

AD-A145 332

(2)



AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

DTIC
ELECTE
SEP 5 1984
S B D

DTIC FILE COPY

STUDENT REPORT

STAN/EVAL PROGRAMS OVERVIEW:
A HANDBOOK FOR
SAC AIRCREW EVALUATORS

MAJOR GEORGE L. BURRUS 84-0395

"insights into tomorrow"

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

84 09 05 206

DISCLAIMER

The views and conclusions expressed in this document are those of the author. They are not intended and should not be thought to represent official ideas, attitudes, or policies of any agency of the United States Government. The author has not had special access to official information or ideas and has employed only open-source material available to any writer on this subject.

This document is the property of the United States Government. It is available for distribution to the general public. A loan copy of the document may be obtained from the Air University Interlibrary Loan Service (AUL/LDEX, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 36112) or the Defense Technical Information Center. Request must include the author's name and complete title of the study.

This document may be reproduced for use in other research reports or educational pursuits contingent upon the following stipulations:

-- Reproduction rights do not extend to any copyrighted material that may be contained in the research report.

-- All reproduced copies must contain the following credit line: "Reprinted by permission of the Air Command and Staff College."

-- All reproduced copies must contain the name(s) of the report's author(s).

-- If format modification is necessary to better serve the user's needs, adjustments may be made to this report--this authorization does not extend to copyrighted information or material. The following statement must accompany the modified document: "Adapted from Air Command and Staff Research Report (number) entitled (title) by (author)."

-- This notice must be included with any reproduced or adapted portions of this document.



REPORT NUMBER 84-0395

TITLE STAN/EVAL PROGRAMS OVERVIEW: A HANDBOOK FOR
SAC AIRCREW EVALUATORS

AUTHOR(S) MAJOR GEORGE L. BURRUS, USAF

FACULTY ADVISOR MAJOR CLARENCE O. HERRINGTON, JR.
ACSC/EDOWB

SPONSOR MAJOR RANDY C. SIEPMANN, HQ SAC/DO8T

Submitted to the faculty in partial fulfillment of
requirements for graduation.

DTIC
ELECTE
S SEP 5 1984 **D**
B

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE
AIR UNIVERSITY
MAXWELL AFB, AL 36112

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER 84-0395	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD A145332	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) STAN/EVAL PROGRAMS OVERVIEW: A HANDBOOK FOR SAC AIRCREW EVALUATORS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) George L. Burrus, Major, USAF, [REDACTED]		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS ACSC/EDCC, Maxwell AFB, AL 36112		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS ACSC/EDCC, Maxwell AFB, AL 36112		12. REPORT DATE March 1984
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 42
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) STATEMENT "A" Approved for public release; Distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Presents a general overview of SAC aircrew stan/eval programs to orient newly assigned SAC aircrew evaluators. Provides rationales for the various programs and explains how each program supports the overall stan/eval mission. Provides suggestions for programs where requirements are vaguely spelled out in the governing regulations. Provides references where more detailed information can be found after gaining a general overview from this handbook.		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

PREFACE

The intent of this handbook is to orient newly assigned SAC aircrew evaluators to the programs involved in managing a successful stan/eval program. It is not intended to make anyone an expert in stan/eval programs nor to serve as a sole source of information for administering programs. Rather, it is an attempt to provide a common sense, general overview of the various stan/eval programs into which individuals can plug specific facts extracted from the appropriate regulations. Accordingly, references where more information can be obtained for each program are provided at the end of each chapter.

This handbook is a result of the fact that information governing stan/eval programs is sometimes sketchy and often scattered among several regulations. Consequently, where specific guidance is available in one reference, the subject is treated lightly herein and the reader is referred to the specific guidance. Where guidance is not so specific, the subject is treated in greater depth with suggestions and points to consider when administering the particular program.

Since an analysis of flight evaluation procedures and techniques is beyond the scope of this handbook, qualification evaluations are mentioned only to show how they fit into the overall stan/eval mission and how stan/eval programs fit into the same mission. The emphasis placed on programs is not intended to detract from the importance of consistent, impartial flight evaluations. Indeed, the intent of the entire stan/eval program would be defeated if it were not based on objective data. However, doing justice to an analysis of evaluation procedures and techniques would require another entire handbook. Newly assigned evaluators are encouraged to read SACR 50-6, Chapters 2 and 3, and SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 10 for guidance on conducting evaluations.

This handbook is intended to apply to all crew positions in all types of aircraft assigned to SAC. If a bias exists toward -135 aircraft and the navigator crew position, it is unintentional but due to the author's background. Similarly, not all information contained herein will apply to Air Reserve Force (ARF) units. Exceptions for ARF units may be found in SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 15.

CONTINUED

Finally, although this handbook is not intended as a checklist for 1 CEVG evaluation preparation, with two exceptions, the programs covered are arranged in the groupings used by 1 CEVG for grading purposes: Stan/eval organization and facilities are assumed to be above the responsibility of the newly assigned evaluator and are therefore omitted. Stan/eval office administration is assumed to be the responsibility of the branch/division chief and administrative personnel and is also omitted.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

The author, Major George Burrus, has spent 13 years as an Air Force navigator. Initially assigned to F-4s, he flew 137 combat missions in Southeast Asia. In 1973 he was assigned to KC-135s at Altus AFB, Oklahoma. While at Altus, Major Burrus spent three years in stan/eval and one year as chief of the navigation branch. In 1979 he was transferred to Headquarters, 1st Combat Evaluation Group (1 CEVG). During four years at 1 CEVG, Major Burrus was qualified in ten different models of EC/KC-135s and served as an aircrew evaluator and evaluation team chief. He has made inputs to SACR 60-4 during conferences with Headquarters SAC representatives and evaluated recommendations for flight manual changes covering 13 models of -135s and 28 air refueling manuals. He has evaluated stan/eval programs throughout SAC and SAC assigned Air Reserve Forces. This handbook represents a compilation of command intent combined with what Major Burrus has observed to work in units throughout the command, both viewed from the perspective of a MAJCOM evaluator.

DSIS
Date
11/18/80
2

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iii
CHAPTER ONE - THE PURPOSE OF STAN/EVAL	
Qualification Evaluations	1
Stan/Eval Programs	2
CHAPTER TWO - THE NO-NOTICE PROGRAM	
Program Goals	5
Target Population	7
CHAPTER THREE - ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMS	
Scheduling	11
Test Construction	13
Flight Evaluation Folders	15
Manuals Control	17
CHAPTER FOUR - TRENDS ANALYSIS	
Trends	21
Analysis	24
Reporting	25
CHAPTER FIVE - TRAINING MONITORING	
Academic Training	27
Instrument Training	28
Training Devices	29
Reporting	29
CHAPTER SIX - THE TRAINING REVIEW PANEL	
Stan/Eval Role	31
Bibliography	33
Index	35

Chapter One

PURPOSE OF STAN/EVAL

OVERVIEW

"SAC standardization and evaluation programs provide the means to monitor and control crew reliability and the effectiveness of the training they receive" (3:1-1). This dual purpose is accomplished by annual qualification evaluations and the programs described in this handbook.

QUALIFICATION EVALUATIONS

Part of the mission of SAC standardization and evaluation programs is to

evaluate aircrew performance to determine crew adherence to standardized operating procedures, techniques, and capability to perform EWO/contingency/reconnaissance/training assignments (6:1-1).

Qualification evaluations, as required by and specified in AFR 60-1, determine the qualification of individuals to perform their aircrew duties. Qualification evaluations are thoroughly covered in AFR 60-1, SACR 50-6, and SACR 60-4, Vol. I. This handbook examines the stan/eval programs that supplement qualification evaluations in

monitoring, aircrew reliability and evaluate the effectiveness of the training aircrews receive.

STAN/EVAL PROGRAMS

"Stan/eval personnel must evaluate both the individual and the training he/she has received" (6:16-1). The programs discussed in this handbook affect both of these functions. The no-notice program enhances monitoring aircrew reliability. Administrative programs facilitate both qualification and no-notice evaluations. The trends analysis program is the vehicle for detecting unfavorable trends in performance that reflect weakness in the training program. The training monitoring program is designed to detect weaknesses in the training program before those weaknesses result in aircrew deficiencies. The Training Review Panel is where stan/eval reports its findings to the commander, and where corrective action is assigned to remedy training program deficiencies.

The remaining chapters of this handbook are devoted to examining the programs that SAC has established to monitor and control crew reliability and the effectiveness of the training crews receive. Although the programs are examined individually, they all work together and tend to flow into each other in a smoothly functioning organization.

REFERENCES

The following regulations provide specific information on the purpose and responsibilities of stan/eval:

AFR 60-1, Chapters 1, 4, 5, 6

AFR 60-1/SAC Supp 1

SACR 50-6, Chapters 1, 2, 3

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapters 1, 2, 3

Chapter Two

THE NO-NOTICE PROGRAM

RATIONALE

The program established for conducting qualification evaluations allows a five-month period for crewmembers to complete all evaluation requirements. After having completed the various prerequisites and knowing in advance when the evaluation will be conducted, the crewmember being evaluated may well be better prepared to demonstrate proficiency in his/her particular specialty than he/she would normally be on a day-to-day basis. In order to observe how crewmembers perform routinely, when they haven't had advance notice of the evaluation, AFR 60-1 provides for and SACR 60-4, Vol. I, directs the establishment of no-notice evaluation programs.

NO-NOTICE PROGRAM

The different types of no-notice and spot evaluations included in the no-notice program are described in SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 3. Although the types of evaluations are spelled out, SACR 60-4 does not specify exact goals or percentages a no-notice program should



accomplish, nor does it identify likely candidates for no-notice evaluations. The reason for this is to allow units the discretion to tailor the programs to their specific situations. The no-notice program is intended as "a management tool for the unit commander," and sufficient latitude is granted to make the program as responsive as possible to unit needs (6:2-4).

All crewmembers evaluated in-flight must be administered an emergency procedures examination and a publications check within 10 working days of the flight unless they have had one within the 30 calendar days prior to the flight (6:3-2). No-notice flight evaluations require the completion of an AF Form 8. No-notice EP exams and spotchecks do not require an AF Form 8 unless corrective training is required (6:14-1). No-notice EP exams that do not require corrective training should be documented in the Remarks section of the AF Form 8 that reflects the individual's current qualification check (6:14-2).

Program Goals

In order to measure its own effectiveness in conducting the no-notice program, stan/eval should establish program goals. Program goals serve as benchmarks to measure no-notice accomplishment against and help focus attention on the program to ensure it receives adequate emphasis and support. Although a common in-flight

no-notice goal is to evaluate 50% of each crew position annually, your unit goal should reflect a level that gives stan/eval an adequate sampling, yet is realistically achievable. Goals for ground no-notice and spot checks vary widely. The same adequate but achievable guidelines apply. In all cases, any no-notice rate that provides stan/eval and the commander with a valid indication of day-to-day crewmember performance is an effective goal.

Whatever goal is selected should be tracked separately for each crew position so that an adequate sampling is obtained for each specialty. Otherwise, surpassing the goal for one crew position could obscure the fact that an adequate sampling was not obtained for another crew position.

Another goal consideration is to obtain no-notice evaluations outside individual eligibility periods.

The no-notice evaluation program is not intended to be a substitute for, or a replacement of, the scheduled Qualification/Instrument evaluation (6:3-2).

Conducting no-notice evaluations during the time when crewmembers are consciously preparing for an evaluation defeats the purpose of the program.

Target Population

Closely tied to the problem of establishing no-notice program goals is the question of whom to select for evaluation. The goal of the program is to sample the

routine performance of a cross-section of crewmembers, yet fairness and prudence demand that some consideration be given to evaluate selection. Neither the program goal nor fairness is served by evaluating the same people repeatedly. By identifying people who have not had a no-notice evaluation of similar activity or a no-notice evaluation of any activity (for whatever time period is appropriate for your situation), you can reduce feelings of harassment and, in the long run, obtain a better cross-section.

On the other hand, since part of the overall stan/eval mission is to document aircrew qualification, there are going to be crewmembers whose qualification you will want to check even though such evaluations might reduce the randomness of your sampling. These evaluations are justified by safety considerations and the commander's need to be sure his aircrews can fulfill their missions. Examples of this category include recent graduates of Combat Crew Training School who have had sufficient time to become proficient and learn local procedures but are not yet in their qualification eligibility periods; people who have demonstrated less than satisfactory performances on previous evaluations whose progress you want to check; and people identified by squadron commanders, flight commanders, and staff instructors.

REFERENCES

The following regulations contain information on the no-notice program:

AFR 60-1, Chapter 5

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapters 2, 3, 14

Chapter Three

ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMS

RATIONALE

Although the administrative programs covered in this chapter do not contribute directly to evaluating aircrew performance or the quality of aircrew training, they facilitate both of these goals and are necessary for the effective accomplishment of stan/eval's mission. The specific rationale for each program and how each program supports the stan/eval mission should become apparent as the programs are individually covered.

SCHEDULING

Before evaluations can be accomplished, some type of scheduling system is necessary to ensure that evaluators and evaluatees are available to fly on a sortie that includes required evaluation activity before the evaluatee's current qualification expires. SACR 60-4, Vol. I, specifies a scheduling procedure to accomplish this function. The person(s) in stan/eval responsible for scheduling need to coordinate with the Operations Systems Management Branch (DOTF) and the aircrew scheduling branches to



get evaluations properly scheduled and to get DOTF flight records updated after the evaluation is complete.

Every week DOTF will provide stan/eval with a minimum of two copies of the Flying Resources Scheduling Action Report (6:2-4). This report contains a six-month listing of individual qualification expiration dates. The stan/eval scheduler should use this report to plan an evaluation schedule that precludes individuals from exceeding their expiration dates. No later than the fifth day of each month, stan/eval then gives the scheduling branches the desired evaluation schedule for the next month and completes preliminary coordination of the second subsequent month (7:3-1).

A representative from stan/eval must attend the weekly pre 60-9 meeting to review and finalize the details of the next week's flying schedule (7:3-5). This is the last quality control check before the schedule goes to print, so the proposed schedule should be checked carefully to make sure all required activity is included. Some additional items to check before and/or during this meeting include: ensuring the scheduled evaluatees have all their evaluation prerequisites complete; checking that tactical crewmembers are scheduled to be evaluated while flying with their own crews; and ensuring that qualification and instrument checks are combined when appropriate (6:3-1 to 3-3).

The stan/eval scheduler must coordinate with other evaluators to stay informed of evaluations that are incomplete or require rechecks. Evaluation activity that was not accomplished needs to be completed prior to the evaluatee's expiration date, and the stan/eval scheduler needs to coordinate rescheduling this activity with the scheduling branch. Similarly, rechecks need to be accomplished after the corrective training is complete but before the corrective training due date expires. The scheduler must coordinate with the agency conducting the corrective training (usually the squadron) and with the scheduling branch to get the recheck evaluation scheduled within the time constraints mentioned earlier.

After qualification evaluations are complete, DOTF needs to be advised so their master records can be updated. One copy of the Flying Resources Scheduling Action Report should be annotated with all flight check completion dates and new expiration dates. The reasons for any expiration dates that were exceeded should be listed and the annotated text should be returned to DOTF weekly. The following duty day, stan/eval should receive an updated report from DOTF (6:2-4).

TEST CONSTRUCTION

Written examinations are required for qualification and must be administered before the flight evaluation (1:27). In SAC, unit stan/eval organizations are responsible for

constructing the necessary examinations (6:9-1). SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 9, and SACR 50-6, Chapter 4, contain specific instructions on the mechanics of examination construction. These regulations also clearly spell out the content requirements for emergency procedures exams, but 1 CEVG evaluation results reports indicate some misunderstanding exists concerning the content of open book qualification exams and instructor exams.

Qualification Exams

Like any stan/eval exam, open book qualification examinations should measure knowledge applicable to every crewmember of the particular specialty that is not determined through flight evaluations. Unlike emergency procedure exams, open book examinations do not measure knowledge of critical, need-to-know items. Rather, they measure knowledge of systems, malfunction analysis, performance, procedures, etc. In short, they measure the ability of crewmembers to respond to both normal and abnormal situations that are not of a critical nature. Consequently, exam questions should be pertinent and challenging enough to require the average crewmember to refer to the source books. The purpose of the open book exam is not served by asking questions that are common knowledge or reflect situations that commonly occur on any flight. On the other hand, questions should not be so obscure as to be meaningless.

Instructor Exams

Instructor examinations should challenge knowledge required to be a successful instructor. Questions should pertain to instructors and instructing, not obscure facts that are applicable to but less well-known by non-instructors. Question sources such as SACR 50-24, SACR 50-46, the 51-series regulations, and other sources that apply to training and instruction are more appropriate than sources containing information that applies to all members of the crew specialty regardless of instructor status. Instructor techniques, required training forms and their completion, rules governing academic training, etc. are more appropriate areas for instructor exam questions than systems questions, for example.

FLIGHT EVALUATION FOLDERS

Flight Evaluation Folders (FEF) are used to document the results of qualification and no-notice flight evaluations, CPT checks, and any spot or ground no-notice activity that requires corrective training. Since the FEF is the only complete record of an individual's evaluation activity, it should be accurately maintained to reflect actual performances that were observed. The FEF contains two forms, AF Forms 8 and AF Forms 942.

AF Forms 8

Although AFR 60-1 and SACR 60-4, Vol. I, contain specific guidance for properly filling out the AF Form 8, it is impossible to cover every possible contingency in a regulation. For situations not covered in the regulations, an accurate description of the situation that existed during the evaluation and the performance observed will provide a clear record of the evaluation. The Additional Comments block of the Form 8 can be used to clarify anything the evaluator feels is necessary. Even if a situation not covered in the book occurs, if a person not already familiar with the situation can read the form and determine what the circumstances, performance, and outcome were, the purpose of the form will have been served.

AF Form 942

Since AF Forms 8 are generally removed from the FEF after two years, the AF Form 942 is the only permanent record of evaluation activity. Therefore, it should accurately reflect the individual's evaluation history. AFR 60-1, Attachment 1, and SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 14 contain specific instructions for filling out the AF Form 942 and the maintenance of Flight Evaluation Folders.

MANUALS CONTROL

As mentioned earlier, stan/eval is responsible for evaluating crewmember qualification. Qualification is based, for the most part, on the correct performance of normal and emergency procedures. To ensure crewmembers are aware of the most current procedures, they need current flight manuals. Within SAC, stan/eval organizations administer the flight manual program as specified in AFR 60-9, SACR 60-4, Vol. I, and T.O. 00-5-2 (6:11-1).

A wing/base manuals control officer and assistant from within stan/eval must be appointed and designated in writing. The manuals control officer must comply with T.O. 00-5-1 and T.O. 00-5-2 in establishing requirements, and procuring and distributing flight manual technical orders to flying personnel and appropriate wing staff agencies (6:11-1).

The manuals control program also includes two quality control functions. The manuals control officer is responsible for ensuring that a current list of flight manual publications and operating procedures is prominently displayed within each manuals control office and flight planning area if not located within the same facility (6:11-1). This allows individuals to check their personal flight manuals for currency. Secondly, the wing/base manuals control officer is responsible for inspecting each squadron/unit's manuals control procedures once each month to ensure that timely distribution and receipting procedures are being accomplished (6:11-1).

Specific instructions for managing the manuals control program are contained in SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 11.

Though not the responsibility of the manuals control officer, stan/eval is the unit point for contact for the submission of recommendations for changes to flight manuals. The flight manual change program is designed to get everyone who uses flight manuals involved in keeping them as current and accurate as possible. Anyone with a recommendation for improving, clarifying, or correcting information in a flight manual can and should prepare an AF Form 847 and submit it to stan/eval. Someone in stan/eval of the same crew specialty should evaluate the recommendation and discuss its merits with the stan/eval chief/branch chief who will complete the first endorsement. Three copies of the endorsed form should then be mailed directly to 1 CEVG/ST for further evaluation (8:1). Further guidance on the procedures for recommending flight manual changes is contained in ARF 60-9 and SAC Supp 1 thereto.

REFERENCES

The following regulations contain specific guidance for the administrative programs listed:

Scheduling

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 2

SACR 60-9, Chapter 3

Test Construction

AFR 60-1, Chapter 5

SACR 50-6, Chapter 4

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 9

Flight Evaluation Folders

AFR 60-1, Chapter 6, Attachment 1

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 14

Manuals Control

AFR 60-9

APR 60-9/SAC Supplement 1

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 11

T.O. 00-5-1

T.O. 00-5-2

Chapter Four

TRENDS ANALYSIS

RATIONALE

For any evaluation administered, the corrective training assigned as a result of any discrepancies should bring that individual's performance back within standards. "However, evaluation of training programs is equally important" (6:16-1). If several instances of the same discrepancy are observed, there is a strong indication of a weakness in the training program that needs to be addressed. If such a weakness exists, improving or amending the training program can prevent other crewmembers from making the same mistake, resulting in an overall improvement in aircrew performance and mission capability levels.

TRENDS

"A trend may exist if two or more individuals in a relatively short time span make the same error while performing similar tasks" (6:16-1). Four operative words in this definition are: "may," "short," "same," and "similar." These terms are vague because it is nearly impossible to quantify the definition of a trend; there are too



many variables. Thus "may" indicates that the final decision as to whether a trend exists is a judgment call. However, further consideration of the operative words of the definition can help make judgment calls easier.

How short is a "short" time? Although trends have to be analyzed at least quarterly, a calendar quarter is not a magic figure (6:2-5). Quarters are used as the minimum for trend evaluation to ensure analysis is conducted routinely without increasing the frequency to the point that the data sample size is insufficient for valid results. Some trends, however, can become apparent quickly within a quarter. If a trend is noted prior to the end of a quarter, it should be reported at the next monthly Training Review Panel (TRP) rather than waiting until the quarterly review. Trends can also develop between quarters. Errors observed near the end of a quarter may not appear to be a trend until combined with similar errors in the subsequent quarter. Failing to consider discrepancies from the previous quarter, even though they did not appear significant at the end of the quarter, can preclude identifying the trend and correcting the training problem as early as possible. Finally, the time period cannot be divorced from the sample size. Three similar errors in a month may be a trend if they occurred during six evaluations; they may not represent a trend if they occurred during 50 evaluations.

Defining the "same" error seems fairly straightforward at first glance: two or more people made the same mistake. But, what about the magnitude of the error?

To discriminate between a trend and a number of isolated incidents, the severity as well as the frequency of less than desirable activity must be considered (6:2-5).

Thus, activity does not have to be unqualified to be considered in trends analysis. Qualified with training and qualified but critiqueable performances can also be considered. Although inputs from these sources do not reflect unqualified activity, they can help indicate possible training program weaknesses. How many instances of each level or combination of levels constitute a trend is still a judgment call, but considering all sources of data can often clarify situations.

What are "similar" tasks?

Data for trend identification will be derived from any available source, i.e., examination results, ground evaluations (training devices, instrument school, etc.) and flight evaluations (6:2-5).

Although a trend can be indicated by data from these various sources, the discrepancies should be similar enough to define the weakness and indicate training to correct it. Four unqualified navigation legs due, respectively, to DR errors, celestial computation errors, celestial plotting errors, and use of an unauthorized aid probably do not constitute a trend. However, three unqualified navigation legs due to DR errors very well may be a trend. On the

other hand, three unqualified instrument approaches flown, respectively, with TACAN, ILS, and VOR may indicate a trend if the problem is similar, for example, exceeding course tolerances due to ineffective crosswind corrections. Thus, thorough analysis is necessary to determine if discrepancies are similar enough to constitute a trend. This does not imply that high failure rates in nonrelated areas should be ignored. While not a specific trend, such a situation may indicate a deficiency in the overall training program (6:10-1).

ANALYSIS

A good data collection and tabulation system can simplify the process of determining whether discrepancies noted during evaluations fit the definition of a trend. A good system can prevent having to rely on hazy memories or wading through stacks of paper to discriminate between a trend and a number of isolated incidents. Specific remarks about each grading area should be recorded as soon after each evaluation as possible. Remarks should be as specific as possible to allow comparison with other discrepancies to determine if the same errors were made while performing similar tasks. To facilitate comparison, some method of cross-referencing the remarks can save a lot of reading through extraneous information. One cross-referencing method that works well is color coding evaluation results by grading area and date on a summary

sheet. Possible trends are readily apparent on the summary sheet. Specific remarks for the evaluation dates involved can then be analyzed to determine whether a trend actually exists. Some units have computerized their trends analysis programs. Computerized programs work well when the unit has the evaluation workload to justify it, access to a computer, and the expertise to develop a computer program. While a well-written computer program can save considerable time, it is not a replacement for judgment. Any system that saves time in accurately identifying possible trends can reduce stan/eval's workload, but, in the end, the determination of the existence of a trend is a judgment call.

REPORTING

Any time a trend is identified, it will be reported to the next TRP (6:2-5). SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 2 details how trends are handled after they are reported to the panel. The trends analysis and correction process can also be aided by stan/eval newsletters and notices posted on squadron bulletin boards. By advising crewmembers and squadron staff members of problem areas in aircrew performance, individual and collective efforts can be made earlier to reverse the trend. This does not replace action by the TRP, but, rather, supplements it by allowing action to correct the problem as soon as possible. The stan/eval

chief and members of the TRP must still evaluate any action taken for adequacy.

In addition to identifying local unit trends, stan/eval participates in the SAC command-wide trends program. To accomplish this, local stan/eval divisions prepare and submit the SAC-DOT(M) 7109 report to 1 CEVG/ANY monthly (6:16-1). The 7109 report compiles the results of all evaluations administered during the month. 1 CEVG further compiles these results for the command and analyzes the data for command-wide trends that may not be apparent at any given unit or that can best be corrected through command level training program improvements. Instructions for completing the 7109 report are contained in SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 16.

REFERENCES

The following regulations provide guidance and information on the Trends Analysis program:

AFR 60-1, Chapter 6

SACR 50-6, Chapter 2

SACR 51-XX, Vol. I, Chapter 1

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapters 2, 16

Chapter Five

TRAINING MONITORING

RATIONALE

One of stan/eval's primary responsibilities is monitoring the effectiveness of training aircrews receive (3:1-1). The Trends Analysis program accomplishes part of this task by monitoring aircrew performance for adverse trends that indicate training program deficiencies. This process is supplemented by the Training Monitoring program. By monitoring individual ground training courses and training device lessons, the quality of training can be evaluated and, if necessary, improved before possible deficiencies result in adverse aircrew performance.

ACADEMIC TRAINING

Stan/eval is responsible for evaluating aircrew academic training courses "as required" (6:2-5). Although no evaluation frequency or interval is specified, the offices responsible for the courses are required to review the lesson plans and course materials prior to use (4:2). Since most course materials are used during specific scheduling blocks, each course should have been reviewed prior to the schedule block in which it is presented.

Thus, if stan/eval monitors the course each training block, any changes made to the lesson plan and course materials can be evaluated. Although reevaluations of unsatisfactory courses aren't specifically required, if the original evaluation is conducted early in the scheduling block, a reevaluation can be accomplished later in the block to determine if course quality has improved. For training that is not accomplished during specific scheduling blocks, but on a random basis, periodic evaluations provide a spot check to ensure course quality is adhering to standards. Reevaluations can be conducted as necessary when the course is presented again. For either type of course scheduling, evaluations should cover any aspect of training that affects its quality such as adherence to course objectives, instructor effectiveness, accuracy, and overall course quality.

INSTRUMENT TRAINING

Because of its potential impact on accident prevention, instrument training must necessarily be of the highest possible quality. Therefore, in addition to evaluating academic training, stan/eval must periodically inspect the unit instrument program including the ground school and simulator instrument training, if applicable (6:2-4). The instrument ground school will be inspected quarterly for compliance with the requirements specified in SACR 50-24 (6:2-4). Weapon System Trainer instrument training will be

evaluated semiannually for compliance with the appropriate 51-series regulations and SACR 50-46 (6:2-5).

TRAINING DEVICES

Stan/eval is also responsible for evaluating "aircrew training devices and lesson plans in accordance with SACR 50-46 and SACR 50-1" (6:2-5). The evaluation objective is to determine the quality of instruction in each type of training device and may be accomplished as part of the no-notice program. This is accomplished by evaluating a typical training mission in each type training device assigned to the unit once every other training quarter. Training aspects to be evaluated include quality of instruction, lesson technical accuracy, adequacy of lesson plan content, and training material content (5:3). Training devices to be evaluated include WST, OFT, CPT, IFT, mission simulators, bomb-nav simulators (including CTD), mission trainers (T-10, T-4, T-1), BOPTT, and ARPTT. Egress, SRAM, CFT, and other part task trainers need not be evaluated by the unit DOV (5:3). Areas of training instruction which are unsatisfactory during the evaluation mission will be corrected and rechecked within seven days (5:4).

REPORTING

Written reports for all evaluations of academic training will be forwarded to the office responsible for

the course. Additionally, an information copy of the evaluation report will be forwarded to the DO or his designated representative (4:2).

Training device evaluation results will be reported to the unit DOT, DON, or squadron commander, as applicable, depending on which office is responsible for the training device. A sample format for this letter is contained in SACR 50-46, attachment 8 (5:4).

In addition to the above routine reporting procedures, any deficiencies noted in academic, instrument, or training device instruction must be reported in writing directly to the DO. Any deficiencies noted must also be discussed at the Training Review Panel (6:2-5).

REFERENCES

The following regulations contain specific information about Training Monitoring:

SACR 50-24, Vol. I

SACR 50-24, applicable volume to aircraft type

SACR 50-46

SACR 51-XX, applicable volumes to type of training

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 2

Chapter Six

TRAINING REVIEW PANEL

RATIONALE

The unit commander is the individual at the local level who is ultimately responsible for the training and evaluation of aircrews and for insuring his aircrews are qualified to perform their duties (1:5). The Training Review Panel (TRP) is the forum where the commander is regularly apprised of the status of aircrew qualification and the unit training program. Each wing office involved with aircrew training participates in reviewing the wing training program and any actions that impact on it. The TRP is a totally integrated program for adjusting the training program to ensure sufficient training of the highest possible quality is being accomplished.

STAN/EVAL ROLE

For stan/eval, the TRP completes the loop between evaluation and the unit training program. Stan/eval reports discrepancies noted on evaluations and the panel discusses the adequacy of corrective action taken (6:2-5). Additionally, the TRP is where trends are reported. The panel reviews trends and the presiding officer assigns

corrective action, an OPR, and a suspense date to reverse the trend (6:2-5). Possible corrective actions include one-time training classes, creating ongoing training, or modifying the Wing Directed Training Program. After the corrective action has been completed, the action agencies forward reports to the stan/eval chief who reviews them to ensure the corrective training is adequate and does not conflict with existing directives (6:2-5). During subsequent TRP meetings the stan/eval chief will discuss the corrective action taken on previous trends and the panel will review the status of any previously identified trend until it is resolved. Finally, deficiencies noted in the ground training or training device programs should be reported to the panel for discussion so that improvements can be made and/or evaluated.

REFERENCES

Specific information on the Training Review Panel is contained in the following regulations:

SACR 51-XX, Vol. I, Chapter 1

SACR 60-4, Vol. I, Chapter 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. REFERENCES CITED

1. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters U.S. Air Force. Flight Management. AF Regulation 60-1. Washington, D.C., 6 August 1982.
2. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters U.S. Air Force. Flight Manuals Program. AF Regulation 60-9. Washington, D.C., 25 September 1980.
3. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Standardization and Evaluation Concepts and Techniques. SAC Regulation 50-6. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 4 December 1978.
4. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Aircrew Recurring Academics--General. SAC Regulation 50-24, Volume I. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 20 July 1981.
5. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Aircrew Training Devices. SAC Regulation 50-46. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 12 February 1982.
6. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Standardization/Evaluation Program. SAC Regulation 60-4, Volume I. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 2 December 1983.
7. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Planning and Scheduling Aircrew and Aircraft Usage. SAC Regulation 60-9. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 30 June 1980.
8. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Flight Manuals Program. SAC Supplement 1 to AF Regulation 60-9. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 24 August 1983.

CONTINUED

B. RELATED SOURCES

U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Aircrew Training Policy. SAC Regulation 51-XX, Volume I. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 22 March 1983.

U.S. Department of the Air Force, Headquarters Strategic Air Command. Flight Management. SAC Supplement 1 to AF Regulation 60-1. Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, 2 September 1983.

INDEX

Administrative Programs	11
Flight Evaluation Folders	15
Forms	
AF Form 8	16
AF Form 942	16
Instructor Exams	15
Manuals Control	17
No-Notice Program	5
Qualification Evaluations	
Qualification Exams	14
Scheduling	11
Test Construction	13
Training Monitoring	27
Academic Training	27
Instrument Training	28
Reporting	29
Training Devices	29
Training Review Panel	31
Trends Analysis	21
Reporting	25