintains training on the Air Force Officer and Enlisted Evaluations Systems. AFPC/DPMSP provides training to MAJCOMs and MPFs at least annually.

1.6.12.2. AFPC may review a random sampling of evaluations for compliance with policy directives and this instruction within myEval.

1.6.13. Headquarters Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC).

1.6.13.1. Receives all referral evaluations for ARC members.

1.6.13.2. Forwards all ARC referral evaluations to ARMS/PRDA.

1.7. Rating Chain Deviations and Evaluator Changes. This paragraph does not apply to rater changes due to PCS, PCA, separation, or retirement of the rater.

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 policy. When necessary, commanders may deviate from the normal (supervisory) rating chain to meet grade requirements. Commanders may accommodate unique organizational structures and situations when personnel are assigned to other activities outside the ratee's assigned PAS code. The commander of the assigned billet and the commander of the outside activity must formally agree to rating chain deviations that include evaluators from outside the owning organization. **(T-2)**

1.7.1.1.1. For officer ratees, the parent management level must approve rating chains that involve evaluators from other management levels; however, both management levels (the parent and the temporary management level) must formally agree to the rating chain deviation. **(T-2)**

1.7.1.1.2. For enlisted ratees, the owning senior rater must approve rating chain deviations. **(T-2)**

1.7.1.1.3. A rating chain deviation must be in effect for at least 12 months or longer, for the temporary rating chain or management level to be able to sign reports. **(T-2)** If there is a rating chain deviation for less than 12 months, then the parent/owning organization must sign all reports. **(T-1)** Rating chain deviations must be initiated no later than 60 days prior to the close-out date of the evaluation. **(T-2)**

1.7.1.1.4. Upon rating chain deviation approval, the temporary organization will be responsible for writing the member's enlisted or officer evaluation, PRF, LOE, decoration, etc. until the member is placed back under their parent/owning organization. **(T-1) Example:** A major is on loan from a wing to the Numbered Air Force (NAF) commander to fill an executive officer position for 12 months. Through agreement with the parent management level and temporary management level, the parent management level can approve a rating chain deviation. Once approved, the NAF commander will sign the officer's evaluation, PRF, LOE, decoration, etc. **Note:** Approved rating chain deviations must be forwarded to AFPC/DPPSP (RegAF) or ARPC/DPTSE (ARC) for historical purposes.

1.7.1.1.5. It is prohibited to make rating chain deviations (such as skipping an evaluator) solely for reasons of convenience. **(T-1) Example:** Do not skip a member in the rating chain who is temporarily unavailable (on leave, TDY, etc.). Do not skip a member in the rating chain for the sole purpose of affording another official in the supervisory chain (e.g., the rater's rater or the senior rater) the opportunity to endorse or comment in an evaluation.

1.7.1.1.6. 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 United States Air Force (USAF) mission (e.g., AFR/ANG with the RegAF). In these cases, evaluation rating chains may involve different USAF components and shall normally be written by the member's day-to-day supervisor in accordance with affected management level direction. However, evaluations must be returned to the member's administrative control commander/reviewer/HLR/senior rater to finalize the evaluation/endorsement. This allows for maximum operational integration and reporting accuracy while still meeting administrative (PAS code driven) requirements.

1.7.1.1.7. If a member is performing duty in an organization other than their assigned PAS code, enter the assigned information, followed by "with duty at . . ." to indicate the organization where the ratee performed duty. This includes personnel on 365-day extended deployment billets. **Example:** 341st Security Forces Squadron (AFGSC), Malmstrom AFB MT, with duty at 447 ESFS (USAFCENT), Baghdad International Airport, Baghdad, Iraq. **Note**: Do not use this to enter a second organization if the ratee is filling a dual-hatted role. **(T-1)** Instead, mention the dual-hatted role in the job description or elsewhere in the evaluation.

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

1.7.1.3. Health Professionals.

1.7.1.3.1. The Defense Health Agency-aligned network director will be the rater for colonel military treatment facility (MTF) directors/market directors. **(T-1)** The HLR will be the respectively aligned NAF commander (or equivalent) or Field Command (FLDCOM) commander (for USSF bases/organizations). See **paragraph 1.7.1.5**.

1.7.1.3.2. The management level will be the supported MAJCOM commander. **(T-1)**

1.7.1.3.3. This policy applies to current and future medical units that are also defined as MTFs and configured as wings, groups, squadrons, or flights.

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

1.7.1.4.1. SDO/DATT personnel will be rated by Defense Intelligence Agency.

1.7.1.4.2. For individuals assigned or attached to a combatant command (CCMD), normal processing procedures apply. PRFs in these cases, will be accomplished by the CCMD.

1.7.1.5. DELETED.

1.7.1.5.1. DELETED.

1.7.1.5.2. DELETED.

1.7.1.6. DELETED.

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. If an evaluator is the subject of a formal complaint of harassment or assault, the commander or higher-level commander must review the evaluator's ability to continue evaluating the complainant; if necessary, the evaluator may be removed from the complainant's rating chain. **(T-1)** Cases involving threats of reprisal or retaliation are serious allegations and have the potential to impede trust and readiness. Therefore, removing an evaluator from a rating chain for either of these reasons will be at the commander's discretion.

1.7.2.1. If it is determined that removal from evaluator responsibilities is necessary, the removing official 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. **(T-1)** The evaluator being removed must acknowledge receipt within 30 calendar days from the date, or the date of discovery, of the incident that led to the removal from evaluator responsibilities. **(T-1)**

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 HLR/senior rater (officers) or commander (enlisted) because the rater is formally relieved from duties as an evaluator or relieved from duty for cause:

1.7.2.2.1. The commander will assign a new rater to assume the responsibilities. **(T-1)**

1.7.2.2.2. When this occurs, a statement explaining why the rater did not prepare the evaluation must be included in the mandatory comments section of the evaluation. **(T-1)**

1.7.2.2.3. Evaluations prepared by a rater under these circumstances which are not yet a matter of record are considered working copies and may be re-accomplished.

1.8. Evaluator's Mandatory Considerations.

1.8.1. Convictions. Any conviction for a violation of criminal law of the U.S. or of any other country must be reported, in writing, by all officers and enlisted members. Members in an active status will report a conviction to their rater within 15 days of the date of the conviction. **(T-0)** Members not in an active status will report the conviction to their wing commander/equivalent at the first drill period or within 30 calendar days of the date of conviction, whichever is earlier. **(T-0)** Individual Ready Reserve members will report the conviction to the Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC) within 30 calendar days of the date of the conviction. **(T-0)**

1.8.1.1. Comments are required on members who have been convicted of a civilian offense that: 1) is a sexual offense that is the same as, or closely related to, sex-related offenses punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), or attempts to commit any of those offenses, 2) carries a possible sentence of confinement for more than one year or death, or 3) results in a sentence that includes unsuspended confinement. **(T-0)** For further guidance, supervisors and commanders will contact an attorney in the servicing office of the staff judge advocate.

1.8.1.1.1. Waiver Requests.

1.8.1.1.1.1. In extraordinary cases, raters may request a waiver of the mandatory requirement to document civilian convictions for good cause. The waiver request will route from the rater, through the ratee's commander, to the ratee's senior rater. The senior rater may either deny the request or endorse and forward to the MAJCOM/CC. In the case of reports within Air Force District of Washington (AFDW), United States Air Force Academy, or any direct reporting unit of AFDW or field operating agency report to any activity on the Air Staff, requests will be forwarded to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force (VCSAF). For the Air National Guard, requests will be forwarded to the Director, Air National Guard (DANG).

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

1.8.1.1.1.3. When the senior rater endorses the waiver request, they will then forward it to the MAJCOM/CC, VCSAF, or DANG for decision. The final approval authority will either approve or deny the request.

1.8.1.1.1.3.1. The MAJCOM/CC may delegate to the major command deputy commander (MAJCOM/CD), or, in the case of the Air Force, Vice Chief of Staff (AF/CV), to the Air Force, Assistant Vice Chief of Staff (AF/CVA). No further delegation beyond an Adjutant General, or equivalent, is authorized for the ANG. The decision of the approval authority is the final decision for such waiver requests and may not be appealed or considered further. This does not prevent an individual from challenging any completed report in any other appropriate forums, e.g., ERAB or the AFBCMR.

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

1.8.1.2. Comments are required if a member has been convicted of any offense by a court-martial.

1.8.1.3. A rater is not required to comment on any conviction in a current report if the misconduct or event that ultimately resulted in a conviction was addressed on a previous evaluation. For example, if a member is arrested and charged with an offense by off-base officials who decline to waive jurisdiction, and the member ultimately receives a letter of reprimand that is commented on in an evaluation, but later, the off-base prosecution results in a conviction, then the rater is not required to comment on the conviction because the underlying misconduct that led to the conviction was addressed in a previous evaluation.

1.8.1.4. 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.

1.8.1.5. For purpose of this policy, a criminal law of the U.S. includes any federal, state, district, commonwealth, territory/equivalent, county, parish, municipality, city, township, local subdivision, or foreign criminal law or ordinance.

1.8.2. Sex-related Offenses. Document substantiated offenses in the permanent record. **(T-0)** This includes any substantiated allegation of a sex-related offense that results in conviction by court-martial, nonjudicial punishment, or other punitive administrative action (e.g., letter of reprimand). Documenting sex-related offenses in an evaluation does not limit or prohibit the Airman from challenging the placement or appealing for removal.

1.8.3. Equal Opportunity and Treatment. Unlawful discrimination and sexual harassment violate the very premise of what it means to be an Airman. Evaluators must ensure compliance with DoD and Department of the Air Force directives prohibiting such behavior and document deviations on evaluations as prescribed in DAFI 36-2710, *Equal Opportunity Program*. **(T-0)**

1.8.4. Prohibited Activities. Airmen are prohibited from actively advocating supremacist, extremist, or criminal gang doctrine, ideology, or causes, including those that advance, encourage, or advocate illegal discrimination or deprive others of their civil rights. Such behavior is incompatible with military service. Evaluators must consider a ratee's membership in these types of groups and document prohibited activity by the ratee as prescribed in DAFI 51-508, *Political Activities, Free Speech and Freedom of Assembly of Air Force Personnel*.

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

1.8.6. 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.

1.8.7. Adverse Information.

1.8.7.1. For Enlisted. If a member has been convicted by a court-martial, received an Article 15, or if the senior rater decides to file adverse information in the member's senior non-commissioned officer selection record, comments relating to the ratee's adverse conduct are mandatory on the next enlisted evaluation, if not already documented on a previous evaluation; the evaluation becomes a referral. **(T-1)**

1.8.7.2. For Officers.

1.8.7.2.1. If a member has adverse information filed in their officer selection record, comments relating to the ratee's adverse conduct are mandatory on the next officer evaluation or TR, if not already documented on a previous evaluation or TR; the evaluation becomes a referral. **(T-1)** Evaluators are not required to wait for the adverse information to appear in the OSR before documenting it in the evaluation, provided the incident occurred during the reporting period and prior to the SCOD. Comments relating to the officer's adverse conduct are only mandatory on the next PRF if the adverse information has not already been filed in the officer selection record and documented on an evaluation or TR.

1.8.7.2.2. Adverse information includes, but is not limited to, all letters of admonishment or higher and letters of counseling (LOCs) related to a substantiated finding or conclusion from an officially documented investigation or inquiry. LOCs unrelated to a substantiated finding or conclusion from an officially documented investigation or inquiry (referred to as "standalone" LOCs) are not considered adverse information and are not required to be commented on in an evaluation or TR. See DAFI 36-2907, *Adverse Administrative Actions*, for further guidance. **Exception:** When a commander (or equivalent) decides not to issue written command action to an officially documented investigation or inquiry that concludes with a substantiated finding, evaluators are not required to comment on the adverse information summary issued and filed in an officer selection record in the evaluation.

1.8.8. Organizational Climate.

1.8.8.1. Organizational climate is defined as the way in which members in a unit perceive and characterize their unit environment. All Airmen are responsible for creating an organizational climate in which every member is treated with dignity and respect, and one that does not tolerate unlawful discrimination, sexual harassment, or sexual assault in any form. NCOs and officers are not only responsible for creating this environment but are also accountable for it. NCOs and officers will build a healthy organizational climate by: communicating clear direction at all levels of supervision; adhering to and enforcing standards; not tolerating and, when necessary, appropriately responding to any form of sexual harassment, sexual assault, hazing, unlawful discrimination, or any other conduct harmful to the good order and discipline of the unit; being accountable for their actions; and cultivating an environment where teamwork, unity and cohesiveness are the standard practice. **(T-0)**

1.8.8.2. Commanders at every level have an even greater responsibility to create a healthy climate in their command. Additionally, they are responsible for ensuring adherence to Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program directives. Command climate, just like organizational climate, is the perception of a unit's environment by its members. Commanders are ultimately responsible for the good order and discipline in their unit and have unique responsibility and authority to ensure good order and discipline. Therefore, evaluators must take this special responsibility and authority into consideration when evaluating a commander's effectiveness in ensuring a healthy command climate. **(T-0)** A commander's evaluation shall require a statement regarding whether the commander has conducted the required command climate assessments and provided the results with remedy plan to the rater. **(T-0)** A commander's evaluation shall also indicate the extent to which the commanding officer has or has not established a command climate in which:

1.8.8.2.1. Allegations of sexual assault are properly managed and fairly evaluated. **(T-0)**

1.8.8.2.2. A victim of criminal activity, including sexual assault, can report criminal activity without fear of retaliation, including ostracism and group pressure from other members of the command. **(T-0)**

1.8.8.3. All evaluators will assess their ratee(s) on what the member did to ensure a healthy organizational climate. **(T-0)**

1.9. Mandatory Comments. Certain items are required to be considered and may be required to be commented upon in an Airman's evaluation. When an item is required to be commented upon, the evaluator will enter a unique performance statement(s) to address the required item in addition to any specific comment or entry mandated by this instruction. Specific comments or entries are identified by the instruction to "enter" or "include the statement" followed by the specific comment placed within quotation marks and must be documented on the evaluation as stated. See Tables **3.1** and **4.7**.

1.9.1. Commander Evaluations. If a ratee is or was a commander at any point in the rating period, the evaluation will require a mandatory statement stating that the supervisor received the commander's annual climate assessment results and conducted the appropriate review and/or took the appropriate accountability measures with the subordinate commander after reviewing the results. **(T-1)**

1.9.2. Command Oversight of Housing. If the ratee is an installation/wing commander, installation/wing, command chief, mission support group (MSG) commander (MSG/CC) (or equivalent), MSG senior enlisted leader (SEL) (or equivalent), civil engineer squadron (CES) commander (CES/CC), CES SEL, or military installation housing manager (as applicable) at any point in the rating period, the ratee will be evaluated and assessed on the extent to which these individuals have or have not exercised effective oversight and leadership in the following:

1.9.2.1. Improving conditions of military privatized housing. **(T-0)**

1.9.2.2. Addressing concerns of members of the Armed Forces and their families who reside in military privatized housing on the installation. **(T-0)**

1.9.3. If a member has been assigned to serve as a voting assistance officer at any point in the rating period, a comment relating to the performance of the member in these duties is required. **(T-0)** See 10 U.S.C. § 1566, *Voting Assistance: compliance assessments; assistance*.

1.9.4. Referral Reviewer. For a referral LOE, officer or enlisted ALQ evaluation, or TR, the evaluator named in the referral evaluation must comment as required by **paragraph 1.11.5.3.2.2**.

1.9.5. If the rater died, became incapacitated, or was relieved from duties as an evaluator, state the reason in the feedback sections of the officer evaluation (see **paragraph 1.7.2.2**) or in the remarks section of the enlisted evaluation. **(T-1)**

1.9.6. If performance feedback was not accomplished, state the reason why it was not accomplished. Rationale must be placed in myEval when completing ALQ evaluations. **(T-1)** The reason must be honest, plausible, and specific, such as "Midterm feedback assessment not conducted due to only 58 calendar days supervision between initial feedback assessment and the evaluation close-out date," or "Rater was unable to conduct feedback assessment (state specific reason)." Non-receipt of a feedback notice and "administrative oversight" are not acceptable reasons.

1.10. Disagreements.

1.10.1. A disagreement is when a subsequent evaluator non-concurs with or makes any statement that indicates obvious difference with a previous evaluator. Disagreements are a difference in perspective and should not be viewed negatively. When disagreements occur, they must be explained. When this occurs, the "non-concur" block is selected and comments must be included to explain the disagreement. **(T-1)**

1.10.2. Comments to support disagreements are required. **(T-1) Example:** Disagree with rater's assessment of Executing the Mission—TSgt Smith was unable to provide correct operating procedures during monthly evaluation; or Capt Rogers was unable to answer critical questions concerning the operation of his flight leading to an Operational Readiness Inspection rating of "Unsatisfactory" for his squadron.

1.10.3. Evaluators should discuss disagreements when preparing evaluations. Evaluators are first given an opportunity to justify their comment; however, they will not change their comments just to satisfy the disagreement. If, after discussion, the disagreement remains, the evaluator who non-concurs should limit the comments to the space provided.

1.11. Referral Evaluations.

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

1.11.2. General Information. An evaluation becomes a referral when comments are derogatory in nature, or imply or refer to behavior incompatible with, or not meeting minimum acceptable standards of personal or professional conduct, character, judgement, or integrity, and/or refer to disciplinary actions in any of the following areas of an evaluation: any of the MPA sections of the rater's assessment and/or HLR assessment of the officer and enlisted ALQ evaluations, or any of the comments section(s) on the LOE or TR. If a report contains referral comments, the referral section (second page of the officer and enlisted ALQ evaluation or DAF Form 77) or referral memorandum (for training reports) must be completed. Do not complete the referral section or referral memorandum if the evaluation does not contain referral comments in at least one of the rater's/HLR's assessment section or comments sections.

1.11.2.1. Vague Comments. Do not make vague comments about the member's behavior or performance. **Example:** "Due to a recent off-duty incident, Lt Jackson's potential is limited" does not state what occurred. Vague comments do not fully explain the incident or behavior, nor do they justify the referral. When doubt arises as to whether a comment is a referral comment or not, refer the evaluation. This will afford the member an opportunity to respond. 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.

1.11.2.2. Any evaluator whose comments cause an evaluation to become a referral evaluation must give the ratee the opportunity to comment on the evaluation. **(T-1)**

1.11.2.3. A referral evaluation can be detrimental to an Airman's career; therefore, face-to-face interaction is required between the rater (or subsequent evaluator who provides derogatory comments) and ratee. For geographically separated raters and ratees, this face-to-face interaction may be accomplished electronically (e.g., via video conferencing).

1.11.2.4. An evaluation will be referred more than once when a subsequent evaluator gives additional referral comments. **(T-1) Note:** Comments regarding the same incident or behavior will not require the evaluation to be referred more than once.

1.11.2.5. If, after the evaluation has been referred to the ratee, updates are made to the evaluation that add information or change the content (excluding administrative corrections such as spelling or punctuation), the ratee must be given an opportunity to respond to the updates. **(T-1)** Refer the evaluation again and allow 3 duty days for a response (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty). **(T-1)** The date of the new referral evaluation must be on or after the date the updated evaluation is signed. The ratee can submit a new rebuttal or attach the previously submitted rebuttal.

1.11.2.6. 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 in accordance with **paragraph 1.11.4.4**.

1.11.2.7. Ensure the information (e.g., name, organizational information, etc.) of the next evaluator is included on the evaluation or referral memorandum (training reports) when referral procedures are not included on the evaluation itself.

1.11.2.8. The evaluator who refers the evaluation and any subsequent evaluators may continue comments on a DAF Form 77 to explain non-concurrence or the behavior that led to the referral. Comments are limited to the space on the front of the form (Section IV). Each evaluator will use a separate form.

1.11.2.9. All original documents will remain attached to the original evaluation. **(T-1)**

1.11.2.10. In organizations where the rating chain crosses MAJCOM lines (for instance, when there is a "dual-hatted" senior rater), the referral reviewer is the next official in the chain of command from the MAJCOM that controls the ratee's organization of assignment, even if the senior rater's rater belongs to the other MAJCOM.

1.11.2.11. Airmen whose most recent performance evaluation is or will be a referral are ineligible for PCS subject to the parameters of DAFI 36-2110, *Total Force Assignments*.

1.11.3. When to Refer a Performance Evaluation.

1.11.3.1. Performance evaluations must be referred when comments in any officer or enlisted ALQ evaluation, LOE, or TR (to include attachments), that are derogatory in nature, imply or refer to behavior incompatible with or not meeting AF standards, and/or refer to disciplinary actions. **(T-1)** When considering the Airman's ability to meet standards, consider unacceptable performance as actions that are incompatible with, and/or Airmen who have routinely (i.e., a repeated inability to meet standards that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below AF standards and expectations) and/or significantly (i.e., a single instance where failure to meet standards is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts overall aggregated performance assessment) failed to adhere to established AF standards and expectations. **(T-1)**

1.11.3.2. Directed by Commander Evaluations. DBC evaluations provide flexibility to commanders to document substandard performance between SCODs as an embedded report (between two officer or enlisted SCOD ALQ evaluations) and will only contain comments regarding the reason(s) for the evaluation (i.e., only the substandard performance). **(T-1)**

1.11.3.2.1. The referring evaluator must place a performance statement in at least one of the MPAs or in the HLR section (if HLR is documenting) commenting on the behavior in addition to completing the referral section. If all MPAs are not used, the comment, "THIS SECTION NOT USED," will be placed in the remaining MPAs.

1.11.3.2.2. All other comments, specifically those that are positive, and promotion recommendations are not authorized and will be documented on the next SCOD evaluation. **(T-1)**

1.11.4. Who Refers a Performance Evaluation?

1.11.4.1. Any evaluator whose comment(s) causes the evaluation to be a referral will refer the evaluation to the ratee. **(T-1)**

1.11.4.2. If a previous evaluator did not refer an evaluation and a subsequent evaluator determines the evaluation should be referred, return the evaluation to the previous evaluator and discuss the comment. The previous evaluator may change the comment, or the subsequent evaluator may refer the evaluation. **(T-1)**

1.11.4.3. If there is a disagreement as to whether to refer an evaluation, the subsequent evaluator may refer the evaluation.

1.11.4.4. When the rater refers the evaluation, the HLR is the referral reviewer. **(T-1)**

1.11.4.5. When the HLR refers the evaluation, the HLR's rater is the referral reviewer. **(T-1)**

1.11.4.6. If the referral reviewer is above SecAF, a waiver may be submitted to retain ADCON within the Service.

1.11.5. Responsibilities.

1.11.5.1. The Referring Evaluator Responsibilities.

1.11.5.1.1. Prepares the referral evaluation in accordance with **Table 3.1** (officers), **Table 4.9** (enlisted), **paragraph 1.11.6.4** and **Figure 1.1** (training reports) or **Table 5.1** (letter of evaluation), whichever is applicable. **Note:** The date the rater signs the evaluation, and the date of the referral section (second page of the officer and enlisted ALQ evaluation or DAF Form 77) or referral memorandum (for training reports) must be the same date, or after.

1.11.5.1.2. On or after the close-out date of the evaluation, deliver the referral evaluation and referral memorandum (for training reports), if used, to the ratee, discuss the content of the referral evaluation with the ratee, provide counseling (if needed), and obtain the ratee's signature and the date acknowledging receipt. **(T-1)** After the ratee signs the referral section or memorandum, provide a copy to the ratee and forward the original to the referral reviewer. Do not include subsequent evaluator comments on the referral evaluation until after the rebuttal is received or rebuttal period has passed. **(T-1)**

1.11.5.1.3. If the ratee is geographically separated, send the referral evaluation electronically. For those who have passed their date of separation, send a copy of the referral evaluation to the referral reviewer and mail the original referral evaluation to the ratee by "certified mail - return receipt requested." **(T-3)**

1.11.5.1.4. Upon receipt of the completed evaluation (after the referring reviewer has signed), provide feedback to the ratee and obtain the ratee's signature. Next, forward the evaluation to the ratee's servicing CSS who will in turn send to the servicing MPF. (RegAF only) The servicing MPF will finalize the referral. (ARC only) The servicing MPF will route the final referral to ARPC for finalization.

1.11.5.2. Ratee Responsibilities.

1.11.5.2.1. The ratee acknowledges receipt of the referral evaluation by signing and dating the referral section or referral memorandum (training reports). **(T-1)** The signature only acknowledges and verifies receipt of the referral evaluation on the date indicated; it does not signify concurrence with the evaluation or indicate whether or not the ratee will provide rebuttal remarks.

1.11.5.2.2. If the ratee is geographically separated, they will sign the referral section or referral memorandum (training reports) of the evaluation to acknowledge receipt and then forward the original to the evaluator named in the referral section/memorandum. **(T-1)**

1.11.5.2.3. The ratee will provide rebuttal comments to the referral reviewer within 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) from the date of receipt (if mailed from the date of delivery), regardless of if the ratee is still on active duty. **(T-1)** The ratee will upload or deliver the referral documents with all attachments. The ratee may use certified or registered mail if geographically separated. The ratee may request more time from the referral reviewer not to exceed 45 calendar days from acknowledgement. Additionally, the ratee:

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

1.11.5.2.3.2. Must limit comments, including any pertinent attachments, to a total of 10 single-sided pages or 5 double-sided pages. **(T-1)** 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 that are already part of the permanent record, such as copies of previous evaluations, will be removed from the referral package prior to filing. **(T-1)**

1.11.5.2.3.3. May have another individual prepare comments on their 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. **(T-1)** This statement will appear somewhere on the rebuttal document or be attached as a separate statement. **(T-1) 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).

1.11.5.2.4. May choose not to comment on the referral evaluation. Once the time limit has elapsed, the referral reviewer completes the evaluation and continues normal processing (see **paragraph 1.11.5.3**.). Failure to provide comments does not prevent the ratee from later appealing the evaluation in accordance with the procedures in **Chapter 10** once the evaluation becomes a matter of record.

1.11.5.3. The Referral Reviewer. (The Evaluator Named in the Referral Section of the Evaluation or Referral Memorandum [Training Reports].)

1.11.5.3.1. Must allow the ratee 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) to submit a rebuttal. **(T-1)** If the ratee needs additional time, e.g., due to the non-availability of an Area Defense Counsel or the referral reviewer has returned the rebuttal because it is more than 10 pages, the referral reviewer may grant an extension. However, the referral reviewer will not review the evaluation until the 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active members) have passed, even if the ratee has indicated that they will not submit comments. **(T-1)**

1.11.5.3.2. After 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) have passed, the referral reviewer will:

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

1.11.5.3.2.2. Place the applicable mandatory statement in the evaluator's comment block of the appropriate evaluation.

1.11.5.3.2.2.1. If the ratee provided comments, enter the statement: "I have carefully considered (ratee's name) comments to the referral evaluation of (date)." Ensure this date is the date of the referral section/memorandum, not the evaluation close-out date or the date of the ratee's rebuttal. Subsequent evaluators do not enter this statement.

1.11.5.3.2.2.2. If the ratee does not forward comments within 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) (plus mailing time and any approved extensions), enter the statement: "Comments from the ratee were requested but were not received within the required period." **(T-1)** Then forward the evaluation for normal processing.

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

1.11.5.4. Additional/Subsequent Evaluators.

1.11.5.4.1. 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 **paragraph 1.11.4.4**.

1.11.5.4.2. Prepare an endorsement in the referral comment section provided on the evaluation.

1.11.5.4.3. If the evaluator on the DAF Form 77 or in the referral comments section is not an Air Force officer or Air Force NCO, obtain an Air Force Advisor review.

1.11.5.4.4. An HLR/final evaluator who decides to refer an evaluation due to a performance assessment comment made by the rater refers it to the ratee before completing their portion of the evaluation. The referral section in the evaluation or referral memorandum (training reports) will instruct the ratee to direct and return any rebuttal comments back to them. **(T-1)** Upon receipt of the ratee's rebuttal, or when 3 duty days (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) have elapsed, the evaluator completes their portion of the evaluation.

1.11.5.4.5. If, after referral, a subsequent evaluator invalidates the referral comments so the conditions defined in **paragraph 1.11.3** no longer apply, the non-concur block is marked, and comments are made in support of the disagreement in the comments. The evaluation is no longer considered referral; however, retain all original referral documents and/or correspondence with the evaluation.

1.11.5.4.6. If, after referral, a subsequent evaluator upgrades ratings or comments but the conditions defined in **paragraph 1.11.3** 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.

1.11.5.4.7. 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 section or referral memorandum [training reports]) will, upon receipt of the ratee's comments, prepare an endorsement to the evaluation on a DAF Form 77 if no comment area exists on the applicable evaluation. If the evaluator named in the referral section/memorandum does not concur with the comments or ratings of the previous evaluator, their endorsement will, in addition to the mandatory referral comments, describe the disagreement (on the first line in the comments area on the applicable evaluation or may continue comments on a DAF Form 77).

1.11.5.5. Deployed Evaluators. If the referring evaluator is deployed and is referring a home station evaluation, the referring evaluator will sign the referral section and officer or enlisted evaluation and forward the evaluation and referral documents to the next evaluator in the rating chain at home station. 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-day-window (30 calendar days for non-extended active duty) to respond, the referral reviewer processes the evaluation and all referral documents in accordance with **paragraph 1.11.5.3**.

1.11.6. Referral Procedures.

1.11.6.1. Referral Officer and Enlisted Evaluations. The referring evaluator will use the referral section of the evaluation and can fill in the specifics in the blank lines provided. Refer to **Table 3.1** for procedures on preparing the ALQ evaluation for officers (OPB) and **Table 4.9** on preparing the ALQ evaluation for enlisted members (EPB).

1.11.6.2. Referral Education/Training Reports. Prepare a referral memorandum in accordance with **Figure 1.1**. A combination of digital signature (CAC) wet signature, or typed signature are authorized. The approved typed signature must include: two backslashes at the front and two backslashes at the end, the word "signed," the signatory's initials, DoDID number, and date of the typed signature (\\signed, xxx, 0000000000, DD MMM YY\\). The approved wet signature must include the date next to signature (DD MMM YY).

1.11.6.3. Referral Letter of Evaluation. The referral process is accomplished on the form itself.

1.11.6.3.1. Deployed Commander Letter of Evaluation. Complete a DAF Form 77 in accordance with **Table 5.1** and **paragraph 5.2.1.1.1**.

1.11.6.3.2. All Other Letters of Evaluation.

1.11.6.3.2.1. Designated Rater (Officer Only). If an LOE prepared by the officially designated rater contains referral comments, the rater prepares an officer evaluation in accordance with **paragraph 1.11.6.1**. The reason for the evaluation will be DBH. At least 60-calendar days of supervision is required, unless the waiver authority extends the requirement.

1.11.6.3.2.2. Other than Designated Rater. Complete Sections I, II, IV, V and VII in accordance with **Table 5.1**. The referral process itself is not accomplished on the DAF Form 77. **Exception:** Deployed Commander Letters of Evaluation. If someone other than the officially designated rater prepares an LOE with referral comments, forward the letter along with any rebuttal comments the ratee may want to add to the officially designated rater. **(T-1)** The rater will review the documents and decide whether permanent recording is warranted. If so, the letter of evaluation becomes a referral document attached to the evaluation. If the rater decides not to permanently record, they will return the LOE and any rebuttal comments to the ratee.

1.11.6.4. Referral Training Report (TR) (DAF Form 475). Refer the TR to the ratee using the same procedures outlined in paragraphs **1.11.6.1** and **1.11.6.2**. Name the commander of the Department of the Air Force school or unit of assignment as the next evaluator (determined by which organization is preparing the TR). The evaluator reviews the ratee's comments, if provided; adds the applicable mandatory comments in accordance with paragraphs **1.11.5.3.2.2.1** or **1.11.5.3.2.2.2**; and endorses the TR on a DAF Form 77 using the first evaluator's block.

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

1.12.1. Sensitive Information.

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

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

1.12.1.3. Appeal Agencies Outside Rating Chain. Actions taken by an individual outside the normal chain of command that represent guaranteed rights of appeal. **Example:** Inspector general, ERAB, AFBCMR, equal opportunity and treatment/military equal opportunity complaints, congressional inquiries.

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

1.12.1.5. Temporary or Permanent Disqualification under DoDM5210.42_DAFMAN 13-501, *Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Program (PRP)*. The behavior of the ratee that resulted in the action may be referenced; however, it may not be mentioned that the ratee was disqualified.

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

1.12.2. Potential Discriminatory Factors and/or Information.

1.12.2.1. Race, Ethnic Origin, Sex, 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 sex. Pronouns reflecting sex (e.g., he, she, him, her, his) may be used. "She arranged a blood drive at the Baptist Memorial Hospital" is an acceptable comment.

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

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

1.12.2.4. Court-Martial and Administrative Discharge Board Members and Personnel. Do not consider or evaluate the performance of duty of any such member who served as a member of a court-martial or administrative discharge proceeding. Likewise, do not give a less than favorable rating or evaluation of any member because of the zeal with which such member, as counsel, represented the Government or any person in court-martial or an administrative discharge board proceeding. (**Note:** Courts-martial protections are vested under Article 37, UCMJ). This is separate from accurately portraying counsel's competence in representing clients.

1.12.3. Duty History or Performance Outside the Reporting Period.

1.12.3.1. Do not comment on duty history or performance outside the current reporting period, except as permitted by **paragraphs 1.12.3.3**. **(T-1)**

1.12.3.2. Previous Evaluations. Comments from previous evaluations are prohibited (e.g., do not include comments from a DAF Form 475 on an officer ALQ evaluation; or comments from a deployed commander LOE on an officer ALQ evaluation, except in conjunction with performance feedback sessions and as outlined in **Chapter 8** for promotion recommendation forms. **(T-1) Note:** Evaluators may review previous evaluations to prevent repeating prior accomplishments and making inappropriate recommendations.

1.12.3.3. Prior Events. Events that occurred in a previous reporting period that add significantly to the evaluation, were not known to and considered by the previous evaluators and were not already reflected in a previous evaluation in the permanent record (this includes officer and enlisted evaluations, LOEs, and TRs) can be included in a subsequent evaluation. **(T-1) Example:** An event (positive or negative) which came to light after an evaluation became a matter of record, but which occurred during the period of that evaluation, could be mentioned in the ratee's next evaluation because the incident was not previously reported. In rare cases, serious offenses (such as those punishable by courts-martial) may not come to light or be substantiated for several years. In such cases, inclusion of that information may be appropriate even though the incident and/or 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 decided not to comment on a known adverse action, an incumbent commander may not overturn a previous commander's decision by requesting the adverse action be added after the evaluation has been made a matter of record, nor may the incumbent commander include it in the next evaluation. **(T-1)** However, if the behavior has continued into the next rating period, an evaluator may comment on the specific behavior for that rating period.

1.12.4. Derogatory Information and Disciplinary Actions.

1.12.4.1. Conduct Based on Unreliable Information.

1.12.4.1.1. Raters must ensure that information used to document performance, especially derogatory information relating to unsatisfactory behavior or misconduct, is reliable and supported by a preponderance of the evidence. **(T-1)**

1.12.4.1.2. The rater should consult with the servicing staff judge advocate whenever there are questions as to whether this standard has been met.

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

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

1.12.4.2. Acquittals or Similar Results.

1.12.4.2.1. Do not reference any criminal action against an individual or underlying misconduct that resulted in acquittal or dismissal by the convening authority. For example, an evaluator cannot say: "SSgt Johnson was acquitted of assault charges," or "TSgt Jones drove drunk but was found not guilty at trial."

1.12.4.2.2. Do not reference any administrative action taken against an individual where the administrative action is not upheld or set aside. For example, an evaluator cannot say: "SrA Smith's involuntary separation action was unsuccessful."

1.12.4.2.3. There may be limited circumstances where it would be acceptable to reference misconduct under this section. The rater should consult with the servicing staff judge advocate whenever there are questions as to whether to reference underlying misconduct.

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

1.12.4.3.1. Acceptable statements: "Drove while intoxicated, received an Article 15" and "Failed to report to duty, received a letter of reprimand," etc.

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

1.12.4.4. Disciplinary Actions.

1.12.4.4.1. Must be reasonably specific, clearly outlining the event and/or behavior. Comments such as "conduct unbecoming" or "an error in judgment led to an off-duty incident" are too vague.

1.12.4.4.2. When administering disciplinary actions, the issuer should advise ratees specifically on why they are considered substandard in order to avoid speculation and assist them in responding appropriately. **(T-1)**

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

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

1.12.5. A Recommendation for Decoration. Only include those decorations approved or presented during the reporting period. The term “decorations,” as used here, applies to those in which a medal is awarded and worn on the Air Force uniform, such as an Air Force Achievement Medal. Other awards or nominations for honors and awards such as "Outstanding Maintenance Officer" or “Outstanding Airmen of the Year” may be mentioned.

1.12.6. Meeting Goals for/Results of the Combined Federal Campaign. Comments pertaining to met/exceeded goals or collected dollar amount (**Example:** 100% contact, $15K raised, 500 contacted) are prohibited.

1.12.7. Weighted Airman Promotion System Data. Score data on the Weighted Airman Promotion System Data score notice or SNCO promotion score notice, board scores, test scores, relative standings among peers etc., are prohibited.

1.12.8. Performance Feedback Assessment. Evaluators may not refer to performance feedback sessions in any area of the performance evaluation, however, should consider performance feedback during the performance period which was provided to the ratee.

1.12.9. Matrices, fact sheets, background sheets or other documents unless specifically authorized in this instruction. Evaluators will use performance and duty related information from official source documents in the assessment of performance and potential. Demographic diversity information identifying inherent or socially defined personal characteristics such as age, race/ethnicity, religion, sex, socioeconomic status, family status, disability, and geographic origin will not be considered.

1.12.10. Do not establish panels or boards to review and collectively score, rate, rank, or tally records and/or generate a priority list for determining promotion recommendations, level of endorsement or stratification, except as authorized in this instruction.

1.12.11. Awards are recognitions based on a given set of criteria and are standalone achievements. Accordingly, stratification statements based on awards are not authorized.

1.13. Policy Deviations and Waiver Requests. See **Table 1.1** for the offices of primary responsibility mailing addresses. Send requests for deviations or waivers through the wing commander or the comparable level to their MAJCOM. The requests will then be sent to AFPC/DPPSP for RegAF and to ARPC/DPTSE for ARC who, in turn, will forward the request to appropriate office of primary responsibility.

1.13.1. Requests will be in memorandum format or on the DAF Form 679 with all the appropriate endorsements and detail the reason for the request with full justification IAW DAFMAN 90-161, paragraph 9.4. If the request is applicable to a specific organization or individual, it must include the name of the unit or the name and grade of the individual.

1.13.2. All deviation requests pertaining to SRID issues require coordination through the respective management level and must be signed by the head of the management level or may be delegated to the MLR president. **(T-1)**

1.13.3. Signed requests will be mailed or emailed to the AFPC/DPPSPE or appropriate ANG/AFR office stated in **Table 1.1**.

1.13.4. All waiver requests to use the AF Form 715 and AF Form 716 will require coordination through the wing commander/equivalent to AFPC/DPPSP (ARC will route to ARPC/DPTSE, who will in turn send to AFPC/DPPSP) with final approval from AF/A1PP. If authorized, enter the following statement in the "Mandatory Comments" block: "Use of the AF Form 715/AF Form 716 is authorized IAW AFI 36-2406."

1.13.5. All deviation requests pertaining to FDID issues require coordination through the respective forced distributor and must be concurred on by the senior rater (gaining and losing). If under a single senior rater, the senior rater must concur with the deviation. **(T-1)**

1.14. Missing, Late, and Removed Performance Evaluations. When an evaluation is missing and all attempts to locate it are exhausted and 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 have a copy of the original report; can the evaluators now give a fair and accurate report based on the timeframe? (See **Table 1.2**.). **Note: Re**-accomplishment of evaluations should generally not occur more than 18 months after the close-out date. However, exceptions beyond this window may be granted when the evaluation can still be completed with fairness and accuracy, including situations where original evaluators remain available and sufficient supporting documentation exists to substantiate performance. Leaders are responsible for ensuring evaluation timelines and referral procedures are executed with transparency, accountability, and consistent with DAFI 36-2907.

1.14.1. Missing Evaluations on RegAF Officers and Senior Noncommissioned Officers. The CSS, MPF, and/or AFPC initiates action to try and locate the missing report.

1.14.1.1. If the report is located or can be re-accomplished (must be the original evaluators at the time of the close-out), place the original evaluation in the permanent record or send the original to AF/A1LO for colonels and colonel selects, and forward a copy to AFPC/DPSORM for file into ARMS/PRDA.

1.14.1.2. If the report is not located, or cannot be re-accomplished, the CSS, MPF, or AFPC will prepare a DAF Form 77 according to **Table 5.1** and insert the original into the eOSR/SNCO selection record, or send the original to AF/A1LO for colonel and colonel selects, AF/A1LE for CMSgts and CMSgt selects, and forward a copy to AFPC/DPSORM for file in ARMS/PRDA.

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

1.14.2.1. If the report is located, forward the original evaluation to AFPC Evaluation Support Section (AFPC/DPSTSP) for file in ARMS/PRDA.

1.14.2.2. If a report is not located or cannot be re-accomplished, the MPF prepares a DAF Form 77 in accordance with **Table 5.1** and forwards to AFPC/DPSORM for file in ARMS/PRDA.

1.14.3. Missing Evaluations for AFR. The CSS or MPF initiates action to locate the missing report.

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

1.14.3.2. If the report is not located or unable to be re-accomplished, the CSS or MPF will prepare a DAF Form 77 in accordance with **Table 5.1** and forward to ARPC/DPTSE for filing in ARMS/PRDA.

1.14.4. Missing Evaluations for ANG only. The CSS, MPF, or human resource (HR) specialist will initiate action to locate missing reports for Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) or DSG personnel, and NGB Human Resources Directorate (NGB/HR) for statutory tour personnel.

1.14.4.1. If the report is located, forward a copy of the original evaluation to ARPC/DPTSE for filing in ARMS/PRDA.

1.14.4.2. If the report is not located or unable to be re-accomplished, the CSS, MPF, or HR specialist will prepare a DAF Form 77 in accordance with **Table 5.1** and forward to ARPC/DPTSE for filing in ARMS/PRDA. **(T-1)** ARPC/DPTSE will update the personnel system.

1.14.5. Missing Legacy Evaluations for AFR Officer Performance Reports/Enlisted Performance Reports with Closeout Dates Prior to 1 April 2023. The CSS or MPF initiates action to locate the missing report.

1.14.5.1. If the report is located, the CSS or MPF will take action to place the original evaluation in the permanent record and forward a copy to ARPC/DPTSE or AFPC/DPSORM (IMAs only) for filing in ARMS/PRDA. **Note:** 28 February 2023 colonel SCOD is not applicable to legacy timeframe.

1.14.5.2. If the report is not located or unable to be re-accomplished, the CSS or MPF will prepare a DAF Form 77 in accordance with **Table 5.1** and forward to ARPC/DPTSE or AFPC/DPSORM (IMAs only) for filing into ARMS/PRDA.

1.14.6. Evaluations Removed From Records Under **Chapter 10** or under DAFI 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*. Prepare a DAF Form 77 in accordance with **Table 5.1**.

1.15. Wartime or National Emergency Provisions.

1.15.1. During wartime or a national emergency, HAF, AFPC, or MAJCOMs, when delegated, may make changes to evaluation policies and procedures to reduce the associated workload while ensuring performance is documented. MAJCOMs may implement these procedures totally or in part depending on the nature and scope of the situation. In implementing wartime provisions, a MAJCOM may implement HAF/AFPC procedures totally or in part. When implementing in part, MAJCOMs must provide specific instructions regarding completing and routing evaluations. **(T-1)**

1.15.2. In implementing wartime provisions, AFPC/DPPSP, in coordination with AF/REP and NGB Force Management Division (NGB/A1P), will provide specific instructions regarding completion of evaluations, routing evaluations once completed, and any other appropriate actions. AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/PB will announce officer promotion recommendation form (PRF) procedures (see **Chapter 8**). AF/A1PP and AFPC/DPPSP 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 assessments optional. MAJCOMs must implement the provisions outlined below or as AFPC/DPPSP directs.

1.15.3. When to Submit Performance Evaluations.

1.15.3.1. Evaluations that are due prior to a deployment.

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

Figure 1.1. Example Referral Memorandum.

Date

MEMORANDUM FOR SRA JOHN SMITH, 123 MDSS/MDSO *Ratee's Grade, Name*

FROM: 123 MDSS/MDSO
1122 Main Street
Any base AFB ST 77777-7777 *Referring evaluator's unit address*

SUBJECT: Referral Education/Training Report

1. This education/training report is being referred to you in accordance with AFI 36-2406, para 1.11 because it contains negative comment(s)/derogatory information. Specifically, the following comment(s): *(insert exact statement(s) that make the report a referral*) cause(s) this evaluation to be referred.

2. Acknowledge receipt of this memorandum by signing and dating in reproducible blue or black ink. Be advised that your signature does not imply acceptance of or agreement with the ratings or comments on the evaluation. Once this memo is signed, you will receive a copy. To rebut the evaluation or address any concerns, submit your rebuttal package to *(name and address of next evaluator)* no later than 3 duty days *(30 calendar days for non-extended active duty members*) from the date of this memorandum. If you need additional time, request an extension from *(name of next evaluator)*. Your rebuttal package is limited to a total of 10 single-side or 5 double-sided pages and must directly relate to the reason the evaluation is referred. Documents included in your rebuttal package that are not maintained elsewhere in your official records will remain attached to the referral report for filing in your official records. Copies of previous evaluations or fitness reports will be removed prior to filing the referral report since these documents are maintained elsewhere in your official records. Rebuttal packages that contain any reflection on the character, conduct, integrity, or motives of the evaluator must be fully substantiated and documented. Contact your supervisor, first sergeant, commander support staff, or MPF if you need assistance with preparing your rebuttal.

3. It is important for you to be aware that receiving a referral report may affect your eligibility for personnel related action (e.g., assignments, promotion). Consult those in your rating chain, starting with your supervisor, for more information on this subject. If you believe this report is inaccurate, unjust, or unfairly prejudicial to your career, you may apply for a review IAW AFI 36-2406, Chapter 10, *Correcting Officer and Enlisted Evaluations*, once the report becomes a matter of record.

Signature of referring evaluator
JAMES JONES, Maj, USAF
Flight Commander

Figure 1.2. Example Referral Memorandum (Continued).

Attachment:
DAF Form 475, 31 Mar 23 *DAF Form 475 close-out date*

Cc: Lt Col Kerry Brown, 123 MDSS/MDSO *Next evaluator's Grade, Name, Unit/Office Symbol*

1st Ind, 2Lt John Smith *Ratee's Grade, Name*

MEMORANDUM FOR MAJ KERRY BROWN, 123 MDSS/MDSO

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

Signature of ratee
JOHN SMITH, 2Lt, USAF

Table 1.1. Mailing Addresses for Correspondence.

RULE	A Address	B OPR
1	AFPC/DPPSP 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150 (**Note:** All processing of evaluations is completed by AFPC/DPSTSP via the case management system).	Manages the Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems, including evaluation appeals, for all RegAF airman basic through lieutenant colonel following direction provided by AF/A1P.
2	AFPC MLR OFFICE 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150	Manages the student management level review (MLR) and all promotion recommendation form actions and processes/executes the RegAF Evaluation Appeals process with direction from AFPC/DPPSP and AF/A1P.
3	AFPC/DPSTSP 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX	Process training reports.
4	AF/A1LG 1040 Air Force Pentagon Washington District of Columbia 20330-1040	Air Force General Matters Office. Manages Officer Evaluation System for, and maintains all evaluations on, general officers and brig gen selects on extended active duty. **Note:** All wet signature evaluations on active duty GOs are sent to this address. See **Note 2**.
5	AF/REG 1150 Air Force Pentagon Washington District of Columbia 20330-1040	AFR General Officer Matters Office. Manages Officer Evaluation System for Reserve general officers (and brig gen selects). See **Note 2**.

RULE	A Address	B OPR
6	AF/A1LO 1040 Air Force Pentagon Washington District of Columbia 20330-1040	Air Force Colonel Management Office. Manages Officer Evaluation System for and maintains all evaluations on, colonels (except brig gen selects) and col selects on the Active Duty List (ADL). **Note:** All wet signature evaluations on RegAF cols are sent to this address. See **Note 1**.
7	AF/A1LE 1040 Air Force Pentagon Washington District of Columbia 20330-1040	Air Force Chief Matters Office. Maintains all evaluations on RegAF CMSgts and CMSgt selects. **Note:** All wet signature evaluations on RegAF CMSgts are sent to this address. See **Note 1**.
8	ARPC/DPTSE 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave Bldg 390 MS 68 Buckley SFB CO 80011	Air Reserve Personnel Center Evaluations Branch. Manages the Officer Evaluation System for ARC officers not on the ADL and the Enlisted Evaluation System for ARC enlisted personnel following policy provided by AF/A1P, AF/RE and NGB/A1PP.
9	AFPC/DPSORM 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150	Maintains the ARMS/PRDA on all RegAF personnel.
10	ARPC/DPTSE 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave Bldg 390 MS 68 Buckley SFB CO 80011	(Reserve/Guard ARMS) Maintains the ARMS on all ARC personnel. See **Note 2**.
11	AF/REP 1150 Air Force Pentagon Washington District of Columbia 20330-1150	Air Force Reserve Directorate of Personnel. Provides AFR Officer Evaluation System and Enlisted Evaluation System policy with collaboration with AF/A1P and AFPC/DPPSP.

RULE	A Address	B OPR
12	AFPC/DPMN 550 C Street West Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4727	Medical Service Officer Management. Provides advice on reporting policy for officers within the health professions, in conjunction with AF/SG1, Medical Force Development Directorate, Office of the Surgeon General, AF/SG.
13	AFRC/A1 330 Cherry Drive, Bldg 555 South Robins AFB GA 31098	Responsible for effective management and operation of all AFRC Manpower, Personnel and Services programs, plans, policies and procedures.
14	AFRC/A1KK 330 Cherry Drive, Bldg 555 South, Rm 126 Robins AFB GA 31098	Air Force Reserve Command, Personnel Directorate. Provides AF Officer Evaluation System and Enlisted Evaluation System policy and guidance following policy provided by AF/A1PP or AF/REP.
15	AFRC/A1Y 330 Cherry Dr., Bldg 555 South, Rm 126 Robins AFB, GA 31098	Recruiting and Retention Division.
16	NGB-SL-B 111 South George Mason Drive, AHS2 Arlington VA 22204	National Guard Senior Leader Management and General Officer Management Office. Responsible for promotions and evaluations for all National Guard brig gen and above.
17	NGB/A1P 3500 Fetchet Ave. Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762	Force Management Division. NGB/A1PO - Responsible for Officer Programs and Policy for colonels and below. NGB/A1PP - Responsible for enlisted evaluations and enlisted promotions with collaboration with AF/A1P and AFPC/DPSID.

RULE	A Address	B OPR
18	Professional Development Directorate 1420 Air Force Pentagon, Suite 5D140 Washington District of Columbia 20330-1420	The Judge Advocate General's Corps Professional Development Directorate. Provides advice on reporting policy for judge advocates.
Notes: 1. All digitally signed evaluations (colonels and below) must be submitted through myEval or CMS. **(T-1).** 2. All digitally signed GO evaluations must be submitted through Right Now Technology.		

Table 1.2. Missing and Late Evaluations (See Notes 1, 2, and 3).

RULE	A The report was located or successfully re-accomplished:	B and the system contains the overall rating and close-out date:	C Then:
1	No	Yes	When authorized by AFPC/ARPC the CSS/MPF/HR specialist or NGB/HR who discovers the discrepancy prepares DAF Form 77. See **Table 5.1**.
2		No	When authorized by AFPC/ARPC the CSS/MPF/HR specialist prepares DAF Form 77. See **Table 5.1**.
3	Yes		File form according to **paragraph 1.14.1.1** (RegAF), **1.14.3.1** (AFR), or **1.14.4.1** (ANG) and update the system, if appropriate.

Notes:
1. The gaining CSS/MPF/HR specialist or NGB/HR tracks missing or late evaluations. Do not re-accomplish evaluations more than 18 months past the close-out date. DAF Form 77s are prepared by the CSS/MPF/HR specialist.
2. When all attempts to find the missing evaluation fail, the HR specialist sends an inquiry to AFPC/DPPSPE or ARPC/DPTSE (officers/SNCOs), requesting that AFPC/DPPSPE or ARPC/DPTSE search the history files for the enlisted evaluation 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 evaluation. For personnel with prior service, do not send a request to AFPC/DPPSPE or ARPC/DPTSE for missing evaluations earlier than 120 calendar days after the date the ratee reentered to duty. The CSS/MPF/HR specialist provides this information when requesting a search for missing evaluations on personnel with prior service: name, grade, social security number, grade at separation, date of separation, whether a DAF Form 1613, *Statement of Service*, might exist.
3. If AFPC/DPPSPE or ARPC/DPTSE finds the rating in the history files, complete a DAF Form 77 according to **Table 5.1**. When more than one evaluation is involved, the MPF/CSS/HR specialist may prepare one DAF Form 77 according to **Table 5.1**, if no gaps exist in the period of the missing evaluations. However, if the MPF/CSS/HR specialist later receives one or more of the missing evaluations, the MPF/CSS/HR specialist prepares one or more DAF Forms 77, as required, so that periods of time in the performance record remain consecutive. If the rating is not available, comply with **Table 5.1**.

Chapter 2

PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK PROCESS

2.1. Purpose.

2.1.1. Performance feedback is a formal two-way communication between a rater and ratee to discuss expectations, responsibilities, and performance relative to established standards. Feedback promotes a culture of accountability, personal development, and mission alignment. Raters will use the MPAs and ALQs as the foundation for assessing and guiding performance and leadership development.

2.1.2. Performance feedback is part of a continuous cycle of development, not a series of isolated events. The cycle begins with setting initial objectives and expectations, is reinforced at the midterm point, and culminates in the annual ALQ evaluation. Each step builds upon the last to maintain alignment between individual performance, mission execution, and leadership expectations. All feedback sessions must include expectations or review of physical fitness standards IAW AFMAN 36-2905.

2.1.2.1. Initial Feedback – Objectives and Expectations. Initial feedback marks the start of the performance cycle. Raters will clearly outline duty expectations, conduct standards, and developmental goals using the MPAs and ALQs to guide discussion. This ensures the ratee understands how performance will be evaluated and how their contributions align with mission objectives.

2.1.2.2. Midterm Feedback – Performance Progress Review. Midterm feedback provides a formal checkpoint to assess progress against expectations set during the initial session. Raters will evaluate demonstrated performance across the MPAs and ALQs, identify areas for improvement, and provide targeted guidance to align behaviors and results with desired outcomes. Midterm feedback supports accountability and ensures performance remains on track.

2.1.2.3. Final Feedback – Annual ALQ Evaluation. Final feedback is conducted near the end of the reporting period to prepare the ratee for their formal evaluation. Raters will summarize how well the ratee met established expectations and standards, referencing MPAs and ALQs to communicate impact and performance outcomes. This session supports transparency and ensures alignment between observed performance and what is documented on the annual ALQ evaluation.

2.2. Responsibilities.

2.2.1. The ratee will:

2.2.1.1. Know when formal feedback sessions are due. **(T-3)**

2.2.1.2. When needed, request a “Ratee Requested” feedback session from the rater. If a ratee requests a feedback session, the rater will provide one within 30 calendar days of the request. **(T-3)**

2.2.1.3. Provide timely notification to the rater and, if necessary, the rater’s rater, when required or requested feedback did not take place. **(T-3)**

2.2.1.4. Sign the feedback indicating the date the supervisor conducted the feedback. **(T-3)**

2.2.1.5. DELETED.

2.2.2. The rater will:

2.2.2.1. Know when formal feedback assessments are due and provide them, at a minimum, as required by this instruction. **(T-3)**

2.2.2.2. Use this instruction to assist in preparing for, scheduling, and conducting feedback sessions. See Tables **2.1** and **2.2**. **(T-3)**

2.2.2.3. Understand, demonstrate, and communicate Air Force standards and expectations such as those outlined in the *Enlisted Force Structure*, when providing feedback assessments to personnel. **(T-3)**

2.2.2.4. Provide effective assessments by being realistic, honest, and timely. This will help the ratee improve performance and grow professionally and personally. Effective assessments may differ for each Airman but can include in-depth discussions with the ratee and written comments on the assessment. **(T-3)**

2.2.2.5. Provide the original completed and signed assessment to the ratee. **(T-3)**

2.2.2.6. Retain a copy of the signed and dated assessment. The midterm formal feedback is required to be routed and reviewed with the evaluation but will not be part the official record. See **paragraph 2.9.3** for individuals authorized to view the assessment. **Exception:** Extremely rare circumstances may exist where a documented midterm assessment is not available to be routed with the evaluation (e.g., the rater has been removed from supervisory/rater duties).

2.2.2.7. Feedback sessions are a communication tool and are not to be used to discover or document behavior which may result in administrative or judicial action. **(T-3)** Document behavior that deviates from USAF standards through a letter of reprimand, letter of counseling, letter of admonishment, or memorandum for record. **(T-3)**

2.2.2.8. Provide the ratee with information on Air Force benefits by referring them to the MyAirForceBenefits website (**https://www.myairforcebenefits.us.af.mil**). **(T-3)**

2.2.2.9. Include expectations to ratees for contributing to a healthy organizational climate for Airmen up to the grade of SrA. **(T-1)** Raters will also ensure that NCOs and officers are accountable for creating a healthy organizational climate. **(T-1)** Raters will ensure that every commander knows they are responsible for, and will be held accountable for, ensuring their unit has a healthy command climate. **(T-0)**

2.2.3. The rater's rater/reviewing officials of evaluations between the rater and the HLR will:

2.2.3.1. Ensure raters properly conduct timely feedback sessions. **(T-3)**

2.2.3.2. Conduct feedback sessions when the rater is not available due to unusual circumstances or when officially assuming the rater's responsibilities. **(T-3)**

2.2.4. The unit commander/director/equivalent will:

2.2.4.1. Oversee the performance feedback program. **(T-2)**

2.2.4.2. Consider disciplining and removing supervisory responsibilities for raters who fail to conduct proper and timely feedback sessions. **(T-2)**

2.2.5. The Military Personnel Flight (MPF) will:

2.2.5.1. Provide guidance on the performance feedback program and assist CSSs when needed. **(T-3)**

2.2.5.2. Not be required to maintain a repository for performance feedback assessments for personnel assigned.

2.2.6. Raters are responsible for maintaining copies of formal feedback assessments on their assigned ratees for the duration of the current rating period, at a minimum.

2.3. Who Requires a Performance Feedback Assessment. Performance feedback assessments are mandatory for all RegAF and ARC Airmen, airman basic through colonel. Performance feedback assessments are not prepared when a ratee is in a captive, patient, prisoner, or absent without leave status. For officers receiving a DAF Form 475 and enlisted in approved initial or advanced skills training courses, performance feedback assessments may be completed at the discretion of the commander of the school. For performance evaluations completed on non-rated initial skills training or advanced skills training course students, academic progress reports will serve in lieu of the mandatory mid-term performance feedback session. **(T-3)**

2.4. Guidance for Conducting Performance Feedback Sessions. Conduct sessions face-to-face (may include video conferencing). **(T-3) Exception:** When this is not feasible, sessions may be conducted by telephone. In these cases, after the performance feedback session is complete, the rater will forward the finalized form to the ratee within 10 calendar days. **(T-3)**

2.5. When to Conduct Documented Performance Feedback Sessions. See **Table 2.1**.

2.6. The Performance Feedback Assessment Notice.

2.6.1. The rater should receive a computer-generated notice 30 calendar days after supervision begins and again halfway between the time supervision began and the projected performance report close-out date. The notice serves to remind the rater that a performance feedback session is due. However, failing to receive a notice does not justify failing to or negate the rater's responsibility to conduct a required session.

2.6.2. For ANG officers, the MPF will send the performance feedback notice to the rater concurrently with the officer evaluation notice or upon initial assignment of the ratee. Conduct the performance feedback session no later than 60 calendar days after the officer evaluation close-out date or initial assignment date.

2.6.3. Since the ratee shares the responsibility to ensure performance feedback sessions are conducted, the notice is also sent to the ratee, 30 calendar days after sending the notice to the rater (for officers) or concurrently with the notice sent to the rater (for enlisted).

2.6.4. ANG does not currently have a standardized, automated process to create airman comprehensive assessment (ACA) notices for raters and ratees. ANG MPFs may not be able to provide raters and ratees with a computer-generated ACA notice. If computer-generated notices are not available, MPFs should use alternate forms of communication to notify raters and ratees. Mass communication from MPF to wing personnel is acceptable. Signed notices are not required for ANG personnel.

2.7. Performance Feedback Assessment Form.

2.7.1. All feedback assessments for all grades will be completed on the AF Form 717, *Performance Objectives and Feedback Form*. See **Table 2.2**.

2.7.2. A rater should use their best judgement when assessing their ratee, bearing in mind that each definition should be relative to the ratee's specific grade, AFSC, and assigned duties.

2.7.3. DELETED.

2.7.4. DELETED.

2.7.4.1. DELETED.

2.7.4.2. DELETED.

2.7.4.3. DELETED.

2.7.4.4. DELETED.

2.7.4.5. DELETED.

2.8. Preparing the Performance Feedback Assessment.

2.8.1. The performance feedback assessment should outline the issues discussed during the feedback session; however, it is primarily a guide for conducting the assessment session, not a transcript. Therefore, omission of an issue from the form does not, by itself, constitute proof that the issue was not discussed.

2.8.2. The assessment may be handwritten or typed by the rater providing the assessment.

2.9. Disposition and Access.

2.9.1. Do not make the performance feedback assessment an official part of any personnel record (including personal information files) or use it in any personnel action except for **paragraph 2.9.3**. **(T-1) Note**: At a minimum, the rater will maintain a copy of the feedback until the evaluation becomes a matter of record. **(T-3)**

2.9.2. The ratee may grant access to the completed forms at their discretion.

2.9.3. The forms will not be reviewed by anyone other than the rater, ratee and authorized personnel as outlined in the following paragraphs, specifically for the purposes of completing performance evaluations. **(T-1)** Neither form will be introduced in any other personnel action unless the ratee first introduces them or alleges either a performance feedback session was not conducted, or the sessions were inadequate. **(T-1)**

2.9.3.1. For enlisted, the HLR, rater's rater (when the HLR is not also the rater's rater), CSS, first sergeant, squadron/group superintendents or equivalent, squadron/group/wing commanders or equivalent, forced distributor, MPF personnel, command chief, final evaluator, and functional examiner/Air Force advisor (when applicable) are authorized access to the performance feedback assessment specifically for the purpose of completing and processing performance evaluations.

2.9.3.2. For officers, the CSS, first sergeant, squadron/group/wing commanders or equivalent, HLR, functional examiner/Air Force advisor (when applicable), and MPF personnel are authorized access to the performance feedback assessment specifically for the purpose of completing and processing performance evaluations.

2.9.4. Temporary Duty (TDY) supervisors may conduct assessments and complete a feedback assessment. However, it will not be sent to the home station rater. **(T-1)** A memo will be sent to the home station rater if there are any issues the temporary supervisor may wish to address. **(T-1) Exception**: If the TDY rater has been officially designated as the ratee's reporting official, a feedback assessment is required.

2.10. Failure to Conduct or Document a Performance Feedback Assessment. While documented feedback sessions are required by this instruction, they do not replace informal day-to-day communication and feedback. A rater's failure to conduct a required or requested feedback session or failure to document the session, will not, in and of itself, invalidate any subsequent evaluation or PRF.

2.11. Tracking Performance Feedback Assessments. Unit commanders may establish procedures beyond those provided in this instruction to validate feedback completion compliance provided those procedures do not violate **paragraph 2.9.3**.

Table 2.1. Performance Feedback Assessment Requirements.

RULE	A **If the ratee is**	B **then the ratee requires the following feedback**
1	an AB through CMSgt (See **Note 5)**, WO1 through CW5, or Lt through Col (see **Note 6**)	Initial (See **Notes 1** & **4**) Midterm (See **Notes 2** & **4**) End-of-reporting period (See **Note 3**)
2	an AB through CMSgt, WO1 through CW5, or Lt through Col	Requested by Ratee (See **Note 7**)
2	an AB through CMSgt, WO1 through CW5, or Lt through Col	When determined necessary by the rater

Notes:

1. The rater must conduct the initial feedback session within the first 60 calendar days they initially begin supervision. An initial feedback session will also be conducted at the beginning of every performance cycle.
2. The rater must conduct the midterm feedback session midway between the date supervision begins and the projected close-out date of the next evaluation.
3. The rater conducts an end-of reporting period feedback session when an evaluation has been accomplished. This session must be conducted within 60 calendar days of the close-out of the evaluation to review and discuss with the ratee the previous reporting period and resulting evaluation.
4. ARC personnel are not required to complete a performance feedback assessment for a member who is pending separation or discharge under DAFI 36-3211, *Military Separations*.
5. For AB through SrA (with less than 20 months total active federal military service or less than 20 months Date Initial Entry Uniformed Services for ARC), an end-of-reporting period feedback is not required. After the initial feedback session is conducted, conduct a (midterm) feedback session every 180 calendar days until the rater writes an enlisted evaluation or a change of reporting official 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 calendar days before the projected evaluation close-out date.
7. When a ratee requests a feedback session, the rater must conduct a session within 30 calendar days of the ratee's request if at least 60 calendar days have passed (at the rater's discretion) since the last feedback session.

Table 2.2. Preparing Performance Feedback and Objectives Assessments.

SECTION I. RATEE DATA. Once this section is completed, the rater forwards the form to the ratee to complete the self-assessment. The self-assessment will assist the rater when accomplishing the "MPA and ALQ Rater Assessment."		
Item	**A**	**B**
	Heading	**Instructions**
1	Grade	Enter grade.
2	Name	In all upper case, 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.
3	Type of Feedback	Initial – Objectives and Expectations, Midterm, Ratee Requested, Rater Initiated
4	Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title.
5	DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC held
6	Airman's Role and Duty Expectations	In narrative format provide the ratee's duties and unique role in achieving the unit mission. This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's role and not be standardized. Be clear, and specific.
SECTION II. MPA AND ALQ RATER ASSESSMENT (Initial and Midterm Feedback)		
7	Executing the Mission	For Initial Objectives & Expectations: In narrative format, clearly communicate the ratee's objectives and expectations, addressing the applicable ALQs. For Performance Feedback: In narrative format, provide feedback on how well the ratee is meeting expectations, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement while referencing the same applicable ALQs: Job Proficiency – determine how well the Airman demonstrates knowledge and professional skill in assigned duties, achieving positive results and impact in support of the mission. Initiative – determine how well the Airman assesses and takes independent or directed action to complete a task or mission that influences the mission or organization. Adaptability – determine how well the Airman adjusts to changing conditions, to include plans, information, processes, requirements, and obstacles in accomplishing the mission. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.1.**
8	Leading People	For Initial Objectives & Expectations: In narrative format, clearly communicate the ratee's

		objectives and expectations, addressing the applicable ALQs. For Performance Feedback: In narrative format, provide feedback on how well the ratee is meeting expectations, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement while referencing the same applicable ALQs: Collaboration – determine how well the Airman works with others to achieve shared objectives and complete tasks or missions as a cohesive unit. Emotional Intelligence – determine how well the Airman exercises self-awareness, manages their own emotions effectively, demonstrates an understanding of others' emotions, and appropriately manages relationship. Communication – determine how well the Airman articulates information in a clear and timely manner, both verbally and non-verbally, through active listening and messaging tailored to the appropriate audience. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.2.**
9	Managing Resources	For Initial Objectives & Expectations: In narrative format, clearly communicate the ratee's objectives and expectations, addressing the applicable ALQs. For Performance Feedback: In narrative format, provide feedback on how well the ratee is meeting expectations, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement while referencing the same applicable ALQs: Stewardship – determine how well the Airman demonstrates responsible management of assigned resources, which may include time, equipment, people, funds, and/or facilities. Accountability – determine how well the Airman takes responsibility for the actions and behaviors of self and/or team; demonstrates reliability and transparency. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.3.**
10	Improving the Unit	For Initial Objectives & Expectations: In narrative format, clearly communicate the ratee's

		objectives and expectations, addressing the applicable ALQs. For Performance Feedback: In narrative format, provide feedback on how well the ratee is meeting expectations, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement while referencing the same applicable ALQs: Decision Making – determine how well the Airman makes well-informed, effective, and timely decisions under one's control that weigh constraints, risks, and benefits. Innovation – determine how well the Airman thinks creatively about different ways to solve problems, implements improvements, and demonstrates calculated risk-taking. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.4.**
11	Rater Name, Grade, and Branch of Service	Enter rater's information. Veronica C. Williams, Lt Col, USAF
12	Rater Signature	The feedback has digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In rare instances where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite, stamp, or type the date next to the signature (DD MMM YY).
13	Ratee Acknowledgement	The feedback has digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In rare instances where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite, stamp, or type the date next to the signature (DD MMM YY).
SECTION III. MPA AND ALQ SELF ASSESSMENT. Ratee will complete the self-assessment prior to the rater completing the midterm "MPA and ALQ Rater Assessment." This section should not be accomplished for an "Initial – Objectives and Expectations" feedback. After the ratee completes the self assessment, they will return to the form to the rater.		
14	Executing the Mission (Job Proficiency, Initiative, Adaptability);	Provide a proficiency level selection for each ALQ and provide any comments regarding overall performance in the Major Performance Area and the applicable ALQs.
15	Leading People (Collaboration, Emotional Intelligence, Communication)	Provide a proficiency level selection for each ALQ and provide any comments regarding overall performance in the Major Performance Area and the applicable ALQs.
16	Managing Resources (Stewardship,	Provide a proficiency level selection for each ALQ and provide any comments regarding overall performance in

	Accountability)	the Major Performance Area and the applicable ALQs.
17	Improving the Unit (Decision-making, Innovation)	Provide a proficiency level selection for each ALQ and provide any comments regarding overall performance in the Major Performance Area and the applicable ALQs.
SECTION III. GETTING TO KNOW YOU. To be completed during formal feedback between rater and ratee.		
18	Professional Goals	In narrative format communicate any short and/or long-term professional goals (assignments, special duties/programs, academic, etc.)
19	Personal Goals	In narrative format communicate any short and/or long-term personal goals (family, fitness, financial, etc.)
20	Additional Information	In narrative format share any additional information. Examples include your personality type, learning style, family members, pets, important dates, hobbies, favorite sports teams/books/movies, etc.
SECTION IV. RATEE EXPECTATIONS. To be completed during formal feedback between rater and ratee.		
21	How Rater Can Help Me	In narrative format discuss ways your rater can help you to maximize your personal and professional potential and success.

Table 2.3. DELETED.

Table 2.4. DELETED.

Table 2.5. DELETED.

Chapter 3

OFFICER PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS/OFFICER ALQ EVALUATIONS

3.1. General Guidelines. See **Chapter 1** for general processing guidance applicable to all evaluations.

3.2. Purpose. Evaluations are used to document performance and potential as well as provide information for making a promotion recommendation, selection, or propriety action; selective continuation; involuntary separation; selective early retirement; assignment; school nomination and selection; and other management decisions. Therefore, evaluators at all levels must use caution to prevent inflation; it is important to distinguish performance among peers and is a disservice to all officers when evaluation ratings are inflated. **Note:** Commanders are held responsible for the command climate (refer to **paragraph 1.8.8.2**) and overall readiness of their unit and are ultimately accountable for its performance. As such, overall command climate, readiness and performance shall be a major contributing factor when assessing a commander's performance. **(T-0)**

3.3. Who Requires an Officer ALQ Evaluation.

3.3.1. All RegAF and ARC colonels (except brigadier general selects) and below (warrant officer 1 through chief warrant officer 5 and second lieutenant through colonel) not being evaluated using a DAF Form 475 (see **paragraph 6.1**), or as specified in **paragraph 3.4** will receive an evaluation as of the established SCOD for their current or select grade (see **Table 3.3**). **(T-1)** If the rater PCSs/PCAs before the SCOD, the rater will complete a draft evaluation, and the rating chain from ratee's unit as of the accounting date will complete the evaluation.

3.3.2. Any officer being released from RegAF to the ARC (participating or non-participating) if there have been 60 calendar days or more since the close out of the last officer evaluation. Reason for the report is DBH, and the close-out date will be 30 days prior to the date of separation.

3.3.3. Officers when initially placed in prisoner status (any sentence of confinement as the result of a court-martial), appellate leave, or who are in absent without leave status.

3.3.4. Separation or Retirement. Annual evaluations are optional for officers with an approved separation or retirement date that is on or prior to one year after the SCOD, provided the criteria in **paragraph 3.3.4.1** (retirement) or **paragraph 3.3.4.2** (separation) are met. However, if an officer is promotion eligible (in-the-promotion zone [IPZ]) and first time above-the-promotion zone [APZ]), then an evaluation is required.

3.3.4.1. For officers with an approved retirement date, the following criteria must be met for an evaluation to become optional:

3.3.4.1.1. The approved retirement date is on or within one year of the projected SCOD evaluation. **Example:** If the approved retirement date is 31 May 25 or earlier, and if the SCOD is 31 May 25, no evaluation is required. However, if the retirement date is 1 June 25 or later, and if the SCOD is 31 May 25, then an evaluation is required.

3.3.4.1.2. The retirement application was approved prior to the projected SCOD. **Example:** If the SCOD is 31 May, and the retirement application (submitted on 1 May 25) was approved on 31 May 25 or earlier, no evaluation is required. However, if the retirement application was not approved until 1 Jun 25 or later, then an evaluation is required.

3.3.4.1.3. The officer will not be considered for promotion, selective continuation, or selective early retirement by a HAF central selection board, a Reserve of the Air Force (ResAF) selection board, or ARC promotion board before retirement.

3.3.4.2. For officers with an approved separation date, the following criteria must be met for an evaluation to become optional:

3.3.4.2.1. The officer voluntarily resigns their commission or warrant, has fulfilled their military service obligation, and is not requesting or accepting a ResAF commission or warrant (RegAF officers) or retaining a ResAF commission or warrant (ARC officers). Reminder—A DAF Form 77 is mandatory for anyone being released from RegAF to the ANG or AFR under the PALACE CHASE or PALACE FRONT programs. **(T-1)** If necessary, one performance statement stating, "No report due to transition from DATE thru DATE (inclusive period)," may be used.

3.3.4.2.2. The officer is RegAF and voluntarily resigns their commission or warrant, or is a Reserve officer, and is granted release from RegAF in lieu of action under DAFI 36-3211, or court-martial. **(T-1) Note:** The evaluation is mandatory following a court-martial conviction. **(T-1)**

3.3.4.2.3. The officer is involuntarily discharged or released from active duty under DAFI 36-3211 unless transferring to the ANG/AFR, or another service, e.g., force management.

3.3.4.3. Supervisors will consult with separating or retiring officers regarding the option to complete a final evaluation. **(T-3)** Members are encouraged to complete a final evaluation for future purposes (e.g., employment, transfer into another AF component). Leadership shall consider the member's preference when deciding whether to accomplish their final evaluation. **(T-3)**

3.3.4.3.1. After consulting with the individual, and the rater opts not to complete a final evaluation, the supervisor will annotate the evaluation with: "FINAL REPORT NOT REQUIRED AND/OR IS NOT MANDATED TO BE RENDERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFI 36-2406." in the first rater's assessment block ("Executing the Mission") and "THIS SECTION NOT USED," in the remaining rater and HLR assessment blocks; process the evaluation through the rater and HLR for signature. **(T-1)**

3.3.4.3.2. An evaluation will not be accomplished after a member has officially separated or retired.

3.3.4.4. Complete a final evaluation when decided by the rater, commander, or senior rater, or mandated in accordance with **paragraph 3.3**. Supervisors and commanders are responsible for completing mandatory evaluations before members final out-process or officially separate or retire.

3.3.4.5. Officers whose Separation or Retirement is Withdrawn. An evaluation is due if the officer's separation or retirement is withdrawn or cancelled. If the original SCOD has not passed, then it will remain the same. **(T-1)** If the original SCOD has passed, an evaluation must be accomplished within 60 days of when the withdrawn or cancelled action is complete. **(T-1)** The SCOD remains the same and the reason will remain annual/biennial. **(T-1)**

3.4. Who is Not Authorized an Officer ALQ Evaluation.

3.4.1. Brigadier General selects. See **Chapter 7**.

3.4.2. AFR officers in a non-pay status (PAS Code: S7XXXXX).

3.4.3. Officers who are in full-time student (functional category: L) or patient status.

3.4.4. Officers in the Wounded Warrior or Career Intermission Programs.

3.4.5. Officers who die while on active duty, in active service, or in an active status. **Exception:** If the death occurred on or after the close-out date of an evaluation that was already being processed, it becomes an optional evaluation.

3.4.6. Officers attending formal education and training, provided one of the following criteria is met:

3.4.6.1. An officer who receives a DAF Form 475 from a formal training or education course that was 20 weeks or more, and the form "thru" date is within 120 days of the SCOD. The officer will receive a report on the next year's SCOD for the appropriate grade. **Note:** This may result in a report over 12 months.

3.4.6.2. Officers attending formal training or education over 20 weeks at the SCOD for the officer's grade. The DAF Form 475 will be completed at course completion and an evaluation will be required at the next SCOD.

3.4.7. Officers in prisoner or confinement status as a result of a court-martial conviction, who have PCS'd and are gained to a long-term confinement facility managed by the Air Force Security Forces Center. **Note:** Officers awaiting publication of a sentence adjudged at a court-martial will remain the administrative responsibility of the losing unit commander/director until such time as the sentence adjudged at a court-martial is published and the member is officially transferred to an Air Force Security Forces Center managed correctional facility. These officers will still require SCOD evaluations (as applicable), completed by the losing commander/director.

3.4.8. Officers undergoing appellate review leave and awaiting an appeals court decision and still permanently assigned to an Air Force Security Forces Center-managed confinement facility.

3.5. When to Submit an Officer ALQ Evaluation – Officer Performance Brief (OPB). The officer ALQ evaluation is completed in myEval to generate the OPB.

3.5.1. For warrant officer 1 thru colonel evaluations, see **Table 3.2**.

3.5.2. For general officer evaluations, see **Chapter 7**.

3.6. Annual Reports. Officers' reports will close out on the appropriate SCOD for the officers' grades. **(T-1)** For an officer who enters active duty, the first evaluation will be required at the next SCOD for their respective grade, given there are at least 180 days between the EAD and the SCOD. **(T-1)** For officers who receive a DAF Form 475, see **paragraph 3.4.6**.

3.7. Change of Reporting Official Reports (including emergencies or no-notice departures). Change of Reporting Official (CRO) reports are not authorized for colonels and below.

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

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

3.8.2. Promotion Release after SCOD. If an officer is selected for promotion prior to the SCOD for their current grade but after the SCOD of their "selected" grade and completing an evaluation on the next selected grade SCOD will create a reporting period of longer than one year, a DBH evaluation must be completed with a close-out date effective the date which the promotion selection results were released. This includes promotion releases with a retroactive date of rank which may apply to promotion selection by a special selection board, special selection review board, or date of rank adjustment from a Captain's Fully Qualified List, etc. **Examples:**

3.8.2.1. Capt Zemke was selected for promotion to major on a promotion select list released on 15 July 2024 with a retroactive date of rank of 15 March 2024. Capt Zemke had an evaluation on the captain SCOD date of 31 August 2023, and the next projected evaluation is 31 May 2025. Since this creates a rating period of longer than one year, a DBH evaluation is required with a close-out date of 15 July 2024, the promotion selection release.

3.8.2.2. Lt Col Hub was selected for promotion to colonel on a promotion select list released on 15 August 2024 with a retroactive date of rank of 1 May 2024. Lt Col Hub had an evaluation on the Lt Col SCOD of 31 May 2024, and the next projected evaluation is 28 February 2025. Since this creates a rating period of less than a year, a DBH evaluation is not required, and Colonel Hub will receive an evaluation on the next colonel SCOD of 28 February 2025.

3.8.3. Missing-in-Action/Captured/Detained. Use the date the ratee was placed in missing-in-action, captured, or detained in captive status.

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

3.8.5. Otherwise Directed. Use the date as otherwise directed by the commander. See **Table 3.2**.

3.8.6. Directed by Commander (DBC). A DBC will be a referral evaluation, and the close-out date will be established by the unit commander that directed the evaluation. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 1.11** for referral procedures. DBC evaluations provide flexibility to commanders to document substandard performance between SCODs as an embedded report (between two officer SCOD ALQ evaluations) and will only contain comments regarding the reason(s) for the evaluation (i.e., only the substandard performance). **(T-1)** All other comments, specifically those that are positive are not authorized and will be documented on the next SCOD evaluation. **(T-1)**

3.8.7. Career Intermission Program (CIP). Members entering CIP will receive a DBH ALQ evaluation if there are more than 120 days from the closeout date of the last evaluation to the first day of entering CIP. The closeout date will be 30 days prior to the first day of entering CIP. Upon returning from CIP, an annual evaluation will be required at the next SCOD for the member's respective grade, given there are at least 180 days between returning from CIP and the SCOD.

3.8.8. Inter-Service Transfer. Members being separated from the USAF to transfer to another US DoD service will receive a DBH ALQ evaluation if there are more than 120 days from the closeout date of the last evaluation and the member's separation date. The closeout date will be 30 calendar days prior to the member's separation date.

3.9. 365-day Extended Deployment Officer ALQ Evaluations. Note: These instructions apply only to members selected to fill an official extended deployment requirement. Do not use these instructions for members filling other requirements, even though they may be extended to or beyond 365 calendar days.

3.9.1. A change of reporting official to the deployment location will occur. **(T-1)** The deployed rating chain will complete evaluations on their ratees at the SCOD if the ratee is assigned to the deployed location as of the established accounting date. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 3.9.4.3**. **Note:** The senior rater matched to the ratee's home station PAS code must perform senior rater duties for PRFs. **(T-1)**

3.9.2. Home Station Rating Chain Responsibilities:

3.9.2.1. Prior to Departure:

3.9.2.1.1. The home station rater should provide input to the deployed rater on the ratee's performance at home station during the reporting period prior to the ratee's departure. The deployed rater may use the information when preparing the annual evaluation, but it is not required.

3.9.2.1.2. If the deployed rater is known prior to departure, the CSS/HR specialist will update the deployed rater. **(T-1)** When the rater is unknown, use the home station commander as a temporary rater. This will facilitate a direct line of communication between home station and deployed commanders to ensure the rating chain is established. **Example:** If the data is not updated immediately, a feedback notification will generate within 30 calendar days, and that should remind the commander that the deployed data needs to be updated.

3.9.2.2. Upon Arrival in the Area of Responsibility. The home station CSS/HR specialist will coordinate with the deployed Personnel Support for Contingency Operations (PERSCO) team and update MilPDS to reflect the member's deployed duty title and DAFSC effective the date the member arrives in the area of responsibility. **(T-1)** They will also update the deployed rater if the rater was unknown prior to departure. **(T-1)**

3.9.2.2.1. Duty Title Format. All extended deployment personnel duty titles will be standardized to reflect the extended deployment "duty title/country" assigned. **(T-1)** If space allows, include the unit assigned. **Example:** "Commander, 442 ECS/Iraq" or "Comm Mentor, Geographically Separated Unit/Afghanistan."

3.9.2.2.2. When determining the deployed rating chain, the rater should be the person who directly supervises the member's day-to-day activities. The unit that owns the unit line number will determine the rating chain. **(T-3)** 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. **(T-1)** In accordance with 10 U.S.C. § 9013, *Secretary of the Air Force*, DAFI 51-509, and Joint Publication 1, Volume 2, *The Joint Force,* the Secretary of the Air Force (SecAF) is responsible for the administrative control (ADCON) and support of DAF forces assigned or attached to combatant commands. **(T-0)** ADCON is the authority necessary to fulfill SecAF's statutory responsibilities for administration and support. In joint environments, an Air Force unit will be designated to have ADCON responsibilities over Airmen. **(T-1)** ADCON responsibility does not necessarily extend to writing the evaluations on those attached to the Air Force unit for ADCON purposes; however, this is at the discretion of the ADCON commander.

3.9.2.3. 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 [MEL] and [RegAF only] will meet respective MLR). **(T-1)**

3.9.3. PERSCO Team Responsibilities. The owning PERSCO team will be responsible for tracking the evaluations on all deployed personnel filling extended deployment billets. **(T-1)**

3.9.4. Deployed Rating Chain Responsibilities.

3.9.4.1. MilPDS Updates. Ensure the home station has updated MilPDS to reflect DAFSC, duty title, and deployed rater.

3.9.4.2. Performance Feedback. Perform initial and mid-term feedback in accordance with **Chapter 2**.

3.9.4.3. Evaluations. The deployed rater (and subsequent evaluator[s]) will render an evaluation on an officer, under the following circumstances:

3.9.4.3.1. On the ratee's established SCOD if the member is assigned to the deployed location as of the SCOD accounting date. See **paragraph 1.4.8.1**.

3.9.4.3.2. {AFR only} Raters will submit biennial evaluations at the appropriate SCOD if two years have passed since the close-out date of the last evaluation (see **Table 3.2**.).

3.9.4.3.3. ANG and AFR officers ordered to extended active duty under 10 U.S.C. § 12304 (other than during war or national emergency) or under 10 U.S.C. § 12302, continue to receive officer evaluations according to **Table 3.2**. Officers ordered to extended active duty under 10 U.S.C. § 12301(a) (war or national emergency) receive evaluations under the RegAF list provisions in this instruction.

3.9.4.4. Officer ALQ Evaluation – Officer Performance Brief (OPB). The deployed rating chain is responsible for completing the evaluation, to include the deployed HLR. For instructions on the officer ALQ evaluation, see **Table 3.1**.

3.9.4.5. DELETED.

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

3.9.6. Evaluator Requirements and Procedures for Officer Evaluations.

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

3.9.6.2. Rater. See **paragraph 1.5**. The rater cannot be substituted for any reason other than those outlined in **paragraph 1.7**.

3.9.6.3. Higher Level Reviewer. The HLR for members on 365-day deployments will be deployed HLRs who meet criteria in **paragraph 3.14**. **(T-1)** Air Expeditionary Wing (AEW) commanders are authorized as HLRs for officers on 365-day extended deployments to the respective AEW. **(T-1)**

3.9.6.4. Single Evaluator. Air Expeditionary Wing commanders/equivalents are authorized as single evaluators if they are the primary rater and HLR. If a rater meets the HLR requirements in **paragraph 3.9.6.3**, but is not an AEW/CC, the rater's rater must be the HLR. **(T-1)**

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

3.9.7. Referral Evaluation Procedures. Use referral procedures in **paragraph 1.11**. When the ratee is deployed in support of a contingency operation, ratee comments on the referral evaluation must reach the next evaluator no later than 30 calendar days after receipt of the referral letter. **(T-1)** Type, handwrite, or print referral correspondence in dark blue or black ink.

3.9.8. Routing Evaluations.

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

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

3.9.8.3. Forward evaluations in a sealed envelope clearly marked, OFFICER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION DATA--TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY, only if no electronic means are available.

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

3.9.9. Quality Control Review. Quality control of the appearance of performance evaluations may relax, but the content and data contained must be accurate. **(T-1)** Evaluations prepared under wartime provisions may be handwritten.

3.10. "FROM" Dates. The "FROM" date is normally the day after the last evaluation closes out, but if different, use the information below to establish the "FROM" date. If the officer is:

3.10.1. On extended active duty (RegAF or under Title 10 U.S.C. orders), and it is the first evaluation: use the extended active duty date; or the day following the close-out date of a TR from a school that is 20 weeks or more.

3.10.2. An ANG officer not on extended active duty and it is an initial evaluation: use the effective date of federal recognition in ANG or the day following the close-out of a TR from a school of 20 weeks or more. **Note:** Use DAF Form 77 to cover any gap from the officer's entry into non-extended active duty status to the "FROM" date of the first evaluation received in non-extended active duty status in accordance with **paragraph 1.14** and DAFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*.

3.10.3. An ANG officer not on extended active duty and was assigned to an ANG unit from ARPC, use the date of the latest federal recognition. Complete a DAF Form 77 to cover a gap caused by insufficient supervision in accordance with **paragraph 1.14** and DAFI 36-2608.

3.10.4. For an ANG officer not on extended active duty and was assigned to an ANG unit from another state: use the date of the latest federal recognition (the losing state will complete a DAF Form 77 to cover a gap caused by insufficient supervision in accordance with **paragraph 1.14** and DAFI 36-2608).

3.10.5. An AFR officer not on extended active duty and it is an initial evaluation, or the officer has been reassigned from the inactive ready reserve: use the date of assignment.

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

3.10.7. An AFR officer not on extended active duty but previously on active duty as RegAF and did not accept an AFR commission concurrently with release from active duty: use the effective date of appointment in non-extended active duty status. (Applies only to the first non-extended active duty-status evaluation.) Use DAF Form 77 to cover any gap from the officer's entry into non-extended active duty status to the "FROM" date of the first evaluation received in non-extended active duty status in accordance with **paragraph 1.14** and DAFI 36-2608.

3.10.8. For AGR officers transferring from active duty, the "FROM" date equals the day after the last evaluation's closeout date. This will not apply if there is a break in service.

3.10.9. If an officer received a TR for a school that is 20 weeks or more, use the day following the close-out day of the TR. This may result in an evaluation over 12 months.

3.11. "THRU" Dates.

3.11.1. {RegAF and ANG only} The "THRU" date will be the appropriate SCOD unless the reason for the report falls under **paragraph 3.8**. **(T-1)**

3.11.2. {AFR only} The "THRU" date for an annual report will be the appropriate SCOD as long as the member earns at least 16 points through inactive duty training periods, active duty, or a combination (do not include Extension Course Institute or membership points). **(T-1)** If the officer does not earn 16 points by the SCOD, submit an administrative LOE for a gap report. Use the statement: "No report required in accordance with AFI 36-2406 for this reporting period: DD Mon YYYY through DD Mon YYYY."

3.12. Number of Days Rater Supervised.

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

3.12.2. Deduct the number of days during non-rated periods authorized in accordance with **paragraph 1.4.11**. Do not deduct any periods of leave, TDY, absences or periods loaned out to other organizations unless they occur during an unauthorized non-rated period.

3.12.3. If, while on extended active duty an officer evaluation is being written by the rater's rater per **paragraph 1.7**, then enter the number of days that the evaluator had personal or written knowledge of the ratee's duty performance during the reporting period.

3.12.4. If a non-extended active duty ANG officer's ALQ evaluation is being written by another rater per **paragraph 1.7**, then enter the 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.

3.12.5. If a non-extended active duty AFR officer, then enter the number of days of supervision under the rater during the reporting period. Deduct from the period of supervision tours of active duty under other than the designated rater for which there is a LOE. **Example:** If preparing an officer ALQ evaluation to cover the period from 1 June to 31 May, 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.

3.13. Performance Feedback Assessment.

3.13.1. Performance feedback assessments will be accomplished in accordance with **Chapter 2**.

3.13.2. The rater certifies the performance feedback assessment in myEval by acknowledging whether feedback was conducted during the rating period. This includes the midterm feedback, or any subsequent feedback sessions requested by the ratee. If the performance feedback assessment was not accomplished, an explanation must be provided in myEval.

3.14. Higher Level Reviewer.

3.14.1. The HLR is the highest-level endorser in the ratee's rating chain.

3.14.1.1. For RegAF and AFR Colonels. The HLR will be the first general officer/senior executive service employee/equivalent, including selects, in the rating chain designated as a senior rater by the management level for RegAF, or for the AFR is in a designated senior rater billet. **(T-1)** The HLR is authorized as a single evaluator. See **paragraph 3.14.3**.

3.14.1.2. For ANG Colonels. The HLR will be the first general officer in the rating chain. **(T-1)** The HLR is authorized as a single evaluator.

3.14.1.3. For RegAF and AFR Lieutenant Colonels, Majors, and Chief Warrant Officers 5 and 4. The HLR will be the first O-6/GS-15/equivalent, or higher, in the rating chain designated as a senior rater by the management level. **(T-1)** The HLR is authorized as a single evaluator. See **paragraph 3.14.3**.

3.14.1.4. For ANG Lieutenant Colonels, Majors, Chief Warrant Officers 5, and Chief Warrant Officers 4. The HLR is the wing or group commander. **(T-1)** 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.

3.14.1.5. For RegAF and AFR Captains and Chief Warrant Officers 3. The HLR is the first O-6/GS-15/equivalent, or higher in the rating chain. **(T-1)** If a rater meets HLR requirements, but is not a senior rater, the next individual up the rating chain (in a grade equal or higher to the rater and in a grade higher than the ratee) will be the HLR; only senior raters are authorized as single evaluators. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 3.14.3**.

3.14.1.6. For ANG Captains and Chief Warrant Officers 3. The HLR is the first O-5/GS-14/equivalent in the rating chain. **(T-1)**

3.14.1.7. For RegAF and ARC Lieutenants, Warrant Officers 1 and Chief Warrant Officers 2. For lieutenants, warrant officers 1, and chief warrant officers 2, assigned to wing/base-level units, the HLR is the first commander on G-series orders/civilian unit director (detachment commanders and section commanders must be in the grade of O-4/GS-12/equivalent or higher). **(T-1)** For lieutenants, warrant officers 1, and chief warrant officers 2 assigned to a wing staff agency, the head of the specific agency (e.g., Wg/JA, Wg/Chaplain, etc.) will serve as the HLR, only when in the grade of O-5/GS-13/equivalent or higher, for those respective staff agencies; allowing the head of the agency to serve as the HLR provides the same level HLR as comparable squadrons. **(T-1)** For lieutenants, warrant officers 1, and chief warrant officers 2 assigned outside of a wing/base structure (e.g., MAJCOMs, NAFs, Centers, FOAs, direct reporting units [DRUs]), the HLR is the first O-5/GS-13/NH-III/equivalent or higher in the rating chain who is no higher in the organization than the senior rater. **(T-1)** If a rater meets HLR requirements, but is not a senior rater, the next individual up the rating chain (in a grade equal or higher to the rater and in a grade higher than the ratee) will be the HLR; only senior raters are authorized as single evaluators. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 3.14.3**.

3.14.2. The HLR will concur or non-concur by marking the appropriate selection. See **paragraph 1.10** for disagreements.

3.14.3. Single Evaluator only. Only officers who are designated as a senior rater by the management level may serve as both the rater and the HLR. If the primary rater meets HLR requirements but is not a senior rater, the next rater up the rating chain must be the HLR. **(T-1)**

3.15. Stratifications. Stratifications serve to provide clear feedback to ratees on their overall performance in relation to a relevant peer group with similar knowledge, skills, experience, and scope of work and responsibility, and to document that performance assessment for future unit-level and enterprise-level talent management decisions (e.g., special application boards, hiring authorities, assignment and development teams, promotion boards).

3.15.1. Stratification Accountability. It is the responsibility of evaluators at all levels to maintain integrity and keep intact the purpose, clarity, and validity of officer stratifications.

3.15.2. Statements outside the Scope of Responsibility. Stratification and broad statements outside the scope of the evaluator's responsibility or knowledge are prohibited. **(T-1)** A broad statement is one which implies knowledge of Air Force members not in the everyday chain of accountability, both mission and personal. Evaluators can only stratify personnel within the confines of their direct rating chain and/or scope of rating responsibility (e.g., within the evaluations which they are the HLR for; AEW/CCs without a SRID may still stratify within their entire wing). As an example of inappropriate and prohibited scope, an evaluator may not include in their stratification pools (denominators) personnel who provide mission support via a cross-functional team, or are on temporary duty status supporting a mission, but are permanently assigned to another unit (PAS code) since these personnel do not officially report in the evaluator's chain.

3.15.3. Stratification statements, when authorized, are not mandatory and are limited to the scope of the rating period (start date to end date). While evaluators may review past evaluations, evaluators will not reference past evaluations in any way, and also will not use past evaluations as context or determinant for any current rating period stratification(s) or content in performance statements or HLR comments. **(T-1)** The omission of stratifications does not constitute an error or injustice. **Note:** An evaluator may remove or change a stratification at any point during the process of an evaluation.

3.15.4. Stratification statements are only authorized within the designated stratification sections in myEval and the AF Form 715 (use of this form is only allowable when authorized by waiver as provided at **paragraph 1.13.4**). **(T-1)** Evaluators are prohibited from placing any form of stratification statement(s) in any ALQ performance statement section, mandatory comments section, HLR assessment comment section, etc., to include stratifications from other evaluators (e.g., deployed stratifications) and veiled stratifications (see **paragraph 3.15.6.2**). **(T-1)** All deployed/TDY performance is authorized for the evaluator's consideration in overall assessment and home station stratification. Stratifications provided on a DAF Form 77 may be used by the rater for consideration when completing the ALQ evaluation but may not be quoted or otherwise included.

3.15.5. Single Evaluator Stratifications. Raters serving as a single evaluator are prohibited from entering a stratification in the rater's stratification block and must enter "RATER IS ALSO THE HLR." Authorized stratifications may be entered in the HLR's stratification block of the officer evaluation and must comply with **paragraph 3.15.7.4.1**. **(T-1)**

3.15.6. Unauthorized Stratifications.

3.15.6.1. Warrant Officers (WOs), Company Grade Officers (CGOs), and/or Field Grade Officers (FGOs) are not authorized peer groups for primary or secondary stratification purposes. **(T-1)**

3.15.6.2. Veiled stratifications are not authorized. **(T-1)** These are statements which imply a stratification but do not conform to the guidance within paragraphs **3.15** and **3.16** (e.g. "#1 CAG Advisor…" This is an inappropriate evaluator comment because it is a veiled stratification with no denominator).

3.15.6.3. Stratification statements based on awards are not authorized, as awards are recognition based on a given set of criteria (e.g., "#1/50 as Sq CGO of the Quarter" is prohibited). **(T-1)**

3.15.6.4. Stratification statements for warrant officers 1 (WO1s) and second lieutenants (O-1s) are prohibited. **(T-1)** While this quantitative comparison against a peer group is prohibited, evaluators should provide these officers with clear feedback regarding their performance in relation to Air Force standards and major performance areas (i.e., executing the mission, leading people, managing resources, improving the unit).

3.15.6.5. It is strictly prohibited to place a stratification referencing a member's placement on a key personnel list and other Development Team vectors on an evaluation.

3.15.6.6. Promotion "Selects." (RegAF and AFR only) A primary stratification is not authorized for officers on a promotion select list. Officers on a promotion select list may be considered in denominator pools for grade stratifications on the SCOD of the lower (current) grade. See the exception at **paragraph 3.15.7.3**. **(T-1)** (ANG only) Officers on a promotion select list will be stratified against other officers in their current grade (e.g., a lieutenant colonel select will be stratified against all other majors). **(T-1)**

3.15.6.7. Stratification Quotes.

3.15.6.7.1. The use of stratification statements from anyone other than the evaluator is prohibited, unless they are between the rater and the HLR in the rating scope of responsibility (e.g., a wing commander HLR may not quote a NAF commander's stratification statement; however, a wing commander HLR may quote a group commander's stratification statement if the group commander is not the rater). In such cases, when the stratification statement comes from someone between the rater and the HLR, either the rater or the HLR is authorized to use it.

3.15.6.7.2. A quoted stratification statement is not the rater's or HLR's own stratification (see **paragraph 3.15.7.2.3**.). A quoted stratification is only a verbatim quote of a stratification already given by a rating chain official between the rater and the HLR.

3.15.6.7.3. If a quoted stratification is used, it must independently comply with the authorized primary and secondary stratification rules in **paragraph 3.15.7** and must only be placed in the designated stratification block for the rater or HLR. It is not authorized to place a quoted stratification anywhere else on the OPB.

3.15.6.7.4. The rater or HLR may only use the quoted stratification exactly as given by the intermediate rating chain official. The rater or HLR may not add to it, modify it, or combine it with another stratification of their own. If a quoted stratification does not comply with authorized primary and secondary stratification rules, the original stratifying official should make corrections and resubmit to the rater or HLR for use.

3.15.6.7.5. A quoted primary stratification does not authorize or "unlock" a secondary stratification by the rater or HLR. Likewise, a primary stratification from the rater or HLR does not authorize a quoted secondary stratification. A quoted stratification and the rater's or HLR's own stratification must each independently meet stratification requirements in **paragraph 3.15**; one cannot be used to satisfy or complete the other.

3.15.6.7.6. A rater or HLR may use either their own stratification or a quoted stratification, but not both. If the rater or HLR provides their own stratification in the authorized stratification block, the evaluator is not authorized to also include a quoted stratification. Likewise, if the rater or HLR uses a quoted stratification, the rater or HLR is not authorized to provide their own stratification. Only one stratification statement may appear in the authorized stratification block.

3.15.6.7.7. Examples of Stratification Quotes:

3.15.6.7.7.1. Quoted primary stratification only: "#1/8 Majs (MSG/CC)"

3.15.6.7.7.2. Quoted primary and secondary stratification: "#1/20 Majs (MXG/CC), #1/5 DOs (MXG/CC)"

3.15.6.7.7.3. Unauthorized use of quoted primary stratification to support rater or HLR secondary stratification: "#1/20 Majs (MDG/CC), #3/50 WG DOs"

3.15.6.7.7.4. Unauthorized use of quoted secondary stratification: "3/8 Lt Cols, #1/4 Sq/CCs (MSG/CC)"

3.15.6.7.7.5. Unauthorized use of quoted stratification that does not comply with policy: "#1/8 Flt/CCs (MSG/CC)" **Note:** Standalone secondary duty position stratifications are only authorized if the ratee is a promotion "select" or if the rater is the same grade as the ratee. See **paragraph 3.15.6.6** and **paragraph 3.15.7.4.2**.

3.15.6.8. When stratifying officers on officer evaluations, evaluators will not consider completion/non-completion of non-resident developmental education or officer professional military education (OPME) if the officer is on the school select list or select/candidate status (because the ratee will attend in-residence). Relative ranking among officers rated by the rating chain should be based on overall performance. This paragraph does not preclude evaluators from making appropriate assignment and developmental education or OPME recommendations on officer evaluations (HLRs only) and retention recommendation forms. See **paragraph 3.16.3**.

3.15.6.9. Except as authorized in **paragraph 3.15.7**, qualifiers/descriptors are not authorized in any stratification statement (e.g., "#3/8 Lt Cols, #4/15 Sq/CCs in first year"; "#2/4 new Majs, #1/1 LAF-C DOs"

3.15.6.10. Officers who are not current on their fitness assessment (received a "Required - Not Current" on their evaluation) or who have failed to meet minimum fitness standards ("Unsatisfactory" score) as of the SCOD are not authorized to be considered for stratification.

3.15.7. Authorized Stratifications. When used, stratification statements must be written in whole number quantitative terms (numerator over denominator) based on authorized peer groups and must remain within the evaluator's scope of rating responsibility. **(T-1)** Use of percentages in the numerator are prohibited (e.g., cannot use "Top 5%/50"). **Note:** Stratification of officers between components (RegAF, Reserve, Guard) is authorized within an evaluator's scope of rating responsibility as long as the stratification is within an authorized peer group. Authorized peer groups are limited to the following categories (see **Table 3.4**.):

3.15.7.1. Primary Stratification. Evaluators may stratify officers by grade. Grade stratifications will only include officers in the same grade (e.g., chief warrant officers 2, first lieutenants, captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels). **(T-1)** Do not stratify officers against civilian grades or include civilian "equivalents" in the denominator pool. **(T-1)** Primary stratifications must include all military officers in that grade under the evaluator's scope of rating responsibility and may not include officers who are assigned within another HLR's scope of rating responsibility.

3.15.7.1.1. United States Air Force Officers. The primary stratification for an officer assigned to a position in which only USAF officers are within an evaluator's scope of rating authority will simply have the grade as the descriptor (e.g., "#2/25 Lt Cols"; "#1/3 CW3s). **(T-1)**

3.15.7.1.2. DAF Officers. The primary stratification for an officer assigned to a unit in which both, and only, USAF and United States Space Force (USSF) officers of the same grade are within an evaluator's scope of rating authority must have "DAF" with the grade as the descriptor (e.g., "#1/7 DAF Lt Cols"). **(T-1)** "Joint" as a stratification category is not authorized among only USAF and USSF officers. **(T-1)**

3.15.7.1.3. Joint Officers. The primary stratification for an officer permanently assigned to a position on a joint manning document in which at least one other non-DAF officer is within an evaluator's scope of rating authority must have "Joint" with the grade as the descriptor (e.g., "#1/5 Joint O-4s"; "#2/6 Joint CW4s"). **(T-1)** Raters with USAF officers and other US DoD service officers in the same grade, except those from USSF, are not authorized to use any other stratification category than "Joint" as a primary stratification (e.g., not authorized to state, "#1/4 USAF Lt Cols" to stratify just Air Force), or to specify specific services (e.g., not authorized to state, "#1/6 USAF/DA Lt Cols" to stratify just Air Force and Army, or "#2/5 USAF/USMC O-4s" to stratify just Air Force and Marines) even if there is only one other US DoD service represented in addition to the USAF officers. **Note:** Officers "loaned" to a joint organization are not authorized a "Joint" stratification and must adhere to the assigned unit's stratification guidelines.

3.15.7.1.4. Service Component. The primary stratification for officers may have service component (RegAF, Reserve, Guard) with the grade as a descriptor and must be within the evaluator's scope of authority (e.g., "#1/4 ANG Majs").

3.15.7.1.5. Reserve Participation Category. The primary stratification for reserve officers may have a Reserve Participation category (i.e., traditional reservist [TR], IMA, Air Reserve Technician [ART], AGR, VLPAD, Leaders Encouraging Airman Development [LEAD], or EAD) with the grade as a descriptor and must be within the evaluator's scope of authority (e.g., "#1/6 IMA O-6s"; "#2/25 VLPAD Majs"). **(T-1)**

3.15.7.1.6. {RegAF only} Frocked and Temporarily Promoted Officers. Frocked or temporarily promoted officers will be stratified amongst the officers in the grade they have been frocked or temporarily promoted to (e.g., a major that has been temporarily promoted to lieutenant colonel will only be stratified amongst other lieutenant colonels; a lieutenant colonel frocked to colonel will only be stratified against other colonels). **(T-1)**

3.15.7.2. Secondary Stratification. In order to use a secondary stratification, the officer must first earn a primary stratification in accordance with **paragraph 3.15.7.1** on their evaluation to ground the secondary stratification statement and communicate the clearest depiction of where an officer stands for all future evaluation readers. When used, the primary stratification must be written first, followed by the secondary stratification. Tertiary stratifications and beyond are not authorized (maximum of two stratifications are authorized [one primary stratification and one secondary stratification]). An evaluator may use one of the following peer groups as a secondary stratification:

3.15.7.2.1. Developmental Category. This refers to the officer's developmental category for promotion. Raters may use a developmental category stratification as a secondary stratification to any primary grade stratification and must be used among officers in the same grade (e.g., "#3/17 Capts, 1/12 LAF-C Capts"; "#5/16 Majs; #2/8 NC Majs"; " #2/25 Lt Cols, #1/10 LSF-O Lt Cols").

3.15.7.2.2. United States Air Force Grade. Raters may use a USAF grade stratification as a secondary stratification to a Joint or DAF primary stratification and must be used among officers in the same grade (e.g., "#2/14 Joint Majs, #1/6 USAF Majs;" "#3/16 DAF Lt Cols, #1/4 USAF Lt Cols"; or "#2/5 Joint CW5s, #1/2 USAF CW5s").

3.15.7.2.3. Subordinate Echelon Grade. This refers to an officer's standing at established echelons (unit levels) organizationally subordinate to the HLR, but organizationally senior to the rater within the HLR's scope of rating responsibility, when the subordinate echelon is not a signatory on the evaluation. Use of this a subordinate echelon stratification is limited to grade within the subordinate echelon. As an example, a wing commander may elect to stratify an officer amongst their peers in a group subordinate to the wing (e.g., "#16/50 Majs, #4/22 MDG Majs;" "#23/90 Majs, #6/25 WSA Majs"). **(T-1)**

3.15.7.2.4. Duty Position. This refers to the officer's duty position type, level, and scope of responsibility (e.g., commander, wing commander, section chiefs, flight commanders, operations officers, branch chiefs, action officers, analysts, instructors, combat systems officers, etc.). Officers may be stratified against civilian personnel and international officers in equivalent duty positions (e.g., "#1/1 Capts, #1/40 Analysts"; "#2/6 Majs, #3/41 Flt CCs"; "#2/5 Majs, #1/15 Instructor Pilots"). Duty position stratifications by grade are not authorized (e.g., "#5/40 Majs, #1/20 Maj Flight Commanders"), except for command position stratifications. Command position stratifications by grade are authorized, if desired (e.g., "#4/35 Majs, #2/6 Maj Sq/CCs;" "#3/60 Lt/Cols, #1/3 Lt Col Sq/CCs"). "Non-" duty position stratifications and overly broad categorizations that obscure the differences in grade and duty positions inherent within the stratification are not authorized (e.g., "#15/60 Lt Cols, #1/6 non-command Lt Cols;" "#20/90 Majs, #1/136 officers"). **(T-1)**

3.15.7.2.5. Air Force Reserve or Air National Guard Components. Raters may use AFR or ANG grade as a secondary stratification to an authorized primary grade stratification within an evaluator's scope of authority and must be used among officers in the same grade (e.g., #23/118 Lt Cols; #1/8 ANG Lt Cols). Raters may also use AFR or ANG as a descriptor to a secondary stratification within an evaluator's scope of authority as long as the stratification is within an authorized peer group and must be used among officers in the same grade (e.g., "#3/7 Majs; #1/3 AFR Analysts").

3.15.7.3. {RegAF and AFR only} Authorized Exception to Primary and Secondary Stratifications for Promotion "Selects." Officers on a promotion select list may be stratified using the secondary duty position stratification only without first using a primary stratification without grade or select grade reference (e.g., "#1/8 Branch Chiefs;" "#3/7 Sq/CCs). Promotion "selects" may be considered in denominator pools for grade stratifications on the SCOD of the lower (current) grade as long as the officer has not promoted to the higher grade as of the day of the SCOD.

3.15.7.4. Exceptions for Higher Level Reviewer Stratifications.

3.15.7.4.1. HLR Stratification Scoping. The primary and secondary stratification denominators for the HLR may not exceed the number of evaluations signed by the HLR on that specific SCOD. Neither primary nor secondary stratification denominators shall include all officers within an HLR's scope of responsibility unless the HLR is a signatory on the evaluations of all officers within that scope. HLRs can only stratify personnel within the confines of their scope of responsibility (e.g., SRID). **Exceptions:** For HLRs also evaluating other US DoD service officers (e.g., USSF, or any Joint officers), the HLR's primary and secondary stratification denominators may exceed the number of USAF officers at the SCOD but still may not exceed the number of evaluations signed by the HLR for all their officers of the same grade during their annual evaluation cycle (e.g., HLR signs 5 Air Force officer evaluations, 2 Army officer evaluations, and 3 Navy officer evaluations; the denominator may not exceed 10). Additionally, an HLR's secondary duty position stratification denominator may exceed the number of Air Force officers at the SCOD when including civilian equivalents and/or international officer equivalents.

3.15.7.4.2. When Ratee is Same Grade as Rater. When the ratee is the same grade as the rater, the HLR has the option to stratify the ratee using the secondary duty position stratification only, without first using a primary stratification. This option offers some discretion to HLRs assessing performance of all officers in a grade at the same time, particularly when a peer group includes officers with varying scopes of responsibility (e.g., when a squadron commander and director of operations (DO) are the same grade, the HLR has the option to stratify the ratee as "#1/6 DOs" without using a primary stratification). **(T-1)**

3.16. Unauthorized Evaluator Considerations and Comments. Certain items are prohibited for consideration in the performance evaluation process and will not be commented upon on any Officer Evaluation System form (see **Chapter 8** for the PRF). Refer to **paragraph 3.15.6** for unauthorized stratifications. See **paragraph 1.12** for other prohibited considerations and comments. Except as authorized in the following paragraphs, do not consider, refer to, or include comments regarding:

3.16.1. Promotion statements or reference to grades and/or positions higher than the ratee holds are prohibited.

3.16.1.1. Promotion statements that are pushes to the next higher grade are prohibited. **Exception:** Statements of fact (e.g., "filled a Lt Col billet") are authorized if the ratee was assigned to the unit manning document (UMD) position. Additionally, while promotion statements are prohibited, an evaluator may make recommendations to select officers for a particular assignment, developmental education, augmentation, continuation, or conditional reserve status.

3.16.1.2. Any reference, direct or indirect, to an officer's order of merit, line number, position sequence, etc. on any boarded selection is unauthorized. **Exception:** Statements acknowledging an officer's selection for promotion during the reporting period are acceptable.

3.16.1.3. The term "Senior" on officer evaluations is prohibited for colonel selects and below. This term is commonly understood as a euphemism for colonels and above, or to refer to members holding a higher grade than the ratee, and therefore constitutes an implied promotions statement and is prohibited in officer evaluations. **Exception:** On PRFs for lieutenant colonels being promoted to colonel, the term "Senior" may be used.

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

3.16.2. Comments on officer evaluations regarding completion of, or enrollment in, Developmental Education (DE)/OPME (in residence or non-residence) and Advanced Academic Degree (AAD) education are prohibited.

3.16.2.1. Performance and special recognition comments on officers attending in-residence education and/or training will be documented appropriately on the DAF Form 475 (see **Chapter 6**). **Exception:** When preparing officer evaluations and PRFs, evaluators may comment on Air War College (other service equivalencies) non-residential program Outstanding Graduates; unlike resident students, non-resident students do not receive a training report to document this achievement.

3.16.2.2. For officer evaluations only: Only HLRs may comment on an officer's competitive assignment selection to programs that fall outside of the Developmental Education Designation Board, to include but not limited to Olmstead, Fulbright, Rhodes, School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, and the School of Advanced Warfighting Studies.

3.16.2.3. Evaluators will not comment on an officer's status on the school's list, selection for DE/OPME, and/or specific schools (e.g., Air Command and Staff College, Air War College, Joint). Only HLRs are authorized to make remarks recommending an officer to "PDE", "IDE", or "SDE" only. **Note:** An assignment recommendation for Air Force Institute of Technology Master's or Doctoral degree program is authorized.

3.16.3. Assignment and DE/OPME Recommendations. Only HLRs are authorized to make assignment and DE/OPME recommendations. Assignment and developmental DE/OPME recommendations on officer evaluations that are inconsistent with an officer's current grade are prohibited. The intent and philosophy of the Officer Evaluation System is to recommend an officer for assignments or positions and resident level of developmental education/OPME that reflect the ratee's potential.

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

3.16.3.2. HLRs are authorized to make one or more assignment recommendations in an officer's evaluation provided the recommendations are both appropriate and realistically achievable for the officer's current grade or current grade plus one. The assignment recommendation may involve the current grade plus one if the officer has completed or is currently completing the last reasonable career development for the current grade. **Example:** "Highly recommend for Air Force Institute of Technology—then Joint Duty." **Note:** Air Force Institute of Technology can be used for an assignment push, however, it cannot be used as a developmental education/OPME push.

3.16.3.3. The intent is to focus on what job or DE/OPME assignment the officer should be doing immediately after their 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 the Officer Evaluation System.

3.16.3.4. In addition to assignment recommendations, HLRs may also make recommendations for the appropriate level of in-residence developmental education/OPME on officer evaluations and LOEs. DE/OPME pushes are not authorized on training reports.

3.16.3.4.1. HLRs determine the appropriate level recommendation by considering the highest level of in-residence DE/OPME the officer has already completed along with the eligibility criteria for each level of in-residence DE/OPME. (e.g., Squadron Officer School is the appropriate level of primary developmental education (PDE) for Air Force officers).

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

3.16.3.4.3. For a captain, once the officer completes PDE, an intermediate developmental education (IDE) recommendation is appropriate.

3.16.3.4.4. For a major, if as of the close-out date of the evaluation, the officer 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 the officer is no longer eligible for consideration, then a senior developmental education (SDE) recommendation is appropriate.

3.16.3.4.5. HLRs cannot recommend officers for specific schools, including "Joint DE." Only the terms "PDE," "IDE," and "SDE" are authorized. The appropriate venue for a specific school recommendation is through the annual DE/OPME process.

3.16.3.5. Examples of Acceptable Assignment DE/OPME Recommendations.

3.16.3.5.1. "Make Capt Cousins a MPF Chief." (Appropriate next level of progression.)

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

3.16.3.5.3. For Air Force officers: "Send Major Smith to Intermediate Developmental Education." (Appropriate DE/OPME progression.)

3.16.3.5.4. For Air Force Officers: "After Intermediate Developmental Education, assign to Air Staff." (Appropriate DE/OPME with follow-on assignment.)

3.16.3.5.5. For a major who has completed Air Command & Staff College in-residence, or who is out of the eligibility window, recommendations for SDE would be appropriate, "Send to Senior Developmental Education."

3.16.3.5.6. For a captain who has completed PDE in-residence, or who is beyond the window of eligibility, an appropriate recommendation would be "In-resident Intermediate Developmental Education a Must."

3.16.3.6. Examples of Prohibited Assignment and DE/OPME Recommendations.

3.16.3.6.1. "Make Lt Keeler an FSS Commander." Inappropriate next level of progression.

3.16.3.6.2. "Send Capt Brown to Intermediate Developmental Education after selection to major." (Reference to Intermediate Developmental Education is appropriate, but the comment "after selection to major" is an implied promotion statement.)

3.16.3.6.3. "Intermediate Developmental Education in 2023, Group Commander in 2028, and Wing Commander in 2031." (Goes beyond the scope of the next assignment).

3.16.3.6.4. "Capt Collins is ready to be a flying Sq/CC" and "Make Maj Joo a group commander." (In both cases, the recommendations are clearly beyond the officer's next assignment and are viewed as veiled promotion statements.)

3.16.4. Officer Bonuses. Comments on an officer's decision to accept or decline retention bonus pay (e.g., aviation bonus, officer retention bonus) are prohibited.

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

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

3.17. Extensions of Close-out Dates. Extensions of close-out dates are not authorized for lieutenant colonels and below; For general officers, see **paragraph 7.6**.

3.18. Ratee's Acknowledgement.

3.18.1. The rater is required to conduct face-to-face (end-of-reporting period) feedback in conjunction with presenting the evaluation to the ratee. The officer evaluation serves as the feedback form. A performance feedback assessment form is not required. Electronic routing of the form does not excuse the rater from providing face-to-face feedback. Only in situations where face-to-face feedback is not feasible will feedback be conducted either by telephone or electronically. The rater should first attempt to call the ratee and conduct the feedback via telephone. If that option is not available, the rater may provide clear, detailed feedback to the ratee via email, using a read receipt to verify the feedback was received and read.

3.18.2. The ratee's signature in the acknowledgment block does not constitute concurrence or non-concurrence of the content and/or rating of the evaluation. The signature is to acknowledge receipt of the evaluation and to certify the ratee reviewed the personal information on the form.

3.18.3. The ratee's signature will be obtained after the HLR has signed. In cases where an Air Force advisor or acquisition/functional examiner signature is required, ratee acknowledgment will occur after the advisor or examiner review.

3.18.4. The ratee must acknowledge receipt of the evaluation prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record unless the ratee refuses or is unable to sign. The ratee will review and verify all dates, markings, and comments on the form. Significant discrepancies and administrative errors can be addressed at this time, and corrected if agreed by all parties before the evaluation becomes a matter of record. This is not to be interpreted to mean the ratee can refuse to sign if they disagree with the evaluation. This is an acknowledgement of the evaluation not concurrence. If evaluators do not agree to change the evaluation and the ratee wishes to dispute it, the ratee should pursue the established appeal/correction avenues available to them as outlined in **Chapter 10** once the evaluation is a matter of record.

3.18.5. The rater will suspense the ratee three duty days (30 calendar days for ARC) to sign the evaluation. **(T-1)**

3.18.6. In cases where the ratee refuses to sign, any evaluator signing the evaluation is authorized to select "Member declined to sign" from the drop-down menu in the ratee's acknowledgement and sign the evaluation in the ratee's acknowledgement block.

3.18.7. In cases where the ratee is unable to sign, any evaluator will select “Member unable to sign” from the drop-down menu in the ratee’s acknowledgement block and sign the evaluation in the ratee’s acknowledgement block.

3.18.8. For the purpose of signing evaluations, the term “Member unable to sign” indicates that the member does not have access to a common access card-enabled computer (e.g., convalescent leave, TDY to a contractor facility without government computer access, deployed to a location without computer access, no longer have digital signature capability, in absent without leave or deserter status, etc.).

3.18.9. “Wet Signature Evaluations Only.” Evaluators can type, handwrite or use the drop-down option to annotate the evaluation when the ratee is unable or declines to sign.

Table 3.1. Instructions for Preparing an Officer ALQ Evaluation (Output Product).

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	**A**	**B**	**C**
	Heading	**Instructions**	**Example**
1	Grade	Enter appropriate grade. See **paragraph 1.4.9**. Use "(S)" when using the select grade and "(T)" when using the temporarily promoted grade.	WO1, CW2, CW3, CW4 (S), CW4, CW5, 2Lt, 1Lt, Capt, Maj, Lt Col, Col, Lt Col (S), Col (T)
2	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial, and any suffix (e.g., 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.
3	DoDID	Enter full DoDID number	1234567890
4	Duty Title	Review and ensure the approved duty title is entered as of the SCOD, unless the member has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment then enter the duty title as of the accounting date. If the duty title 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 receiving notification to complete an evaluation. Ensure the duty title is commensurate with the ratee's grade, AFSC, and responsibility. 365-day extended deployments will use the deployed duty title.	Assistant Director of Operations
5	DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC including prefix	12F3F

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		and suffix, if applicable as of the SCOD; however, if the officer has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the DAFSC as of the established accounting date. Officers on a 365-day extended deployment will use the TDY DAFSC. See **paragraph 1.4.8.**	
6	Reason	Enter reason for report from OPB notice and as determined by **Table 3.2**.	Annual, Directed by HQ USAF, Directed by CC
7	Period	FROM Date: Enter the day following the last evaluation's close-out date. See **paragraph 3.10**. THRU Date: See **paragraph 3.11** and **Table 3.3** to determine the close-out date.	1 June 25 thru 31 May 26
8	Days Supervised	Enter number of days ratee was supervised by the rater during the reporting period. See **paragraph 3.12**.	298
9	Days Non-Rated	Enter number of days Non-Rated (if applicable) in accordance with **paragraph 1.4.11**.	120
10	Ratee Acknowledgement	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 and review of personal information on the evaluation. If the ratee non-concurs with the evaluation, they may submit an appeal in accordance with **Chapter 10**. The rater will suspense the ratee	Digital or wet signatures. A combination of both is authorized.

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		three duty days (30 calendar days for ARC) to sign the evaluation. Non-digital: Handwrite, date stamp or type the date. Sign on or after the close-out date. "Member unable to sign"—use when member is incapacitated or unavailable to sign; rater or HLR (digitally) signs. "Member declined to sign"—use when member refuses to sign the evaluation; rater or HLR (digitally) signs. See **paragraph 3.18**.	
11	Organization and Command	Enter information as of close-out date unless the member has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment then enter the information as of the accounting date. Nomenclature does not necessarily duplicate what is on the evaluation notice. The goal is an accurate description of where and to whom the ratee belongs. Command will be listed inside parentheses. 365-day extended deployments will use the home station unit, "with duty at…" See **paragraph 1.4.7**. AFR only: For IMAs, information will be that of the unit of assignment, and for PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. For Non-EAD members, use this	123d Fighter Squadron (ACC) 123d Fighter Squadron (ACC) (Non-EAD)

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		section to annotate "(Non-EAD)" or "(ANG)."	
12	Location	Enter information as of the close-out date unless the member has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment then enter the information as of the accounting date.	JB Langley-Eustis, VA
13	Duty Description	Comments in narrative format are mandatory and are limited to the space provided. 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 and topical references—they obscure rather than clarify meaning. Only acronyms on the approved acronym list (https://www.afpc.af.mil/Career-Management/Acronyms/) are authorized. Previous jobs held during the reporting period may be mentioned only if it impacts the evaluation. 365-day extended deployments	Combat ready, worldwide deployable Lead Weapons System Officer ready to execute every mission set of the multi-role F-15E. Leads commander's priority programs, to include standardization and evaluation, safety, security, and unit morale. Assists in execution of the daily flying operations for 75 aircrew, 20 support personnel, and 25 aircraft worth $1.4B. Executes large force integration of joint and multinational forces, ensures 24-hr operations.

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		will use the TDY duty description. Commander's duty description will include the total force (RegAF, ANG, AFR, and USSF) assigned. A short description of the unit's missions may be included in the job description if it is necessary to better explain the ratee's duties. For colonels in Chief of Staff of the Air Force (CSAF) selected/designated wing equivalent positions, include "wing Equivalent" up front at the first item in the duty description.	Commands an 80-person combat-coded F-15E squadron, manages and executes a $107M flying hour program with 3.1K sorties & 5.1K hours and responsible for $98K annual budget. Implements combatant command's operational plans and requirements; responsible for readiness and execution of daily flying operations for 60 aircrew, 20 support personnel, and 25 aircrafts worth $1.4B. Combat fighter pilot qualified to evaluate and lead all F-15E mission sets.
	RATER ASSESSMENT		
***14**	Stratification	If stratifying ratee, enter stratification here. See **paragraphs 3.15**. If the rater is not stratifying the ratee and therefore no stratification is used, must enter the statement, "THIS SECTION NOT USED". Single evaluators: If rater is also the HLR, enter the statement, "THE RATER IS ALSO THE HLR" in the rater's stratification block. Rater will enter a stratification in	#3/7 Lt Cols, #2/5 Sq/CCs

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		the HLR stratification block, if used. See **paragraph 3.15.5**.	
***15**	Executing the Mission – Job proficiency, Initiative, Adaptability	Comments are mandatory and limited to the space provided; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.1**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***16**	Leading People – Collaboration, Emotional Intelligence, Communication	Comments are mandatory and limited to the space provided; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.2**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement. For AFR colonels in GO billets, include a mandatory statement that the officer "continues in" or "leave" the general officer position. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 1.10** for disagreements. See **paragraph 1.11** for Referrals.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***17**	Managing Resources – Stewardship, Accountability	Comments are mandatory and limited to the space provided; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.3**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***18**	Improving the Unit – Decision Making, Innovation	Comments are mandatory and limited to the space provided; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.4**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
*19	Mandatory Comments (Fitness/Commander/ Housing/Voting)	Raters must document the ratee's most recent and current fitness assessment score. The comment will include the score achieved, the fitness category, and any component exemptions using the following format: PFA: [score]; Category; Exemptions: [list any component exemptions]. For Airmen who are not current on their PFA, see **paragraph 1.4.10.1.1**. For Airmen who are fully exempt, see **paragraph 1.4.10.1.2.** For Airmen assigned to designated combat-related AFSCs, listed in the terms section, raters will document both the ratee's most recent and current Air Force physical fitness assessment and combat field test (CFT) results. See **paragraph 1.4.10**. If ratee is a commander, voting assistance officer, and/or has command oversight of privatized military housing at any point in the rating period, enter the appropriate statement(s). Rater must also include a unique performance statement(s). See **paragraphs 1.9.1, 1.9.2**, and **1.9.3**. If required, enter the applicable statement(s) "Ratee met all command climate requirements." Or "Ratee did not meet all command climate	PFA: 91.7; Excellent; Exemptions: None. PFA: 99.8; Excellent; Exemptions: None / CFT: 95.2; Excellent; Exemptions: None See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		requirements." If required, enter the applicable statement(s) "The Ratee exercised effective oversight of military privatized housing." Or "The Ratee was not effective in oversight of military privatized housing." If required, enter a unique performance statement on the ratee's performance as the voting assistance officer.	
20	Rater Name, Grade, and Branch of Service	Enter rater's information as of the close-out date. However, if the ratee has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the rater as of the SCOD from the unit as of the established accounting date. See **paragraph 3.3.1**. For ANG, the use of component identification (ID) (e.g., XXANG may be used.	Sue J. Doe, Col, USAF Sally S. Mesaros, SES (O-9 equivalent), DAF Austin T. Smith, GS-15, DAF Jeremy R. Dice, NH-IV (O-6 equivalent), DAF Jacob M. Freer, Col, KSANG
21	Rater Duty Title	Enter rater's information as of the close-out date. However, if the ratee has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the rater as of the SCOD from the unit as of the established accounting date. See **paragraph 3.3.1**.	Deputy Commander
22	Rater Organization and Command	Enter rater's information as of the close-out date. However, if the ratee has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day	366th Fighter Squadron (ACC)

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the rater as of the SCOD from the unit as of the established accounting date. See **paragraph 3.3.1**.	
23	Rater Signature	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite, stamp, or type the date next to the signature (DD MMM YY). See **paragraph 1.4.12**. Do not sign blank forms that do not contain comments and/or 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.	
	HIGHER LEVEL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT		
24	Stratification	If stratifying ratee, enter stratification here. See **paragraphs 3.15**. If no stratification is used, must enter the statement, "THIS SECTION NOT USED"	#5/36 Lt Cols, #4/21 Sq/CCs
25	HLR Assessment	The HLR will select the appropriate box indicating concurrence or non-concurrence of the rater's assessment. See **paragraph 1.10** for disagreements.	X
26	Performance Statement(s)	Comments are mandatory and limited to the space provided; must contain at least one performance statement. See	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		paragraph 1.12 for inappropriate comments. See **paragraph 1.11** for referrals. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement. HLRs may include assignment and/or developmental education recommendations. See **paragraph 3.16.3**.	
***27**	Higher Level Reviewer Name, Grade and Branch of Service (For ANG, the use of component ID [e.g., XXANG] may be used.)	Enter the HLR's information. The HLR is position-based. HLRs assigned on or prior to the close-out date, enter information as of the close-out date; HLRs assigned after the close-out date, enter the information as of the date signed.	Sue J. Doe, Col, USAF Sally S. Mesaros, SES (O-9 equivalent), DAF Austin T. Smith, GS-15, DAF Jeremy R. Dice, NH-IV (O-6 equivalent), DAF Jacob M. Freer, Col, KSANG
28	Higher Level Reviewer Duty Title		Commander
29	Higher Level Reviewer Organization and Command		123d Operations Group (ACC)
30	Higher Level Reviewer Signature	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite, stamp, or type the date next to the signature (DD MMM YY). Do not sign blank forms that do not contain comments and/or ratings, sign before the close-out date (only on or after), or date	

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		before the date the rater signed it or earlier than the date of the ratee's endorsement to a referral letter. See **paragraph 1.4.12**.	
	Functional Examiner/Air Force Advisor		
31	Functional Examiner and/or Air Force Advisor	When applicable, place an "X" in the appropriate box(es) See **paragraph 1.6.7**. Select "No comments" or "Comments" as applicable.	X
32	Functional Examiner and/or Air Force Advisor Comments	The comments block(s) will appear if "Functional Examiner" and/or "Air Force Advisor boxes are marked. If used, comments are limited to the space provided.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
33	Functional Examiner and/or Air Force Advisor Name, Grade, Branch of Service	Enter the functional examiner/advisor's information as of the close-out date.	Sue J. Doe, Col, USAF Sally S. Mesaros, SES (O-9 equivalent), DAF Austin T. Smith, GS-15, DAF Jeremy R. Dice, NH-IV (O-6 equivalent), DAF Jacob M. Freer, Col, KSANG
34	Functional Examiner and/or Air Force Advisor Duty title	Enter the functional examiner/advisor's duty title.	Command Financial Manager
35	Functional Examiner and/or Air Force Advisor Signature	The forms have digital signature and auto-date capability. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite, stamp or type the date. Do not sign blank forms that do	

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		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. Rater assessment block will be locked, and HLR signature capability unlocked with the rater's digital signature. See **paragraph 1.4.12**.	
	Referral Report		
***36**	Referral Report Comments	Complete this section if there is a comment in the rater's assessment and/or HLR assessment of the evaluation causing the evaluation to become a referral. Do not complete this section if there is not a comment in the rater's assessment and/or HLR assessment of the evaluation causing the evaluation to become a referral. See **paragraph 1.11**.	
37	Referring Evaluator Name, Grade, and Branch of Service	Enter the referring evaluator's information as of the SCOD. However, if the officer has a PCS or PCA on or after the accountability date, use the rater as of the established accounting date.	Sue J. Doe, Col, USAF Sally S. Mesaros, SES (O-9 equivalent), DAF Austin T. Smith, GS-15, DAF Jeremy R. Dice, NH-IV (O-6 equivalent), DAF

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
			Jacob M. Freer, Col, KSANG
38	Referring Evaluator Duty Title	Enter the referring evaluator's information as of the SCOD. However, if the officer has a PCS or PCA on or after the accountability date, use the rater as of the established accounting date.	Deputy Commander
39	Referring Evaluator Signature	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite, stamp, or type the date next to the signature (DD MMM YY). Do not sign blank forms that do not contain comments and/or 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.	
40	Date	Date will auto populate when report is signed.	27 Mar 2023
41	Signature of Ratee	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, sign in reproducible blue or black ink and handwrite, stamp, or type the date next to the signature (DD MMM YY). Do not sign blank forms that do not contain comments and/or ratings, sign before the close-out date (only on or after), or date	

	OFFICER PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		before the date the rater signed it or earlier than the date of the ratee's endorsement to a referral letter.	
42	Date	Date will auto populate when report is signed.	27 Mar 2023
Note: There are minor formatting differences between the PDF version (AF Form 715) of the ALQ evaluation and the system generated version completed in myEval.			

Table 3.2. When to Prepare Officer Evaluations (Warrant Officer 1 thru Colonel).

RULE	A If (See Notes 1 and 2)	B Then write evaluation and enter reason as (See Note 10)
1	subsequent evaluations will close out on the SCOD (based on grade). **(T-1)**. See **Note 3** and **Note 4**.	Annual
2	the ratee's performance or conduct is unsatisfactory or marginal and a special evaluation is appropriate, and the supervision period was 60 calendar days. See **Note 5**.	DBC
3	the ratee has been declared missing-in-action, captured, or detained in captive status. See **Note 6**.	DBH
4	a special evaluation is directed by HAF (see **Note 7** and **Note 8**), or NGB for ANG officers.	DBH
5	the ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter. See **Note 9**.	DBC
6	any sentence of confinement as the result of a court-martial.	DBC

Notes:

1. Colonels selected for promotion to brigadier general receive evaluations IAW **Chapter 7**.

2. If the officer evaluation 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 officer evaluation is a valid evaluation and remains in the ratee's records.

3. See **Table 3.3** for appropriate SCODs. (RegAF and AFR only) Evaluations for officers selected for promotion will have a close-out date on the SCOD of the projected grade. **(T-1)** (AFR only) An officer must have at least 16 points (do not include Extension Course Institute or membership points) and 120 calendar days of duty performance outside of a training report to receive an ALQ evaluation; if the officer does not meet this requirement by the SCOD, submit an administrative LOE for a gap report.

4. For an officer who enters active duty, the first evaluation will be required at the next SCOD for their respective grade, given there is at least 180 days between the EAD and the SCOD. **(T-1)** For AFR officers, the first evaluation will be required at the next SCOD for the ratee's respective grade, given there is at least 180 days between the EAD and the SCOD and a minimum of 16 points (do not include Extension Course Institute or membership points); if the ratee had not earned the required number of points, the officer will receive a gap report utilizing an administrative LOE. **(T-1)**

5. This includes placement on the control roster (Director, NGB; Office of Adjutant General; MAJCOM; wing, group, squadron).

6. Do not prepare evaluations for periods of missing-in-action, 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 missing-in-action, captured, or detained in captive status. These evaluations are as directed by AFPC/DPPSP or ARPC/DPTSE.

7. {RegAF and ANG only} AFPC/DPPSP, AFPC MLR OFFICE, and AF/A1LO retain the authority to direct evaluations under this rule. Special evaluations covering outstanding duty performance are not permitted under this rule.

8. {AFR only} AF/REP retains the authority to direct evaluations under this rule. If AF/RE requires special evaluations on certain officers for selection board use, ARPC/DPTSE furnishes ratee names to the MAJCOM along with appropriate suspense dates and directs submission of evaluations under this rule. Special evaluations covering outstanding duty performance are not permitted under this rule.

9. The close-out date of the evaluation is the effective date the ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter, and may only comment on the negative behavior.

10. {AFR only} For Individual Mobilization Augmentees (IMAs), Participating Individual Ready Reserve (PIRR) and Participating Individual Ready Reserve Category E (PIRR Category E), the unit of assignment is responsible for completing the officer evaluation.

Table 3.3. Static Close-out Dates (SCODs) and Accounting Dates for Officer ALQ Evaluations.

Grade (includes selectees)	Static Close-out Date (See Note 1)	Accounting Date (See Note 2)
WO1, CW2, 2d Lt, and 1st Lt	31 Oct	3 Jul
CW3 and Capt	31 Aug	3 May
CW4, CW5, Maj, and Lt Col	31 May	3 Feb
Col	28 Feb	3 Nov

Note:
1. In a leap year, the SCOD will remain 28 Feb, and 29 Feb will be the start of the next reporting period.
2. Accounting dates are approximately 120 calendar days prior to each SCOD and are established as the 3rd of the month for consistency.

Table 3.4. Summary of Authorized Stratification Peer Groups.

RULE	A		B	C
	If an evaluator		**then the ratee's primary stratification is (See Note 1)**	**and the secondary stratification may be either**
1	has under their scope of responsibility	USAF officer(s) only	grade without descriptor (e.g., #1/40 Lt Cols; #2/6 CW3s) (See **Note 3)**	- Duty position (e.g., #1/6 Flight Commanders) (See **Note 4)**, or - Developmental category grade (e.g., #1/7 LAF-C Lt Cols), or - Subordinate echelon grade (e.g., #6/25 WSA Capts) **(HLR only)** - (ARC only) AFR or ANG grade (e.g., #1/8 ANG Lt Cols) (See **Note 5)** See **paragraph 3.15.7.2**.
2		DAF officer(s) (only USAF and USSF)	"DAF" grade (e.g., #1/24 DAF Lt Cols)	- USAF grade (e.g., #1/7 USAF Majs), or - Duty position (e.g., #1/6 Flight Commanders) (See **Note 4**), or - Developmental category grade (e.g., #1/7 LAF-C Lt Cols), or - Subordinate echelon grade (e.g., #6/25 WSA Capts) **(HLR only)**
3		Joint officer(s) (USAF and/or USSF plus at least one officer from another military service)	"Joint" Grade (e.g., #1/7 Jt O-4s; #1/5 Jt CW4s)	

				- (ARC only) AFR or ANG grade (e.g., #1/8 ANG Lt Cols) (See **Note 5)** See **paragraph 3.15.7.2**.
4		AFR officers in a participation category of TR, IMA, ART, AGR, VLPAD, LEAD, or EAD	Participation category grade (e.g., #1/8 IMA Majs) See **paragraph 3.15.7.1.5**.	- Duty position (e.g., #1/6 Flight Commanders), or - Developmental category grade (e.g., #1/7 LAF-C Lt Cols), or - Subordinate echelon grade (e.g., #6/25 WSA Capts) **(HLR only)** - (AFR only) AFR grade (e.g., #1/8 AFR Lt Cols) (See **Note 5)** See **paragraph 3.15.7.2**.
6	(RegAF and AFR only) has a ratee who is a promotion "select"		not authorized (See **Note 3)**	- Duty position (e.g., #1/6 Flight Commanders) (See **Note 4)** See **paragraphs 3.15.6.6** and **3.15.7.3**.
7	is the same grade as the ratee, (See **Note 2**)		(See **Note 2**) optional for use by the HLR in accordance with **paragraph 3.15.7.4.2**.	- Duty position (e.g., #1/6 Flight Commanders), (See **Note 4**)

			See **paragraph 3.15.7.2**.

Notes:

1. A primary stratification must be used to use a secondary stratification. See **paragraphs 3.15.7.3** and **3.15.7.4** for authorized exceptions. The primary and secondary stratification denominators for the HLR may not exceed the number of evaluations signed by the HLR on that specific SCOD, except for DAF and Joint stratifications as detailed at **paragraph 3.15.7.4.1**; neither the primary nor the secondary stratification denominators shall include all officers within an HLR's scope of responsibility (e.g., SRID) unless the HLR is a signatory on the evaluations of all officers within that scope. See **paragraph 3.15.7.4.1**.

2. Optional use of a primary stratification when the rater and ratee are the same grade is only authorized for the HLR. Duty position is the only authorized secondary stratification. See **paragraph 3.15.7.4.2**.

3. Promotion "selects" may be considered in denominator pools for grade stratifications on the SCOD of the lower (current) grade.

4. Duty position is the only category that stratification denominators may include civilians and/or international officers in equivalent duty positions.

5. Raters may also use AFR or ANG as a descriptor to a secondary stratification within an evaluator's scope of authority as long as the stratification is within an authorized peer group and must be used among officers in the same grade (e.g., "#3/7 Majs; #1/3 AFR Analysts").

Chapter 4

ENLISTED ALQ EVALUATIONS/ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEFS (EPBS)

4.1. General Guidelines.

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

4.1.2. Evaluations are used to determine selections for promotions, job and school recommendations, career job reservations, reenlistments, retraining, and assignments. Therefore, evaluators at all levels must use caution to prevent inflation. It is important to distinguish performance among peers and is a disservice when ratings are inflated or inaccurate.

4.1.3. Marking Promotion Recommendations, When Used, on Wet Signature Evaluations. When electronic means are not used, do not hand-mark until signing the evaluation to prevent erroneous entries by other personnel. When hand-marking, use only reproducible dark blue or black ink.

4.1.4. There will be only two evaluators on the enlisted ALQ evaluation unless the rater qualifies as a single evaluator (see **paragraph 4.12.4**): the rater and the HLR. The HLR is the final evaluator (see **paragraph 4.12.5**.).

4.2. Enlisted Evaluation Forms. All enlisted members will use myEval to process ALQ evaluations. See **Table 4.9**. The AF Form 716 will be used by exception only (see **paragraph 1.3.3.1**.).

4.3. When to Accomplish an Enlisted Evaluation.

4.3.1. All enlisted personnel in the grade of SrA through CMSgt will receive an evaluation as of the appropriate SCOD for their grade. ABs, Amn, and A1Cs will receive an evaluation upon completing a minimum of 36 months time in service (TIS) as of the SrA SCOD, 31 March. If the rater PCSs/PCAs before the SCOD, the rater will complete a draft evaluation, and the rating chain from the unit as of the accounting date will complete the evaluation.

4.3.2. See **Table 4.13** for Premier Band Airmen enlisted evaluation guidance.

4.3.3. 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. The Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff retains discretionary authority to render evaluations on an optional basis on the Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff Senior Enlisted Advisor. Chief of the National Guard Bureau retains discretionary authority to render evaluations on an optional basis on the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

4.3.4. Military/Civilian Confinement. HQ AFPC will complete a DAF Form 77 for Airmen who choose to remain in the Air Force following overturn of a sentence adjudged at a court-martial by a subsequent appeals court. The inclusive dates will be the day after the close-out date of the ratee's last evaluation through the day the ratee was returned to present for duty status or the date the sentence is overturned, whichever is earlier. The unit to which the Airman transfers following the return to present for duty will take over performance evaluation responsibilities, beginning the day following DAF Form 77 completion through to the applicable annual SCOD.

4.3.5. Separation/Retirement. Annual evaluations are optional for members with an approved effective date of separation or retirement that is prior to the next SCOD, unless mandated in accordance with **paragraph 4.3**. **Example:** If the approved retirement date is 30 Sep 25 or earlier, and if the SCOD is 30 Sep 25, no evaluation is required; however, if the retirement date is 1 Oct 25 or later, then an evaluation is required. If an Airman is promotion eligible, then a report is required. **(T-1)** Supervisors will consult with separating or retiring Airmen regarding the option to complete a final evaluation. **(T-3)** Leadership shall consider the member's preference when deciding whether or not to accomplish their final evaluation. **(T-3)** After consulting with the individual, the supervisor will annotate the ALQ evaluation accordingly and process the evaluation to the lowest level HLR for signature. **(T-1)** Airmen are encouraged to complete a final evaluation for future considerations (e.g., employment, transfer into another DAF component). An evaluation will not be accomplished after a member has officially separated/retired. **(T-1)**

4.3.5.1. Complete a final evaluation when requested by the ratee, decided by the rater, commander, or senior rater, or mandated in accordance with **paragraph 4.3**. Supervisors and commanders are responsible for completing mandatory evaluations before members final out-process or officially separate/retire. **(T-1)**

4.3.5.2. When a final report will not be rendered, for administrative and tracking purposes, complete the appropriate evaluation form as follows:

4.3.5.2.1. Include "FINAL REPORT NOT REQUIRED AND/OR IS NOT MANDATED TO BE RENDERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFI 36-2406," In the first rater's assessment block ("Executing the Mission") on the ALQ evaluation. Include "THIS SECTION NOT USED," in the remaining rater's and HLR's assessment blocks on the ALQ evaluation.

4.3.5.2.2. The member, rater, HLR will endorse the report no earlier than 30 calendars days before the member's final-out process, or before the member officially separates/retires. **(T-1)**

4.4. Evaluations not Authorized. Performance evaluations will not be accomplished on the following:

4.4.1. RegAF personnel in the grade of AB-A1C with less than 36 months total active federal military service as of the SrA SCOD and ARC personnel in the grades of AB-A1C if they have not already received an evaluation. **Exception:** A DBC may be completed on these personnel to document substandard performance only after a minimum of 20 months TIS. See **paragraph 4.7.3.1.4** and **Table 4.2**.

4.4.2. Members who die while on active duty or in the selected reserve. **Exception:** If the death occurred on or after the close-out date of an evaluation that was already being processed, it becomes an optional evaluation.

4.4.3. Commissioning Program. Airmen who are enrolled in a commissioning program as of the SCOD. **Note:** If an Airman does not complete a program and is returned to enlisted service, complete a DBH enlisted ALQ evaluation to document the performance that resulted in removal from the program. The inclusive period will be from the last evaluation through the effect date of removal from the commissioning program.

4.4.4. Airmen in prisoner or confinement status as a result of a court-martial conviction, who have PCS'd and are gained to a long-term confinement facility managed by the Air Force Security Forces Center. **Note:** Airmen awaiting publication of a sentence adjudged at a court-martial will remain the administrative responsibility of the losing unit commander/director until such time as the sentence adjudged at a court-martial is published and the member is officially transferred to an Air Force Security Forces Center managed correctional facility. These Airmen will still require SCOD evaluations (as applicable), completed by the losing commander/director.

4.4.5. Airmen undergoing appellate review leave and awaiting an appeals court decision and still permanently assigned to an Air Force Security Forces Center-managed confinement facility.

4.5. When to Submit an Enlisted Evaluation.

4.5.1. See **Table 4.2** for RegAF Airmen and ARC Airmen on AGR or Statutory (Stat) Tour.

4.5.2. See **Table 4.3** for part-time ARC Airmen.

4.6. "FROM" Dates. Establish the "FROM" date if the member:

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

4.6.2. For RegAF Airmen who have not had a previous evaluation, the "FROM" date equals the total active federal military service date.

4.6.3. For United States Air Force Academy Airmen removed from cadet status and returned to enlisted grade the "FROM" date equals the extended active duty date.

4.6.4. For AFR members who have not had a previous evaluation, use the member's date of assignment to the ARC. For SrA and below use the DIEMS. For members transferring to a different component (e.g., RegAF to ARC, ANG to AFR, etc.) or ARC members changing status (e.g., AGR to Non-AGR), the "FROM" date equals the day after the last evaluation's closeout date. This will not apply if there is a break in service.

4.6.5. For ANG SrA and below who have not had a previous evaluation, the "FROM" date equals the DIEMS. SSgt through CMSgt who are transferred from any branch or component, the "FROM" date equals date arrive station.

4.7. "THRU" Dates.

4.7.1. First Annual/First Biennial Reports.

4.7.1.1. For RegAF the close-out date will be the first SCOD after the Airman attains the grade of SrA or reaches 36 months time in service as of the SCOD (whichever occurs first).

4.7.1.2. For ARC the close-out date will be the first SCOD reached as a SrA.

4.7.2. Annual/Biennial Reports.

4.7.2.1. Reports for RegAF Members. Reports will close-out on the next appropriate SCOD unless selected for promotion. Those on a select list will have their evaluation close-out on the appropriate SCOD for their promotion selected grade. **Example:** The SSgt SCOD is 31 Jan; therefore, SSgt evaluations will close-out on that date. However, TSgt selects (SSgts/Sgts with a line number) will have their evaluations close-out on the TSgt SCOD on 30 Nov.

4.7.2.2. Reports for ARC Members. Reports will close-out on the appropriate SCOD. If a promotion, demotion or transfer out of inactive/active occurs and there is more than 24 months (12 months for AGR) from the last evaluation and the SCOD for the new grade, a DBH report is required. The close out is the day prior to when the status occurred. **Example:** An AGR MSgt is promoted to SMSgt effective 1 Sep 23. A DBH report will be required to close out 31 Aug 23 because the member will have more than 12 months from the last evaluation and the new static close-out date for the new grade.

4.7.3. For Directed by Headquarters, NGB, or Commander (MAJCOM, wing, group, or squadron, as appropriate) reports, the "THRU" date will be established by the following:

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

4.7.3.1.1. Missing-in-Action/Captured/Detained. Use the date the ratee was placed in missing-in-action, captured, or detained in captive status.

4.7.3.1.2. Stripes for Exceptional Performers or supplemental promotions. If an Airman is Stripes for Exceptional Performers-promoted or selected for supplemental promotion to the next higher grade, and if completing an evaluation on the next SCOD in the new grade will create a reporting period of longer than one year, then a DBH enlisted evaluation must be completed with a close-out date effective the date of Stripes for Exceptional Performers promotion or the date which the results of the supplemental were released. **Examples:**

4.7.3.1.2.1. SSgt McDaniel was selected for supplemental promotion or Stripes for Exceptional Performers promoted to TSgt on 15 Apr 23 and SSgt McDaniel had an enlisted evaluation on the SSgt SCOD date of 31 Jan 23, then no enlisted evaluation is required as TSgt (or TSgt select) McDaniel will receive a performance evaluation on 30 Nov 23 (TSgt SCOD).

4.7.3.1.2.2. SSgt Snowden was selected for supplemental promotion or Stripes for Exceptional Performers promoted to TSgt on 10 Jan 23. TSgt (or TSgt select) Snowden's last evaluation was completed on the 31 Jan 22 (SSgt SCOD) and the next projected enlisted evaluation is the 30 Nov 23 (TSgt SCOD). Since this creates a rating period of longer than one year, a DBH enlisted evaluation is required with a close-out date effective the date of the supplemental release/Stripes for Exceptional Performers promotion date.

4.7.3.1.3. If an Airman is demoted after the SCOD of the grade held prior to demotion, an enlisted evaluation will be completed as of the previous grade's SCOD and, subsequently, as of the SCOD of the new grade. **Example:** TSgt Smith is demoted to SSgt effective 5 Dec 23. The now-SSgt Smith will receive an evaluation on the TSgt SCOD of 30 Nov 23 and, subsequently, on the SSgt SCOD of 31 Jan 24.

4.7.3.1.4. Directed by Commander (DBC). A DBC will be a referral evaluation, and the close-out date will be established by the unit commander that directed the evaluation. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 1.11** for referral procedures. DBC evaluations provide flexibility to commanders to document substandard performance between SCODs as an embedded report (between two enlisted SCOD ALQ evaluations) and will only contain comments regarding the reason(s) for the evaluation (i.e., only the substandard performance). **(T-1)** All other comments, specifically those that are positive, and promotion recommendations are not authorized and will be documented on the next SCOD evaluation. **(T-1) Note**: A1C or below with less than 36 months total active federal military service (or 36 months time in service from the DIEMS for ARC) shall not receive an enlisted evaluation unless the member has a minimum of 20 months TIS.

4.7.3.1.5. Career Intermission Program (CIP). Members entering CIP will receive a DBH ALQ evaluation if there are more than 120 days from the closeout date of the last evaluation to the first day of entering CIP. The closeout date will be 30 days prior to the first day of entering CIP. Upon returning from CIP, an annual evaluation will be required at the next SCOD for the member's respective grade, given there are at least 180 days between returning from CIP and the SCOD.

4.7.3.1.6. Inter-Service Transfer. Members being separated from the USAF to transfer to another US DoD service will receive a DBH ALQ evaluation if there are more than 120 days from the closeout date of the last evaluation and the member's separation date. The closeout date will be 30 calendar days prior to the member's separation date.

4.7.4. 365-day Extended Deployment Enlisted Evaluations. **Note**: These instructions apply only to those individuals who are selected to fill an official extended deployment requirement. **(T-1)** These instructions will not be used for individuals filling other requirements, even though they may be extended to, or beyond 365-days. **(T-1)**

4.7.4.1. Home Station Rating Chain Responsibilities Prior to Departure. If the deployed rater is known prior to departure, the CSS/HR specialist will update the deployed rater. **(T-1)** 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 manner. **Example**: If the data is not updated immediately, a feedback notification report on individual personnel will be produced within 30 days, and that alone should act as a reminder to the commander that the deployed data needs to be updated.

4.7.4.2. Upon Arrival in the Area of Responsibility (AOR). The home station CSS/HR specialist will coordinate with the deployed PERSCO team and update MilPDS to reflect the member's deployed duty title and DAFSC effective the date the member arrives in the AOR. **(T-1)** They will also update the deployed rater if the rater was unknown prior to departure. **(T-1)** All updates should be completed as soon as possible but no later than 30 days after the member arrives in the AOR.

4.7.4.2.1. Duty Title Format. All extended deployment personnel duty titles will be standardized to reflect the extended deployment "duty title/country" assigned. **(T-1)** If space allows, include the unit assigned. **Example**: "Senior Enlisted Leader, 442 ECS/Iraq" or "Comm Specialist, GSU/Afghanistan."

4.7.4.2.2. When determining the deployed rater, the rater should typically be the person who directly supervises the individual's day-to-day activities. The unit that owns the unit line number will determine the rater. **(T-1)** 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. **(T-1)** In accordance with 10 U.S.C. § 9013, DAFI 51-509 and Joint Publication 1, Volume 2, SecAF is responsible for the ADCON and support of DAF forces assigned or attached to combatant commands. **(T-0)** ADCON is the authority necessary to fulfill SecAF's statutory responsibilities for administration and support. In joint environments, an Air Force unit will be designated to have ADCON responsibilities over Airmen. **(T-1)** ADCON responsibilities include personnel management. With regard to evaluations, this involves managing the evaluation program, ensuring evaluations are accomplished on individuals on extended deployments as well as decorations and informal LOEs processed per local and air component command or MAJCOM direction. ADCON responsibility does not necessarily extend to writing the evaluations on those attached to the Air Force unit for ADCON purposes; however, this is at the discretion of the ADCON commander.

4.7.4.3. Upon Return from the AOR:

4.7.4.3.1. 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. **(T-1)**

4.7.4.3.2. The home station forced distributor will continue to complete the commander's review/reviewer's (senior rater) portion of all evaluations, including those completed by the deployed rating chain. **(T-1)**

4.7.4.4. Forced Distributor/Senior Rater Responsibilities. The forced distributor/senior rater matched to the ratee's home station PAS code must perform forced distributor/senior rater duties (enlisted personnel will be on the home station forced distributor/senior rater's MEL). **(T-1)**

4.8. Number of Days Rater Supervised.

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

4.8.2. Do not deduct any periods of leave, TDY, absences or periods loaned out to other organizations. **Exception:** Non-rated periods authorized in accordance with **paragraph 1.4.11**.

4.8.3. When the rater's rater prepares an enlisted evaluation in accordance with **paragraph 1.7**, enter number of days for which the evaluator had personal or written knowledge of the ratee's duty performance during the reporting period.

4.9. Completing Evaluations. The rater will evaluate how well the ratee performed during the rating period by completing the rater assessment section of the ALQ evaluation. No evaluator may coerce another into changing their comments or ratings unless they are missing mandatory comments (**paragraph 1.11**), or the evaluation includes prohibited comments (**paragraph 1.12**). **(T-1)**

4.10. Promotion Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Time-In-Service (TIS) eligibility (AB - TSgt only).

4.10.1. TIG/TIS requirements are based on promotion eligibility as of the SCOD regardless of if a member is promotion ineligible for other reasons. TIG/TIS eligibility should be verified on the MEL, and the rater or HLR should verify with the CSS/MPF prior to selecting/changing that a member is promotion eligible in myEval.

4.10.2. Stratification statements are prohibited on the junior NCO ALQ evaluation.

4.11. Time-In-Grade (TIG)/Time-In-Service (TIS)/Senior Rater Stratification/Endorsement Eligibility (MSgt – SMSgt only).

4.11.1. TIG/TIS requirements are based on promotion eligibility as of the SCOD and are assigned before the accounting date. Senior rater stratification/endorsement is not automatic or mandatory. The decision to forward the evaluation for senior rater stratification/endorsement is determined by the evaluator who is eligible to close-out the evaluation and each level thereafter, without necessarily going to the senior rater.

4.11.1.1. The first evaluator of the organization in which the ratee is assigned, who meets the grade requirements to close-out the report, determines if a report will be forwarded for endorsement/stratification consideration. If the report is not forwarded to the senior rater for endorsement/stratification, the first evaluator who meets the grade requirements will close out (sign) the report as the HLR.

4.11.1.2. When a senior rater determines senior rater stratification is warranted, they will close out the report as the HLR. If senior rater endorsement/stratification is not warranted, the report will be returned to the first evaluator who meets the HLR grade requirements, and they will close-out (sign) the report as the HLR. **(T-1)**

4.11.1.3. Stratification statements by anyone (lower or higher in the chain-of-command) other than the senior rater are prohibited. This includes any other form of implied stratification (e.g., #1 SNCO," "my go to SNCO," "#1 First Sergeant," etc.). Stratification statements based on career field or functional community are prohibited. **(T-1)**

4.11.2. SNCO Stratifications.

4.11.2.1. {RegAF and AFR only} Senior rater HLRs may stratify up to 25% of SNCOs within their senior rater identification and only within each component. **(T-1)** The top 20% of SMSgts and top 10% of MSgts will receive a numerator and denominator stratification (#x of x). **(T-1)** An additional 5% of SMSgts and 15% of MSgts will receive a stratification of "Top 25% of (respective grade)." **(T-1)** When calculating the number of authorized stratifications, normal rounding rules apply (.49 rounds down to the whole number and .50 rounds up to the whole number). **Note:** (AFR only) Non-AGR members are to be included in the stratification denominator of eligible peer AGRs during off-cycle evaluation years. Further stratifying ARC personnel by status within component is prohibited.

4.11.2.1.1. SMSgt Stratification Calculations. To calculate the total number of authorized numerator and denominator stratifications for SMSgts, units will multiply the total number of eligible SMSgts by 20% and apply normal rounding rules. To calculate the total number of authorized "Top 25% of SMSgts" stratifications, units will multiply the total number of eligible SMSgts by 5% and apply normal rounding rules. This is the only authorized method to calculate the number of authorized stratifications. **(T-1) Example:** In a total eligible population of 29 SMSgts, the first 20% of eligible SMSgts (.2 x 29 = 5.8) rounds up to 6 total numerator and denominator stratifications among the 29 eligible SMSgts; an additional 5% of eligible SMSgts (.05 x 29 = 1.45) rounds down to 1 total "Top 25% of SMSgts" stratifications among the remaining 23 eligible SMSgts who did not receive a numerator and denominator stratification.

4.11.2.1.2. MSgt Stratification Calculations. To calculate the total number of authorized numerator and denominator stratifications for MSgts, units will multiply the total number of eligible MSgts by 10% and apply normal rounding rules. To calculate the total number of authorized "Top 25% of MSgts" stratifications, units will multiply the total number of eligible MSgts by 15% and apply normal rounding rules. This is the only authorized method to calculate the number of authorized stratifications. **(T-1) Example:** In a total eligible population of 11 MSgts, the first 10% of eligible MSgts (.10 x 11 = 1.1) rounds down to 1 total numerator and denominator stratification among the 11 eligible MSgts; an additional 15% of eligible MSgts (.15 x 11 = 1.65) rounds up to 2 "Top 25% of MSgts" stratifications among the remaining 10 eligible MSgts who did not receive a numerator and denominator stratification.

4.11.2.1.3. For units with less than the required TIG/TIS eligible members to start normal rounding rules (.49 rounds down to the whole number; .50 rounds up to the whole number), a stratification/endorsement statement either in a numerator and denominator format or a "Top 25%" format is authorized; the use of both stratification formats combined between the eligible members is not authorized. See Tables **4.10** and **4.11**.

4.11.2.2. {ANG only} Enlisted stratifications are at the discretion of each TAG/Command equivalent for NGB staff. Senior rater HLRs may stratify up to 25% of SNCOs within the senior rater identification and by component. The top 20% of SMSgts and top 10% of MSgts will receive a numerator and denominator stratification (#x of x). **(T-1)** An additional 5% of SMSgts and 15% of MSgts will receive a stratification statement of "Top 25% of (respective grade)." **(T-1)** If used, see paragraphs **4.11.2.1.1** and **4.11.2.1.2** for instructions on how to calculate the number of authorized stratifications. For units with less than the required TIG/TIS eligible members to start normal rounding rules (.49 rounds down to the whole number; .50 rounds up to the whole number). See Tables **4.10** and **4.11**. **Note:** Further stratifying ARC personnel by status within component is prohibited.

4.11.2.3. {RegAF only} Joint Stratifications. In joint organizations, a stratification referencing the joint population (e.g., "#1 of 8 Joint E-7s"; or, "Top 25% of Joint E-8s") may be used as a secondary stratification if the member receives a "Top 25% of promotion eligible USAF SNCO stratification." Joint stratification statements will include all SNCOs in the same grade from all US DoD services, regardless of component promotion eligibility, under the HLR's scope of supervision. The HLR's denominator may exceed the number of USAF SNCOs at the SCOD but still may not exceed the number of evaluations signed by the HLR for all their SNCOs of the same grade during their annual evaluation cycle. The authorized number of "Joint" stratifications will be calculated using the total joint population of SNCOs. **Example:** An HLR signs evaluations for 3 USAF E-7s, 2 USN E-7s, 3 Army E-7s; therefore, the secondary stratification denominator may not exceed 8. See paragraphs **4.11.2.1.1** and **4.11.2.1.2**. The HLR will document the "Joint" stratification in the HLR assessment comment section only. If an HLR has both, and only USAF and USSF SNCOs, the use of "Joint" as a stratification category is not authorized.

4.11.2.4. {RegAF only} DAF Stratifications. If an HLR has both, and only, eligible USAF and USSF SNCOs of the same grade subordinate to them, a DAF stratification statement referencing the DAF population (e.g., "#2 of 9 DAF SMSgts"; "Top 25% of DAF MSgts") may be used as a secondary stratification if the member receives a "Top 25% of promotion eligible USAF SNCO stratification" in lieu of "Joint" since "Joint" is not permissible among only USAF and USSF SNCOs; however, "DAF" may not be used as a stratification category if there are any other US DoD service SNCOs in the same grade and subordinate to the same rater. The HLR's denominator may exceed the number of USAF SNCOs at the SCOD but still may not exceed the number of evaluations signed by the HLR for all their SNCOs of the same grade during their annual evaluation cycle. The authorized number of "DAF" stratifications will be calculated using the total DAF population of SNCOs. See paragraphs **4.11.2.1.1** and **4.11.2.1.2**. The HLR will document the "DAF" stratification in the HLR assessment comment section only.

4.11.2.5. {RegAF only} Airmen with an approved high year of tenure retirement date prior to the first day of the month promotion increments begin will not be factored into senior rater allocations.

4.11.2.6. The ratee must meet all of the following minimum requirements as of the close-out date of the evaluation (except as authorized by **paragraph 4.12.5.6** due to forced endorsements):

4.11.2.6.1. Meet the TIG eligibility requirements outlined in **Table 4.12**.

4.11.2.6.2. Successfully completed an Associate's or higher-level degree from a nationally or regionally accredited academic institution in any discipline or specialty. The degree must be awarded as of the close-out date of the evaluation. Completing the last required course, College Level Examination Program, or Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Services is not sufficient.

4.11.2.6.3. Have a current fitness assessment and meet minimum fitness standards as of the SCOD.

4.11.2.7. Evaluators are prohibited from placing any form of stratification in either an ALQ performance statement section or HLR assessment comment section. **Exception:** For "Joint" or "DAF" stratifications, the HLR will document the stratification in the HLR assessment comment section only.

4.11.2.8. Airmen Assigned to Units Above the Management Level. Airmen assigned directly to the offices of the President of the United States (POTUS), Vice President of the United States (VPOTUS), SecDef, CJCS, SecAF, CSAF, CSO, CMSAF, and CMSSF with that individual as their direct reporting official are above the management level and require special provisions because they do not fall within the usual jurisdiction of a management level. These select units generally have few promotion eligible airmen. The above the management levels have unconstrained stratifications.

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

4.11.3.1. When the senior rater is the rater, the senior rater will mark the "Forced Endorsement" box on the ALQ evaluation. **(T-2)**

4.11.3.2. When the senior rater is the evaluator named in a referral section of the ALQ evaluation. **(T-2)**

4.11.4. If the member is not TIG/TIS-eligible for a senior rater stratification/endorsement, the HLR will be the evaluator in the position organizationally closest to the airman. For members assigned to wing/base-level units, the HLR is the commander on G-series orders/civilian unit director (detachment commanders and section commanders must be in the grade of O-4/GS-12/equivalent or higher). For members assigned to a wing staff agency, the head of the specific agency (e.g., Wg/JA, Wg/Chaplain, etc.) will serve as the HLR, only when in the grade of O-5/GS-13/equivalent or higher, for those respective staff agencies; allowing the head of the agency to serve as the HLR provides the same level HLR as comparable squadrons. **(T-1)** For members assigned outside of a wing/base structure (e.g., HAF staffs, MAJCOMs, NAFs, FOAs, DRUs, etc.), the HLR is the first O-5/GS-13/NH-III/equivalent or higher in the rating chain who is no higher in the organization than the senior rater.

4.11.5. Determine TIG/TIS eligibility for senior rater stratification/endorsement using the formulas below. See the TIG Eligibility Chart, **Table 4.12**.

4.11.5.1. For MSgt ratees (RegAF only).

4.11.5.1.1. If the close-out date is on or before 30 Sep, determine the number of months TIG from date of rank (DOR) to 1 Mar of the next year following the evaluation close-out date. If less than 20 months, then TIG eligibility is "NO." If greater than or equal to 20 months, then TIG eligibility is "YES." All Airmen meeting a promotion board are required to have an enlisted evaluation on file closed out within 12 months of the promotion eligibility cutoff date.

4.11.5.1.2. If the close-out date is after 30 Sep, determine the number of months TIG from the date of rank to 1 Mar two years following the evaluation close-out date. If less than 20 months, TIG eligibility is "NO." If greater than or equal to 20 months, TIG eligibility is "YES." All Airmen meeting a promotion board are required to have an enlisted evaluation on file closed out within 12 months of the promotion eligibility cutoff date.

4.11.5.2. For SMSgt Ratees (RegAF only).

4.11.5.2.1. If the close-out date is on or before 31 Jul, determine the number of months TIG from the date of rank to 1 Dec. If less than 21 months, then promotion TIG/TIS eligibility is "NO." If greater than or equal to 21 months, then promotion TIG/TIS eligibility is "YES."

4.11.5.2.2. If the close-out date is after 31 Jul, determine the number of months TIG from the date of rank to 1 Dec of the year following the evaluation close-out date. If less than 21 months, promotion TIG/TIS eligibility is "NO." If greater than or equal to 21 months, promotion TIG/TIS eligibility is "YES." All Airmen meeting a promotion board are required to have an enlisted evaluation on file closed out within 12 months of the promotion eligibility cutoff date. **(T-1)**

4.11.5.3. For SMSgt promotion selects (RegAF only). Promotion TIG/TIS eligibility is based upon the SCOD of the enlisted evaluation. If the SCOD falls on the day of or day after the promotion public release date (to include supplemental promotions), individuals on the selectee list are not eligible for senior rater endorsement on that evaluation. Conversely, if the SCOD enlisted evaluation closed out prior to the promotion public release date, the member is eligible for senior rater endorsement because they were still a MSgt as of the SCOD and not officially a SMSgt promotion selectee.

4.11.5.4. Senior raters must either use the following approved panel process (**paragraph 4.11.5.4.1**) to determine senior rater stratification/endorsement or develop and disseminate their own guidance within their organization no later than the accounting date of each evaluation cycle. **(T-1)**

4.11.5.4.1. Review the last five evaluations, all awards and decorations, career data brief, and the most recent fitness tracker report from myFitness. **(T-1)** Panel members will include the senior raters' command chief or senior enlisted advisor, as well as the first HLR, commander or director who submitted the evaluation for senior rater stratification/endorsement consideration. **(T-1)**

4.11.5.4.2. RegAF Airmen with an approved high year of tenure retirement date prior to the first day of the month promotion increments begin are no longer considered eligible for senior rater endorsement and will not be factored into senior rater endorsement allocations. **(T-1)**

4.11.5.4.3. Supplemental senior rater stratification/endorsement consideration will not be given for the following reasons:

4.11.5.4.3.1. Incorrect data reflected on the career data brief.

4.11.5.4.3.2. Denied forwarding for senior rater stratification/endorsement consideration due to incorrect data reflected on the MEL or career data brief.

4.11.5.4.3.3. MELs not returned to the MPF, or individual was "overlooked" on the listing.

4.11.5.4.3.4. Senior rater stratification/endorsement packages not completed/turned in/approved in time for consideration.

4.11.5.5. CMSgt and CMSgt-selects. The senior rater will be the HLR and will endorse all CMSgt ALQ evaluations. **(T-2)**

4.12. Higher Level Reviewers and Single Evaluators. The HLR is the final evaluator.

4.12.1. RegAF and AFR Higher Level Reviewers. For TSgt and below, the grade of an HLR must be an O-3/GS-12/NH-III/equivalent or higher; for MSgt – SMSgt, the grade of an HLR must be an O-5/GS-13/NH-III/equivalent or higher. **(T-1) Exceptions:** (1) for MSgt – SMSgt, unit commanders below the grade of O-5 on G-Series orders (detachment commanders and section commanders must be in the grade of O-4/GS-12/equivalent or higher) may sign as the HLR; (2) the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force (CMSAF) or Chief Master Sergeant of the Space Force (CMSSF) may endorse enlisted evaluations as a senior rater and may also serve as the HLR and as a single evaluator. See **paragraph 4.12.5** to determine the HLR.

4.12.2. ANG Higher Level Reviewers. The HLR must be at a minimum the unit commander (to include DSG Unit CCs) or the senior full-time officer serving in the grade of O-4/GS-12/NH-03 or higher, but no higher in organization than the senior rater. **(T-1) Exception:** The CMSAF or CMSSF may endorse enlisted evaluations as a senior rater and may also serve as the final evaluator.

4.12.3. For HLRs assigned on or prior to the 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.

4.12.4. Single Evaluator Only.

4.12.4.1. For SNCO Evaluations.

4.12.4.1.1. For SNCOs receiving a senior rater endorsement, a single evaluator must be an O-6/GS-15/NH-IV/equivalent or higher designated as a senior rater and may not be delegated to a lower-level evaluator.

4.12.4.1.2. For SNCOs not receiving a senior rater endorsement:

4.12.4.1.2.1. At the wing/base level, an O-5/GS-13/NH-III/equivalent or higher in the rating chain may serve as a single evaluator if also the rater. **Exception:** Unit commanders below the grade of O-5 on G-series orders may serve as a single evaluator if also the rater.

4.12.4.1.2.2. At above the wing/base-level, an O-6/GS-15/NH-IV/equivalent or higher in the rating chain may serve as a single evaluator if also the rater.

4.12.4.2. For junior enlisted evaluations, the forced distributor may serve as a single evaluator if also the rater.

4.12.4.3. Single Evaluator Exceptions.

4.12.4.3.1. If a ratee is not promotion eligible, or if a senior rater endorsement and/or stratification is not warranted, the SNCOA Commandant may serve as an HLR and single evaluator on MSgt and SMSgt enlisted evaluations within their direct rating chain and/or scope of responsibility. The SNCOA Commandant is also authorized to sign as a single evaluator on the junior enlisted ALQ evaluation for non-promotion eligible Airmen or if an enlisted forced distribution is not warranted.

4.12.4.3.2. The CMSAF or CMSSF may serve as an HLR and single evaluator if also the rater.

4.12.4.4. If the rater is a senior rater, the evaluation must close out at this level unless it is a referral evaluation. **(T-1)** The evaluator must meet both grade and evaluator requirements for each section of the applicable evaluation form and must be a commander/director. **(T-1)**

4.12.5. Determining the Higher Level Reviewer.

4.12.5.1. For CMSgts. The HLR will be the senior rater. **(T-1)** The senior rater must be at least an O-6/GS-15/NH-IV or higher, serving as a wing commander or equivalent or higher, and designated by the management level. **(T-1)**

4.12.5.2. For SMSgts and MSgts.

4.12.5.2.1. The HLR will be the senior rater only when senior rater stratification is warranted. **(T-1)** The senior rater must be at least an O-6/GS-15/NH-IV or higher, serving as a wing commander or equivalent or higher, and designated by the management level. **(T-1)**

4.12.5.2.2. If a senior rater stratification is not warranted, the HLR will be the evaluator in the position organizationally closest to the airman. For members assigned to wing/base-level units, the HLR will be the unit commander on G-series orders/civilian unit director (detachment commanders and section commanders must be in the grade of O-4/GS-12/equivalent or higher). **(T-1)** For members assigned to a wing staff agency, the head of the specific agency (e.g., Wg/JA, Wg/Chaplain, etc.) will serve as the HLR, only when in the grade of O-5/GS-13/equivalent or higher, for those respective staff agencies; allowing the head of the agency to serve as the HLR provides the same level HLR as comparable squadrons. **(T-1)** For members assigned outside a wing/base structure (e.g., HAF staffs, MAJCOMs, NAFs, FOAs, DRUs, etc.), the HLR is the first O-5/GS-13/NH-III/equivalent or higher in the rating chain who is no higher in the organization than the senior rater. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 4.12.5.5** for exceptions.

4.12.5.3. For RegAF TSgts and Below. The HLR will be the forced distributor. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 4.18.1.2**. For members assigned to an official 365-day extended deployment, see **paragraph 4.7.4.4**.

4.12.5.3.1. The forced distributor as of the SCOD will sign all junior enlisted ALQ evaluations (TSgt and below) assigned to their Forced Distributor Identification for TIG/TIS eligible Airmen (see paragraph **4.12.1** and **4.12.5.5** for exceptions regarding SNCOA commandants). **(T-1)**

4.12.5.3.2. If the forced distributor appointed another officer/civilian to represent them at the Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel, the signature authority is still the forced distributor. **(T-1) Exception:** In joint agencies, the Air Force element (AFELM)/CC on G-series orders is authorized to sign ALQ evaluations in lieu of the forced distributor when the forced distributor signs the MEL.

4.12.5.4. For ARC TSgts and Below. For wing/group/squadron-level organizational structures, the HLR will be the G-series orders commander or civilian director at the squadron or group assigned per the unit personnel management roster. **(T-1)** If assigned at the wing, the HLR is the deputy commander, delegable to the director of staff. **(T-1)** If assigned outside of a wing/base structure (e.g., HAF staffs, MAJCOMs, NAFs, FOAs, DRUs, etc.), the HLR will be the military or civilian director. **(T-1)** MAJCOM, FLDCOM, and CCMD commanders may delegate their HLR role/responsibility to the deputy commander.

4.12.5.5. HLR Exceptions. The SNCOA Commandant is designated as the HLR when the ALQ evaluation is not endorsed/stratified by the senior rater or the SNCO is non-promotion eligible. **(T-1)** The SNCOA Commandant is also authorized to sign as the HLR for non-promotion eligible TSgt and below Airmen or if an enlisted forced distribution is not warranted. Furthermore, if a ratee is not promotion eligible, or if a senior rater endorsement and/or stratification is not warranted, the SNCOA Commandant may act as the HLR on MSgt and SMSgt evaluations within their direct rating chain and/or scope of responsibility.

4.12.5.6. Senior Rater Forced Endorsement. This block will be marked when the senior rater must complete the HLR section, whether the ratee is TIG/TIS promotion-eligible or has completed the minimum requirements for senior rater stratification/endorsement, due to rating chain or final evaluator requirements.

4.12.6. Evaluators with Dual or Multiple Roles. When an evaluator serves in multiple roles on an enlisted evaluation, consider each section of the evaluation independently. The evaluator may include written comments in each separate section of the evaluation (**Example:** If the rater is also the senior rater and a SNCO is receiving a stratification/endorsement, then the rater and HLR sections will be completed and comments in both areas are authorized.). When an evaluator chooses not to include performance comments in a section, they will enter "THIS SECTION NOT USED" in the applicable section and sign. **(T-1)** Signature elements, to include the signature, are required in all sections of the evaluation regardless of whether there are performance comments included, or the evaluator has entered "THIS SECTION NOT USED." **Note**: For single evaluators, refer to **paragraph 4.12.4**.

4.13. Higher Level Reviewer Responsibilities.

4.13.1. The HLR reviews evaluations to ensure comments accurately describe performance. HLRs must return evaluations with unsupported comments for additional information or reconsideration. **(T-1)** However, HLRs may not coerce an evaluator to make changes.

4.13.2. The HLR will mark the "concur" or "non-concur" block. See **paragraph 1.10** for disagreements.

4.14. Performance Feedback Assessment.

4.14.1. Performance feedback assessments will be accomplished in accordance with **Chapter 2**.

4.14.2. The rater certifies that the required performance feedback assessment was conducted during the reporting period in myEval.

4.15. Authorized Evaluator Considerations and Comments.

4.15.1. {MSgt and SMSgts} Promotion Statements and Assignment Recommendations.

4.15.1.1. Promotion statements, limited to the next higher grade, are only authorized when a SNCO is TIG/TIS promotion-eligible and may only be made by the HLR in the HLR assessment comment section. The SNCO must have a current fitness assessment and must meet minimum fitness standards as of the SCOD. **Example:** The AF needs SMSgt Jacobs as a Chief today.

4.15.1.2. Promotion statements must refer to the ratee's next higher grade.

4.15.1.3. Promotion statements on promotion selectee evaluations are prohibited. **(T-1)**

4.15.1.4. Assignment recommendations are authorized regardless of TIG/TIS eligibility. **Examples:**

4.15.1.4.1. For a TIG/TIS promotion eligible MSgt, the HLR may state, "promote to SMSgt, then select for Flight Chief" as it states the next eligible grade and assignment.

4.15.1.4.2. For a MSgt not TIG/TIS promotion eligible, the HLR may not state, "promote to SMSgt, future Command Chief," as the ratee is not TIG/TIS eligible and the assignment recommendation is a CMSgt position. **(T-1)**

4.15.1.4.3. HLRs may also provide assignment recommendations in their comments. Like promotion statements, assignment recommendations may only be made by the HLR and may only refer to the positions in the ratee's current grade if not promotion eligible. **(T-1)** If the ratee is promotion eligible or a selectee, assignment recommendations may be made for positions in the current and selected grade.

4.15.2. {AB – TSgt} Promotion Statements in the HLR's section that are statements of fact (e.g., "selected for promotion Below-the-Promotion Zone" or "STEP promoted to TSgt") are authorized. Additionally, recommendations of "pushes" to commissioning sources are also authorized (e.g., "Selected for Officer Training School"). For AFR, promotion statements are authorized but are not required. **Note**: Promotion pushes to the next higher grade are prohibited.

4.15.3. Performance statements regarding an Airman serving in a ceremonial/event-related position that has a "title" higher than the grade the Airman currently holds is acceptable. **Examples:** An Honor Guard SrA serving as Noncommissioned Officer-in-Charge, Firing Team or Noncommissioned Officer-in-Charge, Colors during a ceremony. A SSgt serving as the First Sergeant of the Mess at a formal Order of the Sword Ceremony.

4.16. Inappropriate Comments Referring to Separation/Retirement, Civilian Employment, and Professional Military Education. Certain items are prohibited for consideration in the performance evaluation process and will not be commented upon on any Enlisted Evaluation System form. See **paragraph 1.12** for other prohibited considerations and comments. Except as authorized in the following paragraphs, do not consider, refer to, or include comments regarding:

4.16.1. Separation or retirement status. Comments referring to separation, retirement, or transfer to reserve status are prohibited. **(T-1)** However, comments may be warranted when an Airman displays a reluctance to accept responsibility, a negative attitude toward the job, and/or exhibits a decrease in performance that can be reasonably attributed to a pending separation or retirement. Comments are limited to the behavior and not the fact the Airman is separating, retiring or transferring to a reserve status. **Note:** Although comments are mandatory, the minimum performance statements required in accordance with **Table 4.9** may be used.

4.16.2. Civilian Employment. Comments about civil service jobs or other civilian occupations are prohibited unless it directly relates to the military position and their military performance. Recommendations for civilian employment are prohibited. **(T-1)**

4.16.3. Enlisted Professional Military Education Comments in Enlisted Evaluations. The only permissible professional military education comments in enlisted evaluations will be those referencing selections for an official professional military education award or completion of Senior Enlisted Joint Professional Military Education I/II web-based courses. All other comments, to include recommendation for any other professional military education and selection for any other professional military education attendance are prohibited. Comments referencing Air Force prerequisite professional military education (or US DoD service equivalent) selection, attendance and/or completion are prohibited, to include implied comments.

4.17. Ratee's Acknowledgement.

4.17.1. The rater is required to conduct face-to-face (end-of-reporting period) feedback in conjunction with presenting the evaluation to the ratee. **(T-1)** The enlisted evaluation serves as the feedback form. A performance feedback assessment form is not required. Electronic routing of the form does not excuse the rater from providing face-to-face feedback. Only in situations where face-to-face feedback is not feasible will feedback be conducted either by telephone or electronically. **(T-2)** 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 other electronic means and should verify the feedback was received and read.

4.17.2. The ratee's signature in the acknowledgment block does not constitute concurrence or non-concurrence of the content and/or rating of the evaluation. The signature is to acknowledge receipt of the evaluation and to certify the ratee reviewed the personal information on the form.

4.17.3. The ratee will sign after all other evaluators have signed. In cases where an Air Force advisor or acquisition/functional examiner is required to sign, the ratee's acknowledgment will occur after the advisor or examiner review.

4.17.4. The ratee must acknowledge receipt of the evaluation prior to the evaluation becoming a matter of record unless the ratee refuses or is unable to sign. The ratee will review and verify all dates, markings, and comments on the form. Significant discrepancies and administrative errors can be addressed at this time, and corrected if agreed by all parties before the evaluation becomes a matter of record. This is not to be interpreted to mean the ratee can refuse to sign if they disagree with the evaluation. If evaluators do not agree to change the evaluation and the ratee wishes to dispute it, the ratee should pursue the established appeal/correction avenues available to them as outlined in **Chapter 10** once the evaluation is a matter of record.

4.17.5. The rater will suspense the ratee three duty days (30 calendar days for ARC) to sign the evaluation. **(T-1)**

4.17.6. In cases where the ratee refuses to sign, any evaluator will select "Member declined to sign" from the drop-down menu in the ratee's acknowledgement block and sign the evaluation in the ratee's acknowledgement block.

4.17.7. In cases where the ratee is unable to sign, any evaluator will select "Member unable to sign" from the drop-down menu in the ratee's acknowledgement block and sign the evaluation in the ratee's acknowledgement block.

4.17.8. For the purpose of signing evaluations, the term "Member unable to sign" indicates that the member does not have access to a common access card-enabled computer (e.g., convalescent leave, TDY to a contractor facility without government computer access, deployed to a location without computer access, no longer have digital signature capability, in absent without leave or deserter status, etc.).

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

4.18. {RegAF Only} Forced Distribution (SrA – TSgt only).

4.18.1. Terms and Definitions.

4.18.1.1. Forced Distribution. The allocation of the top two promotion recommendations, "Promote Now" and "Must Promote," from a force distributor on the ALQ evaluation for junior enlisted Airmen for promotion eligible SrA, SSgts, and TSgts.

4.18.1.2. Forced Distributor (FD). For wing/group/squadron-level organizational structures, the FD will be the G-series orders commander or civilian director (delegable to section commander [minimum grade must be an O-3/GS-12/NH-III/equivalent or higher] only for non-TIG/TIS eligibles). For wings, the FD is the deputy commander, delegable to the director of staff. Within MAJCOMs, FLDCOMs, CCMDs, FOAs, DRUs, NAFs, and centers, the FD will be the military or civilian director. For MAJCOM, FLDCOM, and CCMD commanders, the FD will be the deputy commander.

4.18.1.3. Airmen Assigned to Units Above the Management Level. Airmen assigned directly to the offices of the President of the United States (POTUS), Vice President of the United States (VPOTUS), SecDef, CJCS, SecAF, CSAF, CSO, CMSAF, and CMSSF with that individual as their direct reporting official are above the management level and require special provisions because they do not fall within the usual jurisdiction of a management level. These select units generally have few promotion eligible airmen.

4.18.1.3.1. Allocation Process. To ensure these airmen receive full and fair consideration, the individual above the management level unit acts as the FD and receives their own promotion recommendation allocations. Since there is no opportunity for this small pocket of quality airmen to aggregate up, the above the management level heads are authorized to award additional promotion recommendations.

4.18.1.3.2. Promotion Recommendations. The above the management level heads are sole evaluators and may award "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" recommendations without constraints. They award all promotion recommendations and are not authorized to delegate.

4.18.1.4. Forced Distributor Identification (FDID). A nine-digit code that is assigned to a position/PAS code and identifies the FD.

4.18.1.5. Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel (EFDP). The EFDP is comprised of the EFDP president, command chief or Air Force senior enlisted leader (SEL), FDs of small units (flight chiefs/designated representatives for large units), and recorder.

4.18.1.6. Master Eligibility Listing (MEL). Identifies all Airmen with an enlisted evaluation scheduled to close out on the applicable SCOD as well as Airmen who are and are not TIG/TIS-eligible. The listing also reflects the number of promotion allocations earned.

4.18.1.7. Accounting Date. The date approximately 120 calendar days before the SCOD. This date is used as a file freeze in order to account for the actual number of eligible TIG/TIS promotion-eligible Airmen for each FD's PAS code(s). All Airmen who are separated/retired (actual date and not permissive TDY/Terminal Leave) prior to the established SCOD will be removed from the MEL. No changes will be made to the number of allocations on or after the SCOD unless specifically authorized by AFPC Evaluations Policy as an exception. **(T-1)** See **Table 4.6**.

4.18.1.8. Static Close-out Date (SCOD). This is the fixed annual date that all enlisted evaluations will close out for a specific grade. It is used to determine the final TIG/TIS-eligible pool for forced distribution allocations and senior rater stratification/endorsement. All Airmen who are separated/retired (actual date and not permissive TDY/Terminal Leave) prior to the established SCOD will be removed from the MEL. Enlisted evaluations cannot be signed before this date. **(T-1)** See Tables **4.7** and **4.8**.

4.18.1.9. Large Unit. Any organizational structure with 11 or more TIG/TIS-eligible Airmen (by grade) as of the SCOD.

4.18.1.10. Small Unit. Any organizational structure with 10 or less TIG/TIS-eligible Airmen (by grade) as of the SCOD.

4.18.1.10.1. Under a wing-level construct, squadrons, group staffs and wing staff agencies could be classified as small units. Under a direct reporting unit or field operating agency level construct, squadrons, group staffs, and directorates could be classified as small units.

4.18.1.10.2. Under an office of the Secretary of the Air Force (SAF)/HAF/CCMD/MAJCOM management level construct, subordinate directorates with military or civilian directors that are senior raters could be classified as small units.

4.18.2. EFDP Member Roles and Responsibilities.

4.18.2.1. Panel President. A voting and scoring panel member. They must be the senior rater assigned to the SRID or management level (assigned as the head of the management level); for combatant commands (CCMDs) this will be the Air Force element commander (the Air Force officer designated by the CCMD/CC as the AFELM/CC).

4.18.2.1.1. Responsibilities. Design and document procedures for their respective EFDP and perform administrative duties in connection with the proceedings.

4.18.2.1.2. Ensures all members understand discussions regarding individual records or award recommendations. Discussions between panel members are not to be shared outside of the panel process. However, at the completion of the panel process and the release of the promotion recommendations, panel members will out brief eligible members to provide feedback and increased transparency of the panel process.

4.18.2.1.3. Ensure the consideration of all Airmen nominated to the EFDP without prejudice or partiality in a consistent, fair, and equal manner.

4.18.2.1.4. Administer EFDP charge to all panel members prior to board convening. USSF panel President will administer the AF EFDP charges when presiding over an AF EFDP.

4.18.2.2. Command Chief or Air Force Senior Enlisted Leader. Serves as an advisor to the panel.

4.18.2.3. Forced Distributors. Voting and scoring panel members who represent Airmen nominated from their particular small unit.

4.18.2.4. Recorders. A non-voting and non-scoring member. Recorders will not serve on a panel for which they are being considered. They will also not assume the role or responsibilities of a voter, scorer, or advisor for the same panel.

4.18.2.4.1. Assists the EFDP president with ensuring panel proceedings meet all requirements.

4.18.2.4.2. Advises all panel members on the EFDP process and other administrative matters.

4.18.3. Delegation of Roles and Responsibilities.

4.18.3.1. EFDP President. Only under extraordinary circumstances may EFDP president responsibilities be delegated to the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (normally the deputy commander). If applicable, the deputy commander, etc., will delegate the FD authority for the small unit to the next senior Air Force officer/civilian. **(T-2) Example:** If the MAJCOM/CD is appointed EFDP president by the MAJCOM/CC, the next senior Air Force officer/civilian will be appointed FD for the MAJCOM's small unit FD.

4.18.3.1.1. Numbered Air Force/Center/Wing/Direct Reporting Unit/Field Operating Agency. The deputy wing commander, field operating agency or direct reporting unit deputy commander or director of staff, will serve as the "small unit commander" only when there are eligible Airmen assigned to those respective staff agencies, under the direct authority of the commander (senior rater). Senior raters will not serve in a dual-hatted capacity, where they act as both the small unit commander and EFDP president. **(T-1)** Allowing the deputy wing commander or director of staff to represent eligible staff agency Airmen at the EFDP as a panel member gives the senior rater impartiality as the EFDP president.

4.18.3.1.2. If the deputy commander or director of staff has been appointed as the EFDP president, they cannot be dual-hatted and also serve as a panel member. **(T-1)** The next senior Air Force officer/civilian will serve as the FD (panel member).

4.18.3.1.3. Numbered Air Forces/centers will hold EFDPs at the numbered Air Force/center level and not roll up to the management level. The numbered Air Force/center commander/director as the president (unless delegated).

4.18.3.1.4. Headquarters Air Force (HAF) Staff/Major Commands (MAJCOMs). Management level commanders may delegate management level EFDP president responsibilities no lower than the deputy commander. When EFDP president responsibilities are delegated, the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (e.g., director of staff) will serve as the "small unit commander" when there are eligible Airmen assigned. Management levels or appointees, when management level EFDP president responsibilities have been delegated, will not serve in a dual-hatted capacity. Allowing the deputy commander or appointee to represent promotion eligible Airmen at the EFDP gives the management level impartiality as the EFDP president. **Exception**: If the deputy commander is unavailable due to deployment or TDY, EFDP president responsibilities may be further delegated to the next highest ranking Air Force officer or civilian equivalent (no lower than colonel).

4.18.3.1.5. Combatant Commands (CCMDs). The Air Force element commander (AFELM/CC) will assume EFDP president responsibilities with a CCMD, unless the CCMD's commander is Air Force and requests to chair the EFDP proceedings. **(T-1)** If the AFELM/CC is unavailable due to a prolonged deployment or TDY, EFDP president responsibilities may be delegated to the next highest senior Air Force officer. This delegation will be for the current EFPD only, not on a permanent basis. Short absences (leave, routine TDY) do not qualify as a reason to delegate responsibilities below the AFELM/CC.

4.18.3.1.6. For joint organizations, such as United States Military Entrance Processing Command, which may not have an Air Force general officer or Air Force colonel assigned, an exception to policy may be submitted to AFPC/DPPSP. The request must include the organizations proposed EFDP process.

4.18.3.1.7. For joint organizations, the FD can request to designate the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (no lower than Lt Col/civilian equivalent) to attend the EFDP. This request must be approved by the EFDP president and documented in writing. **(T-1)**

4.18.3.2. Command Chief and SELs. When circumstances warrant, the interim command chief or SEL will serve as the advisor for the EFDP.

4.18.3.3. Force Distributor (FD) Authorities. When circumstances warrant, requests can be made to the EFDP president to designate the next senior Air Force officer/civilian (no lower than major or civilian equivalent) to represent them on the panel. **(T-3)** If the next senior officer/civilian does not meet the grade requirement, another FD within the senior rater's purview (e.g., another squadron commander, group deputy) may represent the organization. All requests must be approved by the EFDP president and documented in writing. The FD authority will maintain all other responsibilities such as signing enlisted evaluations and MELs.

4.18.4. Allocations and Notification.

4.18.4.1. Allocations. AF/A1 determines forced distribution promotion allocations.

4.18.4.2. Allocations are based on 5% of the total TIG/TIS promotion-eligible SrA, SSgt, and TSgt population for "Promote Now" allocations, 10% of the total TIG/TIS promotion-eligible SSgt and TSgt population for "Must Promote" allocations, and 15% of the total TIG/TIS promotion-eligible SrA population for "Must Promote" allocations. In accordance with the aforementioned allocation rates, AFPC provides the actual number of "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" allocations to each FD authority via the final MEL. See Tables **4.7** and **4.8**. The tables are subject to change, therefore FDs and EFDPs will utilize the allocations provided on the final MEL.

4.18.4.2.1. Large units (11 or more TIG/TIS eligible Airmen) will receive their own forced distribution promotion allocations, and large unit FD authorities will award their allocations at the unit level. **(T-1)** Large unit commanders (FD authorities) cannot exceed the promotion allocations listed on the final MEL.

4.18.4.2.2. Small units (10 or less TIG/TIS eligible Airmen) roll-up, compete at and receive promotion recommendation allocations via the senior rater or management level (whichever is applicable) EFDP.

4.18.4.3. In cases where after aggregation there are not enough eligible Airmen from the small units to earn "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" promotion allocations, the senior rater or management level EFDP (whichever is applicable) will receive an outright allocation of one "Promote Now" and "Must Promote." **(T-1)**

4.18.4.4. When there is only one eligible out of the senior rater or management level's total promotion eligible population, the senior rater or management level (whichever is applicable) will receive an outright allocation of one "Promote Now" and one "Must Promote." **(T-1)** The senior rater or management level (whichever is applicable) will determine if the promotion-eligible member's record of performance warrants allocation of either a "Promote Now" or "Must Promote" promotion recommendation and will award the appropriate promotion recommendation.

4.18.4.5. Allocations Not Used. Management levels, senior raters, and FDs are not required to use all allocations if they believe the performance quality and promotion potential of Airmen in their unit does not warrant the full share of allocations. Additionally, redistribution or carry-over of allocations is strictly prohibited. **(T-1)**

4.18.4.6. Forced Distribution of Students or Patients. FDs have a separate FDID for in-utilization permanent party students. FDs will receive a separate allocation for their TIG/TIS promotion-eligible student or patient populations. See **paragraph 4.18.6.1**. **(T-1) Note:** Airmen TDY to school less than 20 weeks will fall under their home station FDID.

4.18.5. Identifying and Notifying Organizations.

4.18.5.1. Identifying Organizations. AFPC will provide MELs identifying TIG/TIS-eligible and non-TIG/TIS-eligible Airmen assigned as of the accounting date. **(T-1)** The MEL identifies all Airmen with an enlisted evaluation scheduled to close out on the applicable SCOD, regardless of an Airman's promotion ineligibility condition(s) (e.g., on the control roster, primary AFSC skill level too low, undergoing Article 15 suspended reduction). See **Table 4.6** for accounting dates.

4.18.5.2. Notifying Organizations. Organizations will receive an initial MEL identifying if they are a large or small unit no later than the accounting date associated with each grade's SCOD. A final MEL will be forwarded following the applicable SCOD. Units should adjudicate each MEL to ensure all unit promotion-eligible Airmen are accurately captured.

4.18.6. Eligibility and Nominations.

4.18.6.1. Verifying Eligibility. Using the organization's MEL, FD authorities verify the eligibility of each Airman to ensure they meet the TIG/TIS requirements for promotion. Only verify the TIG/TIS requirements and do not consider normal individual promotion ineligibility conditions. **(T-1)** This will ensure only those meeting the TIG/TIS requirements are considered, and the FD authority receives the correct number of forced distribution promotion allocations. **Note:** FD authorities with SrA, SSgt, or TSgt promotion-eligible students (student squadrons) or patients (patient squadrons) will receive forced distribution promotion allocations for their TIG/TIS promotion-eligible student or patient populations separate from the forced distribution allocations for their TIG/TIS promotion-eligible SrA, SSgt, or TSgt permanent party populations.

4.18.6.2. Nominations. Large or small unit FDs are responsible for considering all individuals appearing on the unit's final MEL. **(T-1)** FDs will consider all individuals meeting TIG/TIS requirements. Individuals who are not current on their fitness assessment (received a "Required - Not Current" on their evaluation) or who have failed to meet minimum fitness standards ("Unsatisfactory" score) as of the SCOD are ineligible to be considered for promotion allocations ("Must Promote" and "Promote Now").

4.18.6.2.1. Small unit promotion-eligible Airmen are nominated by the unit FD authority to compete for award of a forced distribution promotion allocation at the senior rater or management level EFDP (whichever is applicable). The maximum number of "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" allocations the EFDP may award is based on the combined total number of TIG/TIS promotion-eligible Airmen from each small unit, by grade.

4.18.6.2.2. Each unit may nominate up to the maximum number of available allocations. **Example:** If the total combined number of SSgt promotion eligible Airmen from all small units is 28, the total promotion allocations the EFDP may award is four (one "Promote Now" allocation and three "Must Promote" allocations) based on a 5% "Promote Now" allocation and 10% "Must Promote" allocation. Therefore, a small unit FD may nominate no more than four eligible SSgts.

4.18.6.2.3. If a small unit does not nominate an eligible Airman, the FD will annotate the MEL accordingly and sign.

4.18.7. EFDP Nomination Folders.

4.18.7.1. To assist in ensuring the information being considered for all promotion-eligible Airmen nominated to the EFDP is consistent, fair, and equal, the nomination folder will only include the Airman's: career data brief (vMPF), decorations, last three enlisted evaluations (this includes the enlisted evaluation being considered for forced distribution), and the most recent fitness tracker report from myFitness. Commanders may also submit a push-note (limited to system space availability/two lines) when the panel proceedings are held virtually or when nominee packages will be sent to panel members in advance of the physical panel. Push-notes will only convey the nominee's relative standing amongst all other Airmen nominated by the commander.

4.18.7.2. Enlisted evaluations being considered for forced distribution must be signed by the rater prior to the EFDP proceedings. **(T-1)** Additionally, enlisted evaluations meeting the EFDP cannot be awarded "Promote Now" or "Must Promote" allocations or be signed by the FD prior to the panel. **(T-1)**

4.18.7.3. Performance assessment changes made after panel proceedings are limited to significant quality force indicators negative or positive, that were not previously known.

4.18.8. EFDP Procedures.

4.18.8.1. EFDP proceedings may not commence, and promotion allocation selections may not be made any earlier than the day following each applicable grade's SCOD. **(T-1)** Any and all notional or pre-forced distribution proceedings, ahead of the completion of each grade's entire reporting period (e.g., prior to 1159 hours on the applicable grade's SCOD) are prohibited. **(T-1)**

4.18.8.2. Physical or Virtual Panel. It is up to the EFDP president to determine how to hold the EFDP based upon the nature of the organization's structure. When the EFDP president chooses to hold a physical panel (i.e., in person), nominee records may be provided for review in advance of the physical proceedings. In such cases, the EFDP recorder will ensure all records are available to all panel members to allow ample time to review prior to the physical panel.

4.18.8.3. Small Units.

4.18.8.3.1. Small unit TIG/TIS promotion eligible Airmen aggregate up to compete at the senior rater or management level EFDP. HAF/SAF/CCMD/MAJCOM FDs with 10 or less TIG/TIS eligible Airmen aggregate from the senior rater up to the management level EFDP. When a commander has promotion authority over two or more units, the eligible Airmen are not combined. Each unit will comply with the large or small unit.

4.18.8.3.2. Small unit FDs nominate eligible Airmen to compete at the EFDP. Nomination folders will include the Airmen's career data brief (vMPF), decorations, last three enlisted evaluations (this includes the enlisted evaluation being considered for forced distribution), and the most recent fitness tracker report from myFitness. A push-note may also be included.

4.18.8.3.3. Once selections are made, the SRID authority annotates and signs the applicable MEL, identifying those selected to receive "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" allocations. The SRID authority will then return all evaluations to the owning small unit FD for application of the awarded allocation as well as enlisted evaluation signature by the responsible unit HLR. Individual senior raters or management levels will not sign evaluations in-lieu of the FD.

4.18.8.4. Large units.

4.18.8.4.1. Large unit FDs are authorized to utilize the small unit EFDP process (but not participate in small unit panels) or develop their own process. If the large unit develops a process, the FD must disseminate the forced distribution procedures within their organization that will be utilized no later than the accounting date for each applicable evaluation cycle. **(T-1)**

4.18.8.4.2. Once selections are made, the FDID authority annotates and signs the applicable MEL, identifying those selected to receive "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" allocations. The FDID authority will also sign as the HLR on all evaluations receiving a "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" recommendation. This must not be delegated below the FD. **(T-1)**

4.18.8.5. If an egregious event or negative information transpires and is substantiated during the reporting period and is discovered after the SCOD and after promotion recommendations are allocated, the FDID authority, senior rater, or management level (whichever is applicable), may remove or downgrade the promotion recommendation from the ratee's evaluation. **(T-3)** In such a case, the applicable forced distribution promotion allocation will not be reallocated. **(T-1)**

4.18.9. Scoring.

4.18.9.1. Records are scored on a best-qualified basis. EFDP members will ensure that Airmen selected to receive forced distribution promotion allocations are fully qualified to assume the next higher grade.

4.18.9.2. The senior rater or management level (whichever is applicable) may use either:

4.18.9.2.1. A "rack-n-stack" process by which each panel member rank orders all records from highest to lowest and all rankings are combined to develop an order of merit.

4.18.9.2.2. A panel or MLR scoring process by which EFDP records are scored in 6-to-10 point increments.

4.18.9.3. Scoring is based on documents in each eligible's EFDP nomination folder only. **(T-1)**

4.18.9.4. Panel members will assign each eligible a score (6-to-10 point) or ranking, reflecting their assessment of relative performance, leadership/followership, and the potential to serve at the next higher grade.

4.18.9.5. Panel members may score nomination folders in advance on the EFDP when authorized by the EFDP president.

4.18.9.6. If a panel member identifies a record-based matter that causes concern, they will bring the matter to the other panel members, the panel recorder, or directly with the panel president, so that the matter has the attention of the other panel members.

4.18.9.7. Panel members are encouraged to discuss their own knowledge and evaluation of the professional qualifications of their respective promotion-eligible Airman.

4.18.9.8. Panel members may not discuss or disclose the opinion of any person not a member of the panel concerning the member.

4.18.9.9. Scoring Scale. See **Table 4.1**.

4.18.9.9.1. Defining "Splits." A "split" is a significant disagreement between EFDP members about the score of a record. A "split" is considered a difference in a score of 2 or more points between any two panel members.

4.18.9.9.2. Resolving "Splits." All scoring stops and all voting EFDP members must be present (physically or virtually) to discuss the records involved in a "split." Only EFDP members with split scores may change their scores in the process of resolving a split. A "split" is resolved when there is a difference in a score of 1.5 or less points between any two panel members. **Note:** If the EFDP is unable to resolve "splits," the EFDP president will be the deciding factor.

4.18.9.9.3. Resolving "Ties." If two or more records tie, and there are insufficient numbers of "Promote Now"/"Must Promote" recommendations to award one to each, the EFPD president will determine an appropriate method for breaking the tie. **(T-1)** **Note:** If the EFDP is unable to resolve "ties" the EFDP president will be the deciding factor.

4.18.10. EFDP Report.

4.18.10.1. The panel report should contain a list of panel members, panel recorder, order of merit (identifying total score, if/when applicable), and forced distribution promotion recommendation status based on the available number of "Promote Now" and "Must Promote" allocations, and cutoff score.

4.18.10.2. The report should be approved and signed by the senior rater or management level as the panel president and by the panel recorder.

4.18.10.3. Supplemental EFDP consideration will not be given for the following reasons:

4.18.10.3.1. Incorrect data reflected on the career data brief (vMPF).

4.18.10.3.2. Denied EFDP nomination due to incorrect data reflected on the FDID output products or in the career data brief (vMPF).

4.18.10.3.3. MELs not returned to the MPF, or individual was “overlooked” on the listing.

4.18.10.3.4. EFDP nomination packages not completed/turned in/approved in time to meet the board.

Table 4.1. Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel Scale.

Score	Potential
10.0	Absolutely superior
9.5	Outstanding
9.0	Few could be better
8.5	Strong
8.0	Slightly above average
7.5	Average
7.0	Slightly below average
6.5	Well below average
6.0	Lowest

Table 4.2. When to Submit Enlisted Evaluations for RegAF, Active Guard Reserve, and Stat Tour.

RULE	A If	B then the reason for the evaluation is
1	RegAF ONLY: The ratee is a SrA as of the 31 March SCOD.	First Annual
2	RegAF ONLY: The ratee is an A1C or below, with 36 or more months total active federal military service as of the 31 March SCOD. See **Note 1**.	First Annual
3	ARC ONLY: The ratee is a SrA or above as of the SCOD of the evaluation and has not had an evaluation.	First Annual
4	ARC ONLY: The ratee is a SSgt or above and has not had an evaluation for at least one year.	Annual
5	RegAF ONLY: Subsequent evaluations will close-out on the SCOD (based on grade). See **Note 2**.	Annual
6	The ratee requires an enlisted evaluation due to placement on a control roster. See **Notes 1**, **3**, and **10**.	Directed by Commander (DBC)
7	An evaluation is necessary to document substandard performance or conduct. See **Notes 1** and **10**.	DBC
8	The ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter. See **Notes 3**, **4**, and **10**.	DBC
9	The member needs an evaluation following a discharge action per DAFI 36-3211. See **Notes 1** and **5**.	DBH
10	Authorities place the ratee in evaluating identifier 9A100 or 9A000. See **Notes 6** and **7**.	DBH
11	Personnel have declared the ratee missing-in-action, captured, or detained in captive status. See **Notes 1** and **7**.	DBH
12	HAF directs a special evaluation. See **Note 8**.	DBH
13	The ratee is a CMSgt.	Annual
14	The ratee needs an evaluation in conjunction with involuntary removal from ANG AGR or Statutory Tour.	Directed by unit commander, TAG or NGB/CF
15	ANG unit commander, The Adjutant General (TAG) or NGB/CF directs a special evaluation.	Directed by unit commander, TAG or NGB/CF
16	A1C who enlisted under the National Call to Service program. See **Note 9**.	First Annual

RULE	A If	B then the reason for the evaluation is
17	Any sentence of confinement as the result of a court-martial. See **Note 1**.	DBC
18	ARC ONLY: A DBH report is required in cases where a promotion or demotion has occurred, and a member will have more than 12 months from the close-out date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new grade.	DBH

Notes:

1. For ARC refer to **paragraph 4.7.1.2** for close-out date.
2. The close-out date is on the SCOD for the applicable grade (for example, a SSgt will have their evaluation close out on 31 Jan [SSgt SCOD]). **(T-1) Exception**: Airmen selected for promotion or Airmen who are demoted will have their evaluation close out on the SCOD of their projected or received grade and in some cases, may exceed a year. **(T-1) Example**: A SSgt selected for TSgt will now have their evaluation close out on 30 Nov. A SSgt demoted to SrA will have their evaluation close out on 31 March.
3. The close-out date of the evaluation prepared when placing a member on a control roster is the day before the date of placement on the control roster.
4. The close-out date is the effective date the ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter.
5. When a member is undergoing an involuntary separation due to substandard performance, a commander will complete a DBC evaluation and may only comment on the negative behavior. **(T-1)** This applies to TSgts and below and the commander will close out the evaluation one day before the written notice of the proposed action to the Airman. **(T-1)**. If a member is being involuntarily separated for reasons other than substandard performance, then a DBC evaluation is not required.
6. The evaluation's close-out date is the day before the date that authorities place the ratee in reporting identifier 9A100 or 9A000.
7. Do not prepare enlisted evaluations for periods of missing-in-action, captured, or interned status of less than 15 calendar days. For 15 calendar days or more, prepare an enlisted evaluation as AFPC/DPPSP directs.
8. AFPC/DPPSP (or AFPC/DPMSP if the evaluation is necessary for promotion consideration) directs evaluations under this rule.
9. A1Cs who enlisted under the National Call to Service program will receive their initial enlisted evaluation upon completion of 16 months total active federal military service minus 1 day. **(T-1)**
10. A1Cs or below with less than 36 months total active federal military service (or DIEMS for ARC) do not receive an enlisted evaluation unless the member has a minimum of 20 months TIS.

Table 4.3. When to submit Enlisted Evaluations for ARC Non-AGR.

RULE	A **If (see Notes 1 and 7)**	B **Then the reason for the evaluation is**
1	Close-out date will be first SrA SCOD, refer to **paragraph 4.7.1.2**.	First Biennial (see **Note 2**)
2	The ratee is a SSgt or above and has not had a report for at least two years. See **Note 3**.	Biennial
3	The commander directs an evaluation.	DBC (see **Note 8**)
4	The commander directs an evaluation to document substandard performance or conduct.	
5	The ratee is placed into record status 6, deserter status. See **Note 6**.	
6	HAF, AF/RE, ARPC or NGB directs a special evaluation. See **Note 4**.	DBH
7	The ratee needs an evaluation in conjunction with discharge.	DBH
8	The ratee is declared missing-in-action, captured, or detained in captive status. See **Note 5**.	DBH
9	The ratee is a CMSgt. See **Note 3**.	Annual for AFR; Biennial for ANG.
10	In cases where a promotion or demotion has occurred, and a member will have more than 24 months from the close-out date of their last evaluation and the new established SCOD for their new grade.	DBH

Notes:

1. For IMAs, PIRR and PIRR Category E, the unit of attachment is responsible for completing the evaluation.
2. Initial evaluation implementation for ANG Non-AGR SrA and above who have no previous report; refer to **paragraph 4.5**.
3. If the ratee did not participate during the period, the report must state this information. **(T-1).**
4. AF/REP directs enlisted evaluations under this rule for AFR; NGB/A1P for ANG.
5. Do not prepare evaluations for periods of missing-in-action, 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 missing-in-action, captured, or detained in captive status. These evaluations are as directed by

RULE	A If (see Notes 1 and 7)	B Then the reason for the evaluation is
AFPC/DPPSP or ARPC/DPTSE. 6. The close-out date of the evaluation is the effective date the ratee is placed in record status 6, deserter. 7. Only one day is required for raters to close out an evaluation. 8. Only negative behavior and/or substandard performance is documented. Positive behavior and/or performance will be documented on the next SCOD enlisted evaluation. **(T-1)**		

Table 4.4. Static Close-out Date Chart for RegAF, Active Guard Reserve, and Stat Tour.

Grade	SCOD
SrA and Below	31 Mar
SSgt and SSgt selects	31 Jan
TSgt and TSgt selects	30 Nov
MSgt and MSgts selects	30 Sep
SMSgt and SMSgt selects	31 Jul
CMSgt and CMSgt selects	31 May

Table 4.5. Static Close-out Date Chart for ARC Non-AGR.

Grade	SCOD
SrA and Below	31 Mar (Even years)
SSgt	31 Jan (Odd years)
TSgt	30 Nov (Even years)
MSgt	30 Sep (Odd years)
SMSgt	31 Jul (Even years)
CMSgt	31 May (Annual for AFR, Odd years for ANG)

Table 4.6. Accounting Dates for Static Close-out Date Evaluations.

Grade (includes selectees)	Static Close-out Date	Accounting Date
SrA and below	31 Mar	3 Dec
SSgt	31 Jan	3 Oct
TSgt	30 Nov	3 Aug
MSgt	30 Sep	3 Jun
SMSgt	31 Jul	3 Apr
CMSgt	31 May	3 Feb
Note: Accounting dates are approximately 120 calendar days prior to each static close-out date and are established as the 3rd of the month for consistency.		

Table 4.7. {RegAF Only} Forced Distribution Allocation Table (SrA).

Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP	Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP	Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP
11 - 12	1	1	178 - 182	9	27	343 - 347	17	52
13 - 17	1	2	183 - 187	9	28	348 - 349	17	53
18 - 22	1	3	188 - 189	9	29	350 - 357	18	53
23 - 27	1	4	190 - 197	10	29	358 - 362	18	54
28 - 29	1	5	198 - 202	10	30	363 - 369	18	56
30 - 37	2	5	203 - 207	10	31	370 - 377	19	56
38 - 42	2	6	208 - 209	10	32	378 - 382	19	57
43 - 47	2	7	210 - 217	11	32	383 - 387	19	58
48 - 49	2	8	218 - 222	11	33	388 - 389	19	59
50 - 57	3	8	223 - 227	11	34	390 - 397	20	59
58 - 62	3	9	228 - 229	11	35	398 - 402	20	60
63 - 67	3	10	230 - 237	12	35	403 - 407	20	61
68 - 69	3	11	238 - 242	12	36	408 - 409	20	62
70 - 77	4	11	243 - 247	12	37	410 - 417	21	62
78 - 82	4	12	248 - 249	12	38	418 - 422	21	63
83 - 87	4	13	250 - 257	13	38	423 - 427	21	64
88 - 89	4	14	258 - 262	13	39	428 - 429	21	65
90 - 97	5	14	263 - 267	13	40	430 - 437	22	65
98 – 102	5	15	268 - 269	13	41	438 - 442	22	66
103 – 107	5	16	270 - 277	14	41	443 - 447	22	67
108 - 109	5	17	278 - 282	14	42	448 - 449	22	68
110 – 117	6	17	283 - 287	14	43	450 - 457	23	68
118 – 122	6	18	288 - 289	14	44	458 - 462	23	69
123 – 127	6	19	290 - 297	15	44	463 - 467	23	70
128 – 129	6	20	298 - 302	15	45	468 - 469	23	71
130 – 137	7	20	303 - 307	15	46	470 - 477	24	71
138 – 142	7	21	308 - 309	15	47	478 - 482	24	72
143 - 147	7	22	310 - 317	16	47	483 - 487	24	73
148 - 149	7	23	318 - 322	16	48	488 - 489	24	74
150 - 157	8	23	323 - 327	16	49	490 - 497	25	74
158 - 162	8	24	328 - 329	16	50	498 - 500	25	75
163 - 167	8	25	330 - 337	17	50			
168 - 177	9	26	338 - 342	17	51			

Note: Table is subject to change. Utilize allocations on the final MEL(s).

Table 4.8. {RegAF Only} Forced Distribution Allocation Table (SSgt and TSgt).

Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP	Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP	Total Eligible	Total PN	Total MP
11 - 16	1	1	177 - 183	9	18	344 - 349	17	35
17 - 23	1	2	184 - 189	9	19	350 - 356	18	35
24 - 29	1	3	190 - 196	10	19	357 - 363	18	36
30 - 36	2	3	197 - 203	10	20	364 - 369	18	37
37 - 43	2	4	204 - 209	10	21	370 - 376	19	37
44 - 49	2	5	210 - 216	11	21	377 - 383	19	38
50 - 56	3	5	217 - 223	11	22	384 - 389	19	39
57 - 63	3	6	224 - 229	11	23	390 - 396	20	39
64 - 69	3	7	230 - 236	12	23	397 - 403	20	40
70 - 76	4	7	237 - 243	12	24	404 - 409	20	41
77 - 83	4	8	244 - 249	12	25	410 - 416	21	41
84 - 89	4	9	250 - 256	13	25	417 - 423	21	42
90 - 96	5	9	257 - 263	13	26	424 - 429	21	43
97 - 103	5	10	264 - 269	13	27	430 - 436	22	43
104 - 109	5	11	270 - 276	14	27	437 - 443	22	44
110 - 116	6	11	277 - 283	14	28	444 - 449	22	45
117 - 123	6	12	284 - 289	14	29	450 - 456	23	45
124 - 129	6	13	290 - 296	15	29	457 - 463	23	46
130 - 136	7	13	297 - 303	15	30	464 - 469	23	47
137 - 143	7	14	304 - 309	15	31	470 - 476	24	47
144 - 149	7	15	310 - 316	16	31	477 - 483	24	48
150 - 156	8	15	317 - 323	16	32	484 - 489	24	49
157 - 163	8	16	324 - 329	16	33	490 - 496	25	49
164 - 169	8	17	330 - 336	17	33	497 - 500	25	50
170 - 176	9	17	337 - 343	17	34			
Note: Table is subject to change. Utilize allocations on the final MEL(s).								

Table 4.9. Instructions for Preparing an Enlisted ALQ Evaluation (Output Product).

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
1	Grade	Select appropriate grade. See **paragraph 1.4.9**.	SrA, TSgt (S), SMSgt
2	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial, and any suffix (e.g., JR., SR., III). If there is no middle initial, the use of "NMI" is optional. Name will be in all upper case.	DOE, MATTHEW A.
3	DoDID	Enter full DoDID number	1234567890
4	Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title from MilPDS as of the SCOD or in the event of a PCS or PCA, the information as of the accounting date. If the duty title is abbreviated and entries are not clear text, spell them out. Consult with the CSS/MPF for any corrective actions. Ensure the duty title is commensurate with the ratee's grade, AFSC, and responsibility. Refer to the *Enlisted Force Structure* for guidance pertinent to duty titles. (use format in example) For personnel on a 365-day extended deployment, use the deployed duty title.	Admin NCOIC
5	DAFSC	Enter DAFSC held as of the "THRU" date of the evaluation, including prefix and suffix, if applicable, or in the event of a PCS or PCA, enter information as of the accounting date. 365 day extended deployments will use the TDY DAFSC.	3F051

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
6	Reason	Select the reason for evaluation.	Annual, Biennial, First Annual, First Biennial, Directed by Commander, or Directed by HAF
7	Period	"FROM" Date: See **paragraph 4.6**. "THRU" Date: 31 May of current year. This is the SCOD for the appropriate grade. See **paragraph 4.7** for variations.	SrA: 31 Mar 2023 – 30 Mar 2024 SSgt Select/SSgt: 31 Jan 2023 – Jan 30 2024 TSgt Select/TSgt: 30 Nov 2023 – 29 Nov 2024 MSgt Select/MSgt: 30 Sep 2023 – 29 Sep 2024 SMSgt Select/SMSgt: 31 Jul – 30 Jul 2024 CMSgt Select/CMSgt: 31 May 2023 – 30 May 2024
8	Days Supervised	Enter the number of days of supervision. See **paragraph 4.8**.	365
9	Days Non-Rated	Enter number of days Non-Rated (if applicable) in accordance with **paragraph 1.4.11**.	120
10	Organization and Command	Enter information as of close-out date or in the event of a PCS or PCA, the information as of the accounting date. Nomenclature does not necessarily duplicate what	123d Fighter Squadron (ACC)

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		is on the evaluation notice. The goal is an accurate description of where and to whom the ratee belongs. Command will be listed inside parentheses. 365-day extended deployments will use the home station unit, "with duty at…" AFR only: For IMAs, information will be that of the unit of assignment, and for PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. See **paragraph 1.4.7**.	
11	Location	Enter information as of the close-out date unless the member has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment then enter the information as of the accounting date.	JB Langley-Eustis, VA
12	Duty Description	Comments in narrative format are mandatory. 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 and topical references—they obscure rather than clarify meaning. Only acronyms on the approved acronym list are authorized.	Supervises two Airmen. Authors guidance on performance evaluations. Prepares lesson plans for ALS curriculum.

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		Previous jobs held during the reporting period may be mentioned only if it impacts the evaluation. 365-day extended deployments will use the TDY duty description.	
	RATER ASSESSMENT		
***13**	Executing the Mission	Comments are mandatory; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.1**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***14**	Leading People	Comments are mandatory; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.2**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***15**	Managing Resources	Comments are mandatory; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.3**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***16**	Improving the Unit	Comments are mandatory; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.6.3.12.4**. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***17**	Mandatory Comments (Fitness/Housing/Voting)	Raters must document the ratee's most recent and current fitness assessment score. The comment will include the score achieved, the fitness category, and any component exemptions using the following format: PFA: [score]; Category; Exemptions: [list any component exemptions]. For	PFA: 91.7; Excellent; Exemptions: None. PFA: 99.8; Excellent; Exemptions: None / CFT: 95.2; Excellent;

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		Airmen who are not current on their PFA, see **paragraph 1.4.10.1.1**. For Airmen who are fully exempt, see **paragraph 1.4.10.1.2.** For Airmen assigned to designated combat-related AFSCs, listed in the terms section, raters will document both the ratee's most recent and current Air Force physical fitness assessment and combat field test (CFT) results. See **paragraph 1.4.10**. If ratee has oversight of military privatized housing and or is a voting assistance officer at any point in the rating period, enter the appropriate statement(s). Rater must also include a unique performance statement(s). See **paragraphs 1.9.2**, and **1.9.3**. If required, enter the applicable statement(s) "The Ratee exercised effective oversight of military privatized housing." Or "The Ratee was not effective in oversight of military privatized housing." If required, enter a unique performance statement on the ratee's performance as the voting assistance officer.	Exemptions: None See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
***18**	Rater Name, Grade, and Branch of Service	Enter rater's information as of the close-out date. However, if the ratee has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the rater as of	Sue J. Doe, Col, USAF Sally S. Mesaros, SES (O-9 equivalent), DAF

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		the SCOD from the unit as of the established accounting date. See **paragraph 4.3.1**.	Austin T. Smith, GS-15, DAF Jeremy R. Dice, NH-IV (O-6 equivalent), DAF
19	Rater Duty Title	Enter rater's information as of the close-out date. However, if the ratee has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the rater as of the SCOD from the unit as of the established accounting date. See **paragraph 4.3.1**.	Commander
20	Rater Organization and Command	Enter rater's information as of the close-out date. However, if the ratee has a PCS, PCA, or departs from a 365-day extended deployment on or after the accounting date, use the rater as of the SCOD from the unit as of the established accounting date. See **paragraph 4.3.1**.	366th Fighter Squadron (ACC)
21	Rater Signature	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, evaluators may use a typed signature. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2.1**. Do not sign blank forms, 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 1.4.12**.	
	HIGHER LEVEL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT		

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
22	**CMSgt Only:** Higher Responsibility	Select the block that accurately describes the ratee's next level of responsibility: **READY NOW** - Select this category when CMSgts are ready to immediately assume greater responsibility in a more challenging position than currently held. **ON-TRACK** - Select this category when CMSgts are excelling in their current position, demonstrating growth potential, and are ready to transition to a position in a related specialty, or at a different organizational level, at the first available opportunity. **CURRENT ASSIGNMENT** – Select this category when CMSgts should remain in their current assignment for one or some of the following reasons: are not forecasted to be moved in the near-term; have not been evaluated as a CMSgt in their current position; may have a specific expertise required in-place; be in pre-defined tour lengths; or be in nominative positions. **GROOM** - Select this category when CMSgts require additional grooming in their duty position or as a CMSgt prior to being placed in a position with greater responsibilities. These CMSgts	Use drop down function to select level of responsibility.

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		may be ready for increased responsibilities in the future. **DO NOT RETAIN** – Select this category when CMSgts are not recommended for retention. Do not retain recommendations constitute a referral evaluation and therefore require senior rater comments in Section II, part 1. Comments that exceed one line will require the use of a DAF Form 77.	
23	**SrA –TSgt Only**: Promotion Recommendation	This section is to be completed only when the member is eligible for a promotion recommendation. **Promote (P):** Recommended for promotion based on performance at or above established DAF standards and expectations. Performs with the majority of personnel and at a level commensurate with peers. **Must Promote (MP):** Recommended for accelerated promotion based on stellar performance well above established DAF standards and expectations. Designated for outstanding performers who perform at a level higher than their peers. RegAF personnel receiving a "MP" receive a distinct promotion advantage over their peers. **Promote Now (PN):** Recommended for immediate	

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		promotion based on exemplary performance that far exceeds established DAF standards and expectations. Reserved for elite performers who perform well above other personnel in their peer group. RegAF personnel receiving a "PN" receive a significant promotion advantage over their peers. **Not Ready Now (NRN):** Not considered ready for promotion at this time based on the need for additional grooming in the current grade, or when personnel may require specific attention with regard to performance of established DAF standards and expectations. NRN evaluations do not necessarily constitute a referral, provided the report contains no negative comments.	
24	**MSgt – SMSgt only:** Stratification	(RegAF and AFR only) Senior rater HLRs may stratify up to 25% of SNCOs by SRID and only within each component. The top 20% of SMSgts and top 10% of MSgts will receive a numerator and denominator stratification (#x of x). An additional 5% of SMSgts and 15% of MSgts will receive a stratification statement of "Top 25% of (respective grade)." For units with less than the required TIG/TIS eligible members to start normal rounding rules, a stratification/endorsement statement either in a numerator	

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		and denominator format or a "Top 25%" format is authorized; the use of both stratification formats combined between the eligible members is not authorized. See **Tables 4.10** and **4.11**. See **paragraph 4.11.2.1**. (ANG only) Enlisted stratifications are at the discretion of each TAG/Command equivalent for NGB staff. See **paragraph 4.11.2.2** If no stratification is used, must enter the statement, "THIS SECTION NOT USED"	
25	Rater Assessment	Concur/non-concur with the rater's assessment by making the appropriate selection.	
26	Future Roles	Recommend up to three roles/assignments that best serve the United States Air Force and continue the member's development. Future roles may not serve as veiled promotion statements, i.e., you may ONLY recommend personnel for a future role that they are eligible for based on current or projected grade and/or the grade that they are TIG/TIS eligible for promotion to, as of the evaluation SCOD. **Example:** A SSgt may not be recommended for Section Superintendent duties as that constitutes a veiled promotion statement to MSgt. (CMSgt Only) If the senior rater marks either "Ready Now, On-Track, Current Assignment, or Groom" then select the block	Type or use drop down functions to select/input future roles. 1. NCOIC, Force Management 2. NCOIC, Operations 3. Section Chief 4. Flight Chief 5. First Sergeant

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		that accurately describes the ideal future roles (no more than two roles; first recommendation or "primary vector" has highest precedence). (CMSgt Only) **Note:** Senior raters may not recommend future roles for those ratees considered "Do Not Retain" for higher responsibility. (CMSgt Only) **Note:** Senior raters will stratify all CMSgts receiving a primary vector for the current year's Command Chief Screening Board. **(T-1)** CMSgts being nominated will be stratified against all CMSgts under the senior rater's purview, not just those eligible for or nominated for Command Chief Master Sergeant (CCM) duty. **(T-1)** CMSgt selects may not to be included in the total number of CMSgts under the senior rater's purview. (CMSgt Only) A stratification is prohibited for those CMSgts not receiving nomination for the current year's Command Chief Screening Board. CCM nominations must be accompanied by a "Ready Now" recommendation. CMSgts not receiving a "Ready Now" recommendation for higher responsibility are not eligible for a primary vector CCM duty nomination.	

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		(RegAF Only) CMSgt ratees may only be nominated for CCM duty provided they meet the minimum CCM TIG requirements established by AF/A1LE for the applicable year's Command Chief Screening Board.	
*27	Performance Statement(s)	Comments are mandatory; must include at least one performance statement. See **paragraph 1.12** for inappropriate comments. See **paragraph 1.11** for referrals.. May use "THIS SECTION NOT USED" as a mandatory performance statement.	See **paragraph 1.3.3.2**.
*28	Higher Level Reviewer Name, Grade, and Branch of Service	Enter the HLR's information. The HLR is position-based. HLRs assigned on or prior to the close-out date, enter information as of the close-out date; HLRs assigned after the close-out date, enter the information as of the date signed.	Sue J. Doe, Col, USAF Sally S. Mesaros, SES (O-9 equivalent), DAF Austin T. Smith, GS-15, DAF Jeremy R. Dice, NH-IV (O-6 equivalent), DAF Jacob M. Freer, Col, KSANG
29	Higher Level Reviewer Duty Title		Commander
30	Higher Level Reviewer Organization and Command		123d Operations Group (ACC)
31	Higher Level Reviewer Signature	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, evaluators may use a typed	

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
		signature. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2.1**. Do not sign blank forms, 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 1.4.12**.	
	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		
32	Comment(s)	Complete only if criteria are met for additional comments. If not needed, state, "THIS SECTION NOT USED"	
33	Evaluator Name, Grade, and Branch of Service	Enter evaluator's information as of the SCOD.	
34	Role	Enter evaluator's role.	Air Force Advisor, Functional Examiner
35	Evaluator Duty Title	Enter evaluator's duty title as of the SCOD.	Financial Manager
36	Evaluator Organization and Command	Enter evaluator's information as of the SCOD.	
37	Evaluator Signature	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, evaluators may use a typed signature. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2.1**. Do not sign blank forms, 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.	
	REFERRAL REPORT		

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A Heading	B Instructions	C Example
38	Referral Report Comments	Complete this section for referral evaluations only. See **paragraph 1.11**.	
39	Referring Evaluator Name, Grade, and Branch of Service	Enter the referring evaluator's information as of the SCOD.	
40	Referring Evaluator Duty Title	Enter the referring evaluator's information as of the SCOD.	
41	Referring Evaluator Signature	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, evaluators may use a typed signature. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2.1**. Do not sign blank forms, 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.	
42	Date	Date will auto populate when report is signed.	27 Mar 2025
43	Ratee Acknowledgement	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 and review of personal information on the evaluation. If the ratee non-concurs with the evaluation, they may submit an appeal in accordance with **Chapter 10**. The rater will suspense the ratee three duty days (30 calendar days for AFR) to sign the evaluation.	Digital or wet signatures. A combination of both is authorized.

	ENLISTED PERFORMANCE BRIEF		
ITEM	A	B	C
	Heading	Instructions	Example
		Non-digital: See **paragraph 1.4.12.2.1**. Sign on or after the close-out date. "Member unable to sign"—use when member is incapacitated or unavailable to sign; rater or HLR (digitally) signs. "Member declined to sign"—use when member refuses to sign the evaluation; rater or HLR (digitally) signs. See **paragraph 4.17**.	
44	Signature of Ratee	The evaluations have digital signature capability which includes a date stamp. In the rare instance where digital signatures cannot be used, the ratee may use a typed signature. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2.1**. Do not sign blank forms, 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.	
45	Date	Date will auto populate when report is signed.	27 Mar 2025
Note: There are minor formatting differences between the PDF version of the Enlisted Performance Brief (AF Form 716) and the system generated version completed in myEval.			

Table 4.10. {RegAF and AFR only} MSgt Stratifications.

# of TIG/TIS Eligible	Total # of Stratifications Available	# of Stratifications Available in Top 10% (X of X) (See **Note 1**)	# of Stratifications Available in Top 25% (See **Note 1**)
1	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
2	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
3	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
4	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
5	2	1	1

6	2	1	1

Note:
1. To calculate the total number of authorized numerator and denominator stratifications for MSgts, units will multiply the total number of eligible MSgts by 10% and apply normal rounding rules. To calculate the total number of authorized "Top 25% of MSgts" stratifications, units will multiply the total number of eligible MSgts by 15% and apply normal rounding rules. This is the only authorized method to calculate the number of authorized stratifications. **(T-1)**
2. When there are four or less TIG/TIS eligible MSgts, HLRs may give only one stratification. In this instance, the HLR may use only one numerator and denominator stratification or a "Top 25%" stratification.

Table 4.11. SMSgt Stratifications (RegAF and AFR only).

# of TIG/TIS Eligible	Total # of Stratifications Available	# of Stratifications Available in Top 20% (X of X) (See **Note 1**)	# of Stratifications Available in Top 25% (See **Note 1**)
1	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
2	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
3	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
4	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
5	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
6	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
7	1	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
8	2	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
9	2	(See **Note 2**)	(See **Note 2**)
10	3	2	1
11	3	2	1
12	3	2	1

Note:

1. To calculate the total number of authorized numerator and denominator stratifications for SMSgts, units will multiply the total number of eligible SMSgts by 20% and apply normal rounding rules. To calculate the total number of authorized "Top 25% of SMSgts" stratifications, units will multiply the total number of eligible SMSgts by 5% and apply normal rounding rules. This is the only authorized method to calculate the number of authorized stratifications. **(T-1)**
2. When there are seven or less TIG/TIS eligible SMSgts, HLRs may give only one stratification; when there are eight to nine TIG/TIS eligible SMSgts, HLRs may give only two stratifications. In these instances, the HLR may use either a numerator and denominator stratification or a "Top 25%" stratification.

Table 4.12. Time-in-Grade (TIG) Senior Rater Eligibility Chart.

MSGT CHART			
If ratee is:	**and EPR c/o date is:**	**and date of rank is:**	**TIG Eligible**
MSgt	1 Jan 25 - 30 Sep 25	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 24	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 25 - 30 Sep 25	after 1 Jul 24	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 25 - 31 Dec 25	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 25	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 25 - 31 Dec 25	after 1 Jul 25	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 26 - 30 Sep 26	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 25	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 26 - 30 Sep 26	after 1 Jul 28	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 26 - 31 Dec 26	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 26	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 26 - 31 Dec 26	after 1 Jul 26	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 27 - 30 Sep 27	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 26	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 27 - 30 Sep 27	after 1 Jul 26	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 27 - 31 Dec 27	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 27	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 27 - 31 Dec 27	after 1 Jul 27	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 28 - 30 Sep 28	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 27	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 28 - 30 Sep 28	after 1 Jul 27	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 28 - 31 Dec 28	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 28	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 28 - 31 Dec 28	after 1 Jul 28	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 29 - 30 Sep 29	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 28	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 29 - 30 Sep 29	after 1 Jul 28	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 29 - 31 Dec 29	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 29	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 29 - 31 Dec 29	after 1 Jul 29	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 30 - 30 Sep 30	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 29	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 30 - 30 Sep 30	after 1 Jul 29	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 30 - 31 Dec 30	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 30	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 30 - 31 Dec 30	after 1 Jul 30	NO
MSgt	1 Jan 31 - 30 Sep 31	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 30	YES
MSgt	1 Jan 31 - 30 Sep 31	after 1 Jul 30	NO
MSgt	1 Oct 31 - 31 Dec 31	prior to or equal to 1 Jul 31	YES
MSgt	1 Oct 31 - 31 Dec 31	after 1 Jul 31	NO
SMSGT CHART			
If ratee is:	**and EPR c/o date is:**	**and date of rank is:**	**TIG Eligible**
SMSgt	1 Jan 25 - 31 Jul 25	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 24	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 25 - 31 Jul 25	after 1 Mar 24	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 25 - 31 Dec 25	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 25	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 25 - 31 Dec 25	after 1 Mar 25	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 26 - 31 Jul 26	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 25	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 26 - 31 Jul 26	after 1 Mar 25	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 26 - 31 Dec 26	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 26	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 26 - 31 Dec 26	after 1 Mar 26	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 27 - 31 Jul 27	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 26	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 27 - 31 Jul 27	after 1 Mar 26	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 27 - 31 Dec 27	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 27	YES

SMSgt	1 Aug 27 - 31 Dec 27	after 1 Mar 27	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 28 - 31 Jul 28	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 27	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 28 - 31 Jul 28	after 1 Mar 27	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 28 - 31 Dec 28	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 28	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 28 - 31 Dec 28	after 1 Mar 28	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 29 - 31 Jul 29	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 28	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 29 - 31 Jul 29	after 1 Mar 28	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 29 - 31 Dec 29	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 29	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 29 - 31 Dec 29	after 1 Mar 29	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 30 - 31 Jul 30	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 29	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 30 - 31 Jul 30	after 1 Mar 29	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 30 - 31 Dec 30	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 30	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 30 - 31 Dec 30	after 1 Mar 30	NO
SMSgt	1 Jan 31 - 31 Jul 31	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 30	YES
SMSgt	1 Jan 31 - 31 Jul 31	after 1 Mar 30	NO
SMSgt	1 Aug 31 - 31 Dec 31	prior to or equal to 1 Mar 31	YES
SMSgt	1 Aug 31 - 31 Dec 31	after 1 Mar 31	NO
Note: This table is used for static close-out date and out-of-cycle EPRs such as Directed by Headquarters, DBC, etc.			

Table 4.13. The United States Air Force Band (3N2X1) and The United States Air Force Academy Band (3N3X1) Direct Reporting from Basic Military Training and Promotion to TSgt.

ITEM	If the Airman has	then the member's Initial enlisted evaluation will begin with Date of Rank and have a close-out date of:	Examples
1	both a total active federal military service date (TAFMSD) and DOR between 2 July and 30 November of the same year	the following year's TSgt SCOD	1
2	any other combination of TAFMSD and DOR	the first TSgt SCOD following their DOR	2, 3, 4

Examples:
1. An Airman with a TAFMSD of 2 Jul 23 and DOR (E-6) of 8 Sep 23, would have an FIRST ANNUAL TSgt evaluation of 8 Sep 23 - 30 Nov 24.
2. An Airman with a TAFMSD of 1 Apr 23 and DOR (E-6) of 10 Jun 23, would have an FIRST ANNUAL TSgt EPR of 10 Jun 23 - 30 Nov 23.
3. An Airman with a TAFMSD of 1 Jul 19 and DOR (E-6) of 3 Sep 23, would have an FIRST ANNUAL TSgt EPR of 3 Sep 23 - 30 Nov 23.
4. An Airman with a TAFMSD of 1 Oct 23 and DOR (E-6) of 3 Dec 23, would have an FIRST ANNUAL TSgt EPR of 3 Dec 23 - 30 Nov 24.

Retraining guidance for Airmen selected to become a 3N2 or 3N3 TSgt (e.g., from regional bands, or other Air Force Specialties):

If a member has no previous enlisted evaluations, an FIRST ANNUAL report will be accomplished by the premier band with a rating period from the date they arrived at their previous duty station to the first 30 November TSgt SCOD following the new DOR (date arrived on station at premier band), regardless of where member was assigned on the accountability date. The losing unit will provide an LOE to assist in writing first TSgt ALQ evaluation.

If a member has received a previous enlisted evaluation prior to becoming a 3N2 or 3N3 TSgt, an ANNUAL report will be accomplished by the premier band with a rating period immediately following their last enlisted evaluation and close out on the first 30 November TSgt SCOD following new DOR (date arrived on station at premier band), regardless of where member was assigned on the accountability date. The losing unit will provide an LOE.

Note: If the member was already a TSgt prior to arrival at a premier band, the unit to which they were assigned on the accountability date will maintain member on their MEL and will accomplish the 30 November enlisted evaluation.

Chapter 5

DAF FORM 77, *LETTER OF EVALUATION*

5.1. Purpose. Letters of evaluation (LOEs) assist raters in preparing officer and enlisted evaluations and are most often used when the ratee is under the supervision of someone other than the official rater. Raters may request LOEs from deployed/TDY supervisors or former supervisors with less than 120 calendar days of supervision during the evaluation reporting period.

5.2. Types of LOEs.

5.2.1. Formal LOEs. Formal LOEs, commonly known as the mandatory LOEs, are filed in the member's official records (ARMS/PRDA). Complete mandatory LOEs for the following:

5.2.1.1. Deployed Commander. Documents performance of deployed officers (RegAF, Guard, or Reserve) through the grade of colonel appointed on G-series orders to fill detachment, squadron, group, and wing commander positions for at least 45 calendar days. These LOEs will not restart the officer evaluation "clock" regardless of the TDY tour length. They are considered "embedded" evaluations. Further, there is no required minimum or maximum number of days of supervision. Officers filling 365-day deployments as the detachment, squadron, group, or wing commander will receive an officer evaluation in accordance with **paragraph 3.9**.

5.2.1.1.1. A negative assessment or comments will make the LOE a referral and require additional rater comments. If the evaluation is a referral, the reverse side of the form (Section VIII) is also completed. There is no minimum number of days required for completion of a referral LOE. **Note**: A non-concur does not necessarily make the report a referral.

5.2.1.1.2. Two evaluators, the rater and additional rater, will complete the DAF Form 77. However, if the rater is a wing commander or general officer, then the rater is considered a single evaluator and an additional rater is not required unless the report is a referral.

5.2.1.1.3. The form may be typed or handwritten and completed no later than 7 calendar days after ratee relinquishes command. The goal is to ensure that the LOE is completed before returning to home station. The FROM and THRU dates are determined by the date assumed/relinquished command.

5.2.1.1.4. LOEs will be accepted directly from individual officers. However, they will not be processed until the PERSCO team or the Air Force forward (AFFOR)/A1 verifies the eligibility of the officer. **(T-1)** The officer should contact their PERSCO team or AFFOR A1 to route the LOE through the appropriate channels.

5.2.1.2. Deployment/Contingency Operations. Document performance for deployed personnel not assigned to a deployed commander's billet when there are 60 or more days of supervision. While an LOE is mandatory, it will not be filed in the member's official record. **Note:** When the home station rater is also the deployed rater, an LOE is not required.

5.2.1.2.1. There are no official means to track LOEs in a deployed/contingency operation environment. The rater and ratee are responsible for accomplishing the LOE and ensuring it is forwarded to the ratee's home station rater. Contact the PERSCO team for local procedures.

5.2.1.2.2. An LOE may be accomplished for periods shorter than 60 days. There is no maximum number of days of supervision.

5.2.1.2.3. Complete LOEs no later than 7 calendar days from departure. When circumstances preclude a rater from accomplishing a LOE at the time of departure, every effort should be made to complete and provide a LOE to the home station when feasible.

5.2.1.2.4. Failure to receive a LOE is not grounds to appeal a future evaluation based on the absence or lack of deployment information in an evaluation.

5.2.1.3. PCS/PCA Departures. Document periods for ratees who PCS/PCA prior to the established grade SCOD. While an LOE is mandatory, it will not be filed in the member's official record. In cases where the rater departs, the rater must complete a draft evaluation to fulfill this requirement.

5.2.2. Informal LOEs.

5.2.2.1. Informal LOEs, commonly known as the optional LOEs, are not filed in the member's official records/ARMS/PRDA or attached to the completed evaluation. Raters may use the information from the LOE at their discretion. When used, information may be paraphrased or directly quoted from the LOE.

5.2.2.2. Separation. For A1Cs and below with less than 36 months total active federal military service, an LOE is required for separation cases involving parenthood, conditions that interfere with military service, unsatisfactory performance, or failure in the fitness program. If the ratee is separating to go into the ARC or transferring to another branch of service, an evaluation is required. **(T-1)** However, for officers only, if there is less than 120 calendar days of supervision an LOE is required. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.3. Supplemental LOEs. Supplemental LOEs are filed in the member's official records (ARMS/PRDA), attached to the evaluation they are supplementing.

5.2.3.1. Types of Supplemental LOEs include:

5.2.3.1.1. Continuation sheet for referral evaluations.

5.2.3.1.2. Continuation sheet for evaluator disagreements.

5.2.3.1.3. Continuation sheet for the Air Force Advisor.

5.2.3.1.4. Continuation sheet for the Functional/Acquisition Examiner.

5.2.4. Administrative LOEs. Administrative LOEs are filed in the member's official records (ARMS/PRDA) to document missing, lost, removed, or voided evaluations.

5.2.4.1. Administrative LOEs are not derogatory in nature.

5.2.4.2. Administrative LOEs are used to justify legitimate gaps between evaluations such as:

5.2.4.2.1. To document a break in service. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.4.2.2. To document extended periods of lost time, including prisoner status and appellate leave. Upon release, a DAF Form 77 will be accomplished by the servicing MPF or CSS. The start date will be the day after the close-out of the last evaluation and the end date will be the day the member is released from confinement. The next evaluation will begin the day after the close-out date of the LOE. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.4.2.3. To document educational leaves of absence, e.g., educational leave to a civilian institution. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.4.2.4. To document a legitimate gap when the ratee was on the temporary disability retired list and later removed and returned to duty. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.4.2.5. To document a legitimate gap for other reasons when approved by AF/A1. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.4.2.6. Administrative LOEs are used to document periods while participating in the Career Intermission Program.

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

5.2.4.3.1. Ordered removed by the AFBCMR, in accordance with DAFI 36-2603. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.4.3.2. Ordered removed by the ERAB in accordance with **Chapter 10**. See **Table 5.1**.

5.2.4.3.3. Lost and/or missing evaluations in which all actions to locate lost and/or missing evaluations have failed. See **paragraph 1.14** for procedures and **Table 5.1** for preparation of the DAF Form 77.

5.2.4.4. The use of administrative LOEs must be approved by AFPC or ARPC prior to filing them into the member's official records (ARMS/PRDA).

5.2.5. Other Purposes. AFPC MLR Office may use the DAF Form 77 to document when a board specific PRF is not required or available as stated below:

5.2.5.1. For officers on appellate leave or in prisoner status.

5.2.5.2. For officers who enter RegAF directly into Air Force-level training.

5.2.5.3. For officers who have a break in service and reenter directly into Air Force-level training.

5.3. Who Can Prepare.

5.3.1. Raters or any evaluators. Do not skip evaluators who are temporarily unavailable or to afford a higher-level evaluator the opportunity to endorse or comment on the LOE.

5.3.2. Personnel responsible for observing a ratee's performance when the ratee is not under the direct supervision of the designated rater.

5.3.3. Personnel directed to do so by the Air Force Board of Correction or ERAB.

5.3.4. MPF or CSS/HR specialist personnel as authorized in **paragraph 5.2**.

5.4. Administrative Practices.

5.4.1. LOEs will cover the period from the first day of supervision (or the day following the close-out date of the last officer evaluation, enlisted evaluation, or TR, whichever is later) through the last day of supervision.

5.4.2. DAF Form 77 may be typed or handwritten.

5.4.3. Limit comments to space provided on formal LOEs. If additional space is required on informal or supplemental LOEs, continue comments on a separate page, limited to one single-sided typed white bond paper, and attach it to the LOE.

5.4.4. Prepare LOEs in one copy.

5.4.5. Prepare LOEs using performance statements only.

5.4.6. Prohibited Comments. See **paragraph 1.12** for prohibited comments.

5.4.7. Raters may show a DAF Form 77 to the ratee.

5.5. Completing DAF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation*.

5.5.1. See **Table 5.1** for step-by-step procedures on completing all LOEs.

5.5.2. Deployed Commander LOEs. See **paragraph 5.2.1.2.1**.

5.5.3. Formal LOEs. See **paragraph 5.2.1**.

5.5.4. General Officer (to include selects) LOEs. See **Chapter 7**.

5.6. Routing, Updating and Disposition Responsibilities.

5.6.1. Informal LOEs will not be placed in the electronic Master Personnel Record Group (eMPerRGp). For all other informal LOEs, to include deployed enlisted ANG AGR/Statutory Tour personnel, the rater/supervisor forwards the completed form to the MPF, CSS/HR specialist PERSCO team who will, in turn, forward to the ratee's new and/or designated rater.

5.6.2. Supplemental LOEs are required to be attached to the evaluation they are supplementing and will be made a matter of record. They will be placed in the eOSR/SNCO selection record attached to the documents they are supplementing. A copy will be forwarded to ARMS/PRDA. **(T-1)**

5.6.3. Administrative LOEs are required to be placed in the official record in the eMPerRGp to substitute a missing evaluation or explain a gap between evaluations. The preparing agency forwards the original to the eMPerRGp (ARMS/PRDA), and performs any personnel system updates if required.

5.6.4. For all other LOEs not listed above, contact AFPC MLR Office or ARPC/DPT for procedures and/or further guidance.

5.7. MPF, CSS/HR Specialist, and PERSCO Team Responsibilities.

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

5.7.2. When applicable, make appropriate updates and forward the LOE to the rater pending the next evaluation.

5.7.3. Provide LOEs to the member's rater for use in preparing the next performance evaluation or training report. LOEs closing during the period of the performance evaluation will accompany the evaluation through the rating chain and remain with the evaluation until received by the MPF.

5.7.4. Forward LOEs to the member's gaining MPF or CSS/HR specialist when the member departs PCS, and no evaluation was required prior to departure.

5.7.5. Give the LOE to the member upon separation, retirement, or completion of the next performance evaluation. **Note:** If an evaluation is required, LOEs closing during the period of the performance evaluation will accompany the evaluation through the rating chain and remain with the evaluation until received by the MPF or CSS/HR specialist. Once the MPF or CSS/HR specialist determines the evaluation is acceptable for processing to file, they return the LOE to the ratee.

5.7.6. PERSCO Team Specific Responsibilities.

5.7.6.1. Identifies raters' and ratees' projected departure dates to AFFOR/A1, works with AFFOR/A1 to review and validate the list of commanders they service on G-series orders, and establish tracking and suspense control for all deployed commander LOEs at the deployed location. See **paragraph 5.6** for disposition of completed LOEs.

5.7.6.2. Provide the deployed rating chain the G-series order number and date for LOE preparation.

5.7.6.3. Upon receipt of final LOEs from deployed rating chain, verify if an Air Force advisor is required and forward to the Air Force advisor if required.

5.7.6.4. Final disposition of completed deployed commander LOEs.

5.7.6.4.1. For mandatory digitally signed LOEs, upload the completed DAF Form 77 according to the Personnel Services Delivery Guide and submit to AFPC/ARPC for transmission to ARMS/PRDA.

5.7.6.4.2. For mandatory wet signature LOEs, PERSCO teams upload the completed DAF Form 77 according to the Personnel Services Delivery Guide. PERSCO teams without system access will mail the completed DAF Form 77 to AFPC/DPSTSP, 550 C Street West Suite 7, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph, TX 78150 for RegAF, or to ARPC/DPTSE, 18420 East Silver Creek Ave, Bldg 390, Buckley SFB, CO 80011 for ARC. When the servicing PERSCO team is not collocated with the rater, the rater will mail the form to AFPC/DPSTSP or ARPC/DPTSE. If in a location where there is no mailing capability, PERSCO teams will place the completed form in a pre-addressed envelope and seal it. The ratee, rater, PERSCO team member, or trusted agent will be allowed to hand-carry and mail the form at first opportunity.

5.7.7. Additional Processing Responsibilities.

5.7.7.1. AFPC/DPSTSP.

5.7.7.1.1. Will validate the form and update MilPDS upon receipt of the DAF Form 77 for RegAF officers and send to ARMS/PRDA. For colonels, AFPC MLR Office sends "wet" signed LOEs to ARMS/PRDA, AF/A1LO.

5.7.7.1.2. If it is determined that the officer is not eligible at any time in the process, then the LOE will be changed to “Optional” and forwarded to member’s home unit rater.

5.7.7.2. ARPC/DPTSE.

5.7.7.2.1. For ARC officers, will be responsible for distribution and/or update to applicable organizations, depending on component and status.

5.7.7.2.2. Will conduct a quality control review of all deployed commander LOEs, process through ARMS/PRDA, and file the LOE in the officer’s eOSR.

5.7.7.3. MAJCOM or Combatant/Component Command. Responsible for designating the AF advisor (must be a colonel or above) when the final evaluator for a deployed commander LOE is not an AF officer or Department of the Air Force official.

Table 5.1. Instructions for Completing the DAF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation* (See Note 5).

SECTION I. RATEE IDENTIFICATION DATA	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
1. Name	Enter Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial, and JR., SR., III, etc. Use of "NMI" (no middle initial) is optional. The name will be in all upper case.
2. Social Security Number	Enter the Social Security Number.
3. Grade	Select the appropriate grade using the drop down menu. See **Note 1**.
4. Duty Air Force Specialty Code	Enter the Duty Air Force Specialty Code 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 LOE only. If applicable, enter the operation/contingency name ratee was deployed in support of (e.g., Operation ENDURING FREEDOM).
SECTION II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
PART A - Type of Report	Drop Down Menu. For formal/informal LOEs, enter: Letter of Evaluation For supplemental sheets, enter: Supplemental Sheet For acquisition examiner, functional examiner, Air Force advisor, enter: Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, Air Force For administrative LOE: leave blank.
SECTION II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
PART B	
1. From Thru See **Note 2**	From Date: Enter the date supervision began Thru Date: Enter the date supervision ended
2. Report Is	Drop Down Menu. Select either Mandatory or Optional. See **Table 5.2**.
3. Level of Deployed Commander Duties Performed	Deployed CC LOE Only. Drop Down Menu. Select either, Detachment CC, Squadron CC, Group CC, or Wing CC.
4. Number of Days in Commander Position	Deployed CC LOE Only. Enter the number of consecutive days served in the deployed commander position, on G-series orders.
5. G-Series Order Number	Deployed CC LOE Only. Enter the G-series order number.
Date of Order	Deployed CC LOE Only. Enter the date of the G-series order.
SECTION III. DEPLOYED COMMANDER ASSESSMENT (For Deployed CCs Only)	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
Officer Satisfactorily Completed	Deployed CC LOE Only. Select "Yes" if the officer satisfactorily

Their Deployed Command Tour	completed their deployed commander tour. Select "No" if completion was unsatisfactory. If "No," the report must be referred.
SECTION IV. COMMENTS/ IMPACT ON MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
Comments Area	This section is prepared by the deployed rater and the focus of the evaluation should be on what the officer did and on the officer's leadership, team building, and problem-solving abilities in accomplishing the mission. Performance statements must be used when preparing the LOE. Limit performance statements to the space provided on formal LOEs. If additional space is required on informal or supplemental LOEs, continue performance statements on a separate page and attach it to the LOE. See **paragraph 1.12** for prohibited comments; **paragraph 1.9** and **Notes 5** and **6** for mandatory comments; and **paragraph 1.11** 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 the close-out date.
Duty Title	Enter authorized deployed duty title.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwrite or type the date. Use the format DD Mmm YY. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not date before close-out date.
Social Security Number	Enter last four of the evaluator's social security number.
Signature	Digitally or manually sign. The typed signature format is: \\signed, xxx, DoDID #, DD Mmm YY\\. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not sign before the close-out date.
SECTION VI. ADDITIONAL RATER *(*Deployed CC Letter of Evaluation Only*)*	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
Concur/Non-concur Boxes	Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If non-concur is marked, explain the reason for the non-concurrence in the comments area.
Comments Area	Insert comments only if referral or to document non- concurrence. Referral LOEs must contain the applicable mandatory statement in accordance with **paragraph 1.11.5.3.2.2**.
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 the close-out date. 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 or type the date. Use the format DD Mmm YY. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not date before close-out date.
Social Security Number	Enter last four of the evaluator's social security number.
Signature	Digitally or manually sign. The typed signature format is: \\signed, xxx, DoDID #, DD Mmm YY\\. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. 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, "Member Unavailable to Sign" and "Member Declined to Sign." In this case the rater or additional rater in the rating chain may sign for the ratee.
Signature	Digitally or manually sign. The typed signature format is: \\signed, xxx, DoDID #, DD Mmm YY\\. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not sign before the close-out date.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwrite or type the date. Use the format DD Mmm YY. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not date before close-out date.
SECTION VIII. REFERRAL REPORT (Deployed CC LOE Only) (All other referral LOEs must use the same procedures as outlined in Chapter 5. The DAF Form 77 is designed to include the referral memorandum directly on the form.)	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
I am referring.	State specifically what comments make the LOE a referral.
Send Comments to	Enter the grade and name of the referring evaluator's deployed rater.
Name, Grade, Branch of Service of Referring Evaluator	Enter evaluator identification as of the close-out date. See **Note 3**. If the evaluator named in this section is the additional rater, Section VI will be completed in accordance with **paragraph 1.11**.
Duty Title	Enter the duty title as of the close-out date.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwrite or type the date. Use the format DD Mmm YY. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not date before close-out date.The ratee has 3 duty days (30 calendar days for ANG/AFR) to submit comments and the rebuttal. All supporting documentation is limited to a total of 10 pages, 5 pages front and back.
Signature	Digitally or manually sign. The typed signature format is: \\signed, xxx, DoDID #, DD Mmm YY\\. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not sign before the close-out date.
SECTION VIII. REFERRAL REPORT (Deployed CC LOE Only)	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
Signature of Ratee	Signature is for acknowledging receipt. It does not constitute agreement or disagreement. Wet sign 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 or type the date. Use the format DD Mmm YY. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**.
SECTION IX. REFERRAL REVIEWER (Deployed CC Letter of Evaluation Only. Used Only if Additional Rater Refers the letter of evaluation or as authorized by AFPC/DPPSP)	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
Ratee Did/Did Not Submit Comments	Place an "X" in the appropriate box.

I Do/Do Not Concur With Assessment	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	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwrite or type the date. Use the format DD Mmm YY. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**.
Social Security Number	Enter only the last four of the evaluator's social security number.
Signature	Digitally or manually sign. The typed signature format is: \\signed, xxx, DoDID #, DD Mmm YY\\. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not sign before the close-out date.
SECTION X. ACQUISTION OR FUNCTIONAL EXAMINER/AIR FORCE ADVISOR REVIEW (Used only as applicable)	
Item/Description	**Instructions**
Acquisition Examiner	Place an "X" in the applicable box.
Functional Examiner	Place an "X" in the applicable box.
Air Force Advisor	See **Note 4**.
Name, Grade, Branch of Service, Organization, Command, Location	Enter evaluator identification as of close-out. See **Note 3**.
Signature	Digitally or manually sign. The typed signature format is: \\signed, xxx, DoDID #, DD Mmm YY\\. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**. Do not sign before the close-out date.
Date	Digital signatures will auto-date form. If not available handwrite or type the date. Use the format DD Mmm YY. See **paragraph 1.4.12.2**.

Notes:

1. Grade Data. Use the information below to determine the appropriate grade entry. For:

a. Officers. Enter the active duty grade in which serving on the close-out date. If the ratee has been frocked, enter actual grade, not the grade the member is wearing.

b. Non-AGR ANG and AFR Officers. Enter grade in which serving and "Non-Extended Active Duty." 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 Extended Active Duty under 10 U.S.C. §§ 10211, 10305, 12310, 12402 or 32 U.S.C. § 708. Enter grade in which serving and "AGR."

d. LEAD officers on Extended Active Duty under 10 U.S.C. § 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 evaluation or TR whichever is later; or if there is not previous evaluation, the extended active duty or total active federal military service date.

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, temporary duty action, or the day before the commander's written notice of a planned separation in accordance with DAFI 36-3211.

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 social security number. If the evaluator is a civilian or a member of a foreign service, the social security number is not authorized.
b. Upon Senate confirmation, colonels on the brigadier general select list are permitted to sign all Officer Evaluation System forms as "Brig Gen (Sel)" provided they are either designated by their respective management level as a senior rater or they are assigned to an authorized, funded or unfunded, brigadier general officer position, frocked or not.
c. Upon Senate confirmation, brigadier generals on the major general select list are permitted to sign all Officer Evaluation System forms as "Maj Gen (Sel)" provided that they are either evaluating other general officers or are assigned to an authorized, funded or unfunded, major general officer position, frocked or not.
d. Any LOE closing out prior to the senate confirmation date will not reflect the "Select (Sel)" and, if necessary, be forwarded up the chain for endorsement. In addition, all frocked general officers are authorized to sign all Officer Evaluation System forms in their frocked grade without designating their frocked status (e.g., major general vice major general "frocked").
4. The examiner/advisor may provide clarification about the ratee's duty performance, 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 DAFI 36-2608.
a. Documenting Unrated Periods between Officer Evaluations. Complete an DAF 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 DAF Form 77. When an officer enters the Air Force from another service, prepare a DAF 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 MPF prepares the DAF Form 77 and forwards a copy to the custodian of the SNCO selection record, eOSR, and ARMS/PRDA. The servicing MPF informs the officer of the preparation and filing of the DAF Form 77. Responsibility for the preparation of the DAF Form 77 is as follows:
(1) ARPC for individuals recalled under 10 U.S.C. §§ 10301, 10211, 12301(d), 12310, 10305, 9038 and 12402; US Property and Fiscal Officers recalls under 32 U.S.C. § 708; and recalls to serve with the Selective Service.
(2) The losing ARC MPF, if assigned to nonparticipating status:
(a) For Reservists. ARPC/DPTSE documents voids in records for periods of service for officers assigned to a reserve section, 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 their last officer evaluation.
(b) For unit recalls, the servicing MPF or CSS prepares the DAF Form 77.
b. For Individuals with Prior Service with Previous Evaluations. When the ratee, including an enlistee with prior service, has previous 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 DAF Form 77. For the THRU date:
(1) Update the day before the extended active duty date in the system for active duty personnel.
(2) Update the day before the assignment begins in the system for non-active duty SrA and above.
(3) For enlisted members, project the annual evaluation one year from their extended active duty date, unless the ratee does not have at least 20 months total active federal military service on the extended active duty date; in this case, close out the evaluation when the ratee completes 20 months total active

federal military service as an initial evaluation. **Exception:** A DBH evaluation is required for promotion consideration. For ARC, less than 20 months DIEMS.
(4) For officers, project the annual evaluation one year from their extended active duty date. **Exception:** A 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 DAF Form 77 begins with the ratee's total active federal military service date (Enlisted) or extended active duty date (Officers) and closes out the DAF Form 77 one day before the reentry to extended active duty 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 DAF Form 77.
(2) For enlisted members, update the system with rating code "PB" (Not rated (break in service)) and the close-out date. For officers, forward the DAF Form 77 to the eMPerRGp custodian for routing and distribution.
(3) For enlisted members, project the evaluation to the next static close-out date unless the ratee does not have at least 20 months total active federal military service on the extended active duty date; in this case, close-out the evaluation when the ratee completes 20 months total active federal military service, as an initial evaluation.
(4) For officers, project the annual evaluation one year from their extended active duty date. **Exception:** A DBH evaluation is required for promotion consideration.
d. Restored to Regular Active Duty. A release from active duty that has been voided by the Board for Correction of Military Records and the ratee has been ordered back to active duty. AFPC/DPMSP will prepare the DAF Form 77. Enter the statement: "No evaluation available for the period (date) through (date). Officer restored to regular active duty by direction of the Secretary of the Air Force," in Section IV of the DAF Form 77.
e. Lost Time, Confinement or 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 MPF or CSS will prepare the DAF Form 77. Enter the statement: "No evaluation available for the period (date) through (date). No evaluation required in accordance with AFI 36-2406," in Section IV of the DAF Form 77.
f. Career Intermission Program (CIP). To document unrated periods on individuals who are participating in the CIP, the period will be from the time the individual started the CIP through when the member returned to the unit. Section II A will have marked "Supplemental Sheet." No other areas will be marked on the DAF Form 77. The DAF Form 77 will be signed by no lower than the unit commander of the member's assigned unit. Enter the statement: "Career Intermission Program from (date) through (date). No evaluation required in accordance with AFI 36-2406," in Section IV of the DAF Form 77. The next evaluation period will start the day after the thru date on the DAF Form 77.
g. Temporary Disability Retired List. To document an unrated period when the ratee was on the Temporary Disability Retired List; then removed and returned to active duty (Temporary Disability Retired List removal and return to active duty is prepared by AFPC Disability Program Administrator [AFPC/DPFD]) 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 DAF Form 77.
h. AFBCMR Directed. Board actions taken by the AFBCMR under DAFI 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 DAF Form 77.
i. ERAB Directed. Board actions taken by the ERAB in accordance with **Chapter 10** will enter the statement: (USAF) "Not rated for the above period. Evaluation removed by order of the Chief of Staff, USAF," in Section IV of the DAF Form 77.
j. Lost and/or Missing Evaluations. See **paragraph 1.14** for procedures. For lost and/or missing

evaluations in which all actions to find/recover have failed, use the DAF Form 77 as a substitute for a missing evaluation. Complete the name, social security number, 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." If the system has a rating, also include the statement: "The system [reflects an overall rating of "X"]/ [does not reflect an overall rating]," in Section IV of the DAF Form 77.

6. When an DAF Form 77 is used for other than performance evaluations, the HR specialist enters their information in the signature block and signs in Section IV.

Table 5.2. When to submit a Letter of Evaluation.

RULE	When to Prepare a Letter of Evaluation	Type	File in eMPerRGp Yes/No	Mandatory	Optional
1	Deployed Commander Letter of Evaluation. See **Note 1**.	Formal	Yes	X	
2	Separation.	Informal	No		X
3	Change of Reporting Official (CRO) due to the PCS/PCA of the ratee or rater; and the ratee is an active duty A1C or below, with less than 20 months Total Active Federal Military Service, 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 program. See **Note 4**.	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No	X	
4	Officer - CRO due to the PCS/PCA of the ratee or rater with any days of supervision. Enlisted - CRO due to the PCS/PCA of the ratee or rater with any days of supervision**.**		No	X	
5	Enlisted AFR personnel when the rater departs PCS.		No	X	

RULE	When to Prepare a Letter of Evaluation	Type	File in eMPerRGp Yes/No	Mandatory	Optional
6	RegAF officer and enlisted personnel when deployed in support of contingency operations.		No	X	
7	ANG personnel when deployed in support of contingency operations.		No	X	
8	Supplemental Letter of Evaluation. See **Note 2**.	Supplemental	Yes	X	
9	Administrative Letter of Evaluation. See **Note 3**.	Administrative	Yes	X	
10	All Other Letters of Evaluation, (Lt Col and below), not covered above are optional; however, they are highly recommended	Informal (not filed in the permanent record)	No		X

Notes*:*

1. Deployed Commander LOE. Prepare for officers (in the grade of colonel and below) deployed in support of contingency operations to fill detachment, 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, they 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 officer evaluation accomplished if deployed at the commander's respective SCOD.

2. Supplemental LOEs are required to be attached to the document they are supplementing and will be filed in the eMPerRGp with that document.

3. Administrative LOEs are filed in the eMPerRGp for informational purposes, to explain gaps in records, missing evaluations, breaks in service, etc.

4. If the ratee has less than 20 months total active federal military service and comments in the LOE are referral in nature, only an informal LOE is authorized. The comments from this LOE may be included in the ratee's initial evaluation.

Chapter 6

DAF FORM 475, *EDUCATION/TRAINING REPORT*

6.1. When to Use Training Reports (TRs). DAF Forms 475 are not authorized for enlisted members. **(T-1)**

6.1.1. Submissions are mandatory (see **Table 6.2**.):

6.1.1.1. Upon completion or interruption of, or elimination from formal training or education when the scheduled course length is eight weeks or more or as authorized in this chapter when the specific course is less than eight weeks (Chaplain or Medical Programs, Squadron Officer School, and Officer Training School - Accelerated); AFR Air Reserve Technicians (ARTs) and ANG Military Technicians attending formal training or education in civilian status receive a TR and credit in the civilian evaluation system.

6.1.1.1.1. If the interruption or elimination from training was of no fault of the officer, a TR will be completed if the officer was enrolled in training for 10 duty days or more to document performance. If the officer was enrolled in training for 9 duty days or less, a TR is not required. However, a memorandum for record will be produced by the training squadron commander stating the interruption or elimination was of no fault of the officer and they are eligible to attend the training, provided they continue to meet the requirements.

6.1.1.1.2. If the officer is at fault regarding the interruption or elimination from training, a TR is required regardless of length of time enrolled in training.

6.1.1.2. For self-paced courses, when the prescribed course length is eight weeks or more, regardless of the time actually required to complete the course.

6.1.1.3. At the end of each academic year, unless the course completion date is within four months of the annual TR. The academic year for officers attending law school under Funded Legal Education Program or the Excess Leave Program ends after the officer's summer internship training.

6.1.1.4. For personnel participating in the World Class Athlete Program, one year from beginning training, then annually until training is completed or member is eliminated from training.

6.1.1.5. Reserve Chaplain Candidates. At the end of each active duty training tour of 10 days or more and processed as prescribed by AFRC.

6.1.1.6. Member is assigned to a full-time degree program through the Air Force Institute of Technology. Requirements are the same as in effect for officers in attendance. The rater on the TR is designated by the commandant of each Department of the Air Force school or the detachment commander. The designee must serve in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee.

6.1.1.7. 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 advanced academic degrees, 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. Member must meet the following eligibility criteria to reflect degree completion:

6.1.2.1.1. The member was assigned to a full-time degree program through the Air Force Institute of Technology. **(T-3)**

6.1.2.1.2. The member completed all but the thesis or dissertation portion of the degree program. **(T-3)**

6.1.2.1.3. The member has a previous DAF Form 475 in the eMPerRGp that clearly identifies the reason for non-completion as, "Thesis or dissertation not completed during an Air Force Institute of Technology tour," in accordance with **Table 6.1**. **(T-3)**

6.1.2.1.4. The member completed the degree requirements of the Air Force Institute of Technology program in which they were originally enrolled. **(T-3)**

6.1.2.1.5. The officer documented degree completion through Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) channels (verified via a MilPDS inquiry). **(T-3)**

6.1.2.2. The member who meets the above criteria is responsible for submitting an official transcript to the AFIT Academic Coding Branch (AFIT/MSP) requesting completion of a TR.

6.1.3. Directed Submission. When directed by HAF, for courses 8 weeks or longer.

6.1.4. AFIT Master's Degree Students and Other Long School Students. Students will receive one final TR upon completion of a course 18 months or less. **Exception:** Above the promotion zone students will receive DBH 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, consider DBC referral TRs if a student does not meet standards in an area other than training progress.

6.1.5. DELETED.

6.1.5.1. DELETED.

6.1.5.2. DELETED.

6.1.5.3. DELETED.

6.1.5.4. DELETED.

6.2. Who Prepares Training Reports.

6.2.1. The officer designated by the commandant of each Department of the 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**. **(T-1)**

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. **(T-1)**

6.2.3. The education services officer may complete a TR only when they are the rater.

6.2.4. AFIT personnel prepare TRs for officers under the Funded Legal Education Program or Excess Leave Program. 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 PhD program during both the academic and the research phases. During the research phase, sponsoring laboratory and research facility personnel may prepare an optional LOE and submit it to AFIT.

6.2.6. AFIT standardizes TRs that document completion of advanced academic degrees 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 programs that are 26 weeks or longer. The evaluator may communicate directly with the institution to obtain the information required to prepare the evaluation. See **Table 6.1** for recording adverse actions.

6.2.8. Officer Training School personnel prepare TRs for officers in a direct commissioning program who complete Officer Training School – Accelerated.

6.2.9. The Headquarters Air Force Services Agency Commander prepares TRs on members participating in the World Class Athlete Program.

6.3. Referral Training Reports. See **paragraph 1.11.6.4**.

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 AFPC/DPSTSP (RegAF) or ARPC/DPTSE (ARC), who files the TR into the eMPerRGp and updates MilPDS.

6.4.1.1.2. For judge advocates (lieutenant colonel and below), forward a copy of the TR to the Air Force Judge Advocate Professional Development Directorate (AF/JAX).

6.4.1.2. Training reports on extended active duty officers are due to AFPC 60 calendar days after the training report close-out date. **(T-2)** AGR and LEAD officers' training reports are due to ARPC/DPTSE 60 calendar days after the close-out date. **(T-2)**

6.4.1.3. Training reports on non-extended active duty officers are due to ARPC/DPTSE 60 calendar days after the training report close-out date. **(T-2)**

6.4.2. For officers attending school in PCS status:

6.4.2.1. The school prepares the training report and forwards to AFPC/DPSTSP by electronic means or mail to, ATTN: Evaluations Operations, 550 C Street West, Joint Base San Antonio, TX 78150.

6.4.2.2. Training reports are due to AFPC 60 calendar days after the close-out date (120 calendar days for AFIT/civilian institution programs).

6.4.3. For non-extended active ANG officers, send training reports to the servicing MPF for quality review, adding of opening dates and AFSCs. The MPF will distribute the completed original training report to ARPC/DPTSE and copies to the eOSR and State Adjutant General no later than 60 calendar days after close-out date.

6.4.4. AFIT/RRE will forward the completed training report that documents subsequent completion of an advanced academic degree to all appropriate agencies for filing in the eMPerRGp. The training report will be filed based on the signature date of the DAF Form 475, not with the original DAF Form 475 that indicated non completion of the advanced academic degree.

Table 6.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 475, *Education/Training Report* (Officers Only).

SECTION I. Identification Data (See Notes 1 and 2)		
ITEM	**A** **Item To Complete**	**B** **Instructions**
1	Name	Enter Last Name, First Name Middle Initial, and Jr., Sr., etc. Use of "NMI" when there is no middle initial is not mandatory. The name will be in all upper case.
2	Social Security Number	Enter social security number.
3	Grade	Select grade.
4	Duty Air Force Specialty Code	Enter Duty Air Force Specialty Code held as of the THRU date of the TR. Include prefix and suffix.
5	Organization, Command, and Location	Enter organization data. For Squadron Officer School students and Officer Training School - Accelerated students enter the organizational data for Squadron Officer School and Officer Training School - Accelerated.
6	Period of Report	See **Table 6.2**.
7	Length of Course	For all formal training or education, enter number of weeks (rounded down to the nearest whole week and followed by the word "weeks") of the scheduled training or education. Use scheduled length of training even if the officer completes a self-paced course early, course completion is delayed, the officer is temporarily held beyond the actual course/training completion date, or the officer is eliminated from training (see **Note 3** and **Note 9**).
8	Reason for Report	Place an "X" in the appropriate box (see **Note 4**).
9	Name and Location of School or Institution	Enter required information (see **Note 5**).
10	Name or Title of Course	Enter title of course.
SECTION II. Report Data		
ITEM	**A** Evaluation Report Data	**B** Complete only the applicable items in this section; leave non-applicable items blank.
1	AFSC/Aero Rating/Degree Awarded	Enter AFSC, aeronautical rating, or degree awarded.
2	Completion	Place an "X" in the box, if applicable.

3	Distinguished Graduate (DG)	Place an “X,” if appropriate, in the "Yes" or "No DG Program" block on final TR. Leave item blank if DG program exists and ratee did not receive such a designation.
4	DG Award Criteria/Course Non-completion Reason	Enter DG Award Criteria or Course Non-completion Reason. For a student designated as a DG in item 3, provide the criteria (**Example**: Top 10 percent of class or grade point average above 3.5) (see **Note 6**).
SECTION III. Comments		
ITEM	**A**	**B**
	Item To Complete	**Instructions**
1	Academic Training Accomplishments	Do include comments if the ratee received recognition for specific or above average achievement, such as designation as a DG. Do not make promotion/developmental education recommendations or provide a stratification (see **Notes 7** and **8**).
***2**	Professional Qualities	Comments are mandatory concerning general attitude, military bearing, appearance, conduct, and fitness (see **paragraph 1.4.10** for fitness requirements). When an evaluator cannot observe professional qualities due to geographic separation (e.g., civilian institution AFIT students), include the statement, "Ratee is geographically separated from evaluator," in the “Professional Qualities” block of section III. Do not make promotion/developmental education recommendations or provide stratifications (see **Notes 7** and **8**).
3	Other Comments	Section may be used to document other performance outside the training environment (e.g., performance during the inclusive period prior to entering training which has not been previously documented). This may include stratifications earned from the home unit consistent with **paragraph 3.15**.
SECTION IV - Evaluator		
ITEM	**A**	**B**
	Item To Complete	**Instructions**
1	Evaluator Data	Enter information required and command of assignment for evaluator in the spaces provided. Sign the original (copies: sign or initial). Do not sign or date an evaluation before the close-out date. The grade and duty title must coincide with those held on the close-out date of the evaluation. Enter only the last four digits of the social security number. If the evaluator is a civilian or a member of a foreign service, the social security number is not authorized.

Notes:
1. See TR notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the MPF or CSS/HR specialist for correction.

2. See **Table 6.2** for FROM and THRU areas.

3. For AFR selective service officers attending a National Security Seminar, leave blank.

4. Use the following guidelines in determining the reason for the TR:
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 HAF or an appropriate commander for extended active duty officers or AFR officers not on extended active duty, or NGB for ANG officers not on extended active duty. TRs will reflect "Directed."

5. For AFR officers in selective service performing their annual active duty tour for training through attendance at a National Security Seminar, enter "National Security Seminar" and location.

6. If the student has failed to complete the course of training, use one of the following phrases and indicate whether the elimination was due to factors over which the student did or did not have control (if derogatory comments are used, the TR must be referred):
a. Withdrawn without prejudice for the needs of the Air Force (only used for those in training for 10 duty days (or more) and training was interrupted or the officer was eliminated due to no fault of their own).
b. Withdrawn for humanitarian reasons (only used for those in training for 10 duty days (or more) and training was interrupted or the officer was eliminated due to no fault of their own).
c. Eliminated for academic deficiency.
d. Eliminated for flying deficiency.
e. Eliminated for physical reasons.
f. Eliminated for fear of flying.
g. Eliminated for manifestation of apprehension.
h. Eliminated for instructor non-adaptability.
i. Eliminated for skill or aptitude deficiency.
j. Voluntary self-elimination.
k. Thesis or dissertation not completed during AFIT tour.
l. 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 court-martial convictions.
b. Comments regarding elimination or interruption of training by official orders, citing specific reason when possible.

c. If an officer has any adverse information filed in their officer selection record, comments relating to the ratee's behavior are mandatory if not already documented on a previous evaluation or TR. See **paragraph 1.8.7.2**.
d. Comments mandatory for AFR selective service officers: enter "Officer is attending this section of National Security Seminar as their annual short tour." **Note:** Evaluators are required to make comments on TRs regarding adverse information filed in an officer's officer selection record.

8. Comments may be standardized on TRs.

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 DAF Form 475, Training Report.

RULE	A **If the member is attending**	B **and education or training is**	C **then the information management tool (IMT) is**
1	A degree granting academic education program through AFIT.	any length. See **Notes 1** and **2**.	filed in eOSR, electronic Senior Noncommissioned Officer Selection Record (eNSR) and eMPerRGp. See **Note 3**
2	Developmental Education, In- Residence: (Air Force) Primary Developmental Education (PDE), Intermediate	8 weeks or more, but less than 20 weeks. See **Note 4**.	
3	Developmental Education (IDE), Senior Developmental Education (SDE),	20 weeks or more. See **Note 1**.	
4	The National Security Seminar for all selective service AFR officers not on extended active duty (AFR Officers only).		
5	A course or series of courses considered initial training in a utilization field. See **Notes 5** and **6**.	8 weeks or more, but less than 20 weeks. See **Notes 4** and **8**.	
6		20 weeks or more. See **Notes 1** and **8**.	
7	A direct commissioning program, such as Officer Training School – Accelerated. See **Note 6**.	8 weeks or less	
8	The World Class Athlete Program. See **Note 11**.	any length. See **Note 1**.	
9	The Air Force Intern Program. See **Note 7**.	20 weeks or more. See **Note 1**.	
10	The Reserve Chaplains Program (AFR Officers only).	10 days or more. See **Note 8**.	filed in the eOSR at ARPC/ DPTS
11	The Chaplain Candidate Program (AFR Officers only).	active duty tour of 10 days or more. See **Notes 1** and **9**.	
12		8 weeks or less	
13	Training or education not covered above. See **Note 10**.	8 weeks or more but less Than 20 weeks. See **Notes 4** and **8**	filed in eOSR, NSRG and

14		20 weeks or more. See **Notes 1** and **8**.	eMPerRGp. See Note 3
15	Interrogator Duty Training.	23 weeks or more. See **Note 12**.	

Notes:

1. TRs prepared under this rule begin the day following the THRU date of the student's last officer evaluation or TR unless it is an initial TR. For initial TRs, the FROM date is: the date of officer's entry on extended active duty or start of the current AGR/LEAD assignment; or the date of the first federally recognized appointment for ANG students not on extended active duty; or for AFR students not on extended active duty, the date of the last assignment to the Ready Reserve position presently held. The THRU date is the date the training or course ends or when the officer is released by the training organization. **Example:** A student has an officer evaluation that closed out on 1 July 2023 and attends a course beginning on 6 August 2023. The course graduated on 5 August 2024. The period of evaluation should be 2 July 2023 to 5 August 2024. In the event the officer remains in casual status with the training organization, the period of the evaluation will be to the date the officer is released. AFR Air Reserve Technicians (ARTs) 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 at site https://usaf.dps.mil/teams/app10-etca/sitepages/home.aspx, or other appropriate directive.
2. Do not accomplish TRs on students in the Education Leave of Absence Program in TDY status unless course length is 26 weeks or more.
3. The eOSR is not maintained on lieutenants or non-promotion eligible captains on the ADL.
4. TRs prepared under this rule cover a period independent of the ratee's officer evaluation period. Therefore, it is not necessary to prepare an officer evaluation 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:** A ratee had an officer evaluation that closed out on 1 Nov 2023 and attends a course from 1 January 2024 to 1 Apr 2024. The DAF Form 475 covers the period from 1 January 2024 to 1 Apr 2024. The ratee's next officer evaluation will have a FROM date of 2 November 2023 and the time the officer is absent will be subtracted from the period of supervision on the next officer evaluation. AFR ARTs 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 at site https://usaf.dps.mil/teams/app10-etca/sitepages/home.aspx, or other appropriate directive.
5. Includes Undergraduate Pilot Training, Student Undergraduate Pilot Training, Undergraduate Navigator Training, and Student Undergraduate Navigator Training, Undergraduate Space and Missile Training, Aircraft Maintenance Officer Course and other entry-level courses (as determined by the MAJCOM). Officials at MAJCOM HQs and HAF are responsible for the

course content and curriculum and determine if the course is initial qualification. **Note:** Officers in the second year of Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations (AF/A8)-sponsored Nuclear Technology Fellows Program, working in their primary specialty, and health profession officers who are in-utilization training for one year or more will have an officer evaluation versus a TR. AF/A8 and AF/SG will determine the rating chain for the identified officers and in coordination with AFPC/DPPSP, 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 guidance affects officer evaluations only; it has no impact on the requirement for narrative only PRFs for the officers in training.

6. This training applies to judge advocates, chaplains, medical officers, cyberspace officers, and Air Force Reserve operation analysts, intelligence officers, security forces officers, chemists, nuclear chemists, physicist/nuclear physicists, developmental engineers, and acquisition managers.

7. Annual, Directed, and Final TRs, as appropriate, will be prepared at the end of each training phase.

a. Annual TRs will be prepared by the sponsoring organization for interns in Phase IIIA; they will close-out on 30 Jun.

b. Directed TRs will be prepared by the sponsoring organization for interns in Phase IIIB who opt to complete a master's degree or elect a third rotation; TRs will cover the period 1 Jul to 31 Dec.

c. Final TRs will be prepared by the sponsoring organization for interns who opt for a post-training assignment upon completion of Phase IIIB or who opt for and complete a third rotation.

8. For self-paced formal Air Force training courses when the prescribed course length is eight weeks or more, regardless of the time actually required to complete the course.

9. DAF Forms 475 on chaplain candidates are prepared and processed as prescribed by ARPC. ARPC/DPTSE will file chaplain DAF Forms 475 in the selection folder.

10. 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.

11. For members participating in the World Class Athlete Program, one year from beginning training, then annually until training is completed or member is eliminated from training.

12. 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.

Chapter 7

GENERAL OFFICER EVALUATIONS

7.1. Overview. This chapter covers procedures for completing DAF Form 78, *Department of the Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation*. It applies to all RegAF and ARC brigadier generals and major generals (to include selects) except State Adjutant Generals.

7.2. Forms Used.

7.2.1. For brigadier generals and major generals (to include Senate confirmed selects and frocked), use DAF Form 78. See **Table 7.1**.

7.2.2. A DAF Form 77 can be used to document performance and potential and to provide that information to the management level. See **Table 7.2**. It is also used to document performance of general officers/selectees who are serving in a TDY status for more than 60 but less than 179 calendar days. General officers/selectees that are serving in a TDY status for more than 180 calendar days receive a DAF Form 78. See **Table 7.1**.

7.3. Reasons for Reports.

7.3.1. Annual Reports. Brigadier general (including Senate confirmed selects) reports close-out 31 July; non extended active-duty brigadier general (including Senate confirmed selects) reports close-out 31 May.

7.3.2. Change of Reporting Official (CRO) Reports. In the event a CRO occurs, and there are at least 60 calendar days of supervision, a CRO report is optional if the CRO occurs outside 60 calendar days from the annual requirement with the approval of AF/A1LG. A CRO is any close-out date other than the SCOD (31 July for brigadier generals and Senate confirmed selects).

7.3.3. Directed by HAF Reports. AF/A1LG (AF/REG for non-extended active duty officers) may direct general officer (GO) reports at any time, regardless of the days of supervision.

7.3.4. Directed by NGB Reports. NGB-SL-B may direct GO reports at any time, regardless of the days of supervision.

7.3.5. Officers Selected and Confirmed 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. Use the Colonel SCOD when the selected member's report is due prior to Senate confirmation and prior to the brigadier general SCOD. This report will count for the entire calendar year. See **paragraph 7.4.8** for further details.

7.4. General Instructions.

7.4.1. Who receives reports. Brigadier generals (including Senate confirmed selects) will receive at least one DAF Form 78 per calendar year. **(T-1)** If a CRO occurs between January and the general officer SCOD (31 July for brigadier generals and Senate confirmed selects), coordinate with AF/A1LG to determine appropriate procedures.

7.4.2. General Officers Selected and Senate Confirmed for Major General. Once a GO is selected and Senate confirmed for promotion to major general, completion of the report is optional with the exception of the deputy judge advocate general (Major General) to ensure their records match the eligible 1-stars and colonels meeting the judge advocate general (TJAG) board.

7.4.3. General Officers Who Have Applied for Retirement. If the GO is a brigadier general and is eligible for promotion consideration to major general and the approved retirement date is more than 90 calendar days from the promotion board convening date, a report is mandatory. If the brigadier general is promotion eligible and the approved retirement date is within 90 calendar days of the major general board convening date, remove the GO from the management control group.

7.4.3.1. Write a report if a GO withdraws their retirement. The report will close-out on the appropriate current cycle performance report close-out date. **(T-1)**

7.4.3.2. Make a promotion recommendation on DAF Form 78, block 15, only if the member withdraws their retirement within 90 calendar days prior to the annual cycle close-out date.

7.4.4. General officers with dual responsibilities in separate management levels. The ratee's management level of administrative assignment controls the promotion recommendation (or evaluation). However, any of the ratees' supervisors may submit appropriate communications to the management level for consideration.

7.4.4.1. Use the ratee's duty effective date and the annual cycle close-out date to determine the management level of administrative assignment.

7.4.4.2. Any member of the ratee's rating chain (in either management level) 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/A1LG (AF/REG for non-extended active duty officers, or NGB-SL-B for Air National Guard of the United States general officers) to determine appropriate procedures.

7.4.6. General officers reassigned to a new management level during the evaluation process. If the GO is reassigned to a new management level within 60 calendar days before or after the annual cycle close-out date, either the gaining or losing management level completes the endorser portion (block 16) on the DAF Form 78. Both management levels must agree on which management level will function as the endorsing official. **(T-1)** AF/A1 and AF/A1LG (AF/REG for non-extended active duty officers) must concur with the decision. **(T-1)** If a CRO occurs within the period 60 to 90 calendar days before the annual cycle closes out and the ratee changes management levels during this period, the losing management level 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 management level, then the losing management level completes blocks 1-15 of the DAF Form 78. The gaining management level will complete the remaining portion, to include the final endorsement or promotion recommendation. **(T-1)**

7.4.6.2. If the ratee did not work directly for the losing management level, then the losing rater completes the rater portion of the DAF Form 78 (through block 15) and forwards it to the losing management level. The losing management level provides information. This may be accomplished using DAF Form 77.

7.4.7. General officers reassigned within the current management level during the evaluation process. If the GO moves within 90 days of the appropriate annual cycle close-out date and the officer's management level does not change, the rater completes a CRO report (minimum 90 calendar days supervision). This report will serve in place of the annual report. **(T-1)** Provide the report to the management level for completion of blocks 15 through 19 (on promotion-eligible officers) or blocks 16 through 19 (not promotion-eligible). The management level will complete the report upon the annual cycle close-out date along with other annual reports on officers in the same control group. **(T-1)** If a CRO occurs within the period 60 to 90 calendar days before the annual cycle closes out and the ratee does not change management levels during this period (e.g., rater departs PCS or ratee changes jobs within management level), the rater completes a CRO report and the management level holds the report until the end of the annual cycle. The CRO report will serve as the annual report. **(T-1)**

7.4.8. Officers Selected and Confirmed for Brigadier General.

7.4.8.1. When promotion to brigadier general is publicly announced by AF/A1LG (AF/REG for non-extended active duty officers) as Senate confirmed, prepare a DAF Form 78.

7.4.8.2. If the member's last performance report as a colonel closes out before the annual brigadier general cycle (31 Jul or 31 May for non-extended active duty), the member's next performance report will close-out 31 Jul, or 31 May for non-extended active duty, unless a CRO or DBH report is required. **(T-1)** The member's next report will comply with **paragraph 7.3**. **(T-1)**

7.4.8.3. Use the colonel SCOD when the selected member's report is due prior to Senate confirmation and prior to the brigadier general SCOD. This report will count for the entire calendar year. **(T-1)**

7.4.8.4. Forward reports within 30 calendar days of the close-out to: AF/A1LG for extended active duty officers; NGB-SL-B for ANG officers; and AF/REG for reserve officers.

7.5. Processing General Officer Evaluations. Email all digitally signed GO evaluations to AF/A1LG for update in MilPDS and upload into the member's record in ARMS/PRDA.

7.5.1. Extended Active Duty Officers Assigned to an Air Force Activity. In activities with a director of personnel (A1/S1/J1) function (e.g., MAJCOMs), the A1/S1/J1 ensures evaluators complete all reports correctly and forwards them to AF/A1LG within 30 calendar days of the report close-out date.

7.5.2. Extended Active Duty Officers Assigned to Air Force Secretariat, Air Staff, or Non-AF Activities. For activities not serviced by an Air Force A1/S1/J1, AF/A1LG assists executive officers with the preparation of the DAF Form 78.

7.5.3. Air Force Reserve General Officers. Send reports to AF/REG within 30 calendar days of the report close-out date.

7.5.4. Air National Guard General Officers. Send reports to NGB-SL-B within 30 calendar days of the report close-out date.

7.5.5. Release of Reports to Ratees by Reporting, Reviewing, and Endorsing Officials. The management level should provide a copy of the completed report to the ratee. The rater, reviewing official or management level (at their discretion) should discuss its contents with the ratee. Ratees may access copies of their reports via ARMS/PRDA or request copies from AF/A1LG. Offices of primary responsibility are NGB-SL-B for ANG general officers, or AF/REG for non-Extended Active Duty officers.

7.5.6. AF/A1LG maintains all extended active duty 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.

7.6. Extensions of Close-out Dates.

7.6.1. The authorities to extend the close-out date for general officer evaluations are AF/A1LG (for RegAF and AFR extended active duty general officers), AF/REG (for AFR non-Extended Active Duty officers), NGB-SL-B (for non-extended active duty ANG general officers). **Exception:** In the event a CRO occurs prior to the annual close-out date of an evaluation, and 60 calendar days of supervision has not been obtained as of the annual close-out date, MPF/CSS personnel will adjust the close-out to the date on which the rater achieves 60 days of supervision.

7.6.2. Events that occur after the close-out date. Extensions are only granted to allow evaluators to document negative behavior (e.g., court-martial actions, investigations, etc.). Extensions are not granted to document awards, achievements, or completion/non-completion of any training. Extensions on DBH evaluations are not authorized. Extensions must be requested prior to but no later than 30 calendar days after the close-out date of the evaluation.

7.6.3. Pending Administrative Actions. If an incident or event occurs that reflects 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 officer evaluation 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.

7.6.4. When the approving authority grants an extension, only one extension, not to exceed 59 days will be granted. **(T-1)** If the action cannot be finalized by, or event occurs after, the extended close-out date, the evaluation will be completed using the original close-out date. **(T-1)** 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.

Table 7.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 78, *Department of the Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation*.

A	B	C
To Complete		**Instructions**
Block	**Item**	
1	Name	Self-Explanatory.
2	Social Security Number	
3	Grade	Enter the appropriate grade and include the status if the ratee is a selectee frocked. For example, Brig Gen (Sel) or Brig Gen.
4	Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title as of the SCOD.
5	Organization	Enter organization, command, and location of assignment (with attachment, if applicable)
6	Total Active Federal Commissioned Service (TAFCS) /Total Federal Commissioned Service Date (TFCSD)/Total Years' Service Date (TYSD)	Self-Explanatory.
7	Mandatory Retirement Date (MRD)/Mandatory Separation Date (MSD)/Date of Separation (DOS)	
8	Reason	Check appropriate block.
***9**	"FROM" Date	Members selected to brigadier general and publicly announced by AF/A1LG as confirmed: The report opens on the day following the close-out of the colonel's previous report. Subsequent general officer reports will open the day following the close-out date of the previous report.
	"THRU" Date	Brigadier general reports (includes brigadier general selectees and those frocked to brigadier general) will close-out 31 July (31 May non-extended active duty) unless a CRO or DBH or NGB report is necessary.

***10**	Fitness	Enter the member's most recent and current physical fitness assessment score, category, and any exemptions. See **paragraph 1.4.10.1.1** for full exemptions. **Example:** PFA: 91.7; Excellent; Exemptions: None For members assigned to designated combat-related AFSCs, listed in the terms section, enter both the ratee's most recent and current Air Force physical fitness assessment and combat field test (CFT) results. **Example:** "PFA: 99.8; Excellent; Exemptions: None / CFT: 95.2; Excellent; Exemptions: None"
11	Rater's Comments	Comments will be typed in plain language (narrative) format and limited to 350 characters. Include comments concerning the ratee's personal and professional characteristics with emphasis on the ratee's potential to assume a higher grade or increased responsibilities. Also, consider ratee's success in contributing to a healthy organizational climate, or command climate (if ratee is a commander). As supporting rationale, identify specific jobs where the ratee could be used in a higher grade. If not being recommended for promotion but is being recommended for further service in the ratee's 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 the issue(s). Do not consider or comment on marital status or the employment, educational activities, or volunteer service activities of the ratee's spouse.
12	Rater's ID (name, grade, and duty title)	Major general selectees may, once confirmed by the Senate, sign the DAF Form 78 as a selectee. See **Table 7.2** notes. Do not date or sign prior to the THRU date.
13	Signature	Digital signature to the maximum extent possible. Wet signatures by exceptions approved by AF/A1LG (for RegAF officers), AF/REG (for AFR officers), NGB-SL-B (for ANG general officers).
14	Date	Date of signature will auto populate when using a digital signature. For wet signatures, enter the date signed (DD MMM YY).
15a	Endorser's Promotion Recommendation	For Brigadier Generals**:** Block 15a will be completed on all brigadier general and brigadier general selects. All brigadier generals must have at least one year time in grade to be considered for promotion to the next higher grade. **(T-0)** See 10 U.S.C §§ 619, 14303. If the brigadier general or brigadier general select will have one year time-in-grade as of the board convening date mark "ELIGIBLE FOR PROMOTION THIS CYCLE." If the brigadier general or brigadier general select will not have one year time-in-grade as a brigadier general as of the board convening date mark "NOT ELIGIBLE FOR

		PROMOTION THIS CYCLE." If the brigadier general has an approved retirement on file mark "RETIREMENT." Contact AF/A1LG for any questions regarding the board convening date.
15b	Endorser's Numerical Grade if Eligible for Promotion	Complete this block for brigadier generals only if "Eligible For Promotion This Cycle" is checked in block 15a. The exception to this rule is for officers who are approved for retirement. If an officer has a date of separation within 90 days of the board convening date, do not complete this block. If the date of separation is 90 or more days from the convening date the officer must be considered and block 15b must be completed.
16	Endorser's Comments	See instructions for block 11 (this table). Comments will be typed in plain language (narrative) and limited to 250 characters. If the rater is also the management level, use block 11 to enter comments or type "The rater is also the endorsing official," in block 16.
17	Endorser's ID (name, grade, and duty title)	Do not sign or date prior to the "TO" date. This block will still be completed if marked "The rater is also the endorsing official."
18	Signature	Digital signature to the maximum extent possible. Wet signatures by exceptions approved by AF/A1LG (for RegAF officers), AF/REG (for AFR officers), NGB-SL-B (for ANG general officers).
19	Date	Date of signature will auto populate when using a digital signature. For wet signatures, enter the date signed (DD MMM YY).

Table 7.2. Instructions for DAF Form 77 for General Officers.

A	B	C
To Complete		
Sec	**Block**	
I	Name	In all upper-case letters, enter last name, first name middle initial, and JR., SR., etc. Use of "NMI" when there is no middle initial is optional.
	Social Security	Enter social security number.
	Grade	Select the appropriate grade.See **Notes**.
	Duty Air Force Specialty Code	Enter "90G0."
	Duty Title or Title of Additional Duty	Enter the approved duty title as of the THRU date of the evaluation.
	Deployed Location or Named Operation	Deployed CC LOE only. If applicable, enter the operation/contingency name ratee was deployed in support of. (e.g., Operation ENDURING FREEDOM).
IIA	Type of Report	Drop Down Menu. For Formal/Informal LOEs, enter: Letter of Evaluation; For Supplemental Sheets, enter: Supplemental Sheet; For Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor, enter: Acquisition Examiner, Functional Examiner, AF Advisor For Administrative LOEs, leave blank.
IIB	Report Dates	Enter the dates as they appear on the DAF Form 78. If a TDY rating official is rendering a report because of the ratee's TDY of 90 days or more, enter the inclusive dates of the TDY.
	"Report is..."	Drop Down Menu. Select either "Mandatory" or "Optional." See **Table 5.2**. If the DAF Form 77 will be attached to the DAF Form 78 or is being rendered by a TDY rating official resulting from the ratee's TDY of 60 calendar days or more, mark the box entitled, "Mandatory." All other DAF Forms 77 are optional.
	Level of Deployed CC Duties Performed	Deployed Commander LOE only. Drop Down Menu. Select either Det CC, Squadron CC, Group CC, or Wing CC.

	Number of Days in CC Position	Deployed Commander LOE Only. Enter the number of consecutive days served in the deployed commander position, on G-series orders.
	G-Series Order Number/Date of Order	Deployed Commander LOE Only. Enter the G-Series Order Number.
		Deployed Commander LOE Only. Enter the date of the G-Series Order.
III	Deployed Commander Assessment	Deployed Commander LOE Only. Select "Yes" if the officer satisfactorily completed their deployed commander tour. Select "No" if completion was unsatisfactory. If "No," the report must be referred.
IV	Comments	The form may be typed or handwritten in reproducible blue or black ink (see **paragraph 5.4.2**). Limit comments to the space provided. Include comments concerning personal and professional characteristics with emphasis on potential to assume a higher grade or increased responsibilities. Also, consider ratee's success in contributing to a healthy organizational climate, or command climate (if ratee is a commander). As supporting rationale, identify specific jobs where the ratee could be used in a higher grade. If not being recommended for promotion but is being recommended for further service in the ratee's 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 the issue(s). Do not consider or comment on the marital status or the employment, educational activities, or volunteer service activities of the ratee's spouse.
IV	Evaluator Data	Information will be as of the THRU date of the report. Sign original on or after THRU date. Once the U.S. Senate confirms the promotion, major general selectees may sign the DAF Form 77 as a selectee. See **Notes**. Remaining blocks are self-explanatory.

Notes: (Brigadier and Major General "(Sel)"/"Frocked" signing Officer Evaluation System forms)

a. Once Senate confirmed, colonels on the brigadier general select list are permitted to sign all Officer Evaluation System forms as "(Sel)" provided that they are either designated by their respective management level as a senior rater or they are assigned to an authorized brigadier general officer position.

b. Once Senate confirmed, brigadier generals on the major general select list are permitted to sign all Officer Evaluation System forms as "(Sel)" provided that they are either evaluating other general officers or are assigned to an authorized Maj Gen officer position.

c. Frocked general officers are authorized to sign all Officer Evaluation System forms in their frocked grade without designating their "Frocked" status (e.g., major general vice major general "Frocked").

d. Once Senate confirmed, all general officer selects assigned to joint billets or unified commands may sign all Officer Evaluation System forms as "(Sel)".

Chapter 8

PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION AND MANAGEMENT LEVEL REVIEW (MLR) PROCESS

8.1. DAF Form 709 (for ADL officers).

8.1.1. Purpose. The purpose of the promotion recommendation process is to provide performance-based differentiation to assist central selection boards. The DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation Form*, is used for promotion purposes only. **Note:** Except for paragraphs **8.1.2.3.2**, **8.1.3.1.1**–**8.1.3.2.1.2**, **8.1.3.2.3**– **8.1.3.2.6.3**, **8.2** and **8.6**, this chapter does not pertain to ARC officers who are not on the ADL.

8.1.2. Types of PRFs:

8.1.2.1. Narrative-Only PRFs. The losing senior rater completes these on all lieutenant colonels and below. **Exception:** Not required for majors who are lieutenant colonel selects, or lieutenant colonels who are colonel selects departing PCS for a school (e.g., developmental education, AFIT, or other AF-level training programs as described by **paragraph 8.3.5.2**) or PCA/PCS to patient status. Complete narrative-only PRFs regardless of promotion zone/promotion opportunity. Do not complete PRFs on lieutenants or captains who will have less than four years' time-in-grade as a captain upon completion of schooling. **Exception:** For medical corps and dental corps officers only, complete narrative-only PRFs 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**. **Note:** In the rare case where a PRF is required for lieutenant colonels while in a student status, the senior rater prior to the officer's departure to developmental education will write the PRF.

8.1.2.2. Recommendation-Only PRFs. The Air Force Student MLR President completes these for all officers who are eligible for consideration by that review. Attach the recommendation-only PRF to the narrative-only PRF and file both in the eOSR. 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 calendar days prior to the central selection board for which the officer is promotion eligible (PRF cutoff date) and awards one of three recommendations (or four recommendations for officers in the grade of colonel only):

8.1.2.3.1. A "Definitely Promote This Board" recommendation (for colonel only). The strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential warrants promotion in the board in which the officer is eligible for promotion.

8.1.2.3.2. A "Definitely Promote" (DP) recommendation. The strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential warrants promotion. **Note:** Officers who receive a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF cutoff date are not authorized to be considered for stratification or a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.

8.1.2.3.3. A “Promote” 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.

8.1.2.3.4. A “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendation. The strength of the ratee’s performance and performance-based potential does not warrant promotion by the central selection boards for which the officer is eligible. A senior rater must make comments explaining to the central selection boards why the officer should not be promoted. **(T-1)** Comments must focus on the substandard behavior of the officer and, if desired, the punishment received. **(T-1)**

8.1.3. Completing the PRF. See **Table 8.4** and **paragraph 8.7** on promotion-eligible colonels for specific guidance on preparing PRFs.

8.1.3.1. Comments in Section IV, Promotion Recommendation, of the PRF are mandatory for In- or Above-the-Promotion Zone eligible officers. Senior raters retain the latitude to push their best-qualified officers for promotion consideration. Senior raters should consider providing comments for officers two or more times Above-the-Promotion Zone up to the grade of colonel; comments are optional on PRFs prepared to the grade of brigadier general when the overall recommendation on the DAF Form 709 is “Promote.” Comments are required on all PRFs with a “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendation, regardless of zone (**Table 8.1**.). Final decision authority for including comments on Below-the-Promotion Zone and two or more times Above-the-Promotion Zone officers remains with the senior rater. Officers with an approved separation or retirement date remain required to receive a PRF if they meet the basic eligibility criteria in the applicable PSDM. Comments regarding an officer’s intent to separate, retire, or uncertainty of their intent will not be commented on the PRF.

8.1.3.1.1. In the performance recommendation, the senior rater should use plain language and limit use of acronyms and/or abbreviations to provide a performance-based differentiation and/or characterization of the eligible officer’s potential to serve in the next higher grade. For officers being considered for colonel and below, promotion recommendations are limited to the space provided. If a stratification is used, the promotion recommendation narrative will begin with the stratification.

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

8.1.3.1.3. Comments on PRFs regarding completion of, or enrollment in, DE are prohibited. Performance and special recognition comments on officers attending in-residence education and/or training will be documented appropriately on the DAF Form 475 (see **Chapter 6**). Additionally, evaluators will not comment on an officer's status on the school's list, selection for DE, and/or specific schools. **Note:** An assignment recommendation for Air Force Institute of Technology Master's or Doctoral degree program is authorized. Senior raters may consider and comment on PRFs regarding the selection for, attendance at, or completion of AADs.

8.1.3.1.4. Comments relating to an officer's adverse conduct are only mandatory on the PRF if the adverse information has not already been filed in the officer selection record and documented on an evaluation or TR. See **paragraph 1.8.7.2.1**.

8.1.3.2. Promotion Recommendation Form Stratification Guidance. Officer stratification is defined as a quantitative comparison of an individual's standing within an authorized peer group and within a specific evaluator's scope of rating authority. On the PRF, officer stratifications provide a current period performance-based differentiation of officers against their peers to assist central selection boards. Senior raters may provide a maximum of two stratifications—one primary and, if desired, one secondary—as part of their promotion recommendation comments. If used, the primary stratification must be among promotion eligible officers based on the MEL, and the optional secondary stratification must be among an authorized peer group. If a senior rater does not stratify an officer among eligible officers by promotion zone, they may not provide any other stratification. **Exception:** For narrative-only PRFs, senior raters will not stratify among eligible officers by promotion zone but may provide one peer group stratification statement. Officers who receive a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF cutoff date are not authorized to be considered for stratification.

8.1.3.2.1. Stratification Types.

8.1.3.2.1.1. Primary – Eligible by MEL. Senior raters may stratify among eligible officers based on the MEL by zone and/or DevCat (e.g., In-or-above-the promotion zone (I/APZ) from the MEL for a specific promotion board). **Examples:** #3/10 I/APZ eligible; #3/10 eligible; #3/10 LAF-C.

8.1.3.2.1.2. Secondary – Peer Group Stratification. If a senior rater provides a primary stratification, they may also provide one secondary stratification in accordance with the following guiding principles: **Note:** Stratification of officers between components (RegAF, Reserve, Guard) is authorized as long as it is within a senior rater's scope of authority and within one of the authorized peer groups.

8.1.3.2.2. Authorized Peer Groups. For the purposes of stratification, authorized peer groups are limited to the following categories: (**Note:** Only one authorized peer group will be used as a secondary stratification.)

8.1.3.2.2.1. AF Grade. Includes only Air Force officers in the same grade (e.g., captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, colonels). For officers who are temporarily promoted, use the temporary grade (e.g., for an officer temporarily promoted to lieutenant colonel, use "Lt Col"). **Exception**: An officer permanently assigned to a position on a joint manning document may be stratified against officers of the same grade, regardless of service affiliation, within the senior rater's scope of rating authority as described below.

8.1.3.2.2.2. Command Position. This refers to officers filling command positions (e.g., detachment, squadron, group, or wing commanders to include wing command equivalents, and materiel leaders). This does not include section commanders or flight commanders. Command position stratification statements for individuals below the grade of colonel (O-6) may also include their grade with the stratification statement (e.g., #2/6 Maj Sq/CCs). For temporarily promoted officers, if using the grade, use the temporary grade (e.g., for an officer who has been temporarily promoted to lieutenant colonel, use "Lt Col").

8.1.3.2.2.3. Duty Position. This refers to the officer's duty position type, level and scope of responsibility (e.g., section chiefs, flight commanders, operations officers, branch chiefs, action officers, analysts, instructors, combat systems officers, pilots, etc.). Officers may be stratified against civilian personnel and international officers in equivalent duty positions (e.g., "#1/40 Analysts"; "#2/6 Flight Commanders").

8.1.3.2.3. **Exception:** For narrative-only PRFs, senior raters are only authorized to utilize a secondary stratification based on one of the authorized peer groups.

8.1.3.2.4. Scope of Rating Authority. Senior raters can only stratify officers within the confines of their direct rating chain and knowledge. Senior rater stratifications may not extend beyond the confines of their respective SRID (i.e., senior raters may not stratify officers under subordinate SRIDs' purviews).

8.1.3.2.5. Authorized Usage.

8.1.3.2.5.1. When used, all stratifications must stay within an authorized peer group and the evaluator's scope of rating authority.

8.1.3.2.5.2. Stratifications must be written in quantitative terms. **(T-1)** The use of percentages in the numerator are prohibited (e.g., 5%/50). Examples of authorized stratifications:

8.1.3.2.5.2.1. By AF Grade. "#3/30 Capts;" "#1/1 Majs;" "#2/12 Lt Cols." (**Exception:** "#2/12 Joint Lt Cols." See **paragraph 8.1.3.2.2.1**.)

8.1.3.2.5.2.2. By Command Position. "#1/9 Grp/CCs;" "#1/7 Maj Sq/CCs;" "#3/20 Lt Col Det/CCs."

8.1.3.2.5.2.3. By Duty Position. "#1/6 Flt/CCs;" "#1/40 Analysts;" "#2/12 Branch Chiefs."

8.1.3.2.6. Prohibited Usage.

8.1.3.2.6.1. Company grade officers (CGOs) and/or field grade officers (FGOs) are not an authorized peer group for stratification purposes.

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

8.1.3.2.6.3. The use of stratifications from anyone other than the senior rater are prohibited. A senior rater may not quote stratifications from another evaluator or source. Using more than one secondary stratification is prohibited.

8.1.3.3. If promotion opportunity is 100%, regular PRFs are not required. This includes individuals competing for I/APZ. Senior raters will prepare PRFs on all officers who receive "Do Not Promote" recommendations and on all officers who receive a "Promote" recommendation but have derogatory information (e.g., Article 15, courts-martial, referral evaluation, letter of reprimand) filed in their eOSR.

8.1.3.4. 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, they would get it," are prohibited. This means the head of the management level or MLR president may not use the denominator of the management levels eligibles when stratifying their respective officers, who may have or have not competed at the MLR.

8.1.3.5. Promotion statements, reserved for the senior rater, will only be made on the PRF.

8.1.3.5.1. As a general rule, prohibited promotion statements are any comments, direct or implied, that refer to a higher grade. For example, comments that state the individual is performing above their grade, occupying a position requiring a more senior grade, comparing an individual to officers of higher grade, or alluding to a higher-ranking position are all prohibited. **Exception:** Statements of fact are authorized.

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

8.1.3.5.2.1. "Maj Beidler is senior officer material." The term "senior" is a euphemism for colonel and above, therefore not authorized.

8.1.3.5.2.2. "Capt DeSantis has excelled in a lieutenant colonel's billet," refers to a grade higher than the one the individual currently holds.

8.1.3.5.2.3. "Major Jenkins should be a group commander now," recommends the individual for a position two grades higher than the ratee—not normal progression.

8.1.3.5.2.4. "Capt Korte is ready for our toughest field grade jobs," compares a company grade officer with higher ranking, field grade officers.

8.1.4. Responsibilities:

8.1.4.1. The Senior Rater:

8.1.4.1.1. Reviews the ratee's eOSR, duty qualification history brief (DQHB), and UIF (if applicable) before preparing the PRF. May consider other reliable information about duty performance and conduct except as **paragraph 1.12** or other regulatory guidance prohibits. Examples of other reliable information may include but are not limited to LOEs, statements from a draft officer ALQ evaluation and/or decoration, etc. To reference the "other reliable information" in their record, the officer meeting the board may submit a letter to the central selection board.

8.1.4.1.1.1. Do not use any other single unit retrieval formats (SURFs) other than those indicated above when preparing the PRF (e.g., Assignment Management System (AMS), SURF, myVector).

8.1.4.1.1.2. The intent of the "other reliable information" passage is to allow senior raters to comment on performance accomplishments since the close-out of the last evaluation. This allows a senior rater 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 and/or supervisor asks or allows an officer to draft or prepare their 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 performance evaluations, career data brief, adverse information, and DQHB in order to either award PRF recommendations among eligible officers or submit officers to compete for aggregation or carry-over “Definitely Promote” recommendations. The senior rater submits the PRF with Section IX unmarked when submitting an officer for competition in aggregation or carry-over categories at a MLR and/or HAF MLR.

8.1.4.1.6. Completes promotion recommendations. Corrects any error that results in awarding more “Definitely Promote” recommendations than allocated by the management level. However, if the senior rater fails to fulfill this responsibility, the MLR 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 approximately 30 calendar days before the central selection board. If communication cannot be completed in person, send the PRF via secure communications. 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 central selection board. **Note:** If the ratee is geographically separated, send it to the ratee by secure electronic communication, or “return receipt requested” mail. Contact the MPF for assistance if necessary.

8.1.4.1.8. Must attach a memo (**Figure 8.1**) telling the ratee who receives a PRF with a "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation that they have the right to submit a letter to the Central Selection Board.

8.1.4.1.9. 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 (e.g., executive officer, secretary, MPF), the MLR, and the central selection board. 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.

8.1.4.1.10. Considers preparing a PRF on a newly assigned eligible officer who received an outright "Promote" recommendation from their previous senior rater (an outright "Promote" is someone who received a promote recommendation from the senior rater and was not competed at an MLR). The exception is AF-level students meeting the AF Student MLR, and whose effective date of duty as a result of PCS/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 MEL of officers considered for promotion recommendations to the management level.

8.1.4.1.12. Ensures the management level receives PRFs as required by **paragraph 8.1.5**.

8.1.4.1.13. Ensures their SRID in the Air Force Promotion Management System reflects only their eligible officers no later than 105 days before the central selection board.

8.1.4.1.14. Evaluates all additions to and deletions from the MEL through their MPFs to their management level (e.g., 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: a special selection board (SSB) or AFBCMR actions, administrative errors, changes in date of separation, 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 definitely promote should be awarded, then place a "1" in block VI for IPZ officer or place a "0" in block VI for APZ officers. See **Table 8.2**.

8.1.4.2. The Military Personnel Flight (MPF):

8.1.4.2.1. Assists the management level in verifying accuracy of SRIDs and PAS codes.

8.1.4.2.2. Provides PRF notices, a MEL, and a DQHB on each eligible officer to the senior raters. **Note**: For officers not located with the senior rater, provide these documents to eligible officers' servicing MPF to be used in preparing PRF inputs for the senior rater.

8.1.4.2.3. Provides other senior rater support and review as requested. The MPF will send PRFs to the appropriate management level when requested by the senior raters.

8.1.4.2.4. Ensures officers' eOSRs are available to senior raters, to include records of officers serviced by other MPFs.

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 the 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.

8.1.4.2.9. Evaluates any potential additions or deletions to the MELs for the senior raters and management level they service. See **paragraph 8.1.4.1.14**.

8.1.4.2.10. Monitors Air Force Promotion Management System audit transactions at least twice a week to identify any board adds, deletions, SRID changes, PCS/PCA, and/or date arrived on station actions.

8.1.4.2.11. Coordinates with management level and senior raters as needed.

8.1.4.2.12. Check the Air Force Promotion Management System news daily.

8.1.4.3. The Management Level:

8.1.4.3.1. Designates senior rater positions for all units within their jurisdiction and assigns SRIDs to those positions.

8.1.4.3.2. Identifies officers occupying those senior rater positions by name, assigns them SRIDs by name and PAS code, and ensures the Air Force Promotion Management System is updated accordingly.

8.1.4.3.3. Validates SRID alignment in MilPDS with the PAS code. **Note:** Ensure MilPDS is updated accordingly; contact AFPC for any assistance.

8.1.4.3.4. Notifies senior raters and MPFs of preliminary "Definitely Promote" allocations.

8.1.4.3.5. Notifies affected senior raters on the final PRF allocation date of available "Definitely Promote" recommendations 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 "Definitely Promote" 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 "Definitely Promote" allocations.

8.1.4.3.8. Ensures PRF recommendations on eligible officers are updated in the Air Force Promotion Management System no later than 35 calendar days before the central selection board.

8.1.4.3.9. Send all regular PRFs to the AFPC MLR office to arrive no later than 30 calendar days before the central selection board.

8.1.4.3.10. Maintains copies of all PRFs and MELs until announcement of central selection board results. Destroy all materials pertaining to the MLR upon announcement of results. **Exception**: Maintain a copy of the eOSR, including the PRF, career data brief of the competitive categories considered, and DQHB that earned the last "Definitely Promote" and the top two that earned a "Promote" recommendation in carry-over competition for each competitive category, or in the case that no "Definitely Promote" recommendations were awarded, maintain the top two that earned a "Promote" recommendation. These records will serve as benchmark records in support of a supplemental review.

8.1.4.3.11. Processes PRFs in accordance with **paragraph 8.1.5**.

8.1.4.3.12. Evaluates any potential additions or deletions to their senior raters and coordinates with the AFPC MLR office as needed.

8.1.4.3.13. Monitors the Air Force Promotion Management System audit transactions at least twice a week to identify any board additions, deletions, SRID changes, PCS/PCA/date arrived station actions.

8.1.4.3.14. Coordinates with senior raters, MPFs, and the AFPC MLR office as needed.

8.1.4.3.15. Monitors the Air Force Promotion Management System news daily.

8.1.4.3.16. Ensures the SecAF's memorandum of instruction is available on myFSS, is referenced and utilized for all MLRs and senior rater promotion processes within their purview. The memorandum of instruction provides instructions to all management levels and senior raters to ensure decision makers throughout the officer promotion recommendation process are focused on the same priorities and special emphasis areas as the central selection board.

8.1.4.4. AFPC MLR Office:

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 calendar days prior to the central selection board in the Air Force Promotion Management System.

8.1.4.4.4. Processes all SRID changes with multiple management levels involved. **Note:** It remains the initiating management level's responsibility to obtain all concurrences for other affected management levels prior to submission to AFPC.

8.1.4.4.5. Following the USAF Student MLR, distributes these PRFs to the eligible officers. See **paragraph 8.1.4.1.7**.

8.1.4.5. The Ratee:

8.1.4.5.1. Contacts the senior rater to discuss any errors, omissions pertaining to the PRF or if they have not received a copy of their PRF NLT 15 calendar days prior to central selection board. **(T-3)**

8.1.4.5.2. May correspond by letter with the central selection board 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. **(T-3)**

8.1.4.5.3. Air Force Level students and patients (SRID "ST101" and "PT111") 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. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 8.3.5.3**. The letters will be destroyed upon conclusion of the Student MLR and will not be forwarded to the central selection board. **(T-1)**

8.1.5. Processing and Using the PRF.

8.1.5.1. MPFs send PRF notices and MELs to senior raters upon receipt, approximately 120 days prior to the central selection board.

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 (see **paragraph 8.3.1.9**), must prepare and sign the PRFs, leaving Section IX blank.

8.1.5.3. Senior raters will submit all completed PRFs for quality review and ensure all PRFs are available for update into the Air Force Promotion Management System by the management level no later than 40 calendar days before the central selection board. **(T-1)**

8.1.5.4. The management level sends completed PRFs to the AFPC MLR office to arrive no later than 30 calendar days before the central selection board. Management levels forward PRFs to the AFPC MLR office for officers nominated to the AF MLR aggregate and carry-over, with the "Overall Recommendation" left blank, to arrive no later than 35 calendar days prior to the central selection board.

8.1.5.5. The AFPC MLR office forwards all PRFs to AFPC/DPSORM to be filed in the officer's ARMS for the central selection board. AFPC/DPSORM destroys the PRFs after imaging. PRFs filed in ARMS-LC have limited access. Do not use them for assignments, promotions (except SSBs), 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. MPFs are responsible for processing narrative-only PRFs and ensuring all eligible officers receive a copy of their narrative-only PRF prior to departure for PCS. **Note:** Officers will not depart without a narrative-only PRF being accomplished unless an approved waiver was granted in accordance with **paragraph 8.1.5.6.4.1**.

8.1.5.6.2. The senior rater sends the narrative-only PRF to the MPF no later than 30 calendar days prior to the officer departing PCA or PCS for school. **Note:** An officer may become eligible for I/APZ consideration by a central selection board before departing for school. In this case, prepare both a narrative-only PRF and a regular PRF (see **paragraph 8.1.2.3**.). 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 narrative-only PRFs are not board specific, statements such as "My #1 Below-the-Promotion Zone," may become outdated before the officer meets a promotion board, however, this should not preclude the senior rater from stratifying the officers as would on a regular PRF.

8.1.5.6.3. The senior rater sends the narrative-only PRFs to the MPF for officers in patient or missing-in-action/prisoner of war status. The MPF will process the PRF to the AFPC MLR office no later than 60 calendar days after the officer enters this new status.

8.1.5.6.4. The MPF forwards the original PRFs to the AFPC MLR office NLT 30 calendar days after the officer departs and updates a code "B" in MilPDS. The MPF maintains copies of the PRFs until PRF receipt is confirmed by an update of narrative only (NAR) PRF Flag to code "C" in MilPDS by the AFPC MLR office. MPFs can verify that the "C" code is updated under officer grade data/grade miscellaneous in MilPDS. Once confirmed, the MPF destroys its copies.

8.1.5.6.4.1. All narrative-only PRF waiver requests will be worked directly with the AFPC MLR office.

8.1.5.6.4.2. When requesting narrative-only PRF waivers, please include the following information: Full name, social security number, date of rank, 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 narrative-only PRF will then be required from the senior rater who was in the position when the officer departed for school. Only if the senior rater is not available (retired and unable to be contacted and all attempts have been exhausted, or deceased, etc.) will the current senior rater in the position be authorized to sign the narrative-only PRF after the officer departed.

8.1.5.6.5. Senior raters provide a copy of the narrative-only PRF to the ratee approximately 30 calendar days prior to departure for AF level training or patient status.

8.1.5.6.6. The AFPC MLR office maintains narrative-only PRFs until officers leave student, patient, or missing-in-action/prisoner of war status. The AFPC MLR office destroys narrative-only PRFs when the officer no longer competes as a student. The AFPC MLR office maintains the narrative-only PRFs until distributed as specified below:

8.1.5.6.6.1. The AFPC MLR office forwards the narrative-only PRF to the HAF Student MLR. After completion of the recommendation-only PRFs (which are attached to the narrative-only PRFs), the AFPC MLR office forwards the narrative-only PRF and recommendation-only PRF to the official record, ARMS/PRDA, for inclusion in the eOSR and provides copies to ratees via the ratees' servicing MPF.

8.1.5.6.6.2. The AFPC MLR office 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 the AFPC MLR office and be in the best interest of the officer and the Air Force.

8.1.5.6.6.3. Immediately after completion of the central selection board, the Selection Board Secretariat (AFPC/PB) removes the PRFs from the eOSR and forwards them to AFPC/DPSORM for placement in ARMS-LC.

8.1.5.7. The HAF Student MLR (see **paragraph 8.3.5.2.2**) prepares recommendation-only PRFs and attaches them to the student narrative-only PRFs.

8.2. DAF Form 709 for RASL Officers.

8.2.1. General ARC Guidance.

8.2.1.1. {AFR only} Use DAF Form 709 for promotion to captain through colonel. Refer to **paragraph 8.7** for recommending colonels for promotion to the grade of brigadier general. AFR will use DAF Form 709 for position vacancy promotion nominations to all grades. ARPC/PB will issue instructions specific to each board via ARPC memorandums (ARPCMs).

8.2.1.2. **ANG Only.** The DAF Form 709 is required for mandatory promotion boards to lieutenant colonel, all lieutenant colonels meeting the ANG Colonel Federal Recognition Review Board, or when the senior rater whishes to submit a "Do Not Promote" recommendation for mandatory promotion to major. ARPC/PB will issue instructions specific to each board via ARPCMs. PRFs are not used for position vacancy boards to the grades of major and lieutenant colonel. Officers who receive a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF accounting date are not authorized to be considered for stratification.

8.2.1.3. Mandatory Boards. An eligible officer's senior rater submits the completed PRF no later than 45 calendar days prior to the central selection board. The senior rater awards one of three recommendations from the drop-down menu in block IX of DAF Form 709:

8.2.1.3.1. A "Definitely Promote": The strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential warrants promotion. **Note:** The ARC is not constrained by the number of "Definitely Promotes" it can award. A senior rater may award as many "Definitely Promotes" as desired. Officers who receive a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF cutoff date are not authorized to be considered for stratification(s) in Block IV or a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.

8.2.1.3.2. A “Promote”: 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 degrees, etc. Officers who receive a “Required - Not Current” rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF accounting date are not authorized to be considered for stratification in Block IV but may receive a “Promote” recommendation.

8.2.1.3.3. A “Do Not Promote This Board”: The strength of the ratee’s performance and performance-based potential does not warrant promotion by the central selection board for which the officer is eligible. A senior rater must make comments explaining to the central selection board why the officer should not be promoted.

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 ratees’ evaluations, decoration citations, DQHB, personnel information file, and UIF (if applicable) before preparing the PRF. They may also consider other reliable information about duty performance and conduct except as outlined in **paragraph 1.12** or other regulatory guidance. Examples of other reliable information may include but are not limited to LOEs and statements from a draft performance report and/or decoration. To reference the other reliable information in their record, the officer meeting the board may submit a letter to the central selection board. **Note:** Do not use any other single uniform request formats other than those indicated above when preparing the PRF (e.g., vMPF CDB, etc.). The intent of the other reliable information passage is to allow the senior rater to comment on performance accomplishments since the close out of the last evaluation. This allows a senior rater 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 their 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 record of performance 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 calendar days before the central selection board. 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 "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation that they have the right to submit a letter to the central selection board. The ratee must acknowledge receipt of the memorandum. If the ratee is geographically separated, send it to the ratee by secure electronic communication or by "return receipt requested" mail. Contact the MPF for assistance, if necessary.

8.2.3.2. The MPF or ARPC/PB (as applicable):

8.2.3.2.1. Verifies accuracy of SRID 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 management level as requested by senior raters).

8.2.3.2.4. Makes record of performances available to senior raters, to include records of officers serviced by other MPFs.

8.2.3.2.5. Reviews PRFs to ensure administrative accuracy, when requested.

8.2.3.2.6. Informs senior raters when officers have a change in promotion eligibility status after the PRF accounting date.

8.2.3.2.7. Provides senior raters a listing of newly assigned eligible officers.

8.2.3.3. ARPC/PB. Will announce PRF criteria for ResAF central selection boards via an ARPCM.

8.2.4. Processing and use of PRFs.

8.2.4.1. MPFs 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 ARPC not later than 45 calendar days before the central selection board.

8.2.4.3. ARPC/PB posts the eOSRs from the electronic board operations support system (eBOSS) back to ARMS. The PRF becomes part of the "as-met" records for the officer's future reference.

8.2.5. Officers Relocating During the PRF Process. To ensure officers who are assigned to a new senior rater after the PRF accounting date but on or before the central selection board, receive full consideration for their PRF, the losing and gaining senior raters may discuss the officer's performance and their intentions. For ANG and AFR, the senior rater of record on the PRF accounting date will write the PRF and award performance rating.

8.2.5.1. Award a "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation when derogatory information has been received since departure from previous assignment. If the losing senior rater awards a "Do Not Promote This Board," the gaining senior rater has no further action. A senior rater must make specific comments to support the recommendation in Section IV of the PRF. **(T-2)**

8.2.5.2. The MPF or ARPC/PB (as appropriate) will:

8.2.5.2.1. Screen all officers gained after the PRF accounting date to determine eligibility and notify senior raters accordingly (refer to Air Force Promotion Management System user's guide). Ensure senior raters certify a review of all gained eligible.

8.2.5.2.2. Provide the senior rater a DQHB on newly assigned officers.

8.2.5.2.3. Update corrections to SRIDs on officers who arrive at new locations on or before the PRF accounting date. Notify ARPC/PB when an update to the Air Force Promotion Management System is needed.

8.2.6. Officers Added to Promotion Eligibility. This paragraph applies to officers who become eligible for promotion consideration or change component or competitive categories on or after the PRF accounting date. Cause for a change in eligibility may include, but is not limited to: ANG to AFR transfer; AFR to ANG transfer; change from Participating Reserve to Non-Participating Reserve, or Non-Participating Reserve to Participating Reserve; change from ADL to RASL (without a break in military status); change from other branch of service to USAF RASL; change in date of separation; administrative errors; SSB or AFBCMR actions; or similar circumstances.

8.2.6.1. When an officer is added to a promotion board or changes promotion zone eligibility, the senior rater:

8.2.6.1.1. Prepares a PRF without a restriction as to the type of recommendation awarded, since there are no adjustments made to allocations of definitely promote recommendations on or after the PRF allocation date.

8.2.6.1.2. Only awards definitely promote recommendations to officers whose eOSR and DQHB are comparable to other officers who received "Definitely Promote" recommendations during the normal PRF process.

8.2.6.1.3. Completes PRFs according to **Table 8.1** (except section VI, Group Size). In this section, enter a "1" for IPZ officers and a "0" for AP officers. **Note:** Group size for non-line/LAF-J is always "N/A."

8.2.6.1.4. 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.

8.2.6.2. Senior raters void PRFs completed on officers subsequently deleted from promotion eligibility following the PRF allocation date. When a PRF is voided and an outright definitely promote was awarded, senior raters may re-accomplish PRFs. See **paragraph 8.3.1.8.2** for disposition of "Definitely Promote" recommendations after the MLR convenes. The appropriate MLR must approve changes to I/APZ.

8.2.6.3. When an officer's zone of eligibility for promotion changes (e.g., from IPZ to APZ), the above provisions apply. Senior raters prepare a new PRF as appropriate to reflect the officer's correct promotion zone and void the old PRF.

8.2.7. Ranking of "Definitely Promote" Recommendations. Enter the rank order, in the group size (block IV of the DAF Form 709), for all officers awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation within each competitive category (e.g., line, judge advocate, nurse corps). **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 "Definitely Promote" recommendation. For officers awarded other than a "Definitely Promote" recommendation, leave group size blank. For officers gained after completion of PRFs, to which the senior rater chooses to award a "Definitely Promote" recommendation, the ranking will be 1/1/1. For a position vacancy board, enter the rank order for all officers nominated for position vacancy within each competitive category. **Example:** 3/5. The senior rater has 5 officers in that competitive category meeting the position vacancy promotion selection board. This officer is ranked number three of five officers awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.

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. ARPC/DPTSE will prepare an DAF 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. The total number of eligible 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 Department of the Air Force 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 ALQ evaluation. The Air Force advisor will not change any statements or the promotion recommendation on the PRF.

8.2.10. Promotion Recommendations for Colonels. See **paragraph 8.6** for AFR general officer central selection boards or Air National Guard Federal Recognition Boards information and instruction.

8.2.11. AGR Officers in Student Status. The ARPC Commander (ARPC/CC) is the senior rater for AGR students only (AFR only).

8.2.11.1. The member's servicing FSS will determine if a member is eligible for a promotion board (Position Vacancy or Mandatory) while in student status during out-processing. If member will be eligible, then 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 and will be transmitted to the ARPC Commander's Support Staff (ARPC/CSS) via ARPC CSS workflow: **ARPC.CSS1@us.af.mil**. Please note this PRF will be attached to a recommendation-only PRF and will be seen by the promotion board.

8.2.11.2. DELETED.

8.2.11.3. The ARPC/CC prepares the recommendation-only PRF according to **Table 8.1** and rank orders all officers awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation by competitive category within the student population. **Example:** 1/2/2 rank order means the senior rater has two officers in that competitive category meeting the selection board; the officer is ranked number one of the two "Definitely Promote" recommendations awarded. **Note:** Student AGR PRFs are not included within the SRID that applies to the Air Reserve Personnel Center Commander (ARPC/CC).

8.2.11.4. DELETED.

8.2.11.5. Students meeting the Colonel Promotion board will have a PRF completed as a student IAW instructions via ARPCMs.

8.3. Management Level Reviews (ADL Lieutenant Colonel and Below).

8.3.1. The Allocation Process:

8.3.1.1. Definitely Promote. "Definitely Promote" recommendations are limited in number to ensure only the most qualified records are endorsed. They send a strong signal to the central selection board that the officer is ready for immediate promotion. "Definitely Promote" allocation rates for IPZ and APZ officers are lower than the IPZ promotion opportunity; this ensures a significant number of officers receiving "Promote" recommendations will be promoted. Management levels receive a share of "Definitely Promote" allocations based on the number of IPZ 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 "Promote" recommendation (40% to major, 35% to lieutenant colonel and 25% to colonel); this is called the promotion rate (P-Rate). The AFPC MLR office publicizes the approved DP allocation rates for each PRF cycle in the Day 66 message. Exception to policy requests of the approved DP allocation for each PRF cycle are not authorized and will not be granted. **(T-1)**.

8.3.1.2. PRF Accounting Date (approximately 150 calendar days before the central selection board). On the PRF accounting date, AFPC matches eligible officers to senior raters based on the officers' unit of assignment data in MilPDS. The AFPC MLR office announces the actual PRF accounting date. Between the PRF accounting date and Day 66 before the central selection board, management levels ensure the Air Force Promotion Management System is accurate.

8.3.1.3. PRF Allocation Dates (approximately 150 and 66 calendar days before the central selection board). The initial allocation date is approximately 150 calendar days before the central selection board. This is when management levels estimate the number of allocations available to each senior rater and for each MLR 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 the AFPC MLR office. These adjustments are made up until the day before the PRF final allocation date (approximately 66 calendar days before the central selection board). On that day, the management level determines the actual number of allocations and distributes to senior raters and MLRs based on the number of eligible officers for that level. No changes are made to the number of a

management level's allocations on or after the final allocation date unless authorized by AFPC/DPPSP. In addition, no changes in the management level's allocations are authorized in cases where a brigadier general (Sel) is confirmed by the U.S. Senate on or after day 66 and subsequently becomes eligible to be the senior rater for lieutenant colonels in the organization. The AFPC MLR office will approve exceptions in order to maintain integrity in the Officer Evaluation System and to ensure fair and proper consideration is given to all affected officers. **(T-1) Note**: The "Definitely Promote" allocations are not adjusted automatically in the Air Force Promotion Management System for any approved exception. Calculations must be accomplished manually. **(T-1)** When submitting SRID changes after the final allocation date, the request must be from an O-6/equivalent or above, who has oversight of the MLR process. The request must provide justification as to why the correction was not discovered within the time limit and what actions the management level is implementing to ensure eligible officers are properly aligned prior to the PRF allocation date. If multiple management levels are involved, the O-6/equivalent or above who has oversight of the MLR process is required from each management level.

8.3.1.4. PRF Cutoff Date. This date is approximately 60 calendar days prior to the central selection board. PRFs will not be signed prior to this date. **(T-1)**

8.3.1.5. Determining Air Force-Level Allocations.

8.3.1.5.1. Management levels determine the number of DP allocations they have by applying the appropriate allocation rate to their IPZ or, if authorized, BPZ eligible population. Management levels will round fractions up or down to the next whole number as directed by AFPC with the publication of the Day 66 message. **(T-1)** The allocation process to be used for a specific PRF cycle will be set and made public approximately 120 days prior to the central selection board for each competitive category. **(T-1)** AFPC will direct the MLR process that maintains the appropriate "P-rate," while minimizing the number of "Definitely Promote" recommendations awarded to management levels who do not meet the minimum group size. **(T-1)** Waiver requests are not authorized.

8.3.1.5.1.1. Example of the rounding up process: A management level has 462 IPZ eligible officers, and the allocation rate is 10%; the management level earns 47 "Definitely Promote" allocations (462 IPZ eligible officers x 10% allocation rate=46.2 which rounds up to 47 allocations). The Air Force Promotion Management System should be reviewed to determine "Definitely Promote" allocations, but this does not preclude management levels from doing a manual calculation.

8.3.1.5.1.2. Example of the rounding down process: A management level has 462 IPZ eligible officers, and the allocation rate is 10%; the management level earns 46 "Definitely Promote" allocations (462 IPZ eligible officers x 10% allocation rate=46.2 which rounds down to 46 allocations). The remaining fraction will be used at the HAF MLR for the specified competitive category. **(T-1)** The Air Force Promotion Management System should be reviewed to determine "Definitely Promote" allocations, but this does not preclude management levels from doing a manual calculation.

8.3.1.5.2. APZ officers do not generate separate allocations; however, if the management level has only line of the Air Force APZ eligible officer(s), then a single "Definitely Promote" recommendation is available when the management level is authorized to round up. In this case, the APZ officers would receive a "0" in Section VI on the PRF. Refer to **Table 8.2**.

8.3.1.5.3. Management levels receive separate allocations for in-utilization permanent party students.

8.3.1.6. Determining Senior Rater Allocations.

8.3.1.6.1. Minimum group size for one "Definitely Promote" allocation is at least three eligible, even if the "Definitely Promote" allocation rate is 50% or higher. See **Table 8.3**.

8.3.1.6.2. Management levels determine each senior rater's share of allocations in the same manner as discussed in **paragraph 8.3.1.5.1**, except instead of rounding up, senior raters round down for all categories. **Example:** A 55% allocation rate applied to a senior rater's 10 IPZ captains would yield five "Definitely Promote" allocations (10 IPZ eligible x 55% allocation rate = 5.5 which rounds down to 5 allocations).

8.3.1.7. Returning Allocations. Senior raters may return earned allocations to the management level if they believe the quality of officers in their unit does not warrant the full share of allocations. Additionally, any "Definitely Promote" recommendations awarded by the senior rater to eligible officers that subsequently become ineligible is returned to the senior rater which may be reallocated using the senior rater's order of merit or returned to the management level for distribution.

8.3.1.8. Redistributing "Definitely Promote" Allocations.

8.3.1.8.1. Prior to the MLR convening, if a senior rater chooses not to use the full quota of "Definitely Promote" allocations, those unused go to the carry-over quota.

8.3.1.8.2. Following an MLR, the MLR owns all "Definitely Promote" allocations. Any returned "Definitely Promote" allocations for IPZ/APZ eligible officers are redistributed through the MLR carry-over process using the carry-over order of merit.

8.3.1.8.3. BPZ "Definitely Promote" allocations are redistributed at the next higher level or through the MLR 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 management level and result in allocations called carry-over "Definitely Promote" allocations. Carry-over allocations (and any returned allocations) are awarded to account for variations of quality within organizations under the management level. For IPZ or APZ officers, management levels distribute allocations to MLRs for award. For BPZ eligible officers, they distribute carry-over allocations directly to senior raters or through the MLR process.

8.3.1.10. Aggregation.

8.3.1.10.1. Senior raters without the minimum number IPZ or APZ officers assigned to earn a "Definitely Promote" recommendation in their (senior rater's) own right may compete their officers for "Definitely Promote" recommendations through aggregation. Grouping of all such officers and the application of the allocation rate yields, after rounding down, the number of definitely promote allocations available to officers competing in aggregation. **Example:** If there are two senior raters in a given management level with eligible officers, and each senior rater has only one eligible officer, and the "Definitely Promote" allocation rate is 65%, then: 1 eligible x 65% = 0.65+ 1 eligible x 65% = 0.65 management level total = 1.30 **Note:** After rounding down, the management level earns 1 "Definitely Promote" recommendation to award in aggregation and transfers the remaining .30 to carry-over.

8.3.1.10.2. Senior raters without the minimum number of BPZ officers assigned to earn an allocation aggregate their officers to the next higher senior rater in the rating chain until the number of eligible is large enough to earn at least one allocation.

8.3.1.10.3. Senior raters below the head of the management level who award BPZ "Definitely Promote" 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 management level to satisfy the requirements of **paragraph 8.3.1.10.2**, the head of the management level may:

8.3.1.10.3.1.1. Personally distribute "Definitely Promote" allocations on their own.

8.3.1.10.3.1.2. Convene MLRs to award the "Definitely Promote" allocations based on order of merit.

8.3.1.10.3.1.3. For joint management levels, all PRFs, including BPZ, must be quality reviewed. **(T-1)** See **paragraph 8.3.2.4.2.2**.

8.3.1.10.4. If the total number of line BPZ officers aggregated to the MLR is still too small to earn a "Definitely Promote" 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 "Definitely Promote" recommendation. If awarded, this "Definitely Promote" allocation will come from the carry-over allocation.

8.3.2. Management Level Review Requirements:

8.3.2.1. General. Management levels 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 management level is the sole senior rater, there is no MLR, and the completed PRFs are forwarded to the Air Force MLR for quality review. However, if the PRF cycle for the specific competitive category is determined for management levels to round down, the sole senior rater may nominate the officer to the Air Force MLR for consideration.

8.3.2.2. Timing and functions. Conduct MLRs 40-60 calendar days before the central selection board. They have five functions: (1) to quality review all I/APZ PRFs; (2) to award "Definitely Promote" recommendations to those officers whose senior rater had too few eligible to earn a "Definitely Promote" allocation; (3) to award carry-over "Definitely Promote" allocations available to the management level; (4) to award "Definitely Promote" allocations to management level students; and (5) to nominate officers from their management level to compete for "Definitely Promote" allocations available at the Air Force MLR.

8.3.2.3. MLR Composition. The MLR is comprised of the president (must be an Air Force officer), those senior raters who have either awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation or have officers competing for aggregation or carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations, a functional representative from the category under consideration (if no participating senior rater is from the specific category), and a non-voting recorder designated by the commander or head of the organization responsible for conducting the MLR. **(T-1) Note**: No officer eligible for a particular promotion board/PRF process will be involved with the process for that particular promotion board/PRF process. **(T-1)**

8.3.2.3.1. The head of the management level designates the MLR president. The president must be an AF general officer when evaluating lieutenant colonels, and at least an AF colonel when evaluating majors and below.

8.3.2.3.2. In cases where senior raters are not available to serve on the panel due to some extraordinary circumstance, the head of the management level may authorize senior raters to designate senior officials who meet the minimum grade requirement (a general officer or equivalent when evaluating lieutenant colonels or at least a colonel or equivalent when evaluating majors and below) from their organization or higher chain-of-command to serve on their behalf.

8.3.2.3.3. If extraordinary circumstances require a senior rater's departure during the MLR, the MLR president or another senior rater, as designated by the affected senior rater, may represent the departing senior rater. In all cases, the MLR president or senior rater designated to represent another group of officers is still limited to one vote. Additionally, if extraordinary circumstances require the MLR president to depart during a review, the head of the management level will designate another president or assume the presidency. In these cases, the records already scored will remain and the MLR will continue.

8.3.2.3.4. Management levels may establish a representative sample of senior raters to conduct the quality review of the I/APZ PRFs and officers' eOSRs at the MLR. At the discretion of the management level, all senior raters who awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation or who are competing officers for a "Definitely Promote" recommendation do not need to participate in the quality review process at the MLR.

8.3.2.3.4.1. All senior raters with eligible officers competing for an aggregate "Definitely Promote" allocation must serve as a member of the MLR during the aggregation phase. However, in those cases where senior raters are not available to serve on the MLR due to some extraordinary circumstance, the MLR president may authorize senior raters to designate senior officials (a general review or equivalent when evaluating lieutenant colonels or at least a colonel or equivalent when evaluating majors and below) from their organization or higher chain of command to serve on their behalf. If necessary, the MLR president may represent those senior raters, however the MLR president is still limited to one vote. If during the MLR a senior rater must be excused, the senior rater may designate another senior rater 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 senior raters who are competing officers for carry-over "Definitely Promotes" attend the MLR. If the management level determines this is not practical or deems it otherwise appropriate, it may establish a representative sample of senior raters to award carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations. The management level uses a representative sample to ensure the senior raters selected do not score the records of officers for whom they are the senior rater. **Note:** In all cases, at least one representative will be from the competitive category under consideration and must be a scoring member of the MLR. **(T-1)**

8.3.2.4. Management Level Review Preparation.

8.3.2.4.1. Management Levels.

8.3.2.4.1.1. Establish MLRs.

8.3.2.4.1.2. Distribute aggregation and carry-over "Definitely Promote" allocations to the MLR.

8.3.2.4.1.3. Notify each senior rater of the number of officers they may submit to compete for carry-over allocations subject to limits established by the management level.

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 central selection board 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 officer's eOSR 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 personnel information files, letters of reprimand, and/or Articles 15s. MLR presidents use this listing 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 senior raters do not exceed their share of "Definitely Promote" recommendations.

8.3.2.4.2.2. Ensure all BPZ records are reviewed separately from I/APZ eligible records.

8.3.2.4.2.3. Quality review the eOSRs, DQHBs, and PRFs of all I/APZ officers in order to identify and discuss with appropriate senior raters those PRFs that appear to contain exaggerated or unrealistic comments or comments that do not appear to support the overall recommendation based on the eOSRs and information considered according to **paragraph 1.12**. **Note:** "Definitely Promote" recommendations are limited in number to ensure that only the best qualified records are endorsed. A "Definitely Promote" recommendation sends a strong signal to the central selection board that this officer is ready for immediate promotion. If a senior rater or head of the management level does not have officers fitting this definition, a "Definitely Promote" recommendation should not be awarded even though "Definitely Promote" allocations may be available. To award "Definitely Promote" allocations to BPZ eligible officers when the record does not support a "Definitely Promote" recommendation gives the officer unrealistic feedback and sends mixed signals to the central selection board.

8.3.2.4.2.4. Award "Definitely Promote" recommendations to officers aggregated from senior raters within their jurisdiction with less than minimum group size needed to award "Definitely Promote" recommendations.

8.3.2.4.2.5. Award carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations based on the Management Level's allocations available or to nominate to the Air Force MLR for aggregation or carry-over as appropriate.

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 "Definitely Promote" recommendations. **Note:** Since BPZ records are not required to be quality reviewed, senior raters must submit their BPZ PRFs to the management level for updating.

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 "Definitely Promote" recommendations by annotating an "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 “Definitely Promote” recommendations to be awarded by each senior rater.

8.3.2.5.1.2. The MLR president ensures no senior rater exceeds the allowable number of “Definitely Promote” recommendations. If a senior rater has awarded more “Definitely Promote” recommendations than allowed, the senior rater specifies which PRFs need correction, new PRFs are prepared, and the senior rater completes Sections IX and X.

8.3.2.5.1.2.1. If the senior rater does not specify which PRFs need correcting, the panel reviews the eOSR and DQHB of all officers assigned to that senior rater 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 senior rater.

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 “Definitely Promote” 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 “Definitely Promote” recommendations.

8.3.2.5.2. PRF Review. MLR members will review the eOSRs, DQHBs, and completed PRFs of all I/APZ officers assigned to a senior rater as a group. If the MLR believes a “Definitely Promote” recommendation is unsupported by the ratee's eOSR, they discuss this with the senior rater. Open discussion among MLR members is encouraged. In all cases, a senior rater has the final authority to determine the content of the PRFs they prepare (unless the content is inappropriate in accordance with **paragraph 1.12** of this instruction), and to award “Definitely Promote” recommendations allocated by the management level.

8.3.2.5.3. Aggregation and Carry-over. The MLR assesses the relative merit of eOSRs of competitors for aggregation and carry-over “Definitely Promote” recommendations. This is by a combination of numerical scoring and open discussion among panel members. The MLR must ensure consistent and equal procedures apply to the eOSR of each officer. The scores of all MLR members are totaled, rank-ordered, and “Definitely Promote” recommendations awarded. If two or more records tie, and there are insufficient numbers of “Definitely Promote” 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 “Definitely Promote” Recommendations:

8.3.2.5.4.1. Officers submitted to compete for aggregation "Definitely Promote" recommendations compete among themselves. The MLR president and only those senior raters with officers competing under aggregation will review and score the eOSRs of these officers.

8.3.2.5.4.2. If the total number of IPZ officers aggregated to the MLR is still too small to earn a "Definitely Promote" allocation, all panel members, not just those with officers competing for aggregation, will score the records of the officers in the aggregated group. **(T-1)** If authorized to round up for the specific category, the management level may award one "Definitely Promote" recommendation. If awarded, this "Definitely Promote" allocation will come from the carry over allocations. **(T-1)** If only authorized to round down, then the management level may nominate to the Air Force management level to compete for a "Definitely Promote" allocation.

8.3.2.5.4.3. After all records are reviewed and scored and the MLR has awarded the "Definitely Promote" recommendations, senior raters, 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. Senior raters may make any changes to the PRF as a result of the MLR (e.g., if the last line states, "my next Definitely Promote" and the officer received a "Definitely Promote" recommendation from the MLR then the senior rater should change the last line).

8.3.2.5.4.4. The records of officers from the aggregated group that did not receive a "Definitely Promote" recommendation may compete for carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations at the discretion of the senior rater, within the limits prescribed by the management level.

8.3.2.5.5. Procedures for Award of I/APZ Carry-over Definitely Promote Recommendations.

8.3.2.5.5.1. At the MLR's discretion, and subject to the limit of "Definitely Promote" allocations available in the carry-over phase, those officers who do not receive a "Definitely Promote" recommendation from aggregation will be submitted for carry-over "Definitely Promote" 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 senior raters 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 senior raters available may also participate in carry-over decisions.

8.3.2.5.5.3. Senior raters or their designated representatives complete Section IX on PRFs for their officers by marking either a "Definitely Promote" or a "Promote" as appropriate. The MLR president verifies the results of the MLR by signing the order of merit. Senior raters may make any changes to the PRF as a result of the MLR (e.g., if the last line states, "my next Definitely Promote" and the officer received a "Definitely Promote" recommendation from the MLR then the senior rater should change the last line).

8.3.2.5.6. Recorder Responsibilities. The MLR recorder forwards all PRFs and annotated MELs to the personnel activity responsible for updating the Air Force Promotion Management System. **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. Air Force officers in these categories require special provisions because their organizations of assignment do not fall within the jurisdiction of a management level.

8.3.3.1.1. Allocation Process. For these officers, the Air Force District of Washington acts as the management level. The responsibilities of Air Force District of Washington are the same as those in **paragraph 8.1.4.3**, except for aggregated BPZ officers. The HAF MLR (as described in **paragraph 8.3.3.2**) evaluates BPZ officers aggregated to the highest senior in the rating chain for whom the senior rater does not have the minimum group size required to receive an allocation.

8.3.3.1.2. Promotion Recommendation Form (PRFs). Senior raters submitting officers to compete for aggregation or carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations prepare and forward PRFs to Air Force District of Washington, leaving Section IX blank.

8.3.3.2. HAF Review.

8.3.3.2.1. The AFDW/CC facilitates the HAF MLR to convene 40 to 60 calendar days before the central selection board for which the PRFs are prepared. The AF/CV, or officer designated by the AF/CC, serves as the MLR president. The Air Force District of Washington Commander with the assistance of AF/A1, selects a minimum of four members, consistent with the minimum grade requirements for senior raters, to serve as members (one must be from the competitive category being considered). **(T-1)**

8.3.3.2.2. The HAF MLR will review all completed I/APZ and BPZ PRFs and award aggregation and carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations. Air Force District of Washington is responsible for providing senior raters copies of completed PRFs on their ratees. This MLR will also review all PRFs completed by sole senior raters (see definition of sole senior rater in this instruction).

8.3.3.2.3. The recorder consolidates information on the number of BPZ officers assigned, the number of BPZ "Definitely Promote" recommendations available, and the number of "Definitely Promote" recommendations awarded. **Note:** No officer eligible for a particular promotion board will be involved with the PRF process for that particular promotion board.

8.3.3.2.4. If, during the review of completed PRFs, the board discovers that a senior rater awarded more "Definitely Promote" recommendations than allowed, the MLR president discusses this with the senior rater.

8.3.3.2.4.1. After the senior rater decides which PRFs to correct, they forward the re-accomplished PRFs to the MLR by the most expeditious means.

8.3.3.2.4.2. If the senior rater does not specify which PRFs need correcting, the panel reviews the eOSR, the DQHB, and the career data brief of all officers assigned to that senior rater 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 senior rater. The MLR president marks the "Promote" block in section IX of the re-accomplished PRFs and signs Section X.

8.3.3.2.4.3. The MLR holds PRFs they re-accomplish pending receipt of a re-accomplished PRF from the senior rater. If they receive the senior rater'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 Air Force District of Washington, and the original submitted by the senior rater will be destroyed. The management level will then process the PRF as appropriate.

8.3.3.2.5. Award of "Definitely Promote" recommendations to I/APZ officers is always separate and distinct from award of "Definitely Promote" recommendations to BPZ officers.

8.3.3.2.6. The MLR president completes PRFs with Section IX left blank.

8.3.3.2.7. Since panel members may not be senior raters for the officers meeting the MLR, members are encouraged to discuss an officer's eOSR and current performance with the senior rater in any case where the panel members believe it necessary.

8.3.4. Joint Management Level Reviews.

8.3.4.1. Evaluation Reviews. The president of a panel held to evaluate Joint officers is always an Air Force general officer. Joint management levels may exercise one of two options: 1) hold their own reviews, or 2) allow the HAF MLR to evaluate their officers. If the Joint management level is the sole senior rater, the HAF MLR will review all completed Joint management level sole senior rater PRFs.

8.3.4.2. PRF. When senior raters submit officers to compete at the HAF MLR, Section IX of the PRF is left blank.

8.3.4.3. If the management level chooses to hold a review but there is no Air Force general officer assigned to the activity, the management level may obtain the assistance of an Air Force general officer assigned to another activity. If necessary, the AF/A1 will assist the management level in obtaining a general officer to serve as the president.

8.3.4.3.1. Senior raters submit to the panel all I/APZ completed PRFs as well as the PRFs (Section IX blank) on all IPZ and APZ officers submitted to compete for aggregation or carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations.

8.3.4.3.2. The responsibilities and procedures of joint reviews are the same as in **paragraph 8.3.2**, regardless of recommendation, to be reviewed by a MLR (joint MLR hosted by an Air Force general officer or HAF MLR). This is to ensure 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. Management levels receive separate allocations based on those populations since permanent party eligible and students must be evaluated as two distinct categories. For both I/APZ line of the Air Force permanent party students, allocations round up at the management level and down at the senior rater level. For I/APZ non-line permanent party students, allocations round down. BPZ non-line/LAF-J permanent party student allocations round up at the management level and down at the senior rater level. Evaluation procedures are the same as outlined in **paragraph 8.3.2.5**. Responsibilities of the management level 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 developmental education, degree-granting programs (usually Air Force Institute of Technology sponsored), language training, education with industry programs, attaché/designate training, medical corps (MC)/dental corps (DC) residency programs (when a new Air Force Specialty Code 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. The AFPC MLR office acts as the management level for AF level students and receives "Definitely Promote" allocations based on the number of IPZ officers eligible for consideration by the HAF student MLR discussed in **paragraph 8.3.5.2**. The allocation rate is applied to students, patients, and missing-in-action/prisoners of war separately and rounded up at the management level.

8.3.5.2.2. Air Force Student Management Level Review. Convened at the direction of AF/A1, considers all officers who are permanent party students, patients, and those missing in action/prisoners of war within each separate category. It convenes approximately 70 calendar days prior to the central selection board. AF/A1 designates the MLR president and a minimum of four MLR members consistent with the minimum grade requirements for senior raters (one member should be from the category under consideration to the maximum extent possible). **(T-1)** The MLR is responsible for the following:

8.3.5.2.2.1. Reviewing the eOSRs, DQHBs, career data briefs, and narrative-only PRFs.

8.3.5.2.2.2. Scoring all I/APZ records and awarding "Definitely Promote" recommendations based on the allocation rate prescribed for that competitive category, grade and zone.

8.3.5.2.2.3. Scoring records and awarding promotion recommendations.

8.3.5.2.2.4. Awarding all Promotion Recommendations. There are no separate procedures to award aggregation and carry-over allocations.

8.3.5.2.2.5. Ensuring the recommendation-only PRF is accomplished for each officer, the appropriate recommendation in Section IX is marked, the PRF is signed by the MLR, and is attached to the narrative-only PRF.

8.3.5.2.2.6. Ensuring ratees receive a copy of the completed recommendation-only and the attached narrative-only 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.

8.3.5.3.1. AF-level students eligible for promotion may write a letter to the Air Force student MLR. The submitter must:

8.3.5.3.1.1. Submit the letter in good faith and ensure it contains accurate information to the best of their knowledge. **(T-3)**

8.3.5.3.1.2. Sign and date the letter. **(T-3)**

8.3.5.3.1.3. Send the letter to the AFPC MLR office so it arrives no later than 5 duty days prior to the MLR convening date. The MLR will not consider letters that arrive on or after the convening date. Address letters to: Calendar Year (insert appropriate year and grade) USAF Student Management Level Review, the AFPC MLR office. Letters may be emailed or mailed but must be digitally signed or signed with the member's payroll signature. **(T-3)**

8.3.5.3.1.4. The letter will be destroyed upon conclusion of the student MLR. Letters will not be forwarded to the central selection board. **(T-3)**

8.3.5.3.2. The AFPC MLR office 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 (e.g., PRFs considered by previous central selection boards, unsigned officer evaluations and training reports, decoration narratives, or letters of evaluation which become part of the permanent record).

8.3.6. Air-Force-Level Management Level Review (Aggregation and Carryover). This convenes when the rounding down process is used (see **paragraph 8.3.1.5.1.2**.). Officers compete for promotion by competitive category. Each competitive category may be different and competes only within the category and only when the category rounds down at the management levels. Due to the relatively small number of officers in each of these competitive categories, the number of eligible officers under a senior rater will frequently be insufficient to receive a "Definitely Promote" allocation, as is often the case even when officers aggregate to the management level.

8.3.6.1. Promotion Recommendation Forms. Section IX is blank on PRFs for officers submitted by the MLR to the Air Force MLR. With the results from the Air Force MLR, the AFPC MLR office completes Section IX with either a "Definitely Promote" or "Promote" recommendation. Section VI (Group Size) will always be "N/A". **(T-1)**

8.3.6.2. A MLR and/or the HAF MLR may evaluate I/APZ for all categories.

8.3.6.3. Air Force Management Level Review.

8.3.6.3.1. This panel considers those officers aggregated from management levels recommended to compete for aggregate and carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendations. AFPC convenes these reviews at AFPC approximately 30 calendar days before the central selection board.

8.3.6.3.2. Composition: President (an Air Force officer) and a minimum of four members as designated by AF/A1, or designated representative, consistent with the minimum grade requirements, where possible. The competitive category under consideration will not form the majority of MLR membership. **(T-1)** For MLRs, no more than two members may come from the competitive category under consideration. The remaining members will be from competitive categories not under consideration. **(T-1)**

8.3.6.3.3. The AFPC MLR office limits the number of officers each management level may submit to compete for aggregate and carry-over allocations to the total number of "Definitely Promote" allocations available. The AFPC MLR office ensures the eOSR, DQHB, career data brief, and PRF on each officer being submitted are available for review and holds an Air Force MLR for each competitive category.

8.3.6.3.4. MLR responsibilities are the same as discussed in **paragraph 8.3.2.4**.

8.4. Special Provisions (applies to ADL officers only).

8.4.1. Officers Relocating During the PRF Process. To ensure officers with a PCA or PCS assignment to a new senior rater effective after the PRF accounting date, but on or before the PRF cutoff date, receive full consideration for a "Definitely Promote" recommendation, special provisions apply. The gaining senior rater considers all eligible officers (except patients) regardless of promotion zone, who have a date arrived station (in MilPDS) effective after the PRF accounting date, but on or before the PRF cutoff date, for a "Definitely Promote" recommendation. For similar rules on promotion-eligible colonels. See **paragraph 8.6.2**.

8.4.1.1. The losing senior rater's total number of eligible always includes officers in this category when determining the losing senior rater's share of "Definitely Promote" allocations. As a result, the losing senior rater is responsible for preparing PRFs and ensuring a quality review is completed.

8.4.1.2. Do not adjust the gaining senior rater's number of "Definitely Promote" allocations to include officers in this category. Take any "Definitely Promote" recommendations awarded by a gaining senior rater from available allocations already established by the gaining senior rater's management level.

8.4.1.3. To provide these officers fair consideration, the losing and gaining senior raters may discuss the officers' performance and their intentions (via phone, memo, etc.).

8.4.1.4. The Gaining Senior Rater:

8.4.1.4.1. Must consider only eligible officers who will be given an outright "Promote" recommendation by their losing senior rater. Gaining senior raters have no option to award an outright "Definitely Promote," 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 regardless of the outcome from the MLR.

8.4.1.4.2. Must consider all newly assigned officers who received a "Promote" recommendation on their PRF from the HAF student MLR. Eligible officers considered by the HAF student MLR are not competed in aggregation or carryover; therefore, the gaining senior raters may award an outright "Definitely Promote," 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 in accordance with **paragraph 8.4.1.4.1**. The newly 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 date arrived station (PCS) or duty effective date (PCA) to the gaining senior rater. **Note:** If the gaining senior rater is unable to obtain a "Definitely Promote" recommendation, either outright or by aggregation/carryover, then the accomplished PRF is destroyed and the original PRF accomplished by the losing senior rater will be used for the central selection board.

8.4.1.5. The gaining senior rater will exercise the following options, as appropriate:

8.4.1.5.1. Decide to take no action to submit an individual for a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.

8.4.1.5.2. Award a "Definitely Promote" 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. Award a "Do Not Promote This Board" 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 management level to the AFPC MLR office. Gaining senior raters must get the concurrence of the gaining MLR president and ensure the losing senior rater is informed of the "Do Not Promote This Board" action. This will allow the opportunity for possible redistribution of any previously awarded "Definitely Promote" recommendations to other deserving officers prior to the central selection board.

8.4.1.6. If the gaining senior rater submits an officer for an aggregation or carry-over "Definitely Promote" recommendation, the gaining senior rater must ensure the officer's record of performance is available.

8.4.1.7. The gaining senior rater should notify the losing senior rater of their intentions.

8.4.1.8. The management level 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 senior raters.

8.4.1.8.2. Work with MPFs to notify senior raters of their eligible officers who fall in this category to ensure consideration for a definitely promote recommendation, as outlined in **paragraph 8.4**.

8.4.1.8.3. Notify the AFPC MLR office when a gaining senior rater awards a "Definitely Promote" recommendation or "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation. This includes those awarded within a management level as a result of a PCA action. This is considered a "Stop File" under **paragraph 8.4** (commonly known as old guy/new guy) circumstances and must be in writing in accordance with **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 Military Personnel Flight (MPF) will:

8.4.1.9.1. Screen all officers gained after the PRF accounting date to determine eligibility and notify senior raters accordingly. Ensure senior raters certify a review of all gained eligible officers by signing the old guy/new guy report on individual personnel or projected MEL which is generated from the Air Force Promotion Management System.

8.4.1.9.2. Notify the Management Level of newly assigned officers whose SRID is not correct as soon as possible; monitor date arrived station for changes (resulting from finance office updates) that would necessitate a correction to the SRID.

8.4.1.9.3. Provide the senior rater an eOSR and DQHB on newly assigned members.

8.4.1.10. The AFPC MLR office will:

8.4.1.10.1. Update all "Definitely Promote" and "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendations awarded by gaining senior raters and update inter-command SRID changes upon "Stop File" requests from management levels.

8.4.1.10.2. Receive definitely promote PRFs accomplished by the gaining senior rater through the "Stop File" process. If the losing and gaining senior rater both award the same overall recommendation, the PRF from the gaining senior rater is destroyed.

8.4.2. Officers Added to or Deleted from Promotion Eligibility. This paragraph applies to officers who become eligible or ineligible for promotion consideration in a particular competitive category on or after the PRF allocation date. Causes for a change in eligibility status may include: SSB or AFBCMR actions, administrative errors, changes in dates of separation, or similar circumstances.

8.4.2.1. When an officer is added to a central selection board or changes promotion zone eligibility, the senior rater:

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 definitely promote recommendations on or after the PRF allocation date.

8.4.2.1.2. Only awards definitely promote recommendations to officers whose eOSR and DQHB are comparable to other officers who received "Definitely Promote" 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 officers and a "0" for AP officers. **Note:** Group size for non-line/LAF-J 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. Senior raters void PRFs completed on officers subsequently deleted from promotion eligibility following the PRF allocation date. When a PRF is voided and an outright definitely promote was awarded, senior raters may reallocate “Definitely Promote” recommendations to other officers and re-accomplish PRFs. See **paragraph 8.3.1.8.2** for disposition of “Definitely Promote” recommendations after the MLR convenes. The appropriate MLR must approve changes to I/APZ.

8.4.2.3. When an officer's zone of eligibility for promotion changes (e.g., from IPZ to APZ), the above provisions apply. Senior raters 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 the AFPC MLR office through the management level to have these officers removed from the senior rater MEL unless the status is after the PRF accounting date. The AFPC MLR office prepares a board-specific DAF 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 senior rater. The senior rater’s total number of eligible officers will include these officers when determining “Definitely Promote” allocations.

8.4.4. Officers Eligible for Promotion when the Promotion Opportunity is 100%. When the promotion opportunity for any grade is 100%, senior raters will prepare PRFs only on officers who receive “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendation or on a “Promote” recommendation with derogatory/adverse information (e.g., Article 15, referral evaluation, letter of reprimand) filed in their eOSRs. Exceptions to this rule can be addressed to the AFPC MLR office. Senior raters will annotate on the MEL with either a “P” (for “Promote” recommendations) or “N” (for “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendations) and forward the MEL and PRFs to the management level. Management levels will review all “Do Not Promote This Board” promotion recommendations, update the Air Force Promotion Management System to show either “Promote” or “N” (not recommended for promotion), and forward any completed PRFs and MELs, signed by the MLR president, to arrive at the AFPC MLR office no later than 30 calendar days prior to the board start date. Management levels may use a representative sample of senior raters to evaluate “Do Not Promote This Board” recommendations.

8.4.5. Officers Assigned to Units Above the Management Level. Officers assigned directly to the offices of the CSAF, Chief of Space Operations (CSO), SecAF, Chairman Joint Chief of Staff (CJCS), SecDef, Vice President of the United States (VPOTUS), or President of the United States (POTUS), with that individual as their direct reporting official, are above the management level, require special provisions because they do not fall within the usual jurisdiction of a management level. These select units generally have fewer promotion eligible officers for most boards.

8.4.5.1. Allocation Process. To ensure these officers receive full and fair consideration, the individual above the management level unit acts as the management level and receives separate "Definitely Promote" allocations for IPZ officers assigned. Since there is no opportunity for this small pocket of quality officers to aggregate up or compete for carry-over, the above the management level heads are authorized to award additional "Definitely Promote" recommendations.

8.4.5.2. Promotion Recommendation Forms (PRFs). The above the management level heads are sole senior raters and must prepare PRFs on all promotion eligible officers under consideration by the appropriate central selection board. They award all PRF recommendations.

8.4.5.3. Management Level Review (MLR). Since the above the management level heads are sole senior raters, they do not conduct MLRs; the PRFs are forwarded to the HAF MLR (Air Force District of Washington) 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 central selection board. If the PRF is not a matter of record, senior raters have the flexibility to change PRFs. **Note:** All changes to PRFs should be completed no later than 2 weeks prior to the central selection board. However, in extreme circumstances and on a case-by-case basis, the AFPC MLR office may approve changes up to one duty day prior to the central selection board. 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. Senior rater contacts the management level to discuss the issue. The management level will notify the AFPC MLR office to place an immediate "Stop File" on the affected officer's PRF(s) with written communication, identifying the change (e.g., email and letter) within 24 hours of initial notification.

8.5.1.2. The senior rater 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. The senior rater forwards the corrected PRF to the management level and provides a copy to the officer.

8.5.1.4. The management level forwards the corrected PRF to the AFPC MLR office.

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 "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation, stating the officer's right to write a letter to the central selection board.

8.6. Correction of PRFs (ResAF Officers) ("Stop File" Process). A PRF is considered a working copy until the start of the central selection board. If the PRF is not a matter of record, senior raters have the flexibility to change PRFs. **Note:** All changes to PRFs should be completed NLT two weeks prior to the central selection board. However, in extreme circumstances, and on a case-by-case basis, ARPC/PB may approve changes up to one duty day prior to the central selection board. The request must be from the senior rater (in writing or, if verbal, follow-up in writing/electronic mail within 24 hours of initial notification).

8.6.1. The senior rater must notify the affected officer (in writing or, if verbal, follow-up in writing) of the intent to change the PRF.

8.6.2. 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 "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation, stating the officer's right to write a letter to the central selection board.

8.7. 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 HAF or AFR general officer central selection board or an ANG federal recognition board.

8.7.1. Responsibilities in the Promotion Recommendation Process.

8.7.1.1. Heads of management levels must:

8.7.1.1.1. Prepare PRFs on all promotion-eligible colonels under consideration by the appropriate selection or federal recognition board (e.g., extended active duty 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 ANG colonels being considered for certificates of eligibility to the grade of brigadier general. When preparing PRFs on promotion-eligible colonels, management levels may consider, in addition to the eOSR, other reliable sources of information, to include the senior officer UIF (if applicable). **Table 8.1**, notes 4 and 6, contain further guidance. Guidance in this instruction take precedence over those printed on the DAF Form 709. For ANG colonels, the DAF Form 709 must be signed by the adjutant general. For adjutants general, the DAF Form 709 must be signed by the Governor.

8.7.1.1.2. Personally complete PRFs by competitive category on all promotion-eligible colonels who receive a "Definitely Promote This Board" and "Definitely Promote" recommendation. Complete PRFs no earlier than 60 calendar days and no later than 30 calendar days before the selection or federal recognition board convenes.

8.7.1.1.3. Designate one or more representatives to perform this function for all other promotion recommendations. Representatives must be senior in grade to the ratees. Brigadier general selectees may not be designated as a representative for PRF purposes.

8.7.1.1.4. Send completed PRFs on all AFR colonels to AF/REG no later than 30 calendar days prior to the central selection board convening date.

8.7.1.1.5. Provide each ratee a copy of their PRF approximately 30 calendar days prior to the appropriate board. Attach a memo (**Figure 8.1**) for ratees who received a "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation to advise the officer of the right to submit a letter to the central selection board.

8.7.1.2. Vice Chief of Staff, USAF (AF/CV). The AF/CV, or designated representative, serves as the single management level for Air Force colonels assigned outside the DoD, to other military services, or as Air Force-level (e.g., senior service school) students.

8.7.1.3. Air Force Colonel Management Office (AF/A1LO).

8.7.1.3.1. Manages the PRF process for all RegAF list colonels.

8.7.1.3.2. Announces the PRF accounting date.

8.7.1.3.3. Matches promotion eligible officers to the appropriate management level on the PRF accounting date.

8.7.1.3.4. Announces the "Definitely Promote This Board" allocation rate and a combined allocation rate for the "Definitely Promote This Board"/"Definitely Promote" recommendations in the personnel services delivery memorandum (PSDM) released before the board.

8.7.1.4. Air Force Reserve General Officer Management (AF/REG). Manages the PRF process for all AFR colonels.

8.7.1.5. National Guard Bureau ANG General Officer Management Office (NGB-SL-B/AF). Manages the PRF process for all ANG colonels.

8.7.2. Processing and use of the PRF for colonels.

8.7.2.1. Send completed PRFs on all ADL colonels to AF/A1LO no later than 30 calendar days prior to the central selection board convening date.

8.7.2.2. Send completed PRFs on all AFR colonels to AF/REG approximately 30 calendar days prior to the central selection board convening date.

8.7.2.3. Send completed PRFs on all ANG colonels to NGB-SL-B/AF no later than 30 calendar days prior to the ANG federal recognition board convening date, or as directed by NGB-SL-B.

8.7.2.4. Narrative-only/recommendation-only PRFs for patients and missing-in-action/prisoners of war.

8.7.2.4.1. The senior rater sends the narrative-only PRF to AF/A1LO no later than 30 calendar days prior to the officer departing PCA or PCS for school.

8.7.2.4.2. The senior rater sends evaluations for officers in patient or missing-in-action/prisoner of war status to AF/A1LO no later than 60 calendar days after the officer enters this new status.

8.7.2.4.3. Senior raters provide a copy of the narrative-only PRF to the ratee prior to the officer's departure from home station.

8.7.2.4.4. AF/A1LO maintains narrative-only PRFs until the officer leaves patient, or missing-in-action/prisoner of war status. AF/A1LO destroys narrative-only PRFs when the officer no longer competes for promotion in this status. AF/A1LO maintains the narrative-only PRFs until distributed as specified below:

8.7.2.4.4.1. For officers who become eligible for promotion consideration by a brigadier general central selection board before they change status, AF/A1LO forwards the narrative-only PRFs to AFDW, Military Personnel Branch (AFDW/A1K).

8.7.2.4.4.2. After completion of the AF/CV recommendation-only PRFs (which are attached to the narrative-only PRFs), the AF/CV forwards the PRFs back to Air Force Colonel Management Office for inclusion in the HAF selection folder and provides copies to the ratees.

8.7.2.5. Restrict the use of the DAF Form 709 to the brigadier general central selection boards. Do not use PRFs for any other personnel action.

8.7.2.6. A PRF becomes a "matter of record" upon the convening date of the central selection board for which it was prepared.

8.7.2.7. Destroy a colonel's PRF within 30 calendar days of the officer's promotion, retirement, or separation.

8.7.2.8. Only the offices listed below may maintain copies of the PRF.

8.7.2.8.1. AF/A1LO for all ADL colonels.

8.7.2.8.2. AF/REG for all AFR colonels.

8.7.2.8.3. NGB-SL-B/AF for all ANG Colonels.

8.7.3. For instructions on completing the DAF Form 709 for colonels, see **Table 8.4**.

8.8. Supplemental Management Level Reviews for Recommendation Upgrade Post-Central Selection Board (For ADL Only). The supplemental MLR is a competitive process required to ensure fairness and equality in the post-central selection board PRF appeal process. As stated in **paragraph 8.1.4.3.10**, management levels must maintain copies of the eOSR that earned the bottom "Definitely Promote" recommendation and the top two "Promote" recommendations in carry-over at their MLR for each competitive category as it appeared before the MLR. The eOSR will serve as the "Definitely Promote" recommendation benchmark record to be competed via a supplemental MLR against eOSR of officers seeking a post-central selection board PRF upgrade of the overall recommendation (Section IX) to a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.

8.8.1. Granting Supplemental Management Level Consideration. Management levels will grant supplemental management level consideration only if they have the written support of both the original senior rater and MLR president in accordance with **Attachment 2, paragraph A2.6**.

8.8.2. Supplemental Management Level Review Procedures. Management levels will conduct supplemental MLRs in conjunction with their next scheduled MLR, when appropriate membership is present. When conducting a supplemental MLR, the applicant's eOSR, to include the revised PRF as supported by both the original senior rater and MLR president, will be competed head-to-head against the "Definitely Promote" recommendation and "Promote" recommendation benchmarks and scored by all members of the MLR. Management levels must ensure the applicant's eOSR 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 eOSR must tie or beat the bottom "Definitely Promote" recommendation benchmark in order to be awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.

8.8.3. Disclosing of Supplemental Management Level Results. At the conclusion of the supplemental MLR, the management level must ensure the MLR president certifies the results via a results letter. If the applicant earned a "Definitely Promote" recommendation from the supplemental MLR, the letter, along with the PRF, should be returned to the applicant to be included in their appeal package (ERAB process in accordance with **Chapter 10**). See **paragraph 8.4.2.1.2**. In addition, a copy of the letter and PRF must be forwarded to the AFPC MLR office. If the applicant is not granted a "Definitely Promote" recommendation from the supplemental MLR, then the applicant's appeal to change the overall recommendation of the PRF to a "Definitely Promote" recommendation 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 the AFPC MLR office.

Figure 8.1. Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board or ResAF Central Selection Board (see DAFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, or DAFI 36-2504, *Officer Promotion, Continuation, and Selective Early Removal in the Reserve of the Air Force*, for further guidance).

(date)

MEMORANDUM FOR (Ratee)
(Ratee's address)

FROM: (Senior rater's functional office 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 DAF 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 AFI 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluations Systems*, once the evaluation becomes a matter of record.

DAFI 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 MPF is available to assist you.

(Signature)

(Typed name, grade, branch of service)

Attachment:
DAF Form 709

Table 8.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation Form*, (for officers in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below).

LINE	A	B	C
	To Complete		**Instructions** (See **Notes 1** and **4**)
	Section	**Item**	
1	I	Ratee Identification Data	See PRF notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the CSS/HR specialist and MPF to correct the ADL. For RASL officers, notify the MPF (unit assigned) or ARPC/DPTSE to correct any erroneous data.
2		Name	In all upper case, enter last name, first name, middle initial and Jr., Sr., etc. If there is no middle initial, the use of "NMI" is optional.
3		SSN	Enter Social Security Number.
4		Grade	Select grade (rank) from drop-down menu. For officers who are temporarily promoted, use the temporary grade (e.g., Lt Col (T)). Reserve/Non-EAD colonels must select "Col Non-EAD."
5		DAFSC	Enter the DAFSC, to include prefix and suffix, as of the date the PRF notice is generated. See **Note 2**. See **Note 3** for recommendation-only PRFs.
6		Organization, Command, Location	Enter organization, command, and location of assignment (with attachment if applicable). For IMAs, information will be that of the unit of assignment, and for PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. See **Note 3** for recommendation-only PRFs.
7		PAS Code	Enter the PAS code reflected on the PRF notice. If the PAS code is incorrect, advise the CSS/HR specialist and MPF (ADL officers), MPF (unit) or HQ RIO (IMAs). For IMAs, information will be that of the unit of assignment, and for PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. 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. Comments in narrative format are mandatory and are limited to the space provided. This is normally the organization listed on the PRF. However, in large organizations, it may be necessary to use mission description for a lower level, such as the division level if it more accurately portrays the activity in which the officer performs duty. For recommendation-only PRFs, leave blank.
9	III	Job Description	Complete as if on an officer evaluation. For colonels in CSAF selected/designated wing equivalent positions, include "Wing Equivalent" up front as the first item

			in the job description
10		Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title as reflected in MilPDS. Pending or projected duty titles will not be used (Example: Officer departs to new duty location, losing senior rater may not use new duty title). See the "Personnel Services Delivery Transformation Training – Classifications: Duty History" located in myFSS for further guidance. For students, enter the student duty title (see **Note 2**). For AGR students' recommendation-only PRFs, enter "Student, type of school" (e.g., Student, Industrial College of the Armed Forces). For AFR position vacancy (PV), see **Note 8**. For those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment billet, enter deployed title.
11		Key Duties, Tasks, Responsibilities	This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job and not be standardized. Be clear and specific. Include level of responsibility, number of people supervised and dollar value of resources accountable for projects managed. Avoid jargon, acronyms and topical references as they obscure rather than clarify meaning. Mention additional duties only if they directly relate to mission accomplishment and previous jobs held during the reporting period. For accessions receiving an evaluation while awaiting the start of formal training, the first line of the description will read "Officer is awaiting training." This may mirror the job description. See **Notes 4** and **5**. For recommendation-only PRFs, leave blank.
***12**	IV	Promotion Recommendation	Explain why the officer should or should not be promoted. Limit comments to the next higher grade. See **Notes 4** and **5**. For narrative-only PRFs and RASL officers, comments on all PRFs are mandatory. Comments are mandatory for IPZ one time deferred (passed over) and APZ eligible officers. Comments are optional for two or more times deferred (passed over) APZ eligible officers. When comments are optional, the final decision authority for including comments remains with the senior rater. Comments are required on all PRFs with a "Do Not Promote This Board" recommendation, regardless of zone. For ADL recommendation-only PRFs, this section is blank. Comments are limited to the space provided. Officers who receive a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF cutoff date are not authorized to be considered for stratification.
13	V	Promotion Zone	For ADL I/APZ officers, in the drop-down menu, select "I/APZ." See PRF notice for promotion zone. Type or hand-write entries. For narrative-only PRFs, leave blank.
***14**	VI	Group Size	For ADL officers, see **Table 8.2.** Type or hand-write the entry. For narrative-only PRFs, leave blank. For ARC, (I/APZ) rank order all officers awarded a "Definitely Promote"

			recommendation, within each competitive category, e.g., 2/5/10; the officer is ranked number 2 of 5 officers awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation out of 10 officers in that competitive category meeting the central selection board. Position Vacancy (PV): rank order all officers nominated for PV within each competitive category, e.g., 2/5; the officer is ranked number 2 of 5 officers. The senior rater has 5 officers in that competitive category meeting the PV central selection board. The ARPC/CD ranks AGR student recommendation-only 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 Air Reserve Personnel Center Commander (AFRC/CC). Officers who receive a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF cutoff date are not authorized to be considered for stratification or a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.
15	VII	Board	Enter the central selection board ID for which the senior rater prepared the PRF (Example: P0423A indicates CY23 major board, and A0424A indicates the FY24 ANG major board). The PRF notices includes the board ID. For narrative-only PRFs that are wet signed, enter the date signed in this section; if the narrative-only PRF is digitally signed, leave blank. For RASL narrative-only PRFs, leave blank.
16	VIII	SRID	Enter this code as shown on the PRF notice. For IMAs, information will be that of the unit of assignment, and for PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. For narrative-only PRFs, leave blank.
***17**	IX	Overall Recommendation	The senior rater selects from the drop-down menu one of three recommendations. See **Note 6** for additional information on narrative-only PRFs, non-line/LAF-J, and aggregate PRFs. For RASL, do not mark a recommendation for PV or narrative-only PRFs. Nominees for ANG colonel are exempt. Officers who receive a "Required - Not Current" rating or who received an unsatisfactory on the fitness assessment as of the PRF cutoff date are not authorized to be considered for a "Definitely Promote" recommendation.
18	X	Senior Rater Data	See instructions at **Note 7**.

Notes:

1. Senior raters complete PRFs no earlier than 60 calendar days for the central selection board (the PRF cutoff date). For ARC, complete the PRFs in time to arrive at ARPC no later than 45 calendar days before the board convening date. Senior raters award one of three overall recommendations: Definitely Promote (DP), Promote (P), or Do Not Promote This Board (DNP). Excluding AFR and AGR

officers, 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 central selection board, 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**. **(T-1)** For RASL officers, contact ARPC/DPTSE if data is incorrect. For AGR students, enter "Student of (type of school)." E.g., PDE, IDE, SDE.

3. For Recommendation-Only PRFs:
a. Enter in Item 4, student DAFSC; for Item 5, the organizational designation, MAJCOM, and a location of the ratee's assigned school; and for item 6, student PAS code.
b. For AGR students only: Enter in Item 4 the student DAFSC; for Item 5, Office of Air Force Reserve (HAF), Washington District of Columbia; and for Item 6, student PAS code.

4. Some general guidelines:
a. For RegAF and ARC officers, promotion recommendation narratives are limited to the space provided. In these comments, the senior rater should use plain language and limit use of acronyms and/or abbreviations to provide a performance-based differentiation and/or characterization of the eligible officer's potential to serve in the next higher grade. If a stratification is used, the promotion recommendation narrative will begin with the stratification.
b. Endorsements for promotion are based upon an officer's demonstrated character and competence as detailed in the SecAF's memorandum of instruction for promotion boards. This is an opportunity for the senior rater to tell the central selection board why they should (or should not) promote the officers. This should not be a summary of information already contained in the record of performance. Comments or pushes for items that are decided through other processes or means (e.g., developmental education, jobs, assignments) are not authorized.
c. PRFs may include recommendations for promotion (limit comments to the next higher grade).
d. Do not discuss classified information.
e. Include comments related to adverse actions. It is strongly recommended that control roster actions be recorded.
f. Do not make recommendations for selective continuation since selective continuation boards do not see PRFs. On central selection boards where promotion and selection continuation are involved, PRFs are removed from the selection records before the start of the selective continuation process.
g. Refer to **paragraph 1.12** for inappropriate evaluator considerations and comments on PRFs.
h. Duty information must be within the senior rater's jurisdiction as of the PRF accounting date.
i. Evaluators will not comment on an officer's prior enlisted time. **(T-1)**
j. 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 will not be commented on in the PRF.

5. Comments are mandatory when an officer receives a DP or DNP recommendation, and must substantiate, amplify, or explain the recommendation. **(T-1)**

6. For narrative-only PRFs, do not mark any of the three blocks and type "No Overall Recommendation" in the top of this section. For non-line of the AF/LAF-J officers; MC and DC promotion to major and lieutenant colonel; LAF, nurse corps (NC), medical service corps (MSC), biomedical sciences corps (BSC), and chaplain corps (HC) promotion to captain, only P or DNP

recommendations are used on the PRF (when the promotion opportunity is 100 percent). Do not prepare a PRF for AF/LAF-J promotion to captain. For officers submitted in aggregate or carry-over to an evaluation board, leave this section blank.

7. Senior Rater:
a. Enter name, grade, branch of service (military officers and Department of the Air Force civilians only), organization, command of assignment, and location. Grade must be that in which the Senior rater is serving. **(T-1)**. **Exception**: Enter "Brig Gen (S)" for brigadier general selectees confirmed by the Senate. Retired grade is not authorized. If an officer has been frocked, enter their actual grade unless the officer is serving in a funded billet and the ratee is a lieutenant colonel or above.
b. Enter the last four digits of the Social Security Number if the evaluator is an Air Force officer. The Social Security Number is optional, though encouraged, if the evaluator is a civilian or 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. For ADL officers, enter current data as of the date of PRF completion. Do not complete the PRF before the PRF cutoff date.
f. For ADL recommendation-only PRFs, the President of the AF Management Level Review acts as the senior rater. Enter the following information: name; grade; branch of service; for organization, enter "HAF Student MLR"; for location, enter the location of the review; social security number; and for duty title, enter "President, HAF Student MLR."

8. For PV nomination, place the position number to the far right in the "Duty Title" block. All PV nominations must have a valid funded position number with an authorized grade higher than the officer's current grade when they arrive at ARPC/PB. **(T-1)**. PRFs with missing position numbers may be returned. PRFs with invalid position numbers or those for nominees not the incumbent (an UMD overage) in the position will be returned. **(T-1)**. Direct questions to ARPC/PB.

Table 8.2. What to Enter in (Group Size) on the PRF (ADL Lt Col and below only).

RULE	A If the allocation rate is	B and the number of IPZ eligible in an entire management level is (See Notes 1 and 2)	C then enter
1	10 percent	10 or more	"N/A."
2		9 or less	the actual number of eligible within the entire management level.
3	15 percent	7 or more	"N/A."
4		6 or less	the actual number of eligible within the entire management level.
5	20 percent	5 or more	"N/A."
6		4 or less	the actual number of eligible within the entire management level.
7	25 to 30 percent	4 or more	"N/A."
8		3 or less	the actual number of eligible within the entire management level.
9	35 to 90 percent	3 or more	"N/A."
10		2 or less	the actual number of eligible within the entire management level.

Notes:

1. For line of the Air Force (LAF) officers only, the following rules apply: APZ eligible do not generate "Definitely Promote" allocations; therefore, they do not apply when determining the entry for Section VI on the PRF. For management levels with only LAF APZ eligible members, please reference **paragraph 8.3.1.5.2**. When an officer is added to a central selection board to change promotion zone eligibility after Day 66, enter a "1 for IPZ officers or a "0" for APZ officers.

2. For non-line/LAF-J officers (I/APZ) and officers submitted by the MLR to the Air Force MLR (see **paragraph 8.3.6.1**), always enter "N/A" regardless of the number of eligible unless they fall under the criteria of **paragraph 8.4.2**. (e.g., board adds/promotion zone changes).

Table 8.3. Senior Rater "Definitely Promote" Allocation Rate Table – Active Duty List Officers.

	Allocation Rates (Percentages)																		
Number of IPZ Eligible	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90	95
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
4	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3
5	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
6	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5
7	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6
8	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	6	7	7
9	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8
10	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9
11	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10
12	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	10	11
13	0	1	1	2	3	3	4	5	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	11	11	12
14	0	1	2	2	3	4	4	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	11	11	12	13
15	0	1	2	3	3	4	5	6	6	7	8	9	9	10	11	12	12	13	14
16	0	1	2	3	4	4	5	6	7	8	8	9	10	11	12	12	13	14	15
17	0	1	2	3	4	5	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	11	12	13	14	15	16
18	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
19	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
20	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
21	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
22	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
23	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	16	17	18	19	20	21
24	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	21	22
25	1	2	3	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13	15	16	17	18	20	21	22	23
26	1	2	3	5	6	7	9	10	11	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	22	23	24
27	1	2	4	5	6	8	9	10	12	13	14	16	17	18	20	21	22	24	25
28	1	2	4	5	7	8	9	11	12	14	15	16	18	19	21	22	23	25	26
29	1	2	4	5	7	8	10	11	13	14	15	17	18	20	21	23	24	26	27
30	1	3	4	6	7	9	10	12	13	15	16	18	19	21	22	24	25	27	28
31	1	3	4	6	7	9	10	12	13	15	17	18	20	21	23	24	25	27	29
32	1	3	4	6	8	9	11	12	14	16	17	19	20	22	24	25	27	28	30
33	1	3	4	6	8	9	11	13	14	16	18	19	21	23	24	26	28	29	31
34	1	3	5	6	8	10	11	13	15	17	18	20	22	23	25	27	28	30	32
35	1	3	5	7	8	10	12	14	15	17	19	21	22	24	26	28	29	31	33
36	1	3	5	7	9	10	12	14	16	18	19	21	23	25	27	28	30	32	34

37	1	3	5	7	9	11	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	25	27	29	31	33	35
38	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36
39	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37
40	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
41	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34	36	38
42	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	35	37	39
43	2	4	6	8	10	12	15	17	19	21	23	25	27	30	32	34	36	38	40
44	2	4	6	8	11	13	15	17	19	22	24	26	28	30	33	35	37	39	41
45	2	4	6	9	11	13	15	18	20	22	24	27	29	31	33	36	38	40	42
46	2	4	6	9	11	13	16	18	20	23	25	27	29	32	34	36	39	41	43
47	2	4	7	9	11	14	16	18	21	23	25	28	30	32	35	37	39	42	44
48	2	4	7	9	12	14	16	19	21	24	26	28	31	33	36	38	40	43	45
49	2	4	7	9	12	14	17	19	22	24	26	29	31	34	36	39	41	44	46
50	2	5	7	10	12	15	17	20	22	25	27	30	32	35	37	40	42	45	47

Note: To determine the number of senior rater "Definitely Promote" allocations when there are more than 50 In-the-Promotion Zone eligible officers, multiply the number of IPZ eligible officers times the allocation rate. If the result is not a whole number, round down to the next lower whole number.

Example: A senior rater who has 63 eligible officers applied to a 65% allocation rate earns 40 definitely promote allocations (63 X 65% = 40.95 allocations, rounded down to 40). This table applies to all competitive categories. **Exception:** When the senior rater has three IPZ officers and the allocation rate is 65%, senior raters may award two "Definitely Promote" recommendations even though the computation does not result in two allocations (1.95). This table reflects this exception.

Table 8.4. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation*, (for officers in the grade of colonel).

LINE	A	B	C		D
	To Complete		Status		Instructions (See Notes 1 and 4)
	Section	Item	RegAF	ARC	
1	I	Ratee Identification Data	X	X	See PRF notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the CSS/HR specialist and MPF for computer correction of the active duty list (ADL officers). For RASL officers, notify the MPF (unit assigned) or ARPC/DPTSE to correct any erroneous data.
2		Name	X	X	In all upper case, enter last name, first name, middle initial and Jr., Sr., etc. If there is no middle initial, the use of "NMI" is optional.
3		SSN	X	X	Enter Social Security Number.
4		Grade	X	X	Select grade (rank) from drop-down menu.
5		DAFSC	X	X	Enter the DAFSC, to include prefix and suffix, as of the date the PRF notice is generated. For AFR refer to ARPCM. See **Note 2**. See **Note 3** for recommendation-only PRFs.
6		Organization, Command, Location	X	X	Enter organization, command, and location of assignment (with attachment if applicable). For IMAs, information will be that of the unit of assignment, and for PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. See **Note 3** for recommendation-only PRFs.
7		PAS Code	X	X	Enter the PAS code reflected on the PRF notice. If the PAS code is incorrect, advise the CSS/HR specialist and MPF (ADL officers), MPF (unit) or HQ RIO (IMAs). For IMAs, information will be that of the unit of assignment, and for PIRR and PIRR Cat E, information will be that of unit of attachment. See **Note 3** for recommendation-only PRFs.
8	II	Unit Mission Description	X	X	This block is not used for officers in the grade of colonel. (AFR) Use approved mission description based on PAS.
9	III	Job Description	X	X	Complete as if on an officer evaluation. For colonels in CSAF selected/designated wing equivalent positions, include "Wing Equivalent" up front as the first item in the job description.
10		Duty Title	X	X	Enter the approved duty title as reflected in MilPDS. Pending or projected duty titles will not be used (Example: Officer departs to new duty location, losing senior rater may not use new

					duty title). See the Personnel Services Delivery Transformation Training – Classifications: Duty History located in myFSS for further guidance. For students, enter the student duty title (see **Note 2**). For AGR students' recommendation-only PRFs, enter "Student, type of school" (e.g., Student, Industrial College of the Armed Forces). For AFR, use PRF notice/OSB. For AFR PV, see **Note 9**. For those assigned to a 365-day extended deployment billet, enter deployed title.
11		Key Duties, Tasks, Responsibilities	X	X	This description must reflect the uniqueness of each ratee's job and not be standardized. Be clear and specific. Include level of responsibility, number of people supervised and dollar value of resources accountable for projects managed. Avoid jargon, acronyms and topical references as they obscure rather than clarify meaning. Mention additional duties only if they directly relate to mission accomplishment and previous jobs held during the reporting period. For accessions receiving an evaluation while awaiting the start of formal training, the first line of the description will read "Officer is awaiting training." This may mirror the job description. See **Notes 4** and **5**. For recommendation-only PRFs, leave blank.
12	IV	Promotion Recommendation	X		Explain why the officer should or should not be promoted. Limit comments to the next higher grade. See **Notes 4, 5** and **6**.
				X	Explain why the officer should or should not be promoted. Limit comments to the next higher grade. See **Notes 4, 5** and **6**. For narrative-only PRFs RASL officers and ANG officers meeting an FRB, comments on all PRFs are mandatory.
13	V	Promotion Zone	X	X	This block is not used for officers in the grade of colonel.
14	VI	Group Size	X	X	For RegAF, this block is not used for officers in the grade of colonel. For AFR, if an officer is awarded a DP, indicate the officer's rank order among the total number of DPs awarded, then among the total promotion eligible population (e.g., 2/5/10) (AFR).
15	VII	Board	X	X	Enter the central selection board ID for which the senior rater prepared the PRF (Example:

					P0423A indicates CY23 major board, and A0424A indicates the FY24 ANG major board). The PRF notices includes the board ID. For narrative-only PRFs, enter the date signed in this section. For RASL narrative-only PRFs, leave blank. For ANG colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter "N/A."
16	VIII	SRID	X	X	This block is not used for officers in the grade of colonel.
17	IX	Overall Recommendation	X	X	The senior rater selects from the drop-down menu one of four recommendations (RegAF). See **Note 7** for additional information on narrative-only PRFs, non-line/LAF-J, and aggregate PRFs. For RASL, do not mark a recommendation for PV or narrative-only PRFs. For AFR the senior rater selects from the dropdown menu one of three recommendations (DP/P/DNP). For AFR, senior raters are not constrained by how many DPs they may award. For ANG colonels nominated for brigadier general, enter "Definitely Promote."
18	X	Senior Rater Data	X	X	See instructions at **Note 8** for ADL colonels, **Note 10** for ANG colonels and **Note 11** for AFR colonels nominated for brigadier general.

Notes:

1. Senior raters complete PRFs no earlier than 60 calendar days before the central selection board (the PRF cutoff date). For AFR, complete the PRFs in time to arrive at ARPC no later than 45 calendar days before the board convening date. Senior raters of ADL colonels award one of four overall recommendations: Definitely Promote this board (DPTB), Definitely Promote (DP), Promote (P), or Do Not Promote This Board (DNP). Senior Raters of ARC colonels award one of three overall recommendations: Definitely Promote (DP), Promote (P), or Do Not Promote This Board (DNP).

2. If changes to DAFSC or duty title are approved after the MLR but before the central selection board, 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**. **(T-1)** For RASL officers, contact ARPC/DPTSE if data is incorrect. For AGR students, enter "Student of (type of school)." E.g., PDE, IDE, SDE.

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 the student DAFSC; for Item 5, Office of Air Force Reserve (HAF), Washington District of Columbia; and for Item 6, student PAS code.

4. Some general guidelines:
a. Endorsements for promotion are based upon an officer's demonstrated character and competence

as detailed in the Secretary of the Air Force's memorandum of instruction for promotion boards. This is an opportunity for the senior rater to tell the central selection board why they should (or should not) promote the officers. This should not be a summary of information already contained in the record of performance. Comments or pushes for items that are decided through other processes or means (e.g., developmental education, jobs, assignments) are not authorized.
b. PRFs may include recommendations for promotion (limit comments to the next higher grade).
c. Do not discuss classified information.
d. Include comments related to adverse actions. It is strongly recommended that control roster actions be recorded.
e. Refer to **paragraph 1.12** for inappropriate evaluator considerations and comments on PRFs.
f. Duty information must be within the senior rater's jurisdiction as of the PRF accounting date. **(T-1)**
g. Evaluators will not comment on an officer's prior enlisted time. **(T-1)**

5. Comments are mandatory when an officer receives a DPTB (RegAF), DP (AFR), or DNP recommendation. Comments are optional when an officer receives a DP recommendation (RegAF). Comments must substantiate, amplify, or explain the recommendation. **(T-1)** Comments for P recommendations are prohibited (RegAF). Comments for P recommendations are optional (AFR).

6. On PRFs prepared on promotion-eligible colonels, Section VI does not exist (RegAF). Management level stratification will be placed in Section IV, Comments (RegAF). **(T-1)** Focus on the potential to serve at the GO level. Use ratee's accomplishments as a colonel to demonstrate potential and explain why an officer uniquely qualifies for promotion more so than others. Use comparable terms and gauge difficulty of job challenge, but do not repeat content of officer evaluations. 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). Use personal terms and be clear and concise. Identify true contenders and place heavy emphasis on future use as a GO. The head of the management level (or designated representative) may solicit advice and information from the ratee's supervisors and commanders, both current and past. If rendering a DPTB or DP recommendation, indicate the officer's rank order among the total number of promotion-eligible officers in the management level and competitive category (RegAF). Example: An officer receiving a DP recommendation who is second in a management level of 150 total eligible would have the entry "2/150." If the officer does not receive a DP recommendation, leave this section blank or enter "N/A."

7. For narrative-only PRFs, do not select any of the four blocks and type "No Overall Recommendation," in the top of this section. For officers submitted in aggregate or carry-over to an evaluation board, leave this section blank.

8. For ADL colonels, the head of the management level must complete this section if the recommendation is a DPTB or DP. **(T-1)** For other recommendations, the head of the management level may designate one or more representatives, senior in grade to the ratee, to complete this section.

9. 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 with it arrives at ARPC/PB. **(T-1)** PRFs with missing/invalid position numbers or those for nominees not the incumbent (an UMD overage) in the position for which nomination may be returned. Direct questions to ARPC/PB.

10. For ANG colonels, the PRF must be signed by the Adjutant General of their state affiliation. **(T-1)**

11. For AFR colonels, the head of the management level must complete this section if the recommendation is a DP. **(T-1)** For other recommendations, the head of the management level may delegate to any general officer or equivalent within the chain of command (most commonly the senior rater).

Chapter 9

DAF FORM 3538, RETENTION RECOMMENDATION FORM (RRF)

9.1. When to Use the DAF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*. Use the DAF Form 3538 to provide performance-based differentiation and retention recommendations to assist involuntary separation or retirement central selection boards such as force shaping, reduction in force, or selective early retirement boards.

9.2. Responsibilities.

9.2.1. First Evaluator:

9.2.1.1. Reviews the ratee's eOSR, DQHB, and UIF before preparing the retention recommendation form. 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 eOSR and DQHB and awarding one of three 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 their 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 Retention Recommendation Forms. 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 calendar days before the central selection board (the RRF cutoff date).

9.2.2.2. Ensures no subordinate commander and/or supervisor asks or allows an officer to draft or prepare their 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 the second evaluator 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 the 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 calendar days prior to the board. 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 central selection board. **Note:** If the ratee is geographically separated, send it to the ratee by "return receipt requested" mail.

9.2.2.6. Ensure 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 comments or recommendation only on the RRF if permitted by the ratee.

9.2.2.7. Attach a memo telling the ratee who receives a RRF with a 'Separate/Retire' recommendation that they have 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 they have not received a copy of the RRF no later than 15 calendar days prior to the board.

9.2.3.2. It is the ratee's responsibility to ensure their record is current and accurate.

9.3. Retention Recommendation Form Submission. Administrative processing for the RRF, to include SRID accounting, Air Force Promotion Management System management, unless stated otherwise, will mirror that of the PRF except for those actions directly associated with the MLR process. There is no MLR process for the RRF. Refer to **paragraph 8.1.5** for processing procedures and responsibilities.

9.4. Air Force Advisor Examination. When applicable, type, "AF Advisor Review" on the left margin of the RRF and include the AF advisor's name, grade, "USAF," date, and signature. See **paragraph 1.6.7** for more guidance.

9.5. Correction of a Retention Recommendation Form. An 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 two weeks prior to the central selection board. Use the "Stop File" process (see **paragraph 8.5**) when correcting an RRF.

9.5.1. If the change to the RRF serves to weaken the narrative portion, is a negative content change, or is a downgrade in the recommendation, the officer must be provided a copy of the re-accomplished RRF and a letter, similar to the letter provided to an officer who receives a "separate" recommendation, stating the officer's right to write a letter to the central selection board.

9.5.2. A Retention Recommendation Form becomes a "matter of record" upon the convening date of the central selection board for which it was prepared.

Figure 9.1. Officer's Right to Submit a Memorandum to the Central Selection Board (CSB).

(date)

MEMORANDUM FOR (Ratee)
(Ratee's address)

FROM: (Senior rater's functional office 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 DAF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*. In this evaluation, I recommended to the CSB that you not be selected for retention at this time. Because of this recommendation, I am reminding you of your right to submit a memorandum to the CSB.

If you believe this evaluation is inaccurate, unjust, or unfairly prejudicial, you may write a memorandum to the CSB concerning these matters. In addition, you may apply for a reveal of the evaluation under Chapter 10 of AFI 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluations Systems*, once the evaluation becomes a matter of record.

DAFI 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 MPF is available to assist you.

(Signature)

(Typed name, grade, branch of service)

Attachment:
DAF Form 3538

Table 9.1. Instructions for Completing DAF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*.

ITEM	A	B	C
	To Complete		**Instructions. See Note 1.**
	Sec	**Item**	
1	**I**	**Ratee Identification Data**	See the RRF notice for ratee identification data. If any data is incorrect, notify the CSS/HR specialist and MPF 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.
		Social Security Number	Enter Social Security Number.
		Grade	Enter appropriate grade (rank).
		Duty Air Force Specialty Code/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	Enter the PAS code as reflected on RRF notice. If the PAS code is incorrect, advise the CSS/HR specialist and MPF.
	II	**Job Description**	Complete same as on a performance evaluation.
		Duty Title	Enter the approved duty title. Pending or projected duty titles will not be used. For students, enter the student duty title. See **Note 2**.
		Key Duties	List key duties.
	III	**First Evaluator Comments**	Explain why the officer should or should not be retained. This section covers the entire record of performance and provides key performance factors from the officer's entire career, not just recent performance. Comments must be typed. Do not make prohibited comments. See **Note 3**.
	IV	**First Evaluator Recommendation**	The first evaluator marks one of three recommendations, as appropriate by electronically placing an "X" in the block.
	V	**Board ID/Senior Rater ID**	Enter the board for which the senior rater prepared the RRF. The RRF notice includes the board ID. Enter the five-character code used to identify the position of the senior rater. Enter this code as shown on the RRF notice.

	VI	**Second Evaluator**	The second evaluator indicates concurrence or nonconcurrence with the first evaluator's recommendation by placing an "X" in the appropriate box. See **Note 3**.
	VII	**Second Evaluator Comments**	Comments are mandatory when the second evaluator marks the nonconcur block. The second evaluator must provide specific comments to explain the disagreement. Comments must be typed. Comments are not allowed if the second evaluator concurs.

Notes:
1. Some general guidelines:
a. Comments must be in narrative format.
b. May include recommendations for professional military education and next assignment, but not promotion.
c. **Paragraph 1.12** applies.
d. Evaluators may consider and/or include information from other reliable sources (e.g., Reserve Officer Training Corps distinguished graduates, Officer Training School distinguished graduates, etc.).
e. Do not comment on rankings or recommendations from prior DAF 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 date of separation, 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 actions or letters of reprimand, admonishment or counseling. It is strongly recommended that control roster actions 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 Department of the Air Force social security number civilians only), organization, command of assignment, and location. Grade must be that in which the senior rater is serving. **Exception:** Enter "Brig Gen (S)" for brigadier general selectees. Retired grade is not authorized. If an officer has been "frocked," enter the actual grade unless the officer is serving in a funded billet and the ratee is a lieutenant colonel or above.
b. Show social security number if the evaluator is a USAF officer (last four only). The social security number is not authorized, 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 Report Appeals Board (ERAB) was established to provide Airmen with an avenue of relief for correcting errors or injustices in evaluations at the lowest possible level.

10.1.2. If an evaluation cannot be corrected under **Table 10.2**, an applicant's first avenue of relief for correcting an evaluation is through the ERAB by submitting an electronic application via the vMPF for RegAF; ARC members submit their requests utilizing a DAF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports*, via the myFSS Airmen Ask a Question (AAQ).

10.1.3. An applicant's second and last avenue of relief is via the AFBCMR by submitting a DD Form 149, *Application for Correction of Military Records under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552*, in accordance with DAFI 36-2603. **Note:** Applicants must exhaust all other avenues of relief (e.g., 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 in accordance with DAFI 36-2603.

10.2. Program Elements.

10.2.1. Who Establishes the Board. The Commander, Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC/CC) directs the business process owner of DAF Evaluation Programs to establish an ERAB to assess requests to correct evaluations and to correct substantiated errors or injustices for RegAF personnel. The Commander, Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC/CC) directs the establishment of the ERAB to assess requests to correct evaluations and to correct substantiated errors or injustices on ARC personnel.

10.2.1.1. For officer appeals, the board president must be at minimum an Air Force commissioned officer or civilian in the grade of O-5/GS-12 and above. For enlisted appeals, the board president must be equal to or higher than the requester or at a minimum an Air Force senior noncommissioned officer or civilian in the grade of E-7/GS-9.

10.2.1.2. Each board consists 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. Evaluations that have become a matter of record are presumed to be accurate and objective. Applicants filing an appeal must provide evidence that clearly demonstrate an error or injustice was made.

10.2.2. Who Administers the Appeal Process. The Evaluations Programs Section (AFPC MLR Office and ARPC/DPTSE) manages the appeals process and executes board decisions. Following the board's decision, destroys all working papers, memoranda, worksheets, recommendations, and notes between the board members or between the board and the evaluation section which pertain to the case. The board does not create nor maintain formal records of proceedings.

10.2.3. How the Board Will Operate.

10.2.3.1. Board members review applications and make recommendations to the ERAB President.

10.2.3.2. The ERAB President.

10.2.3.2.1. Reviews the member's request, considers each board member's recommendations, and makes the final decision for the appeal.

10.2.3.2.2. Acts for the full board on applications which involve administrative and technical corrections, or in cases that clearly lack the evidence necessary for presentation to the full board, or in cases that require waiving the time limit for an appeal.

10.2.3.3. The Board.

10.2.3.3.1. May be formal or informal.

10.2.3.3.2. Does not permit personal appearances. Neither applicants nor their representatives can appear before the ERAB.

10.2.3.3.3. Handles all appeals confidentially and does not normally disclose information to outside agencies.

10.2.3.3.4. Refers cases for action to appropriate agencies or individuals, such as Air Force Office of Special Investigations, unit commander, and so on, if documents or statements do not appear to be authentic. The *Manual for Courts-Martial* specifies penalties for creating false or forged official statements and documents. Civilian Air Force employees may be punished under federal law.

10.2.3.3.5. Reviews cases based on information supplied in the application. The ERAB is not an investigative body and does not solicit additional documentation in support of an application. However, if the board decides to consider information that was not available to the applicant, the ERAB will notify the applicant and allow them time to comment on the information. **Exception:** Information contained in MilPDS or the eMPerRGp.

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 (e.g., the applicant requests 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 and/or comments, all subsequent evaluators must also agree to the changes (to include the rater and HLR on ALQ evaluations and the MLR president on PRFs). **(T-1)** Justification is required from the original evaluators. See **Attachment 2, paragraph A2.3**.

10.2.4.7. Re-accomplish an evaluation without the applicant furnishing the new evaluation.

10.2.4.8. Void, correct, or change an evaluation that does not meet the 3-year time limit without a waiver. See **paragraph 10.5**.

10.2.4.9. Correct or rewrite an evaluation post-board based solely on the omission of an optional statement, or to make the evaluation stronger (e.g., professional military educational/developmental educational/assignment recommendations, awards, deployment information, senior rater endorsements, and/or stratifications 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 (e.g., UIF, control roster, Article 15, LOR, LOA, LOC, 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 may still be valid.

10.2.4.10.2. Because the corrective action was "set aside." If the corrective action (e.g., Article 15, LOR) was "set-aside," but the behavior that led to the corrective action is still supported by a preponderance of the evidence, 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 (See DAFI 51-202, *Nonjudicial Punishment*, paragraph 5.7.2, regarding the effects of Article 15 Set Asides). **Examples:**

10.2.4.10.2.1. The ratee received an Article 15/LOR for driving under the influence, and later the Article 15 was set aside for reasons other than a lack of evidence or innocence. However, the evaluation only states "Used poor judgment—drove under the influence of alcohol." Since the evidence shows by a preponderance of the evidence the ratee drove under the influence of alcohol, and the evaluation does not mention the Article 15/LOR, the evaluation is still a valid report.

10.2.4.10.2.2. The ratee received an Article 15/LOR for driving under the influence, and later the Article 15/LOR was set aside for reasons other than a lack of evidence or innocence. The report states "Used poor judgment—rcvd Art 15/LOR for Driving Under the Influence." In this case, the ERAB would not void the evaluation but would correct the evaluation to reflect "Used poor judgment—Driving Under the Influence."

10.2.4.10.2.3. For the ERAB to decide favorably to void the evaluation, the applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the behavior did not take place and the corrected action taken was officially set aside and not just removed or expired.

10.2.5. Appeals based on Promotion/Career Opportunity. Although not prohibited, ERAB requests based solely on a willingness by evaluators to change evaluations after non-selection for promotion will not be favorably considered unless proven the evaluation was erroneous or unjust based on content. See **Attachment 2, paragraph A2.5.1**.

10.3. Correcting Evaluations.

10.3.1. Prior to Becoming a Matter of Record. Once a digital signature is applied, the comments and ratings are locked and cannot be changed. In addition, the digital signatures cannot be deleted. For evaluations outside of myEval, if a correction needs to be made after the form has been digitally signed, then the rater will need to re-accomplish the form. The rater 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. For evaluations completed in myEval, if corrections need to be made after the evaluation has been signed, contact the CSS/MPF to clear the signatures. After the signatures have been cleared, the rater and/or HLR can make the corrections and resign. The evaluation 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 AFPC MLR OFFICE and ARPC/DPTSE are authorized to make corrections to evaluations. Once an evaluation becomes a matter of record, even administrative corrections will require an applicant to submit an ERAB via the electronic process (vMPF) for RegAF or DAF Form 948 submitted through the myFSS AAQ for ARC. An example of a case that would not require an ERAB or AFBCMR is when a report is not viewable in ARMS/PRDA or MilPDS is not updated.

10.3.2.2. When the correction cannot be corrected administratively, the next avenue of relief is through the ERAB. Procedures for appealing evaluations through the ERAB are prescribed in this chapter.

10.3.2.3. If the correction cannot be corrected administratively, the ERAB denies the appeal, or the requested action is not authorized by this chapter, the next avenue of relief would be through the AFBCMR procedures and can be found in DAFI 36-2603.

10.3.2.4. Performance feedback assessment worksheets and sessions are not subject to appeal.

10.3.3. Any changes or corrections that substantially alter the content from the original version require signatures from all original evaluators. If an evaluator (other than the rater) is unavailable and all attempts to contact them have failed (e.g., e-mail, mail, etc.), the individual who replaced the missing evaluator will sign the evaluation.

10.3.4. Re-accomplish evaluations containing an excessive number of erasures, change sentence meaning, or requiring corrections to the ratings. Do not correct ratings.

10.3.5. Evaluations will not be appealed under **Chapter 10** or DAFI 36-2603 before becoming a matter of record.

10.3.6. For PRF corrections, see **paragraph 8.5** and **Attachment 2**, **paragraph A2.6**.

10.3.7. Corrected Copies of Digitally Signed Documents. See **paragraph 1.4.5.2**.

10.4. Responsibilities.

10.4.1. The Military Personnel Flight (MPF). Provides training and advises personnel on the ERAB process. Opens a case management system case when applicable for RegAF or submits a request utilizing the DAF Form 948 via myFSS AAQ for ARC.

10.4.2. The Commander's Support Staff (CSS). Provides guidance on the ERAB process and how to access the vMPF for RegAF/myFSS AAQ for ARC.

10.4.3. The Total Force Service Center (TFSC) Personnel.

10.4.3.1. Be knowledgeable of the appeals process, and familiar with the contents of this instruction.

10.4.3.2. 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 in accordance with **Table 10.2**. **Note:** Any and all corrections involving DAF Form 709 and DAF Form 3538/3538E will immediately be forwarded to AFPC MLR OFFICE for RegAF or ARPC/DPTSE for ARC for correction.

10.4.3.3. Explains application procedures and documentation requirements via the vMPF for RegAF or myFSS AAQ for ARC. The addresses for sending original documents are:

10.4.3.3.1. RegAF:

Figure 10.1. AFPC MLR OFFICE.

AFPC MLR OFFICE

Attn: ERAB

550 C Street West, Suite 7

Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph TX 78150-4709

10.4.3.3.2. AFR/ANG (ARC):

Figure 10.2. ARPC/DPTSE.

ARPC/DPTSE

Attn: ERAB

18420 E Silver Creek Ave, Bldg. 390 MS 68

Buckley AFB CO 80011-9502

10.4.3.4. Refers the applicant to the MPF or CSS/HR specialist if unable to access the vMPF for RegAF or myFSS AAQ for ARC, who will initiate a case management system case for RegAF or submit a request utilizing a DAF Form 948 via the myFSS AAQ for ARC.

10.4.3.5. Provide the military addresses of personnel and assists applicants in contacting retirees through the worldwide locator in accordance with AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*.

10.4.3.6. Explain and emphasize expedited waiver procedures in accordance with **paragraph 10.5** and **Attachment 2, paragraph A2.4**. Advise members that it takes approximately 90-120 calendar days 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 AFPC MLR OFFICE for RegAF or ARPC/DPTSE for ARC no later than 45 calendar days before the board convening date. **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.

10.4.4. The Member.

10.4.4.1. Submits request for correction, insertion, or removal of evaluations electronically via the vMPF for RegAF or utilizing a DAF Form 948 via myFSS AAQ for ARC.

10.4.4.1.1. {RegAF Only} If applicant does not have access to the vMPF, they may contact the servicing MPF or CSS who will open a Case Management System case.

10.4.4.1.2. {RegAF Only} If an applicant does not have access to the vMPF, and the servicing MPF or CSS/HR specialist is unable to open a Case Management System case, then the applicant must obtain AFPC MLR OFFICE approval to submit a request on a DAF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports*. See **Table 10.6** for instructions. Requests on a DAF Form 948 will be authorized only on a case-by-case basis, and under extremely extenuating circumstances (e.g., someone who is in confinement and has absolutely no way to access to the vMPF). Non-availability waiver requests due to being out-of-the office, on leave, or TDY will not be approved.

10.4.4.1.3. {ARC Only} If an applicant does not have access to myFSS AAQ, they may contact the servicing MPF or CSS who will submit the request on their behalf utilizing a DAF Form 948 via the myFSS AAQ.

10.4.4.1.4. {ARC Only} If an applicant and the servicing MPF or CSS does not have access to myFSS AAQ, then the applicant must obtain ARPC/DPTSE approval to use alternative methods to submit the DAF Form 948.

10.4.4.2. Clearly and concisely state what the applicant wants (e.g., "Request my enlisted evaluation rendered for the period 1 Jun 22 – 31 May 23 be removed," or "Correct the duty title in my enlisted evaluation that closed out on 31 May 23").

10.4.4.3. Supply clear and credible evidence to support the application. See **Attachment 2**.

10.4.4.3.1. Supporting statements are required when making changes to an evaluation and must have dates and signatures. These statements must relate specifically to the period of the contested report. When information is not firsthand, the author must identify the source. See **Attachment 2**.

10.4.4.3.2. {RegAF Only} All documents will be processed through the vMPF and will be scanned into the Personnel Processing Application of the vMPF with the application.

10.4.4.3.3. {ARC Only} All documents will be scanned into a single PDF file and uploaded/attached to the myFSS AAQ for processing.

10.4.4.3.4. The applicant can obtain copies of the contested evaluations and or documents required for their appeal through the ARMS/PRDA access in Okta, **https://af.okta.mil/app/UserHome?session_hint=AUTHENTICATED**.

10.4.4.4. Make sure that no rule in this instruction prohibits their request. See **paragraph 10.2.4** and **Attachment 2**.

10.4.4.5. Applicants may contact the TFSC for guidance and application procedures.

10.4.4.6. Corrected Copies. See **paragraph 1.4.5.2** and **paragraph 1.4.5.3**.

10.4.5. Corrections Initiated by Someone Other than the Ratee. When someone other than the ratee finds an error in an evaluation, they:

10.4.5.1. Determine if the evaluation can be corrected administratively in accordance with **Table 10.2**.

10.4.5.2. Take corrective action by contacting the MPF or CSS/HR specialist to initiate a CMS case for RegAF or the myFSS AAQ for ARC, or advise the ratee to take corrective action through the vMPF for RegAF or on a DAF Form 948 via the myFSS AAQ for ARC.

10.4.5.3. Provide a statement from the ratee, acknowledging they are 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, they may explain why the correction should not be approved and suggest an alternative within 10 calendar days from when the ratee was notified of the pending action. Reasonable extensions may be requested. The omission of any remarks will be considered as 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 the member 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. AFPC MLR OFFICE and ARPC/DPTSE.

10.4.6.1. Review all ERAB applications for AFI compliance.

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 applicants of results via the vMPF, CMS, or email.

10.4.6.6. Provide guidance to commanders, MPFs, and CSS/HR specialists as required.

10.5. Meeting Time Limits and Expedited Requests.

10.5.1. Time Limits.

10.5.1.1. Submit appeals within three years following the date the evaluation became a matter of record. If the exact date is not known, add two months to the date the final evaluator signed the evaluation.

10.5.1.2. If the evaluation is more than three years old, submit a waiver of the time limit. See **Attachment 2**, and **paragraph A2.4**.

10.5.1.3. Normal processing time for appeal applications is 90-120 calendar days from a completed application. This does not include periods which applications are returned for corrections or missing documents.

10.5.1.4. Promotion boards are closed out (cutoff) 45 calendar days prior to the board convening date. In order to process an appeal in time, AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/DPTSE must receive the appeal no later than 45 days before the cutoff date, (90 calendar days before the particular SSB 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 an appeal must be resolved before a specific date or event, such as a pending promotion or SSB, submit applications to AFPC MLR OFFICE (RegAF) or ARPC/DPTSE (ARC) no later than 90 calendar days before the specific date or event.

10.5.2.2. The only cases that will be accepted for expedited processing after the 90-day cutoff will be evaluations, including PRFs, that have closed out within 90 calendar 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. When 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 (e.g., evaluations on other individuals, DAF Forms 2096, *Classification/On-The-Job Training Action*, PCS orders, travel vouchers, etc., on supervisors or coworkers), submit a statement from the concerned individual granting 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 the application.

10.6.3. If the information in a restricted release file is essential to the case, request the releasing agency to forward the information directly to AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/DPTSE. When submitting requests to the releasing agency, members 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, AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/DPTSE destroys the restricted file or returns it to the releasing agency.

10.7. Requesting Special Selection Board (SSB) or Supplemental Promotion Consideration.

10.7.1. RegAF officers can, in conjunction with their appeal, request SSB consideration for promotion, RegAF appointment, in-resident professional military education, selective early retirement, or reduction-in-force separation boards.

10.7.2. ARC officers can, in conjunction with their appeal, request SSB consideration for promotion.

10.7.3. RegAF enlisted personnel may request supplemental promotion consideration in conjunction with the appeal application. Such a request must be indicated on the appeal application; however, squadron commander's concurrence is required when submitting the request. The commander must complete the endorsement on the personnel processing application by using the "HR Review" button in Case Management System; by submitting a statement for application submitted by someone other than the ratee; or by signing the DAF Form 948 when the applicant does not have access to the vMPF or MPF or CSS/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/relevant 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.

RULE	A If	B the desired action is	C then submit the request	D then forward to
1	the ratee is serving on RegAF	allowed under this instruction (See **paragraph 10.4.4**)	To the ERAB via the vMPF using the Personnel Processing Application (PPA). See **paragraph 10.4.4.1.2** when the PPA is unavailable. See **Notes 1** and **2**.	AFPC MLR OFFICE, Attn: ERAB 550 C Street West, Suite 7 (Bldg 499), Joint Base San Antonio- Randolph TX 78150-4709
2	the ratee is a participating USAF Reserve or Air National Guard enlisted or officer		on DAF Form 948 via myFSS AAQ. See **paragraph 10.4.4**. See **Note 1**.	ARPC/DPTSE, Attn: ERAB 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave Bldg 390 MS 68, Buckley AFB CO 80011-9502
3	the ratee is a non-participating reservist, retired, discharged, separated, dismissed, or dropped from rolls; or request is not allowed	not allowed under this instruction. (See **paragraph 10.1.4**)	on DD Form 149 in accordance with DAFI 36-2603.	AFBCMR, (SAF/MRBC), 3351 Celmers Lane, Joint Base Andrews NAF Washington, MD 20762-6435 or via email to: saf.mrbc.workflow@us.af.mil.
4	Other than the ratee and have found an error in an evaluation	allowed under this instruction (See **paragraph 10.4.5**)	in accordance with **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 DAF Form 948 with all supporting documents or DD Form 149 (whichever is applicable) with all supporting documents. See **paragraph 10.4.4**.

Table 10.2. Correcting Minor Errors on Evaluations.

RULE	Minor Errors
	Note: Once a digitally signed evaluation has been transmitted to AFPC or ARPC, only AFPC or ARPC is authorized to make the correction. Submit a minor correction request via the vMPF for RegAF or myFSS AAQ for ARC. **The error is considered minor if the request is to correct an error in:**
1	The ratee's identification data: Name, grade, social security number, (component, ANG and AFR only), organizational element, or the identification data of an evaluator who signed the evaluation. Name, grade, social security, duty title, organizational element, date of signature, or final evaluator's position. Education or promotion or TIG/TIS eligible blocks (applies to legacy D/AF Forms 910 and 911 only). See **Notes 1**, **2**, and **3**. Go to **Table 10.3**.
2	The ratee's DAFSC, duty title, or level of duty. DAFSC must be reflected in the ratee's duty history. Officers: For active duty list officers, the DAFSC authorization must be approved by the applicable AFPC assignment functional manager and reflected in the ratee's duty history. For ARC officers, members must submit a request to ARPC/DPTSC for duty title or DAFSC corrections/updates in MilPDS. **Note:** The MPF or CSS/HR specialist performs the duty history update once the duty title is approved. See **Notes 1**, **4**, and **8**. Go to **Table 10.3**.
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, "meets/does not meet standards," Forced Endorsement, "is this a referral report," or to add a missing rating/promotion recommendation. 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 in accordance with **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 MPF evaluations section or the assigned records professional 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 (for legacy D/AF Forms 910 and 911 only) will be made only when the MPF evaluations section or the assigned records professional having custody of the original evaluation determines conclusively that an error exists.
3. If a 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 (grade) with a retroactive effective date prior to the date this evaluation was rendered."
4. The evaluation may be changed when approved documentation existed on or before the close-out date of the evaluation and a central selection board has not considered the evaluation. If approved documentation did not exist, was subsequently approved, or the contested evaluation has been considered by a central selection board, 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, submit a request according to **Table 10.1**.
6. If changing the close-out date of an enlisted evaluation would result in the ratee receiving a supplemental promotion consideration, the rater must submit a request according to **Table 10.1**.
7. Caution. Take extreme care when adding missing ratings or correcting "concur" or "non-concur" boxes. Submit an application in accordance with **Table 10.1** any time the rater's or endorser's rating(s) are missing and the "non-concur" box is also marked, or neither box is marked. However, an unmarked or mismarked "concur" or "non-concur" box may be corrected 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.

RULE	A **If the correction is authorized in accordance with**	B **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 CMS/vMPF for RegAF or myFSS AAQ for ARC.
1	All enlisted grades AB – CMSgt	AFPC See **Notes 1** through **5**.
2	2Lts through Cols (active duty list)	
3	All general officers and brigadier general selectees (RegAF, AFR, ANG)	General Officers' Group AF/A1LG 1040 AF Pentagon, Room 5C238 Washington District of Columbia 20330-1040 See **Notes 1** through **5**
4	All ANG or AFR officers and enlisted personnel in the grade of colonel and below	ARPC/DPTSE Attn: ERAB 18420 E. Silver Creek Ave, Bldg 390 MS 68 Buckley AFB, CO 80011-9502 See **Notes 1** through **5**

Notes:

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 close-out date can change the number of days of supervision, the reason for evaluation, the signature dates, or the FROM date of the subsequent evaluation.
3. If the correction is authorized, the office that maintains the original evaluation will make the correction to the original and forward copies to the appropriate offices.
4. The ERAB and the AFBCMR have the authority to correct or direct correction and distribution of all evaluations.
5. Disposition. Digitally signed via automated system. "Wet Signed" below.

a. RegAF members: Original – AFPC/DPSORM (ARMS/PRDA)

b. ARC members: Original – ARPC/DPTSE, AFPC/DPSORM (ARMS/PRDA)

Table 10.4. Board Directed Corrections - Correcting and Disposition of Documents.

RULE	A If the action is a correction	B that	C then the agency authorized to make the correction is	D who will	E and
1	directed by the ERAB	changes an evaluation	AFPC MLR OFFICE AFPC/DPPSP ARPC/DPTSE	correct and initiate correction of the evaluation. See **Notes 1** and **2**. prepares a DAF Form 77 See **Notes 3**, **4** and **5**. annotates the document. See **Note 6**.	distributes copies of the corrected evaluation, DAF Form 77, or other documents to assigned records professionals with appropriate instructions. See **Note 8**.
2	directed by the AFBCMR			correct and initiate correction of the evaluation as directed by the AFBCMR. See **Note 7**.	

Notes:
1. On the bottom of every page, type “Corrected Copy, AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/DPT, XX XXX XX [date correction made], and certifying official’s DODID.” (**Example:** Corrected Copy, 1 Jun 25, AFPC MLR OFFICE, 0000000000). Align authenticator data in margin to allow adequate space for punched holes. The person signing the annotation must be a SSgt/GS-6 or above.
2. For evaluations being re-accomplished, annotate the signature blocks of evaluators not reasonably available ORIGINAL SIGNED. If used, the comments and ratings of the evaluators must be copied verbatim from the original evaluation. **Note:** All measures must be exhausted before this measure can be used.
3. For voided evaluations (excluding imbedded TRs and PRFs), prepare a DAF 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, prepare one DAF Form 77 that shows the close-out dates of each evaluation.
4. For voided imbedded training reports, prepare a DAF Form 77 with the statement: "A TR 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 replacement TR and request it be included through the ERAB.
5. For a voided PRF, enter the statement: "DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation Form*, for promotion board (specify the promotion board, for example, 0589A) was removed by Order of the Chief of Staff, USAF." Use a similar statement for voided retention forms.
6. For documents that are attached to an evaluation, annotate documents with ACCEPTED FOR FILE--ATTACH TO (closing date) EVALUATION followed by the authenticator's data listed in **Note 2**.
7. Unless otherwise directed by the AFBCMR, annotate evaluations according to **Note 2**. For voided evaluations, prepare a DAF Form 77 according to **Note 4** except show the evaluation was removed "By Order of the Secretary of The Air Force."
8. Disposition. Digitally signed via automated system. “Wet Signed” below:
Original – AFPC MLR OFFICE, processing to AFPC/DPSORM (ARMS/PRDA).

Table 10.5. Correcting DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation Form.*

RULE	A **To correct an error in:** **See Note 1**	B **and the error is verified by, and supporting documents come from:**	C **then request the correction by:**	D **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 senior rater/MPF (for Narrative only PRFs) or the management level (for all other PRFs)	vMPF/CMS for RegAF or myFSS AAQ for ARC	AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/DPTSE
2	Sections II or III (Item 2)	the senior rater	an application under **Table 10.1**. See **Note 4**.	
3	Sections IV or IX	the senior rater and (RegAF and ARC) the president of the MLR Board. See **Note 5** and **Attachment 2**, **paragraph A2.6**.		

Notes:

1. When a PRF is sent to AFPC or ARPC, but it is not yet a matter of record (has not been filed in the officer selection folder and/or scanned into ARMS/PRDA) contact the Evaluations Operations Branch (AFPC MLR OFFICE, ARPC/DPT) for instructions.
2. The duty title may be changed 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, the application may be forwarded to AFPC MLR OFFICE. Please state that the evaluation it is a pre-board PRF that requires expedited 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 their recommendation IAW **paragraph 8.5** and **paragraph 8.6.**

Table 10.6. Instructions For DAF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports* (see paragraph 10.4.4. before completing).

ITEM	TITLE	INSTRUCTIONS
1	Name	Self-explanatory.
2	Grade	Enter data pertaining to the ratee of the contested evaluation.
3	Social Security Number	If an appeal was previously submitted under another name (e.g., 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 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 (e.g., officer or enlisted evaluation, TR, LOE, or PRF). Identify officer or enlisted evaluations, TRs, and LOEs by their THRU (close-out) date. Identify PRFs by the BOARD ID (Found in Section VII on the DAF Form 709).
9	SSB/Supplemental Promotion consideration for officers and active duty enlisted personnel	Applies only to: Enlisted: RegAF Only Officers: RegAF, Reserve, and Air National Guard. For Reserve and Air National Guard enlisted personnel, check the "N/A" block. SSB consideration applies to central selection promotion boards; RegAF boards; in-resident central developmental education boards; selective early retirement board, and report on individual personnel boards. Clearly identify the board for reconsideration. **Example:** "Promotion to Major, CY23A" P0424A, "RegAF augmentation, CY 25", or "SMSgt, 23E8". See **paragraph 10.5**. for expedited processing requirements

10	Commander's Certification	Enlisted Only. The commander must recommend approval or disapproval for SSB consideration by placing an "X" in the appropriate box and signing and dating this section.
11	Action Requested	Clearly identify the action desired for each evaluation being appealed. **Example:** "Void 31 Dec 21 Officer Performance Report;" "Change Duty Air Force Specialty Code 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 requested action is not prohibited by **paragraph 10.2.4**. For enlisted, indicate if supplemental promotion consideration is requested. The commander will complete Item 10 of the application.
12	Reasons to Support Requested Action	Completely describe the error or injustice. (refer to **Attachment 2**) For ease of consideration, list each allegation that applies to the application sequentially. Then, as needed, fully address each allegation. If more space is needed, continue on a separate page. For extremely lengthy statements, enter "See Statement at Attachment" and attach full statement.
13	List of Attachments	List all attachments in chronological order and identify each. **Example:** 1. TDY Travel Voucher 12 Mar 23 2. Contested Enlisted Performance Report C/O 14 May 23 3. Substitute 14 May 23 Enlisted Performance Report 4. Statement MSgt Smith 13 Sep 23 If more room is needed, continue on a separate page. For numerous attachments, use tabs to make the case easier to review.
14	Signature/Date	Applicant will sign and date application. In cases where application is submitted by someone other than the ratee, refer to **paragraph 10.4.5**.

Figure 10.3. Sample, DAF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports*.

CUI (when filled out)

APPLICATION FOR CORRECTION/REMOVAL OF EVALUATION REPORTS

PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT
AUTHORITY: Title 10 U.S.C. 9013, Secretary of the Air Force; AFI 36-2406 (*Air Force*) or SpFI 36-2401 (*Space Force*), and Executive Order 9397 (*SSN*), as amended.
PURPOSE: To apply for correction of evaluation reports. Use of SSN is necessary to make identification of the individual and records.
ROUTINE USES: May specifically be disclosed outside the DoD as a routine use pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(b)(3).
DISCLOSURE: VOLUNTARY: If information is not furnished, applicant may be denied relief sought.
SORN: F036 AF PC A, Effectiveness/Performance Reporting Records

INSTRUCTIONS: Route your application per AFI 36-2406 (Air Force) or SpFI 36-2401 (Space Force). Attach additional sheets of paper if more space is needed. When using additional sheets, list item continuation numbers.

1. NAME (*Print Last, First, Middle Initial*)	2. GRADE	3. SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER
BROWN, JOHN, A.	Maj	123-45-6789
4. RETURN ADDRESS (*address the appeal should be returned to*) 1234 Anderson Drive Sweetwater, TX 12345	5. OFFICE PHONE (*DSN and Extension*) 555-55555	6. CURRENT MILITARY STATUS ACTIVE DUTY ☒ RESERVE ☐ GUARD ☐
7. EMAIL ADDRESS (*enter a working email address to contact you in case of an issue*)		

8. LIST TYPE OF REPORT BEING APPEALED AND THE THRU DATE: APR, EPB, EPR, LOE, OER, OPB, OPR, PRF OR TR		9. SSB/Supplemental Promotion Consideration (*See AFI 36-2406 (Air Force) or SpFI 36-2401 (Space Force), DAFI 36-2501, and DAFI 36-2502.*) Note: Enlisted Personnel must have CC approval in block 10 Not Applicable ☒ Yes (*Complete below information*) ☐
TYPE OF REPORT	THRU DATE (*For PRF enter Board ID*)	ENTER ALL APPLICABLE CYCLE/BOARD INFORMATION (e.g., P0504B or 04E5)
OPB	31 May YYYY	

10. COMMANDER'S CERTIFICATION FOR ENLISTED SUPPLEMENTAL PROMOTION CONSIDERATION

RECOMMEND APPROVAL ☐ RECOMMEND DISAPPROVAL ☐	NAME AND GRADE OF COMMANDER	SIGNATURE	DATE

11. ACTION REQUESTED (*Choose option*) Void report ☐ Substitute Report ☒ Change Duty Information ☐ Other (specify) ☐

12. REASONS TO SUPPORT REQUESTED ACTION (*Be brief and specific*)

- Request 31 May YYYY OPB be substituted with attached re-accomplished OPB.

- Missing Developmental Education push in HLR's comments box.

13. NUMERICAL LIST OF ATTACHMENTS (*List each supporting document in the order attached.*)

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	DATE
John Brown	11 Mar YYYY

DAF FORM 948, 20240213
Prescribed by: AFI 36-2406

PREVIOUS EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE

PRIVACY ACT INFORMATION: The information in this form is CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION. Protect IAW the Privacy Act of 1974.

BRIAN L. SCARLETT, SES, DAF
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the
Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

10 U.S.C. § 1031, *Administration of Oath*

10 U.S.C. § 1566, *Voting Assistance: compliance assessments; assistance*

10 U.S.C. § 1722(g), *Performance Appraisals*

10 U.S.C. § 9038, *Officer of the Air Force Reserve: appointment of chief*

10 U.S.C. § 10211, *Policies and Regulations: Participation of Reserve Officers in Preparation and Administration*

10 U.S.C. § 10216, *Military Technicians (Dual Status)*

10 U.S.C. § 10305, *Air Force Reserve Forces Policy Committee*

10 U.S.C. § 12301, *Reserve components generally*

10 U.S.C. § 12301(a), *(war or national emergency)*

10 U.S.C. § 12304, *Selected Reserve and certain Individual Ready Reserve members; order to active duty other than during war or national emergency*

10 U.S.C. § 12302, *Ready Reserve*

10 U.S.C. § 12310, *Reserves: For Organizing, Administering, etc., Reserve Components*

10 U.S.C. § 12402, *Army and Air National Guard of the United States: Commissioned Officers; Duty in National Guard Bureau*

10 U.S.C. § 619, *Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion*

10 U.S.C. § 641, *Applicability of Chapter*

10 U.S.C. § 9013, *Secretary of the Air Force*

10 U.S.C. § 14303, *Eligibility for consideration for promotion: minimum years of service in grade*

32 U.S.C. § 708, *Property and Fiscal Officers*

32 U.S.C. § 709, *Technicians: Employment, Use, Status*

Joint Publication 1, Volume 2, *The Joint Force*, 10 June 2020

Joint Publication 1-2, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms,* 8 November 2010

DoDI 5400.11, *DoD Privacy and Civil Liberties Program*, 29 January 2019

DoDM5210.42_DAFMAN 13-501, *Nuclear Weapons Personnel Reliability Program (PRP),* 3 April 2024

SORN F036 AF PC A, *Effectiveness/Performance Reporting Systems*

SORN F036 AFPC T, *Officer Performance Report (OPR)/Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) Appeal Case Files*

UCMJ, *Uniform Code of Military Justice*

DAFPD 36-24, *Military Evaluations*, 7 October 2022

AFI 1-2, *Commander Responsibilities*, 8 May 2014

AFI 33-322, *Records Management and Information Governance Program*, 23 March 2020

AFI 33-332, *Air Force Privacy and Civil Liberties Program,* 10 March 2020

DAFI 36-3026V1, *Identification Cards For Members of the Uniformed Services, their Eligible Family Members, and Other Eligible Personnel*, 1 June 2023

DAFI 36-2110, *Total Force Assignments*, 9 August 2024

DAFI 36-2501, *Officer Promotions and Selective Continuation*, 12 January 2024

DAFI 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records (AFBCMR)*, 4 October 2022

DAFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records Systems*, 16 April 2021

DAFI 36-2710, *Equal Opportunity Program*, 23 May 2024

DAFI 36-3211, *Military Separations*, 24 June 2022

DAFI 36-2907, *Adverse Administrative Actions*, 14 October 2022

DAFI 51-508, *Political Activities, Free Speech and Freedom of Assembly of Air Force Personnel,* 24 March 2023

DAFI 51-509, *Appointment to and Assumption of Command,* 28 December 2023

DAFI 91-204, *Safety Investigations and Reports,* 10 March 2021

DAFI 90-302, *The Inspection System of the Department of the Air Force*, 15 March 2023

AFMAN 36-2905, *Air Force Physical Fitness Readiness Program*, 24 March 2026

DAFMAN 90-161, *Publishing Processes and Procedures*, 18 October 2023

DoD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms

Enlisted Force Structure

Prescribed Forms

DAF Form 77, *Letter of Evaluation*

DAF Form 78, *Department of the Air Force General Officer Promotion Recommendation*

DAF Form 475, *Education/Training Report*

DAF Form 707, *Officer Performance Report (Lt thru Col)*

DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation*

AF Form 715, *Officer Performance Brief (O-1 thru O-6)*

AF Form 716, *Enlisted Performance Brief*

AF Form 717, *Performance Objectives and Feedback Form*

AF Form 724, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (2Lt thru Col)*

AF Form 724-A, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Addendum*

DAF Form 910, *Enlisted Performance Report (AB/Spc1 thru TSgt)*

DAF Form 911, *Enlisted Performance Report (MSgt thru SMSgt)*

DAF Form 912, *Enlisted Performance Report (CMSgt)*

AF Form 931, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (AB thru TSgt)*

AF Form 932, *Airman Comprehensive Assessment Worksheet (MSgt thru CMSgt)*

DAF Form 948, *Application for Correction/Removal of Evaluation Reports*

DAF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*

DAF Form 3538E, *Enlisted Retention Recommendation*

Adopted Forms

DD Form 149, *Application for Correction of Military Records Under the Provisions of Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 1552*

AF Form 469, *Duty Limiting Condition Report*

DAF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Product*

DAF Form 2096, *Classification/On-The-Job Training Action*

DAF Form 2098, *Duty Status Change*

DAF Form 1613, *Statement of Service*

AETC Form 156, *Student Training Report*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AAD—Advanced Academic Degree

ACA—Airman Comprehensive Assessment

ADCON—Administrative Control

ADL—Active-Duty List

AEF—AFFORGEN Employment Force

AFBCMR—Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records

AFDW—Air Force District of Washington

AFELM—Air Force Element

AFFOR—Air Force Forward

AFFORGEN—Air Force Force Generation

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFIT—Air Force Institute of Technology

AFPC—Air Force Personnel Center

AFR—Air Force Reserve

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFSC—Air Force Specialty Code

AGR—Active Guard Reserve

ALQ—Airman Leadership Qualities

AMS—Assignment Management System

ANG—Air National Guard

AOR—Area of Responsibility

APZ—Above-the-Promotion Zone

ARC—Air Reserve Component

ARMS—Automated Records Management System

ARPC—Air Reserve Personnel Center

ARPCM—ARPC Memorandum

ART—Air Reserve Technician

BSC—Biomedical Services Corps

CAC—Common Access Card

CCM—Command Chief Master Sergeant

CCMD—Combatant Command

CES—Civil Engineering Squadron

CFT—Combat Field Test

CGO—Company Grade Officer

CJCS—Chairman Joint Chief of Staff

CMSAF—Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force

CMSSF—Chief Master Sergeant of the Space Force

CRO—Change of Reporting Official

CSAF—Chief of Staff, United States Air Force

CSS—Commander Support Staff

DAFI—Department of the Air Force Instruction

DAFMAN—Department of the Air Force Manual

DAFSC—Duty Air Force Specialty Code

DANG—Director, Air National Guard

DATT—Defense Attaché

DBC—Directed by Commander

DBH—Directed by HAF

DC—Dental Corps

DE—Developmental Education

DG—Distinguished Graduate

DIEMS—Date Initial Entry Military Service

DNP—Do Not Promote This Board

DoD—Department of Defense

DOR—Date of Rank

DP—Definitely Promote

DPTB—Definitely Promote This Board

DQHB—Duty Qualification History Brief

DRU—Direct Reporting Unit

EAD—Extended Active Duty

eBOSS—Electronic Board Operations Support System

eMPerRGp—Electronic Master Personnel Records Group

eOSR—Electronic Officer Selection Record

EFDP—Enlisted Forced Distribution Panel

EPB—Enlisted Performance Brief

EPR—Enlisted Performance Report

ERAB—Evaluation Report Appeals Board

ERRF—Enlisted Retention Recommendation Form

FD—Forced Distributor

FDID—Forced Distributor Identification

FGO—Field Grade Officer

FSS—Force Support Squadron

GO—General Officer

HAF—Headquarters Air Force

HC—Chaplain Corps

HLR—Higher Level Reviewer

HQ—Headquarters

HR—Human Resources

ID—Identification

IDE—Intermediate Developmental Education

IMA—Individual Mobilization Augmentee

IMT—Information Management Tool

IPZ—In-the-Promotion Zone

LAF—Line of the Air Force

LAF-J—Line of the Air Force Judge Advocate

LEAD—Leaders Encouraging Airman Development

LOC—Letter of Counseling

LOE—Letter of Evaluation

MAJCOM—Major Command

MC—Medical Corps

MEL—Master Eligibility List

MilPDS—Military Personnel Data System

MLR—Management Level Review

MP—Must Promote

MPA—Major Performance Area

MPF—Military Personnel Flight

MRD—Mandatory Retirement Date

MSC—Medical Service Corps

MSD—Mandatory Separation Date

MSG—Mission Support Group

MTF—Military Treatment Facility

myEval—My Evaluation

NAR—Narrative Only

NC—Nurse Corps

NCO—Noncommissioned Officer

NCOIC—Noncommissioned Officer-in-Charge

NGB—National Guard Bureau

NMI—No Middle Initial

NRN—Not Ready Now

NSRG—Senior Noncommissioned Selection Record Group

OPB—Officer Performance Brief

OPME—Officer Professional Military Education

OPR—Officer Performance Report

P—Promote—PAS—Personnel Accounting Symbol

PCA—Permanent Change of Assignment

PCS—Permanent Change of Station

PDE—Primary Developmental Education

PDS—Personnel Data System

PERSCO—Personnel Support for Contingency Operations

PFA—Physical Fitness Assessment

PIF—Personnel Information File

PIRR—Participating Individual Ready Reserve

PN—Promote Now

POTUS—President of the United States

PPA—Personnel Processing Application

PRDA—Personnel Records Display Application

PRF—Promotion Recommendation Form

PV—Position Vacancy

RASL—Reserve Active Status List

RegAF—Regular Air Force

ResAF—Reserve of the Air Force

RIO—Readiness and Integration Organization

RRF—Retention Recommendation Form

SAF—Secretary of the Air Force

SAPR—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

SCOD—Static Close-Out Date

SDE—Senior Developmental Education

SDO—Senior Defense Official

SecAF—Secretary of the Air Force

SecDef—Secretary of Defense

SEL—Senior Enlisted Leader

SES—Senior Executive Service

SNCO—Senior Noncommissioned Officer

SNCOA—Senior Noncommissioned Officer Academy

SR—Senior Rater

SRID—Senior Rater Identification

SSB—Special Selection Board

SSN—Social Security Number

Stat—Statutory

STEP—Stripes for Exceptional Performers

SURF—Single Uniform Request Format

TFCSD—Total Federal Commissioned Service Date

TAFMSD—Total Active Federal Military Service Date

TAFSC—Total Active Federal Commissioned Service

TAG—The Adjutant General

TDY—Temporary Duty

TFSC—Total Force Service Center (formerly the Air Force Contact Center)

TIG—Time-in-Grade

TIS—Time-in-Service

TR—Traditional Reservist

TR—Training Report

TYSD—Total Years' Service Date

UCMJ—Uniform Code of Military Justice

UIF—Unfavorable Information File

UMD—Unit Manning Document

USAF—United States Air Force

USSF—United States Space Force

U.S.C.—United States Code

VLPAD—Voluntary Limited Period of Active Duty

vMPF—Virtual Military Personnel Flight

VPOTUS—Vice President of the United States

WHtR—Waist-to-Height Ratio

Office Symbols

2AF/A1—Second Air Force, Manpower, Personnel, and Services Directorate

AF/A1—Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel and Services

AF/A1LE—Air Force CMSgt Management Office

AF/A1LG—Air Force General Officer Management Office

AF/A1LO—Air Force Colonel Management Office

AF/A1P—Air Force, Directorate of Force Management Policy

AF/A1PP—Military Force Policy Division

AF/A1PPP—Promotions and Evaluations Policy Branch

AF/CV—Air Force, Vice Chief of Staff

AF/CVA—Air Force, Assistant Vice Chief of Staff

AF/JAX—Air Force Judge Advocate Professional Development Directorate

AF/RE—Chief of Air Force Reserve

AF/REE—Air Force Reserve Executive Services

AF/REG—Air Force Reserve Senior Leader Management Office

AF/REP—Air Force Reserve Directorate of Personnel

AF/SG—Office of the Surgeon General

AF/SG1—Medical Force Development Directorate

AF/A8—Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations

AFDW/A1K—Air Force District of Washington Military Personnel Branch

AFIT/MSP—Air Force Institute of Technology Academic Coding Branch

AFPC/CC—Commander, Air Force Personnel Center

AFPC/DPFD—Air Force Personnel Center Disability Program Administrator

AFPC/DPMN—Air Force Personnel Center Medical Service Officer Management

AFPC/DPSORM—Air Force Personnel Center Military Records Section

AFPC/DPSTSP—Air Force Personnel Center Evaluation Support Section

AFPC/DPPSP—Air Force Personnel Center Promotions, Evaluations and Recognitions Branch

AFPC/PB—Selection Board Secretariat

AFRC/A1K—Air Force Reserve Command, Personnel Directorate

AFRC/CC—Air Force Reserve Command Commander

ARPC/CC—Commander, Air Reserve Personnel Center

AFPC MLR OFFICE—Air Force Personnel Center Evaluations and Recognition Operations Section

ARPC/DPT—Air Reserve Personnel Center Directorate of Personnel and Total Force Services

ARPC/DPTS—Air Reserve Personnel Center Sustainment Division

ARPC/DPTSE—Air Reserve Personnel Center Evaluations Section

ARPC/PB—Air Reserve Personnel Center Promotion Board Secretariat

NGB/A1—National Guard Bureau Manpower, Personnel, and Services Directorate

NGB/A1P—National Guard Bureau Force Management Division

NGB/CF—Director of the Air National Guard

NGB/HR—National Guard Bureau Human Resources Directorate

NGB-SL-B—National Guard Senior Leader Management and General Officer Management Office

SAF/MR—Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs

SAF/OC—Secretary of the Air Force Office of Competitive Activities

Terms

Above the Management Level—There are nine units that are above the level this AFI defines as management levels: President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, SecDef, CJSC, SecAF, CSAF, CSO, CMSAF and CMSSF. For purposes of the AFI, these units are also known as management levels.

Action Officer—A staff-level officer who is responsible for coordinating, analyzing, drafting, staffing correspondence, and central point for specific projects on behalf of senior leaders or a specific directorate within a headquarters or staff organization.

Acquisition Examiner—A person, either within the rating chain or appointed by the management level (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—full-time duty in the active military service of the United States. Such term includes full-time training duty, annual training duty, and attendance, while in the active military service, at a school designated as a service school by law or by the Secretary of the military department concerned. Such term does not include full-time National Guard duty.

Active Duty List (ADL)—Officers on active duty except (per 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 United States 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 (AGR)—An ANG or AFR member serving on active duty in support of the Guard or Reserve mission, under 10 U.S.C. §§ 10211, 10305, 12310, 12402 or 32 U.S.C. § 708 (Property and Fiscal Officers).

Active Service—Service on active duty or full-time National Guard duty.

Active Status—Status of a member of a reserve component who is not in the inactive Air National Guard, on an inactive status list, or in the Retired Reserve.

Advisor—An Air Force designated representative who provides a special review of evaluations in activities outside the Department of the Air Force (**paragraph 1.6.7**.). The Air Force Advisor advises non-United States Air Force evaluators of Air Force rating policies and procedures and reviews officer and enlisted evaluations 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.

Airmen Leadership Qualities—Ten qualities grouped into four major performance areas (MPAs) that are valued in our Airmen; used to develop and evaluate Airmen; and which are indicative of potential for greater responsibility. In the MPA, *Executing the Mission*, the ALQs are: Job Proficiency; Initiative; and Adaptability. In the MPA, *Leading People*, the ALQs are: Collaboration; Emotional Intelligence; and Communication. In the MPA, *Managing Resources*, the ALQs are: Stewardship; and Accountability. In the MPA, *Improving the Unit*, the ALQs are: Decision Making; and Innovation. ALQs are evaluated via a proficiency-level scale.

Air National Guard (ANG) Non-AGR—Refers to members of the Air National Guard who are not on Extended Active Duty nor assigned in permanent Active Guard Reserve (AGR) or Statutory Tour status.

ALQ Evaluations—Represents the performance characteristics the Air Force wants to define, develop, incentivize, and measure in the Air Force's Airmen. Additionally, ALQ evaluations are intended to be simple and consistent across all Airmen, with minor variations specific to grade (e.g., stratification vs. forced distribution). ALQ evaluations include: (1) 2x evaluators (rater and higher level reviewer); (2) alignment to the major performance areas (MPA); and (3) narrative-style performance statements.

ALQ Evaluation Accounting Dates—The accounting date is solely for establishing the unit responsible for accomplishing the evaluation on the SCOD. Accounting dates will be approximately 120 calendar days prior to each SCOD and will be the third day of the month for consistency. For a PCS, the date arrived station establishes the assigned unit on the accounting date. For a PCA, the effective duty date establishes the assigned unit on the accounting date. As of the accounting date, the ratee's assigned unit (i.e., assigned organizational PAS code) and rating chain, from rater to HLR/senior rater, as of the accounting date, will be responsible for drafting, processing, and signing the SCOD evaluation.

ARC—Refers to members assigned to the Air Force Reserve (AFR) or Air National Guard (ANG). Typically used to address the combination of all members assigned within both AFR and ANG.

Annual Cycle Close-out Date (applies to general officers)—Annual major general and major general selectee evaluations close-out 30 June; annual brigadier general and brigadier general selectee evaluations close-out 31 July.

ARC AGR—Refers to members assigned to the Air Force Reserve (AFR) or Air National Guard (ANG) component who are serving in a full-time AGR status or on a Statutory Tour (ANG only).

Carry-over—For line officers, the difference between the "Definitely Promote" allocations (rounded up) based on the population of a management level, and the sum of "Definitely Promote" allocations authorized senior raters (rounded down) based on each senior rater's population (including those senior raters whose population is aggregated).

Civilian Director—Civilians designated to lead units/organizations (PAS codes[s]), excluding flight commanders.

Commander—Officers designated to lead units/organizations (PAS codes[s]), and who are on G-series orders. This is typically the senior ranking officer in the specific PAS code.

Company Grade—Officers in the grades of second lieutenant through captain.

Combat Field Test—The Combat Field Test is an umbrella term used for those Air Force combat related AFSC specific fitness tests to include the Air Force Special Warfare Operator Fitness Test (OSPFA) (1ZXXX and 19ZXXX) and the Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Occupationally Specific Physical Fitness Assessment (OSPFA) (3E8XX and 32EXH).

Combat—Related AFSCs— Air Force combat related AFSCs include the following AFSCs: 19ZXA Special Tactics Officer; 19ZXB Tactical Air Control Party Officer; 19ZXC Combat Rescue Officer; 1Z1X1 Pararescue; 1Z2X1 Combat Control; 1Z3X1 Tactical Air Control Party; 1Z4X1 Special Reconnaissance; 3E8X1 Explosive Ordnance Disposal; 32EXH Explosive Ordnance Disposal Engineer.

Combat Zone—That area required by combat forces for the conduct of operations. The territory forward of the Army rear area boundary**.**

Command Climate—The perception of a unit’s environment by its members. Commanders are ultimately responsible for the good order and discipline in their unit and have unique responsibility and authority to ensure good order and discipline.

Common Access Card—A smart card that authorizes entry into government facilities, buildings, etc.

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 DAF Form 709 that says the strength of the ratee's performance and performance-based potential alone warrants promotion; (colonels only)—Recommendation on DAF Form 709 which indicates an officer demonstrates the potential for immediate promotion.

Department of the Air Force (DAF)—Includes the Regular Air Force, the Air Reserve Component (Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard), and the United States Space Force.

Deployment—The movement of forces into and out of an operational area. This does not include members “deployed in place” in support of a named operation.

Digital Signature—An electronic, encrypted authentication stamp used with the Common Access Card (CAC) to verify the identity of the signer and ensure the integrity of a document.

Do Not Promote This Board (colonels and below)—Recommendation on DAF Form 709 that says the ratee does not warrant promotion on the central selection board for which the PRF is being prepared.

Duty Qualification History Brief (DQHB)—A computer product used by senior raters in the promotion recommendation process which includes such whole person factors as developmental education, advanced academic information, board certification, joint duty and acquisition corps data and award and decoration information.

Electronic Master Personnel Record Group (eMPerRGp)—Consists of officer selection record group; senior noncommissioned officer (SNCO) selection record (AD only); and correspondence and miscellaneous record group (officer and enlisted). The eMPerRGp is maintained at AFPC for RegAF members, and at ARPC for ARC members.

Embedded Evaluations—an evaluation which is required and the inclusive dates are in between two SCOD evaluations (e.g., individual has SCOD evaluation closing out on 31 Aug, goes to training that ends on 21 Jan; this training report would be an embedded evaluation because the training report closes out more than 120 days before the SCOD). **Note:** This will not restart the evaluation period; however, it will be updated in MilPDS.

Enlisted Performance Brief (EPB)—The output of the enlisted ALQ evaluation that is completed in myEval. The offline version of the EPB is the AF Form 716, *Enlisted Performance Brief*.

Evaluations—A general reference to the Airman Comprehensive Assessment (AF Forms 724, 931, and 932), OPB (AF Form 715), EPB (AF Form 716), PRF (DAF Form 709), Education/Training Report (DAF Form 475), Letter of Evaluation (DAF Form 77), and the General Officer Promotion Recommendation (DAF Form 78).

Evaluator—Any individual who signs a performance report in a rating capacity.

Field Grade Officer—Officers in the grade of major through colonel.

Final Out—The day before an individual's departure from the member's station for PCS, retirement, separation, terminal leave, leave in conjunction with PCS, or unit PCA.

Forced Distributor (FD) (also referred to as FDID authority)—The forced distributor is the HLR for TSgt and below and is the evaluator designated to complete the promotion recommendation section of the ALQ evaluation. For wing/group/squadron-level organizational structures, the FD will be the G-series orders commander or civilian director (delegable to section commander or equivalent [must be in the grade of O-3/GS-12/NH-III/equivalent or higher] only for non-TIG/TIS eligibles). For wings, the FD is the deputy commander, delegable to the Director of Staff. Within MAJCOMs, CCMDs, FOAs, DRUs, NAFs, and Centers, the FD will be the military or civilian director. For MAJCOM and CCMD commanders, the FD will be the deputy commander. When there is a subordinate organization/unit below the director and the subordinate organization's unit commander is on G- Series orders, the subordinate organization's commander will serve as the FD, not the parent organization commander/director. **Note:** If the officer in one of these positions is from a sister- service, they must be an O-5 or higher to serve as a FD.

Forced Distributor Identification—A nine-digit code in the military personnel data system (first two digits are the Management ID; the third, fourth and fifth digits are the senior rater code; sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth digits are the last four of the unit PAS code) which will provide identification to the PAS codes just as with the senior rater IDs.

Frock—The practice of a commissioned or noncommissioned officer selected for promotion wearing the insignia of the higher grade before the official date of promotion.

Higher Level Reviewer—The HLR is the final evaluator on the ALQ evaluation who is a senior leader with direct knowledge of and visibility on the performance of the ratee within their peer group during the evaluation period. The intent is to improve Airmen's experience in receiving meaningful and actionable feedback on performance evaluations reviewed by the designated senior leader. For officers, see **paragraph 3.14**. For enlisted, see **paragraph 4.12.3**.

Inappropriate Statements—Statements from inappropriate items that evaluators must not consider or refer to when recording performance.

Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA)—An individual filling a funded authorization identified as augmenting the RegAF components within departments or agencies of the U.S. Government. This is further defined by the DoD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms 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.

Management Level (ML)—DoD organizations (e.g., major command) where the senior official reports directly to the SecDef, SecAF, Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force (CSAF), Chief of Space Operations (CSO) or State Adjutant General or Governor. Only the CSAF may approve exceptions; however, the HAF Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, may exercise similar authority in cases involving the management levels of general officers. No individual can serve as the head of two separate management levels for the same board, unless the individual is serving in a dual-hatted capacity. As used in this instruction, management level also refers to the personnel activity that supports the senior official. For RegAF colonels, the management level must be a 2-star equivalent or higher.

Management Level Control Group (Applies to GOs)—The number of promotion eligible general officers assigned to a management level, subdivided by grade and competitive category.

Management Level Review (MLR)—A process used in the promotion recommendation phase of the officer evaluation system (**Chapter 8**).

Management Level Student—Receives TRs and normal PRFs (other than narrative-only PRFs). The eligible officers' records meet the respective management level evaluation board as a separate category. Training is within the eligible officer's utilization field.

Mandatory Comments—Comments evaluators must include in officer and enlisted ALQ evaluations and TRs (see **paragraph 1.9**.).

Manual Signature—a typed or wet signature. Manual signatures are used when digital signature (CAC) capabilities do not exist.

Matter of Record—Evaluations that have been completed, signed, and loaded into ARMS/PRDA. Evaluations are considered working copies until they become 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 DAFI 36-3026V1, *Identification Cards for Members of the Uniformed Services, their Eligible Family Members, and Other Eligible Personnel*, for grade comparison chart).

a. For officer grades—The senior rater determines equivalency for raters. The management level determines equivalency for HLR/senior rater designations.
b. For CMSgts selects and CMSgts—The management level determines equivalency for senior rater designations.
c. For MSgt selects, MSgts, SMSgt selects and SMSgts—The unit commander determines equivalency for all evaluators (except for the HLR when the HLR is also the senior rater**—** the management level determines senior rater designations).
d. For AB through TSgt —The unit commander determines equivalency for raters.

Military Director—The military director designated to lead a unit/organization.

Military Technician (Dual Status)—Refers to members employed under 10 U.S.C § 10216 or 32 U.S.C. § 709. Follow ARC /ANG Non-AGR (Drill Status) for officer and enlisted ALQ evaluations policy. Technicians are considered drill status guardsmen/traditional reservists for reporting and rating purposes under their military rating chain.

Noncombat Ports and MPFs—All ports and MPFs not falling within either the combat zone or communications zone.

Non-Extended Active Duty—An ARC member who is assigned to an Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve unit, performs regularly scheduled drills (unit training assembly), annual training, and/or equivalent training. This includes drill status guardsmen, unit traditional reservist or individual reservist while in a Title 10 or Title 32 status. These members are not on an Active Duty tour (e.g., Active Guard Reservist (AGR) or Voluntary Limited Period of Active Duty [VLPAD]), however they may be on long tour such as Military Personnel Appropriation or Reserve Personnel Appropriations orders.

Non-Line—As used in this instruction, non-line is a collective general reference to chaplains (AFSC 52RX) and health profession officers (AFSC 4XXX).

Officer(s)—Member(s) in the grade of warrant officer 1 through general.

Officer Performance Brief (OPB)—The output of the officer ALQ evaluation that is completed in myEval. The offline version of the OPB is the AF Form 715, *Officer Performance Brief*.

Offices of Record—The offices which maintain evaluations (original or copies).

Old Guy/New Guy—a report that shows new members to a unit and members who have departed a unit.

Organizational Climate—The way in which members in a unit perceive and characterize their unit environment.

Parent Management Level—The management level of a ratee's permanently assigned unit/organization.

P-Rate—The promotion rate that guarantees the minimum promotion rate for eligible officers receiving a "Promote" recommendation.

Performance Feedback—A progress evaluation from raters to ratees.

Period of Report—The length of time covered by an evaluation.

Period of Supervision—The period of time a member is under the supervision of a rater.

PRF Accounting Date—The date that determines the senior rater responsible for PRF preparation. The senior rater for the unit the eligible officer is assigned on this date is the senior rater for the promotion cycle. For officers in grades lieutenant colonel and below, it is approximately 150 calendar days prior to the central selection board convening date. For colonel, it is 60 calendar days prior to the central selection board convening date.

PRF Accounting Date (Replacing)—The date that determines the senior rater responsible for PRF preparation. The senior rater for the unit the eligible officer is assigned on this date is the senior rater for the promotion cycle. For officers in grades lieutenant colonel and below, it is approximately 150 calendar days prior to the central selection board convening date. For officers in the grade of colonel, it is approximately 210 calendar days prior to the central selection board.

PRF Allocation Date—Sixty-six calendar days before a selection board, when "Definitely Promote" allocations are final (does not apply to ARC).

PRF Cutoff Date—Sixty calendar days prior to the selection board, when final PRF processing begins. PRFs cannot be completed prior to this date (does not apply to ARC).

Primary Stratification—The first level of stratification evaluators must use to ground a stratification statement. Primary stratifications are grade stratifications that will only include officers in the same grade (e.g., chief warrant officers 2, first lieutenants, captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels) and must include all military officers in that grade under the evaluator's scope of rating responsibility and may not include officers who are assigned within another HLR's scope of rating responsibility. Grade stratifications may not include civilian grades or civilian "equivalents" in the denominator pool. The following grade stratifications are authorized primary stratification peer groups: (1) USAF officers, (2) DAF officers, (3) Joint officers, (4) Service Component; or (5) Reserve Participation category. A primary stratification must be used in order to use a secondary stratification. See paragraphs **3.15.6.6** and **3.15.7.3** for promotion "selects."

"Promote (P)"—(lieutenant colonels and below) Recommendation on DAF Form 709 that says the ratee is qualified for promotion and should compete at the central selection board on the basis of performance, performance-based potential, and broader considerations; (colonels only) Recommendation of DAF Form 709 which indicates an officer is making a valuable contribution to the mission and has potential for promotion.

Ratee—The individual being rated.

Rater—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 noncommissioned officer (for enlisted ratees) of a United States or foreign military service serving in a grade equal to or higher than the ratee, or a civilian in a supervisory position that is higher than the ratee in the ratee's rating chain. Management may appoint raters serving in the same grade as ratees without regard to date of rank. (Enlisted)--A civilian rater must be at least a GS-7 or a comparable grade or higher. RegAF members in the grade of SrA may serve as raters only if they have completed the Airman Leadership Course. Only non- active-duty AFR members in the grade of SSgt or above may serve as raters.

Rater's Rater—The second official in the rating chain, after the rater, serving in a grade equal to or higher than the rater and in a grade higher than the ratee. See **paragraph 1.6.4** for other restrictions (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 enlisted ALQ evaluation evaluator when the ratee is a TSgt or below and the rater's rater does not meet the minimum grade requirement to be the HLR. When the senior rater identification designates more than one position as a senior rater within a common rating chain (**Example:** Headquarters Chief of Staff, deputy commander, and commander), the senior rater who signs the evaluation does not have to be the rater's rater, but must be the senior rater designated for the ratee's grade and assigned PAS code (only one senior rater may sign an evaluation).

Recommendation Only PRF—Refer to **paragraph 8.1.5.6**. Does not apply to Reserve of the Air Force.

Record of Performance—Consists of the following D/AF Forms (when filed in the electronic Officer Selection Record (eOSR): DAF Forms 707, AF Forms 707A and AF Forms 707B (historical); DAF Forms 709; DAF Forms 475; DAF Forms 77 and Officer Performance Briefs (AF Forms 715). Evaluators may also use letters of evaluation (LOEs) filed in the eOSR by a CSS/HR Specialist.

Referral Evaluation—A performance evaluation that contains any of the following is a referral: Comments in any officer or enlisted ALQ evaluation, LOE or training report, regardless of the ratings if applicable, or the attachments to that evaluation, that are derogatory in nature, imply or refer to behavior incompatible with, or not meeting minimum acceptable standards of personal or professional conduct, character, judgment or integrity, and/or refer to disciplinary actions. This includes, but is not limited to, comments regarding omissions or misrepresentation of facts in official statements or documents, financial irresponsibility, mismanagement of personal or government affairs, confirmed incidents of discrimination or mistreatment, illegal use or possession of drugs, Absent Without Leave, Article 15 actions, and conviction by court-martial.

Relieved From Supervisory Responsibility—For evaluation purposes, this means an individual was removed from supervisory duties due to either personal or professional shortcomings or misconduct that, in the supervisor's view, made the member incapable of handling, or unsuitable for holding, the position. Personnel removed from supervisory responsibility must be notified in writing and acknowledge understanding.

Reserve Active Status List (RASL)—A list of all ARC officers in an active status (except warrant officers, including commissioned warrant officers), not on the Active Duty List, and in the order of seniority of the grade in which they are serving. Officers serving in the same grade are carried in order of their date of rank to that grade. The RASL for the Air Force shall include officers in the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve. Except as otherwise provided by law, an officer must be on the RASL to be eligible for consideration for selection for promotion, continuation, or selective early removal as a member of the Reserve of the Air Force.

Reviewing Official—Any intermediate-level supervisor above the rater, but below the Management Level.

Routinely—A repeated inability to meet established DAF standards and/or expectations that would render the aggregated performance assessment over the entire reporting period as below standards.

Secondary Stratification—The second level of stratification (and final [tertiary stratifications and beyond are not authorized]) evaluators may use to stratify an officer. To use a secondary stratification, the officer must first earn a primary stratification on their evaluation to ground the secondary stratification statement and communicate the clearest depiction of where an officer stands for all future evaluation readers. See **paragraph 3.15.7.3** for the exception on promotion "selects." An evaluator may use one of the following peer groups as a secondary stratification: (1) developmental category, (2) USAF grade, (3) subordinate echelon grade, (4) duty position, or (5) AFR or ANG Components.

Select Status—When a member has been selected for promotion to the next higher grade. Members who turn down their promotion to the next higher grade are removed from select status. The use of the select status for FGO evaluations corresponds to the public release date of promotion to the next higher grade or once an officer's promotion nomination has been transmitted to the White House. The use of the select status for first lieutenants selected to captain corresponds to the date of AFPC or ARPC public release of the promotion list or once SecDef approves the promotion lists. The use of "select" is not utilized for lieutenant evaluations.

Senior Rater (Officer)—The evaluator designated by the management level who completes the PRF. Senior raters must be in a position to have personal knowledge or access to personal knowledge of the ratee's performance. They must also have the scope of responsibility and breadth of experience to assess performance and its significance as it relates to potential for promotion. The same senior rater normally evaluates all officers in an organization in a particular grade and promotion zone. For all majors and below, the senior rater must be at least a colonel (or equivalent) serving as a wing commander or equivalent. For all lieutenant colonels and colonels, the senior rater must be a general officer (or equivalent) and will be the first general officer in the rating chain. AFPC/DPPSP (Active Duty List) or AFRC/A1 (AFR unit) must approve exceptions.

Senior Rater (Enlisted)—Position that the MAJCOM, field operating agency, direct reporting unit, and other organizations with Air Force enlisted personnel designated to be the highest-level endorser in the ratee's rating chain. For RegAF and ARC members, senior raters must be at least a colonel or civilian equivalent (GS-15 or higher), serving as a wing commander or equivalent.

Senior Rater Identification Code—A five-character code, in the military personnel data system, identifying a senior rater position as the MAJCOM or Management Level specifies.

Significant Disagreement—The disagreement by an evaluator with the previous evaluator that results in one of the following: A change of any Performance Factor rating in any of the performance assessments, or any statement anywhere in an evaluation that indicates obvious disagreement with the previous evaluator.

Significantly—A single instance where failure to meet established DAF standards and/or expectations is either egregious in nature or so far short of a standard that it impacts overall aggregated performance assessment.

Single Evaluator—An individual (colonel/0-6 or equivalent or higher) who may close out an officer or enlisted ALQ evaluation with a single signature. Individual must meet both grade requirements and the evaluator requirements for each section of the applicable evaluation form (**Example**: must meet both grade requirements as an O-6 [or equivalent/higher grade] and must meet the definition of a "unit commander/military or civilian director/other authorized reviewer"). An O-6 or equivalent or higher in and of themselves meet the grade requirement to serve as an HLR on the enlisted ALQ evaluation, provided they are designated as a senior rater by the management level; however, they must also meet the necessary requirements as a unit commander/military or civilian director (see definition of unit commander/military or civilian director) to sign the entire evaluation as a "single evaluator".

Sole Senior Rater—The Sole Senior Rater is the head of the Management Level and is the only senior rater who has In-or-Above-the-Promotion Zone and/or non-line/LAF-J Below-the-Promotion Zone eligible for a specific board. (RegAF only) The Sole Senior Rater awards all PRF recommendations; however, the HAF Management Level Review must review all PRF ratings.

"Standalone" Letters of Counseling—Letters of counseling unrelated to a substantiated finding or conclusion from an officially documented investigation or inquiry. "Standalone" letters of counseling are not considered as adverse information. This preserves commanders' and supervisors' abilities to administratively document and rehabilitate minor instances of substandard behavior or misconduct without making it a part of the permanent record.

Static Close-Out Date (SCOD)—The date that all officer and enlisted evaluations will close-out for a specific grade. It is also the date used to determine the final TIG/TIS eligible pool for senior rater endorsement/stratification and forced distribution allocations.

Stratification—Quantitative comparison of an individual standing among peers within a definable group and within a specific evaluator's scope of authority (i.e., direct rating chain).

Statutory Tour—A controlled tour of active duty service. Usually, a precise number of years at a specific location.

Stop File—Used to award a "Do Not Promote This Board" 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. A stop file must be submitted in writing through the management level to AFPC MLR OFFICE. Gaining senior raters must get the concurrence of the gaining MLR president and ensure the losing senior rater is informed of the "Do Not Promote This Board" action. This will allow the opportunity for possible redistribution of any previously awarded "Definitely Promote" recommendations to other deserving officers prior to the central selection board.

Temporary Management Level—The management level for a ratee who is temporarily assigned to a unit/organization.

Total Force Service Center (TFSC)—Formerly known as the Air Force Contact Center (AFCC). When referenced, use the applicable components TFSC, i.e., RegAF would use the TFSC at AFPC and the ANG AFR would use the TFSC at ARPC.

Typed Signature—A digitally-generated representation of a handwritten signature that is used when a digital signature (CAC) is unavailable. The approved typed signature must include: two backslashes at the front and two backslashes at the end, the word "signed," the signatory's initials, DoDID number, and date of the typed signature (\\signed, xxx, 0000000000, DD MMM YY\\).

Unit Commander/Military or Civilian Director—The military service member designated as the director of, or in command of, a unit (PAS code[s]). A civilian equivalent, assigned to the position of director, or unit director, responsible for the unit (PAS code[s]). See **paragraph 1.6.7**.

Wet Signature—The official signature used when signing in pen and ink (e.g., wet signature on an MFR). The approved wet signature must include the date next to the signature (DD MMM YY).

Whole Airman Concept—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

A2.1. Overview. In this attachment, the term "evaluation" encompasses all versions of enlisted and officer performance reports, training reports, letters of evaluation, promotion recommendation forms, retention recommendation forms and any other forms used by selective early retirement boards and reduction in force separation boards. The presumption is evaluations are accurate and unbiased at the time the evaluation was placed into the official record. Complying with the following guidelines does not guarantee a favorable decision; however, not complying may cause the board to delay its decision or return the application without action.

A2.2. Documenting an Appeal. Documentation must be relevant, accurate, and clear. Do not submit general documentation such as letters of appreciation or character reference statements. Also, quantity does not equate to quality. If the reason a particular item of evidence is not obvious, attach an explanation of its relevancy to the item. If the application has multiple attachments, use tabs to separate them. Before submitting an appeal, review the documentation to ensure it is:

A2.2.1. From a credible source. Information from a person with firsthand or expert knowledge of the situation is an example.

A2.2.2. Relevant to the time and issue. Evaluations assess performance over a specific period of time and documentation must relate to that period.

A2.2.3. Factual. Perceived personality conflict or general character references are subjective, not factual. As much as possible, provide information that is objective.

A2.2.4. Inspector General/Commander Directed/Equal Opportunity and Treatment Investigations. If there has been a completed investigation, these agencies may send a unredacted copy of the investigation to AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/DPTSE for board consideration. The board is not authorized to share the investigation with any other agencies to include the applicant.

A2.3. Statements. The most effective pieces of evidence are statements from the evaluator(s) 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 and why the evaluation should be corrected.

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.

A2.4. 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 the career impact in later 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 does not guarantee approval of an appeal.

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 will 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 developmental education/professional military education, 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. These statements are not mandatory for inclusion and their omission does not make the evaluation inaccurate. It must be proven the evaluation is erroneous or unjust based on its content.

A2.5.2. Ratings/Promotion Recommendations and Comments Inconsistent with Prior or Subsequent Evaluations. Ratings/promotion recommendations are not erroneous or unjust simply because they are inconsistent with previous ratings/promotion recommendations. An evaluation documents performance during a specific period and reflects 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 evaluations.

A2.5.3. Comments Inconsistent with Assigned Ratings/Promotion Recommendations. 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.

A2.5.4. Deflationary Rating Programs. Evaluators must accurately assess personnel and control inflation. Therefore, to appeal on this basis must clearly establish that the evaluator did not use the Air Force evaluation policy in effect at the time.

A2.5.5. Personality Conflict. 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, HLRs, and commanders to review evaluations for quality and accuracy. These officials must reject poorly prepared evaluations and downgrade or reject inflated evaluations. Evaluators who change evaluations after talking with a superior have not necessarily been coerced. Clear evidence must exist proving that the superior violated the evaluators' 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. Evaluators should consider isolated incidents, their significance, and the frequency with which they occurred in assessing performance and potential. 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. The lack of counseling or feedback, by itself, is not sufficient to challenge the accuracy or validity of an evaluation. Documentation should provide specific information about how the lack of counseling or feedback resulted in 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. 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. In cases involving discrimination, the best evidence is an official Equal Opportunity and Treatment investigation, reviewed and validated by appropriate officials. Statements from officials in the rating chain or other credible sources who have firsthand knowledge of the discrimination may also be used.

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. Proof that the evaluation would have been substantially different without the error should be provided. 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/promotion recommendations 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. Provide factual, specific, and substantiated information that is from credible officials and is based on firsthand observation or knowledge. Avoid submitting unsubstantiated statements or opinions about motives.

A2.5.14. Mismarked Ratings/Promotion Recommendations. 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. Statements from all evaluators who signed the evaluation are needed. 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/promotion recommendations, a statement from the unit commander/HLR (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. The evaluation may be re-accomplished, or the endorsement placed in the correct section of a blank form and signed. Include statements from the evaluators explaining the error.

A2.5.16. Evaluation Not Written by Designated Rater. The Air Force does not require the designated rater to be the immediate supervisor. Inaccurate designations and failures to change raters can occur when personnel are reassigned, work centers reorganized, functional areas or units realigned. To prove a case, a member 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 supervision and explain what happened. The erroneous evaluator must clearly explain why they wrote and signed the evaluation when they were not the rater. Likewise, the actual evaluator must explain why they 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.

A2.5.17. Lack of Observations or Insufficient Supervision. Applications based on the fact that evaluators were geographically separated, working on a different shift, or new to the job require conclusive documentation showing there was no valid basis on which to assess performance.

A2.5.17.1. Computer-generated products or other documents that substantiate when supervision began and ended is needed to appeal based on insufficient supervision.

A2.5.17.2. Understand that on-the-job training records, feedback notices, and performance feedback worksheets do not document the date supervision began. They document only that an on-the-job training entry was made, a feedback notice produced, or a feedback session took place.

A2.5.17.3. Often, evaluators feel that the number of days of supervision are not sufficient time to evaluate a ratee. However, Air Force standards establish zero as the minimum days of supervision; therefore, raters should receive meaningful information from the ratee and as many sources as possible (e.g., 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. This standard applies Air Force-wide and appeals based on the rater's belief that insufficient time of supervision is not favorably considered.

A2.5.18. Memorandum of Mitigation. A memorandum of mitigation may be attached 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. A memorandum of mitigation may not be used 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.

A2.5.19. Lack of Training. Provide 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, on the job training records, reviews of on-the-job training records, and on the job training inspection reports do not prove training was not conducted, only that training was not documented.

A2.5.20. Forged Signature. Allegations of a forged signature on an evaluation must be confirmed by a statement from the actual evaluator or by the results of an investigation.

A2.5.21. Re-accomplishing an evaluation. Along with supporting documentations, furnish a substitute evaluation in the appeal case. The substitute evaluation must:

A2.5.21.1. Be signed by all the evaluators who signed the original evaluation. If an evaluator cannot be located, submit evidence of all attempts to locate the missing evaluator (e.g., certified mail receipt, emails, postal service), to include evaluators who have retired or separated. After all attempts have been exhausted, contact AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/DPTSE for guidance.

A2.5.21.2. Be on the correct form not only for the grade, but also for the time the original evaluation was written. If a previous form version is needed, contact the OPR of this instruction. **Example:** If re-accomplishing a 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 re-accomplishing an enlisted evaluation which has a close-out date of Jan 95, the substitute must be on the Jan 93 edition of AF Forms 910/911, not the Jun 95 version.

A2.6. Special Information on Appealing DAF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation Form*. (**Note:** The MLR process does not apply to the ARC).

A2.6.1. General Information. A material error in the PRF itself, substantive changes to the record of performance used to assess performance-based potential, or a material error in the PRF preparation process may justify changes to the PRF. Normally, comments and recommendations are required from the senior rater who signed the PRF and the MLR President who reviewed it. If the senior rater is deceased or retired and not available, the president who originally reviewed the PRF may act instead. When the senior rater is available, but the original president is deceased or retired and not available, the current president can act in their place. **Note:** An evaluator is considered not available when they are incapacitated or, after reasonable efforts, cannot be located or contacted. Include in the application documentation that shows when and how attempts to contact an evaluator, such as certified mail receipts. An evaluator will not be substituted or bypassed simply because they will not support an application.

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 officer evaluation or TR, removing a negative endorsement or adding a positive one, or replacing an evaluation with a substantially different one. 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 does not meet this criteria.

A2.6.1.2. Senior rater 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. Senior raters must weigh the impact of the processing error on the PRF and explain how the error justifies the requested PRF change. See **paragraph A2.3**.

A2.6.1.3. The management level that initially processed the PRF can best route PRF appeals to the appropriate MLR president. Since management levels may have different procedures for processing PRF appeals, contact the appropriate one for instructions. If the management level no longer exists, contact AFPC MLR OFFICE for instructions.

A2.6.2. PRF Appeal Requirements. It is impossible to list exact instructions for each type of appeal; so, if necessary, contact AFPC MLR OFFICE or ARPC/PB for guidance on appeals not covered in this instruction. The following list describes minimum required documentation for the board to reach a fair and equal decision on the appeal:

A2.6.2.1. Voiding a PRF. 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 senior rater and MLR president. The PRF should "provide key performance factors from the officer's entire career." The space on the form is limited and it is not usually possible to describe every achievement in an officer's career. The senior rater 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 inputs from subordinate commanders may be requested, to do so is not mandatory. To change the promotion recommendation, the senior rater 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" recommendation requires the concurrence of both the senior rater and MLR president. The senior rater 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 senior rater 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 "Definitely Promote" recommendation must be fully justified and requires the concurrence of both the senior rater and MLR president. In the promotion process, "Definitely Promote" recommendations are strictly controlled and awarded after a competitive review of the senior rater's pool of eligible members identifies the top officers. The MLR validates the senior rater's decision and conducts a similar competitive review in awarding carry-over or aggregate "Definitely Promote" recommendations. In determining whether to seek award of a "Definitely Promote" recommendation via an appeal, senior raters and MLR presidents must, as much as possible, replicate the original competitive process. Senior raters and MLRs needing assistance in identifying their original pool of eligible officers should contact AFPC MLR OFFICE, 550 C Street West, Suite 7, Joint Base San Antonio-Randolph, TX 78150-4709 to obtain a MEL and copies of records of performance which may be needed for the board in question. The senior rater details the circumstances surrounding the requested change, the rationale for the correction, and the method (an earned "Definitely Promote" allocation, aggregation or carry-over) by which the "Definitely Promote" recommendation 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 senior rater identifies an earned "Definitely Promote" allocation, they certify that the applicant's corrected record would have been awarded a "Definitely Promote" recommendation in competition with the senior rater's original pool of eligible officers. After reviewing the circumstances of the appeal and the applicant's record, the MLR president recommends whether the "Definitely Promote" recommendation should be confirmed.

A2.6.2.4.2. If the senior rater believes a "Definitely Promote" recommendation would have been awarded under aggregation or carry-over, the Management Level Review President reviews the request, the circumstances surrounding the error, and its impact on the strength of the applicant's record. The MLR president, after a competitive review (see **paragraph 8.5** and **paragraph 8.6**), determines if the corrected record would have been sufficiently strong to have earned a "Definitely Promote" recommendation at the original MLR, and makes the appropriate recommendation.

A2.6.3. Changing PRFs reviewed by an Air Force Student MLR or an Air Force MLR (convened at AFPC). The same requirements listed above apply, except after meeting the senior rater's requirement, for an Air Force Student MLR, forward the appeal to AFPC MLR OFFICE for processing. AFPC MLR OFFICE serves as the management level for these boards and will secure a recommendation from the MLR president.

A2.6.4. Board Review. The decision whether or not to grant or deny the appeal rests with the board, which has the independent responsibility to make the determination. Senior rater, 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 DAF Form 3538, *Retention Recommendation*.

A2.7.1. The board carefully evaluates retention recommendation form appeals and obtaining the support outlined below does not guarantee approval, but is the minimum required for the board to reach a fair and equal decision.

A2.7.2. Voiding a Retention Recommendation Form. Evidence requirements are similar to evidence requirements for voiding other evaluation types. Provide substantiating evidence that the form contains an unjust or inaccurate assessment of potential for continued service.

A2.7.3. To change the narrative comments, or the retention recommendation, the support of the evaluators who signed the form is needed. The first evaluator is generally the primary person to substantiate the form is inaccurate. They detail the circumstances surrounding the error and explains why it should be corrected. The second evaluator reviews the circumstances and provides a recommendation. On occasion, the same person may be responsible for the first and second evaluators' portions of the form. If major changes are needed, fill out a new form and attach it to the request for correction.

Attachment 3

NON-RATED PERIOD MEMORANDUM

Figure A3.1. Non-Rated Period Memorandum.

Example: (use appropriate organization letterhead) (Attachment XX) Non-rated Period(s) Memorandum

MEMORANDUM FOR XX SQ/CC DATE

FROM: GRADE, LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MI OF REQUESTING MEMBER (LAST 4 of SSN)

SUBJECT: Non-rated Period(s) on (Enlisted/Officer) Performance Report

1. I am requesting a non-rated period on my next performance report in accordance with AFI 36-2406 paragraph 1.4.11.

2. As a reminder, we met on DD/MM/YYYY and discussed any reasonably foreseeable career impacts with this request.

3. I am requesting a non-rated period to start on DD/MM/YYYY and end on DD/MM/YYYY. (First request will not exceed 80 calendar days; any extensions will require an additional letter and will not exceed 60-day increments)

4. If you have questions, please contact me at (requesting member's contact information).

Requesting Member's Signature Block

1st Ind, XX SQ/CC

MEMORANDUM FOR XX SQ/CSS (Evaluations Monitor)

I have considered (grade/name of requesting member)'s request and approve/recommend disapproval the non-rated period from DD/MM/YYYY to DD/MM/YYYY.

If recommending disapproval, CC must provide justification for the recommendation and forward to the requesting member's wing commander/equivalent for final approval/disapproval (may be delegated no further than deputy commander/equivalent). This may be accomplished on this memo or under a separate attachment.

Once signed, a copy will be provided to the requesting member and wing CDS office.

Unit/CC Signature Block