# AIR FORCE GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND INSPECTOR GENERAL



# TO DETER AND ASSURE

**Unit Effectiveness Inspection** 

# **625TH STRATEGIC OPERATIONS SQUADRON**

Offutt AFB, Nebraska 17 June 2013 – 11 June 2014

This report/electronic transmission contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or part to persons or agencies outside of the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director, SAF/IGI. If you received this message/document in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

# **DEFINITIONS**

This inspection was graded IAW AFI 90-201 and applicable governing guidance.

# 5 Tier (UEI) Item Level grading scale definitions

# **Outstanding:**

Given for a UEI score between 85 and 100, this rating indicates the wing meets/exceeds the criteria for a HIGHLY EFFECTIVE rating AND most or all of the following are consistently true: mission activities, programs and processes are executed in an increasingly cost-effective manner; results of long-term commitment to continuous process improvement are evident; leaders' decisions and priorities demonstrate genuine care for their Airmen; leaders are engaged to help Airmen achieve their own goals as well as the unit's goals; widespread evidence of high proficiency, unit pride and cohesion; programs and processes are institutionalized and produce highly reliable results; programs are nearly deficiency-free, and efforts to benchmark and share lessons learned with other wings are evident; effective management systems are in place and are used to maximum effectiveness at all levels.

# **Highly Effective:**

Given for a UEI score greater than 65 and less than or equal to 85, this rating indicates the wing exceeds the criteria for an EFFECTIVE rating AND most or all of the following are consistently true: mission activities, programs and processes are executed in a highly effective and efficient manner; personnel demonstrate high proficiency; CCIP is institutionalized, used to measure and report improvements in all 4 MGAs, and provide actionable feedback to HHQ on policy, guidance and resource adequacy; continuous process improvement efforts are widespread and have improved efficiency; most programs and processes are measured and repeatable, and produce reliable results; risk-based criteria are habitually applied when allocating resources and making decisions; programs have very few deficiencies and necessary waivers are in effect; deliberate efforts to train, communicate, and engage Airmen are evident; effective processes are in place to improve Airmen's quality of work and home life; management systems are mature and continuous improvement crosses across multiple programs.

## Effective:

Given for a UEI score greater than 35 and less than or equal to 65, this rating indicates most or all of the following are generally true: requirements are met in all mission areas (primary, AEF, mission assurance C2) and personnel are proficient; CCIP provides the command chain an accurate, adequate and relevant picture of unit performance; resources are managed in an effective and compliant manner; leaders treat Airmen with respect and provide a healthy and safe work environment; continuous process improvement efforts are evident; critical programs and processes are measured and repeatable; risk-based criteria are often considered when allocating resources and making decisions; programs have few significant deficiencies and many necessary waivers are in effect; management systems are present and continuous improvement occurs.

This report/electronic transmission contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or part to persons or agencies outside of the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director, SAF/IGI. If you received this message/document in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

# **Marginally Effective:**

Given for a UEI score greater than 15 and less than or equal to 35, this rating indicates the wing does not meet the criteria for an EFFECTIVE rating, and some or all of the following are consistently true: requirements are met in some but not all mission areas (primary, AEF, mission assurance C2); unit personnel meet minimum performance criteria but with limited proficiency; CCIP provides the command chain an accurate, though limited, picture of unit performance; some key processes and activities are not carried out in a competent or compliant manner, or are personality-dependent; little to no evidence exists of continuous process improvement efforts; Resources and programs are not well managed; risk and resource scarcity are not deliberately considered in decision-making processes; deficiencies exist that significantly increase risk to Airmen, the mission or the Air Force; management systems have some elements but are not working in a cohesive process.

## Ineffective:

Given for a UEI score between 0 and 15, this rating indicates the wing does not meet all of the criteria for an EFFECTIVE rating, and some or all of the following are consistently true: wing does not demonstrate ability to meet mission requirements; evidence exists of systemic non-compliance or widespread disregard for prescribed procedures; the number and severity of deficiencies preclude or seriously limit mission accomplishment; CCIP does not provide an accurate, adequate or relevant picture of unit performance; leaders do not treat Airmen with respect or do not provide a healthy and safe work environment; resources and programs are grossly mismanaged; management systems are not evident.

# 3-Tier (UEI) Item Level grading scale definitions

# In Compliance:

Program or operation complies with governing directives and support mission accomplishment. Deficiencies may exist but do not impede mission accomplishment.

#### In Compliance with Comments:

The grade given to indicate performance or operation does not meet some mission requirements. Procedures and activities are not carried out in an efficient manner. Resources and programs are not efficiently managed. Deficiencies exist that impede or limit mission accomplishment.

# **Not In Compliance:**

The grade given to indicate performance or operation does not meet mission requirements. Procedures and activities are not carried out in an adequate manner. Resources and programs are not adequately managed. Significant deficiencies exist that preclude or seriously limit mission accomplishment.

#### **DEFICIENCIES:**

A validated deficiency assessed as CRITICAL, Significant, or Minor.

#### a. CRITICAL:

Any deficiency that results or could result in widespread mission impact or failure.

# b. Significant:

Any deficiency that has or could have significant mission impact.

#### c. Minor:

Any deficiency that is procedurally incorrect but has only modest mission impact.

# **RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENT AREA (RIA):**

An identified process, product, or capability which could be improved by a suggested course of action.

#### STRENGTHS:

An area that far exceeds compliance directives or mission requirements and/or expectations.

# **CORRECTED DURING INSPECTION (CDI):**

Any discrepancy found during the inspection that was corrected prior to the end of the inspection. This will remain a discrepancy on the report but will be identified in the notes as (CORRECTED DURING INSPECTION).

#### **UNIT CORRECTED NEEDS FOLLOW-UP:**

The unit has taken steps to correct the indications of the deficiency. However, additional actions by the wing and follow-up review by the IG is required.

# **SUPERIOR PERFORMERS/TEAMS:**

An organized group or dedicated individual whose knowledge, perseverance, and professionalism contributed greatly to the unit's compliance with directives and high state of mission success

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

11 June 2014

#### **MEMORANDUM FOR 625 STOS/CC**

FROM: AFGSC/IG

245 Davis Avenue East Suite 200 Barksdale AFB, LA 71110

SUBJECT: Unit Effectiveness Inspection

- 1. The AFGSC/IG conducted a Unit Effectiveness Inspection (UEI) on the 625th Strategic Operations Squadron (STOS) from 17 June 2013 11 June 2014. The authoritative guidance for the inspection was IAW AFPD 90-2, as implemented by AFI 90-201, The Air Force Inspection System. The Capstone event was conducted 8-11 June 2014.
- 2. The 625 STOS was graded EFFECTIVE overall.
- 3. The UEI Major Graded Areas were graded as:

a. Managing Resources EFFECTIVE
b. Leading People EFFECTIVE
c. Improving the Unit EFFECTIVE

d. Executing the Mission HIGHLY EFFECTIVE

- 4. The 625 STOS Top 5 Airman To IG Session Issues for SECAF consideration (AFI 90-201, para 4.8.2.1.):
  - a. Perceived Lack of Support/Understanding of Mission by AFGSC (negative)
  - b. Leadership (positive)
  - c. Manning (negative)
  - d. Unit Cohesion/Unity (positive)
  - e. Airborne Command Post Concerns (negative)
- 5. The team also inspected the 625 STOS on Commander's Interest Item 13-01, Health and Wellness. The AFGSC/IG did not find any inappropriate items in the inspected workplace areas.
- 6. Please forward any comments about this report to AFGSC/IGX, 245 Davis Avenue East Suite 200, Barksdale AFB, Louisiana 71110, DSN 781-6301.

KELVIN C. BOWEN, GS-15, DAF

Executive Director

Attachment: 625 STOS UEI Report

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

DEFINITIONS	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
TEAM CHIEF COMMENTS	7
INSPECTION SUMMARY	
Table: 625th Strategic Operations Squadron Unit Grade / Aggregate Totals	9
REPLY INSTRUCTIONS	10
UEI INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS	
625th Strategic Operations Squadron	11
Unit Effectiveness Inspection (UEI)	11
MGA 1 - Managing Resources	
Adequacy	11
Stewardship	
MGA 2 - Leading People	12
Communication	12
Discipline	12
Training	
Development	
Quality of Life Engagement	13
MGA 3 - Improving the Unit	13
Strategic Alignment	13
Process Operations	
CC's Inspection Program (CCIP)	14
Data-Driven Decision	
MGA 4 - Executing the Mission	14
Primary Mission	
AEF Readiness	
Mission-Assurance Command and Control	
HIGHER HEADQUARTERS/OTHER SUPPORT AGENCIES	
SUPERIOR PERFORMERS	
SUPERIOR TEAMS	_
TEAM COMPOSITION	19
DISTRIBUTION LIST	20

# **TEAM CHIEF COMMENTS**

This is the first UEI given by the AFGSC/IG team to the 625 STOS. As such, there are differences in this report from those the IG Team has written for previous inspections. The most obvious is the dates of the inspection on the cover. In this case, it encompasses the period from 17 June 2013 to 11 June 2014. Generally, the period will be 24-30 months--the entire period since the last UEI Capstone closed out with a UEI Report. This affects our thought process on various aspects of inspection operations, such as how a deficiency evolves throughout a UEI. A deficiency could begin as a significant concern during a virtual look at the beginning of the UEI timeframe. We may observe it in person during an on-site visit and see that the wing IG has identified the concern and the unit is working on the corrective action. Finally, at the Capstone event, AFGSC/IG may follow up and find that the original concern is now gone; the deficiency is now a minor concern with a plan for the wing to come to complete resolution.

During the 625 STOS UEI cycle, AFGSC/IG conducted multiple virtual inspections resulting in zero deficiencies. This result was validated during the Capstone visit. Our team identified notable processes within the major graded areas of Improving the Unit and Leading People. A comprehensive evaluation of the 625 STOS and the 55th Wing Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) showcased an error-free program. The ATIS-G/ATIS-I sessions yielded noteworthy concerns in the areas of current unit manning and the ability to meet primary mission directives without extraordinary measures. Additionally, unit personnel expressed concerns in the area of maintaining an organizational identity while striving to meet the needs of multiple mission partners.

This report/electronic transmission contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or part to persons or agencies outside of the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director, SAF/IGI. If you received this message/document in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

# **INSPECTION SUMMARY**

#### **PURPOSE:**

The AFGSC/IG conducted a Unit Effectiveness Inspection (UEI) on the 625 STOS from 17 June 2013 - 11 June 2014. The authoritative guidance for the inspection was IAW AFPD 90-2, as implemented by AFI 90-201, The Air Force Inspection System. The Capstone event was conducted 8-11 June 2014.

The 625 STOS was graded EFFECTIVE overall.

The Major Graded Areas were graded as:

a. Managing Resources
b. Leading People
c. Improving the Unit
EFFECTIVE
EFFECTIVE

d. Executing the Mission HIGHLY EFFECTIVE

Top 5 Airmen-to-IG Session Issues for SECAF consideration (AFI 90-201, para 4.8.2.1.):

- 1. Perceived Lack of Support/Understanding of Mission by AFGSC (negative)
- 2. Leadership (positive)
- 3. Manning (negative)
- 4. Unit Cohesion/Unity (positive)
- 5. Airborne Command Post Concerns (negative)

The team also inspected the 625 STOS on Commander's Interest Item 13-01, Health and Wellness. The AFGSC/IG did not find any inappropriate items in the workplace areas inspected.

# Table: 625th Strategic Operations Squadron Unit Grade / Aggregate Totals

Org Abbrev	Inspected Organization	Unit Grade	Deficiencies										
			Severity Critical Significant Minor SII CII						Donoot	DEM/ O A	Unit	Strengths	RIAs
			Critical	Significant	Minor	SII	C	nnu/SA	кереац	PEVVOA	Identified	į	
625 STOS	625th Strategic Operations Squadron	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0

# Table: 625th Strategic Operations Squadron Unit Item Grades / Summary Table

	SII	Item	Grade											
Index	1			Defice Severity						Popost	DEW &	Unit	Strengths	RIAs
	CII			Critical	Significant	Minor	or SII CII		HHQ/3A	Repeat	FFWXA	Unit Identified		
1		Unit Effectiveness Inspection (UEI)	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.1		Managing Resources	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.1.1		Adequacy	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.1.2		Stewardship	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.2		Leading People	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.2.1		Communication	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
1.2.2		Discipline	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.2.3		Training	Highly Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.2.4		Development	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.2.5		Quality of Life Engagement	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.3		Improving the Unit	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.3.1		Strategic Alignment	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.3.2		Process Operations	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
1.3.3		CC's Inspection Program (CCIP)	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.3.4		Data-Driven Decision	Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.4		Executing the Mission	Highly Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.4.1		Primary Mission	Highly Effective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.4.2		AEF Readiness	Not Graded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1.4.3		Mission-Assura nce Command and Control	Not Graded  Totals:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	

This report/electronic transmission contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or part to persons or agencies outside of the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director, SAF/IGI. If you received this message/document in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

# REPLY INSTRUCTIONS

AFGSC/IG will open deficiencies in IGEMS within 5 working days of the conclusion of the inspection. The 625 STOS will reply within 45 days of report publication to AFGSC/IG with corrective action plans, assigned root cause, deficiency code and countermeasures for all Critical, Significant and other designated deficiencies in accordance with AFI 90-201. Corrective actions and closure recommendations for critical, significant and other designated deficiencies will be coordinated with HQ Functional Area Managers (FAM) as appropriate prior to closure by AFGSC/IG.

All Critical and other designated deficiencies contributing to a less than SATISFACTORY rating in a graded area will be evaluated by the HQ AFGSC/CV, in consultation with AFGSC/IG and the respective NAF/CC, to determine whether the Root Cause Analysis (RCA) as outlined in AFI 90-201, para 2.20.10., and the resulting corrective action will reside at a command level above the commander.

In instances where the RCA is required, commanders will use the rigor of the AF 8-Step Problem Solving Model, using a certified AFSO21 practitioner, as outlined in the AF Smart Operations for the 21st Century (AFSO21) playbook to determine primary and, if applicable, contributing root causes. Commanders will provide RCA results and countermeasures within 30 days to AFGSC/IG for review. AFGSC/IG will forward results to appropriate AFGSC FAM and AFSO21 offices for further review to ensure the true root cause has been identified and countermeasures established to fix the problem permanently. Once these reviews are complete, AFGSC/IG will track all countermeasures/corrective actions through the Quarterly Inspection Working Group (QIWG) and Semi-Annual Inspection Council (SAIC) process and the commander will provide an RCA out-brief during the next scheduled QIWG/SAIC.

For the purposes of this UEI, these reply instructions apply to deficiencies identified in the UEI.

The UEI report may not be used as a cited achievement in the award fee determination process. Additionally, it cannot be used by government or contractor personnel in potential discussions pertaining to termination for default or termination for convenience proceedings.

# **UEI INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS**

625th Strategic Operations Squadron

**Effective** 

Unit Effectiveness Inspection (UEI)

**Effective** 

MGA 1 - Managing Resources

**Effective** 

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Managing Resources.

Adequacy Effective

#### **Comments:**

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Adequacy. Higher Headquarters has effectively provided the necessary resources for 625 STOS to meet mission requirements. Manpower levels are sufficient with few exceptions and are effectively utilized. PRP office has an approved, unfunded E-5 billet that, if filled, would posture the unit for continued program success. Budget allocations have fulfilled mission requirements.

Stewardship Effective

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Stewardship. 625 STOS expertly accomplished mission requirements despite current manning restrictions. Twelve of twelve ALCS Individual Qualification Folders (IQF) reviewed demonstrated an expertly managed IQF program that met all requirements outlined in AFGSCI 13-5302V1. A detailed review of resource and alert force management revealed unit time and manpower are utilized efficiently. A thorough review of the Top Secret Control Accounts at 625 STOS/DOO and DOMX revealed that each unit was able to display superior practices and procedures for the control of classified information. Additionally, the Nuclear Certified Equipment/Item Program tracks over 18 pieces of NCI enhancing overall nuclear surety within the unit.

# MGA 2 - Leading People

**Effective** 

#### Comments:

The IG identified 1 strength and zero deficiencies in the area of Leading People.

Communication

#### Comments:

The IG identified 1 strength in the area of Communication. 625 STOS employed stellar communication processes and systems throughout the organization. Of note, PRP communication across the installation exceeds the intent of the program. Additionally, Airmen felt they were well-informed. Overall, 625 STOS has a solid process for feedback and intent with a focus on reduction of communication-induced waste.

# Strengths:

55 MDG utilizes the Nebraska Electronic Health Information Inquiry, a state developed electronic health information system which greatly enhances notifications to the 625 STOS Certifying Official. This innovative measure solidifies real-time information transfer, enhancing safety, security and reliability in nuclear surety determinations.

**Discipline** Effective

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Discipline. 625 STOS displayed an overall effective discipline process without exception and Airmen were eager to showcase processes with pride and enthusiasm while accomplishing mission directives.

Training Highly Effective

### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Training. 625 STOS maintains a laudable training program. An Airborne Procedures Trainer (APT) Trainer Proficiency Evaluation validated the unit's exceptional ability to train its operators in the procedures necessary to conduct the mission. A thorough review of the Missile Combat Crew - Airborne (MCC-A) certification program verified all certification requirements were accomplished for Alert Crew. During an APT Evaluator Proficiency Evaluation, the unit displayed flawless evaluation

procedures. Additionally, all personnel with a nuclear surety training requirement were current and 18 personnel were tested on their knowledge of nuclear surety requirements with zero failures and a 99% average test score.

**Development** Effective

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Development. 625 STOS placed an appropriate emphasis on PME, mentorship and personal development.

# **Quality of Life Engagement**

**Effective** 

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Quality of Life Engagement. Squadron personnel identified an abundance of available off-base community activities. Airmen throughout the squadron consistently expressed high morale, unit pride and team cohesion.

# MGA 3 - Improving the Unit

**Effective** 

#### Comments:

The IG identified 1 strength and 1 minor deficiency in the area of Improving the Unit.

# **Strategic Alignment**

**Effective** 

## **Comments:**

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Strategic Alignment. 625 STOS consistently displayed sound organizational planning encompassing a balance between the unit's vision and mission. Additionally, 625 STOS aligned and communicated 20 AF and AFGSC commanders' overall vision and mission requirements to all levels of supervision.

# **Process Operations**

**Effective** 

### Comments:

The IG identified 1 strength and 1 minor deficiency in the area of Process Operations.

This report/electronic transmission contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or part to persons or agencies outside of the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director, SAF/IGI. If you received this message/document in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

Personnel throughout the unit displayed highly proficient outputs and outcomes. The unit has done a notable job of developing key processes while utilizing process improvement and operational risk management. 625 STOS fostered an atmosphere of continual commitment to improvement.

# Strengths:

The 625 STOS/DOMX demonstrated an expert ability to track and coordinate modifications to Joint Planning Interim Changes (JPICs) through use of a locally developed tracking tool and improved feedback to subordinate units. The targeting section of 625 STOS developed an Excel based tracking tool to ensure no requirements are violated due to frequent change requests. The tracking tool allows complicated scheduling shifts to be vetted against several regulation based limitations with immediately recognizable results. Additionally, 625 STOS/DOMX has developed a feedback form to broaden units' awareness of the impact of constant JPIC change requests.

# **CC's Inspection Program (CCIP)**

**Effective** 

#### Comments:

Major Graded Area not included in overall score. The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of CCIP. 625 STOS utilizes MICT in their current self-inspection process and maintains a positive attitude and proactive approach to the Air Force Inspection System.

Data-Driven Decision Effective

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Data-Driven Decision. 625 STOS has institutionalized processes to collect and track data relevant to the organizations goals and process improvement.

# MGA 4 - Executing the Mission

**Highly Effective** 

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Executing the Mission.

Primary Mission Highly Effective

#### Comments:

The IG identified zero deficiencies in the area of Primary Mission. 625 STOS superbly executed its primary mission to provide combat capability. Nine of twenty T.O.s were reviewed and Top Secret document page counts were conducted on 100% of applicable material at 625 STOS/DOO. A thorough review of historical data validated sound Operational Test Launch and Service Star Programs at the 625 STOS/DOMX. A review of the JPIC program was conducted and revealed expertly managed programs that accurately accounted for all targeting.

AEF Readiness Not Graded

**Mission-Assurance Command and Control** 

**Not Graded** 

# HIGHER HEADQUARTERS/OTHER SUPPORT AGENCIES

# **Process Operations**

# **Deficiencies:**

F.12886.1512878: Minor

55 WG/CC did not ensure all PRP Certifying Officials attended the wing Nuclear Executive Council (NEC). Specifically, the 625 STOS/CC was not invited to and does not attend the NEC.

Reference: AFI 91-101, para 2.18.1.2.

OPR: 55 WG/SE
OCR: 625 STOS/CC

MAJCOM FAM OPR: AFGSC/SEW

# SUPERIOR PERFORMERS

# MAJOR BURDETTE O. MILLEN 625th Strategic Operations Squadron

Maj Millen demonstrated superior performance, dedication and professionalism during an in-depth look into the capabilities of the 625 STOS ICBM Targeting Section. As Section Chief, he displayed expert knowledge in all aspects of the targeting mission, even beyond the requests of the inspectors. Maj Millen's personal expertise was demonstrated by his perfect Nuclear Surety testing score. His enthusiasm for continued program improvement to enhance targeting processes for subordinate units stood as a shining example of his commitment to the mission. Maj Millen's insistence on going above and beyond expectations greatly contributed to the flawless inspection performance of his section.

# **CAPTAIN RYAN D. MURPHY**625th Strategic Operations Squadron

Capt Murphy displayed sound subject matter expertise and exceptional professionalism throughout all aspects of the 2014 625 STOS UEI. Capt Murphy scored a 100% during the unit's Nuclear Surety testing. Additionally, he displayed superior technical proficiency and quick reaction to an equipment malfunction during an Airborne Procedures Trainer (APT) Training Proficiency Evaluation. Capt Murphy was able to modify his training session while seamlessly providing vital monthly instruction. Furthermore, his attention to tactics and techniques thoroughly enhanced the trainees' knowledge of important concepts. Finally, Capt Murphy's attention to detail contributed to a flawless Top Secret Control Account audit for the 625th STOS.

# SUPERIOR TEAMS

# ALCS EVALUATION TEAM 625th Strategic Operations Squadron

Capt Lavery and Mr. Carlson demonstrated their outstanding professionalism through unparalleled weapon system expertise and exceptional technique while conducting an evaluation during the 2014 625 STOS UEI. Mr. Carlson relied on his unmatched weapon system knowledge and ability to anticipate the evaluation crew's actions to present the most accurate status throughout a series of complicated evaluation scenarios. Capt Lavery displayed superior situational awareness with an eagle eye on the evaluation crew while relaying vital status updates to his teammate. At the conclusion of the evaluation, both evaluators adeptly provided impartial and comprehensive feedback after a well-deserved Q1 rating on a thorough evaluation.

Captain Richard J. Lavery

Mr. Andrew R. Carlson

# **TEAM COMPOSITION**

# **RANK/NAME**

# **FUNCTIONAL AREA**

CIV Kelvin Bowen Lt Col Susan Geer Maj Shannon Hughes Maj Christopher Hughes

Maj Scott Matson Capt Matthew McPherson SMSgt Christopher Kaleta MSgt Bruce Kastner

CIV Melissa Hubbard
CIV Michael Little
CIV Brian Nelson

Executive Director
IG Workcenter Manager
Branch Chief, Mission Support
Branch Chief, Operations
Operations
Operations
IG Workcenter
Mission Support

Mission Support Maintenance Maintenance

# **DISTRIBUTION LIST**

# **AGENCY/OFFICE SYMBOL**

AFGSC/CC, afgsc.ccworkflow@us.af.mil;
AFGSC/CVE, afgsc.cveworkflow@us.af.mil
AFGSC All Directors Distro List, AFGSCAllDirectorsDistroList@us.af.mil;
8 AF/CC, 8af/cccommander@us.af.mil;
2 BW/CC, 2bw.cc@us.af.mil;
5 BW/CC, 5bw.cc@us.af.mil;
509 BW/CC, 509bwcc@us.af.mil;
20 AF/CC, 20af.cc@us.af.mil;
90 MW/CC, 90mw/cc@us.af.mil;
91 MW/CC, 91mw.cc3@minot.af.mil;
341 MW/CC, 341sw.cc@us.af.mil;
576 FLTS/CC, 576flts.cc@us.af.mil;
620 GCTS/CC, joseph.parsons@us.af.mil; afgsc.sfon@us.af.mil;
625 STOS/CC, 625stoscss@stratcom.mil;
SAF/IGI, safigi.workflow@pentagon.af.mil

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

This report/electronic transmission contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or part to persons or agencies outside of the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director, SAF/IGI. If you received this message/document in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

This report/electronic transmission contains internal matters that are deliberative in nature, are part of the agency decision-making process, and/or are otherwise legally privileged, each of which are protected from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552. Do not release in whole or part to persons or agencies outside of the Air Force, nor can it be republished in whole or part in any publication not containing this statement, including Air Force magazines and general use pamphlets, without express approval of the Director, SAF/IGI. If you received this message/document in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete all copies of this message.