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1. The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducts command inspections of echelon 2 commands to provide the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations with a firsthand assessment of Departmental risks and major issues relevant to policy, management, and direction as directed by reference (a). Reference (b) tasks NAVINSGEN with conducting inspections and surveys, making appropriate evaluations and recommendations concerning operating forces afloat and ashore, Department of the Navy components and functions, and Navy programs that impact readiness or quality of life for Navy military and civilian personnel.

2. NAVINSGEN conducted a Command Inspection of the Naval Education and Training Command (NETC) from 20 January-12 February 2016. This report documents our findings.

3. This report contains an Executive Summary, our observations and findings, and documented deficiencies noted during the inspection. A summary of survey and focus group data, as well as a complete listing of survey frequency data is included.

4. During our visit, we assessed NETC’s overall mission readiness in the execution of its echelon 2 responsibilities; functions and tasks as assigned in or defined by OPNAVINST 5450.336C, Mission, Functions, and Tasks of Naval Education and Training Command of 14 May 2012; and other laws, policy, and regulations. We assessed administrative programs, facilities, safety and environmental compliance, security, and Sailor programs. Additionally, we conducted surveys and focus group discussions to assess the quality of work life and home life for Navy military and civilian personnel.

5. Our overall assessment is that NETC is effectively executing its complex mission of training and educating the Fleet. However, the increased workload demands of Ready, Relevant Learning (RRL) implementation will severely impact an already small staff facing further Major Headquarters Activities (MHA) reductions. We have indications from our survey and focus groups that the NETC HQ civilian workforce is under-reporting the hours they are working to meet workload demands; this will only get worse as the MHA reductions are implemented and NETC moves forward with RRL. While we understand that the MHA reductions are driven from the top down, in this case, it highlights Navy’s past track record of undervaluing training. If investing in Sailors’ training is important to the Navy, and if RRL is the corporate solution to
provide that training, now is not the time to reduce NETC HQ staff. Now is the time to invest in NETC so that our force of the future will have the right training at the right time and place.

6. Corrective actions

a. NAVINSGEN identified 85 deficiencies that require NETC’s corrective action. Programs include: Missions, Functions, and Tasks; Environmental Readiness; Safety and Occupational Health; Energy Conservation; Information, Personnel, Operations, and Industrial Security; Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection; Counterintelligence; Cybersecurity; Personally Identifiable Information; Sailor Programs; Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention; Individual Medical Readiness; Legal and Ethics; Freedom of Information Act; Victim Witness Assistance; Personal Property Management; Records Management; Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR); and Suicide Prevention.

b. Additionally, NAVINSGEN provided NETC with 42 separate recommendations for consideration, relating to civilian Human Resources; Information, Personnel, and Operations Security; Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection; SAPR; Suicide Prevention; Command Sponsorship; and Command Indoctrination Program.

c. Correction of each deficiency or adoption of recommendations, and a description of action(s) taken or rationale of why recommendations were not adopted, should be reported via Implementation Status Report (ISR), OPNAV 5040/2, no later than 8 September 2016. Deficiencies not corrected or recommendations not adopted by this date or requiring longer-term solutions should be updated quarterly until completed.

7. My point of contact is [b] (7)(C)
Executive Summary
The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducted a command inspection of Naval Education and Training Command (NETC) from 20 January-12 February 2016. Our last command inspection of NETC was under the Chief of Naval Education and Training construct in 1999; a “Health and Comfort Review” of NETC was completed in 2010. The team consisted of NAVINSGEN staff augmented with subject matter experts from various commands.

During our visit we assessed the command’s overall mission readiness in execution of its echelon 2 responsibilities. Moreover, we assessed their functions and tasks as defined by various laws, policies, and regulations, or as specifically outlined in OPNAVINST 5450.336C, Mission, Functions, and Tasks of the Naval Education and Training Command, dated 14 May 2012. We assessed administrative programs, facilities, safety and environmental compliance, security, and Sailor programs. Additionally, we conducted surveys and focus group discussions to assess the quality of work life (QOWL) and home life (QOHL) for Navy military, civilians, and their families.

Throughout the visit, we found a dedicated and professional workforce committed to mission accomplishment under challenging fiscal realities and limited human resources. Additionally, we received a high volume of positive comments regarding senior leadership during surveys, focus groups, and individual interaction. The staff believes in and trusts senior NETC leadership.

MISSION PERFORMANCE
NETC’s mission is to educate and train those who serve, providing tools and opportunities that enable life-long learning, and professional and personal growth and development, to ensure Fleet readiness and mission accomplishment. Additionally, NETC serves as the sole claimant for individual training and education and as the principal advisor to the Chief of Naval Operations and Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command on all training and education matters.

Our overall assessment is that NETC is effectively executing its complex mission of training and educating the Fleet. However, the increased workload demands of Ready, Relevant Learning (RRL) implementation will severely impact an already small staff facing further Major Headquarters Activities (MHA) reductions. We have indications from our survey and focus groups that the NETC headquarters (HQ) civilian workforce is under-reporting hours worked to meet workload demands; this will only get worse as the MHA reductions are implemented and NETC moves forward with RRL. Now is the time to invest in NETC so that our force of the future will have the right training at the right time and place.

All NETC's work on RRL will be for naught if the Navy does not ensure the Enriched Culture and Modernized Personnel System pillars of Sailor 2025 come to fruition. Navy cannot afford another Revolution in Training (RIT), which failed because the Navy was unwilling to make the required investment for the envisioned integrated training. Instead, the Navy opted to put the RIT on the backs of Sailors and Department of the Navy civilians without granting them sufficient resources or authorities. Navy has identified that lesson, but as budgetary pressures continue to build, there needs to be a firm commitment from Flag and SES leadership that RRL will be executed as designed, and Sailor 2025 funds will not be diverted to pay other bills.

Transition to Ready, Relevant Learning
It is impractical to discuss NETC's mission without discussing RRL. During the course of our inspection, we observed the NETC workforce feeling the strain. Hiring the right skills into the RRL project office will
be essential to success. Specifically, NETC must place emphasis on hiring expertise in the areas of acquisition, human resources, purchasing and contracting, and legal. NETC must engage early and often with the Office of Civilian Human Resources Stennis Operations Center, and other systems commands (SYSCOMs) (such as Naval Sea Systems Command and Naval Air Systems Command) to leverage their expertise in establishing a project office.

Although still early in the process, we recommend NETC identify "red lines" to enable early identification of implementation pitfalls. Additionally, we recommend robust Fleet feedback into the system to identify training deficiencies quickly to allow for reinstituting legacy training until corrective action can be determined. This will require agile responses from not only NETC, but also the Fleet and Navy Personnel Command.

Finally, in addition to NETC’s briefings to the Flag Mess, we recommend the development of a comprehensive communications strategy for all levels of the chain of command - a strategy that Commander, NETC and his staff can use to communicate RRL to the Fleet.

**Training Effectiveness**

NETC attempts to gain feedback on training effectiveness via surveys sent to the Fleet. These surveys attempt to gather information from a Sailor’s supervisor as to how well the Sailor was prepared to perform their job after attending training. However, extremely low survey return rates negatively impact NETC’s ability to utilize Fleet feedback to improve curricula. In addition, although NETC recently revised its training effectiveness instruction in December 2015, the revision did not substantially address this shortfall. We recommend that NETC explore ways to obtain and utilize Fleet metrics as a means to augment the human performance information. We recommend exploring Casualty Reporting data, equipment fail rates, spare parts usage, tech assist frequency, and other metrics to unveil possible ties to Navy training. Additionally, we recommend exploring ways to utilize advancement exam data as a possible feedback tool to evaluate Navy training and Sailor knowledge.

**Staff Organization and Location**

The majority of NETC staff personnel are located at NETC HQ in Pensacola, Florida. However, a portion of the staff, specifically the NETC Learning and Development Division (N7) is located at Naval Air Station Oceana-Dam Neck Annex (Dam Neck). Throughout our inspection, we observed that the geographic separation of NETC N7 Dam Neck created barriers to communication, productivity, and unity of effort. These “seams” become more pronounced during times of stress and/or change - precisely as the staff is experiencing now with the uncertainties of RRL implementation. NETC’s mission is to train and educate the Fleet, so we recognize that proximity to a portion of the Fleet may be advantageous. However, when we look at the NETC organization, we believe that due consideration should be given to consolidating the staff into one location.

**Strategic Planning**

On paper, NETC’s strategic planning process is one of the best we have seen. In the past, it has been utilized to produce not only a strategic 10-year vision, but also an annual written product with actionable, integrated business plans. However, this process is suspended. While we recognize there are existing uncertainties associated with RRL, we observed the workforce becoming increasingly frustrated with either fluid or non-existent policy. Many expressed they are uncomfortable “building the airplane while in flight.” The uncertainty comes at a time when the command can least afford inefficiencies; and, those furthest from Pensacola expressed the most frustration. We recommend recommencing the strategic planning process at the earliest opportunity.
Commander, NETC is aggressively leading the early stages of RRL. In the absence of an overarching Sailor 2025 written strategy, NETC issued a Decision Guidance Memorandum (DGM) in August 2015 to provide a framework and initial path forward so the staff could begin the immense task of implementing RRL. The DGM is a well-written document that provides background, identifies goals, and codifies specific staff responsibilities.

FACILITIES, HIGH RISK TRAINING, SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND ENERGY CONSERVATION

Facilities Management
The NETC N4 team is capturing, consolidating, and ranking diverse manpower, personnel, training, and education infrastructure requirements with input from the warfare enterprises and SYSCOMs. At NETC HQ, employees utilize an intranet web-enabled trouble ticket capability, augmented by a traditional telephonic trouble desk to report and track facility issues.

High Risk Training
The oversight of formal courses covered in NETC’s High Risk Training (HRT) Program is well tracked with effective and thorough oversight. However, OPNAVINST 1500.75C, Policy and Governance for Conducting High-Risk Training, uses an initial Risk Assessment Code (RAC) as the criteria for coverage under the HRT Program. This is more restrictive than NETCINST 5100.13B, NETC High-Risk Safety Training Program, which specifies residual RAC as the criteria (i.e. following engineering, administrative, and physical controls are applied). As a result, this program is considered not compliant. In the near term, NETC intends to conduct an inventory of courses that would be considered “high risk” by Navy instruction, analyze historical data of near misses or incidents, and document the appropriate risk decisions in writing.

Safety and Occupational Health
This program is generally well managed but not fully compliant with governing instructions. Annual reviews of formal safety training (non-high risk courses) do not adequately address Safety and Occupational Health (SOH) hazard controls. Additionally, while NETC performs virtual inspections of echelon 3 commands, their oversight of NETC SOH Programs does not meet instruction requirements.

SECURITY PROGRAMS AND CYBERSECURITY/TECHNOLOGY

Command Security Overview
Overall, NETC security responsibilities are divided between four key personnel (three civilian, one military) who work in two separate directorates within NETC. None of the three civilian security personnel at NETC are classified in the 0080 or 0086 occupational series.

Information Security and Personnel Security
Information Security and Personnel Security are not fully compliant with governing directives. Contributing to this, local directives do not contain all elements specified in Navy-wide directives for both programs. In other instances, command directives meet Navy-wide expectations; however, the directives are not enforced throughout the command.
Industrial Security
NETC does not have an Industrial Security Program although required by governing directives. Furthermore, NETC does not provide oversight to lower echelon commands’ Industrial Security Programs.

Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection
Antiterrorism Force Protection (ATFP) is compliant with governing directives. NETC’s Physical Security Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. NETC provides limited Physical Security/ATFP oversight of its lower echelon commands through virtual program assessments, vice on-site inspections.

Operations Security
The Operations Security (OPSEC) Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. NETC conducts required OPSEC training to assigned personnel, but does not conduct specialized training for personnel involved in public release of information. Despite observed compliance in many areas, we found that the OPSEC Program is not operationalized and requires implementation of the program across the command.

Counterintelligence Training and Support
NETC’s Counterintelligence (CI) training and support is not compliant with governing directives. CI training to NETC personnel does not meet requirements specified in DoD directives. Additionally, the NETC training material has not been reviewed by the local Naval Criminal Investigative Service Field Office.

Cybersecurity
The NETC Cybersecurity Program is compliant with governing directives.

Personally Identifiable Information
The NETC Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. The appointed PII coordinator is assigned to a different command, Region Legal Service Office Southeast in Jacksonville, limiting oversight at NETC HQ and subordinate commands. The NETC Privacy Act Team is designated in writing, but it is not functional [Redacted].

COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS
We found NETC’s Compliance Programs to be effective and executed in accordance with governing instructions. In particular, we found the NETC Manager’s Internal Control, Government Commercial Purchase Card, and Voting Assistance Programs to be exceptionally well managed. NETC is meeting their Navy-wide training responsibilities for the following Navy programs: Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR), Suicide Prevention, Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention (NADAP), and the Physical Readiness Program. We observed that a significant lack of integration of NETC N7 Dam Neck with the HQ staff in Pensacola was a common theme with non-compliant programs.

Individual Medical Readiness
The Individual Medical Readiness (IMR) Program is not compliant with the governing directives. There was no system in place for regular monitoring or reporting of current service member IMR status to the NETC Commander, no process for timely completion of Periodic Health Assessments, and no tracking or oversight of subordinate echelon 3 medical readiness.
Legal, Ethics, Freedom of Information Act Programs
The NETC Legal, Ethics, and Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Programs are not compliant with governing directives. NETC had not completed an annual internal ethics audit for the past two years, “OGE Form 450: Confidential Financial Disclosure Report” files were not reviewed in the required time, the Victim Witness Assistance Program was neglected, and 14 FOIA cases were past the required filing deadlines.

Personal Property Management
The NETC Personal Property Management Program is not compliant with governing directives. There was no established procedure for custodian turnover, inventory plans were not established, and NETC had no codified process to link acquisition and personal property management.

Records Management
The Records Management Program is not compliant with governing directives. NETC had not created a file plan, was unable to demonstrate organization of command records, had not conducted an annual inventory or triannual self-assessment, and did not have a vital records plan.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
The SAPR Program at NETC is not compliant with governing directives. SAPR training for individuals and watchstanders has not been completed, victim advocates have not been designated, and the mandatory one time review of service members' Official Military Personnel Files was not conducted.

Suicide Prevention
The Suicide Prevention Program is not compliant with governing directives. Required individual and watchstander training was not completed, there was no written crisis plan, and the Suicide Prevention Coordinator and Assistant were not designated in writing.

Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
The NADAP Program is not compliant with governing directives. There was no documentation that demonstrated compliance with Urinalysis Program requirements prior to January 2016.

SURVEY AND FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS
Survey and focus group discussions found that QOWL and QOHL at NETC are higher than the historical echelon 2 command averages. Leadership, manning/manpower, and professional knowledge and development are perceived to most adversely impact the mission, job performance, and QOL; NETC HQ Pensacola focus group participants indicated positive impacts on QOWL from NETC HQ Pensacola leadership. Rated on a 10-point scale, the NETC QOWL and QOHL are 6.92 and 9.02, respectively; the corresponding echelon 2 command historical averages are 6.71 and 8.06. Specific comments from focus groups and surveys, as well as a detailed analysis are included in the appendix of this report.
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Areas/Programs Assessed

- **Mission Performance**
  - Transition to Ready, Relevant Learning
  - Training Effectiveness and Fleet Integration
  - Curriculum Development and Review
  - Student Management
  - Headquarters Staff Organization and Location
  - Navy Enlisted Advancement System
  - Voluntary and Non-Traditional Education
  - International Student Training
  - Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps/Navy Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps Oversight
  - Strategic Planning
  - Continuity of Operations
  - Total Force Management
  - Civilian Human Resources
  - Training
  - Equal Employment Opportunity

- **Facilities, Environmental, and Safety**
  - Facilities Management
  - Shore Infrastructure Planning and Management
  - Environmental Readiness
  - Energy Conservation
  - Safety and Occupational Health

- **Security Programs and Information Assurance**
  - Command Security
  - Industrial Security
  - Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection
  - Operations Security
  - Personnel Security
  - Insider Threat
  - Counterintelligence Support
  - Information Security
  - Information Assurance and Personally Identifiable Information

- **Resource Management/Compliance Programs**
  - Comptroller Functions
  - Managers’ Internal Control
  - Personal Property Management
  - Government Travel Charge Card
  - Government Commercial Purchase Card
  - Command Individual Augmentee Coordinator
  - Post Deployment Health Reassessment
  - Individual Medical Readiness
  - Physical Readiness Program
  - Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
  - Command Managed Equal Opportunity
  - Suicide Prevention
  - Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
• Hazing Policy Training and Compliance
• Legal/Ethics
• Victim and Witness Assistance Program
• Voting Assistance Program
• Inspector General Functions

• Sailor Programs
  • Command Sponsorship
  • Command Indoctrination
  • Career Development Program
  • Sailor Recognition Program
  • CPO 365
Observations and Findings

MISSION PERFORMANCE
The Mission Performance Team consisted of Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) staff augmented with subject matter experts from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Policy (DUSN(P)); Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC); Naval Safety Center (NAVSAFECEN); Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR); Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS); Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA); U.S. Naval Academy (USNA); U.S. Fleet Forces Command (USFF); Commander, Naval Air Force U.S. Atlantic Fleet (COMNAVAIRLANT); Commander, Submarine Force Atlantic (COMSUBLANT); Commander, Naval Surface Forces U.S. Atlantic Fleet (COMNAVSURFLANT); Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC); Navy Information Dominance Corps Forces (NAVIDFOR); Navy International Programs Office (NIPO); Chief of Naval Operations staff (OPNAV N12); U.S. Naval Supply Systems Command (NAVSUP); Commander, Navy Region Southeast (CNRSE); Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI); Department of the Navy Assistant for Administration (DON/AA); Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR); and the Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR).

The Mission Performance Team utilized survey and focus group responses, document review, group discussions, and face-to-face interviews to gather information and assess the mission performance of Naval Education and Training Command (NETC). These findings were applied to the functions and tasks as assigned in or defined by OPNAVINST 5450.336C, Mission, Functions, and Tasks of the Naval Education and Training Command, dated 14 May 2012.

NETC’s mission is to educate and train those who serve, providing tools and opportunities that enable lifelong learning, professional and personal growth, and development to ensure Fleet readiness and mission accomplishment. Additionally, NETC serves as the sole claimant for individual training and education, and serves as the principal advisor to the Chief of Naval Operations and Commander, USFF on all training and education matters.

We reviewed the following areas:

- Transition to Ready, Relevant Learning
- Training Effectiveness and Fleet Integration
- Curriculum Development/Review
- Student Management
- Headquarters Staff Organization/Location
- Navy Enlisted Advancement System
- Voluntary Education and Non-Traditional Education
- International Student Training
- Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps/Navy Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps Oversight
- Strategic Planning
- Continuity of Operations
- Total Force Management
- Civilian Human Resource Services
- Military and Civilian Training
- Equal Employment Opportunity
**Mission, Functions, and Tasks**

NETC is an echelon 2 Major Headquarters Activity (MHA) that executes its mission through a headquarters (HQ) staff and its assigned subordinate echelon 3 commands; Naval Education and Training Professional Development and Technology Center (NETPDTTC), Naval Service Training Command (NSTC), Naval Education and Training Security Assistance Field Activity (NETSAFA), Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Services (DANTES), NETC Human Resources Office, three training support centers (TSC), and 12 learning centers (LC). NETC HQ staff is located at Naval Air Station (NAS) Pensacola; the NETC Learning and Development Division (N7) is located at NAS Oceana-Dam Neck Annex (Dam Neck).

![NETC Organizational Structure](image)

Figure 1. NETC Organizational Structure

Echelon 2 shore activity commanders are required to submit an updated mission, functions, and tasks (MFT) statement, as needed and at least every 3 years, in accordance with OPNAVINST 5400.44A, Navy Organization Change Manual. NETC’s MFT is dated 14 May 2012, and exceeds the three-year requirement.

**Recommendation 1.** That NETC develop and submit a revised OPNAVINST 5450.336 mission, functions, and tasks instruction.

**Transition to Ready, Relevant Learning**

As shown in Figure 2, Ready, Relevant Learning (RRL) is a Sailor of 2025 concept pillar; the other pillars are *Modernized Personnel System* and *Enriched Culture*. It is impractical to discuss NETC’s mission effectiveness without discussing it in the context of RRL implementation since RRL dominates nearly all aspects of the command.
Figure 2. Sailor of 2025 Construct

In 2015, Commander, NETC was tasked to lead the Navy’s effort to revise accession training content, sequencing, and delivery for 78 enlisted ratings. As part of RRL, these ratings would temporarily transition to Block Learning (BL) (essentially the same content delivery, but divided into multiple “blocks” of time scheduled before and during a Sailor’s initial tour) by the beginning of 2018. After transition to BL, NETC will further transition accession training into “Mobile Modular Learning,” which includes completely revised content, sequencing, timing, and delivery by 2025.

This effort is gargantuan in nature and involves much more than simply modifying the content and timing of accession training. Challenges include changing the enlisted distribution and tracking system, identifying changes to existing and future acquisition programs, embedding Sailor accession-level training into a Sailor’s first at-sea tour, expanded travel funding requirements, incentivizing commands to enable Sailors to meet training requirements, identification of new information technology (IT) requirements, and much more. Navy established seven RRL planning groups, with membership composed of staff from NETC, Fleet, Bureau of Naval Personnel, OPNAV, LCs, and others. The charter of these groups is to address learning IT requirements, training delivery requirements, acquisition program resources and requirements, acquisition of new training technology, Delayed Entry Program approaches, and distribution processes.

NETC has embraced this effort, but does not yet have all the mechanisms in place to ensure successful implementation. Navy has programmed funding for NETC to establish a project office of approximately 18 personnel in fiscal year (FY) 2017. Until then, NETC must accomplish this tasking utilizing existing staff. There is significant risk associated with an undertaking of this magnitude, especially when coupled with MHA reductions, pending deadlines, and only the promise of additional manpower. During the course of our inspection, we observed the NETC workforce feeling the strain. Continual assessments are required to assess the impact of non-RRL work that is either being delayed, being completed by more junior personnel, or not being completed at all while many of the senior NETC staff are focused on RRL. Hiring the right skills into the RRL project office will be essential to success. Critical skill areas identified during our inspection are acquisition, human resources (HR), purchasing, contracting, and legal.

NETC Decision Guidance Memorandum, dated 5 August 2015, is a well-written document that frames the immense task of implementing the Navy’s transition to RRL. It provides background, clearly identifies the overall goal, and codifies specific roles and responsibilities among the staff. We recognize this as a good first step in codifying Commander, NETC’s vision.
Additionally, it is important to identify "red lines" to help recognize pitfalls before catastrophic failure. As part of these red lines, there must be Fleet and systems commands (SYSCOM) feedback into the system, to quickly identify training deficiencies and reinstitute legacy training until corrective action can be implemented. This will require agile responses from not only NETC, but also the Fleet and Navy Personnel Command.

NETC is exploring several science and technology efforts within the learning enterprise. For example, the Center for Information Dominance (CID) is testing a program known as Digital Tutor (DT). DT students graduate several weeks faster than non-DT students do. Although it is too early to assess the effectiveness of this program, we applaud NETC’s attempts to leverage emerging technologies. NETC is also exploring other technologies: eSailor, demonstration videos, Virtual World/Blackboard/.edu tools, immersive gaming experience, a General Military Training (GMT) “App”, and a Littoral Combat Ships Avatar.

**Recommendation 2.** That NETC liaise with SYSCOMs to leverage their expertise in establishing a project office.

**Recommendation 3.** That NETC continue to publish written RRL implementation guidance on a recurring basis, to ensure constant alignment of workforce effort.

**Recommendation 4.** That NETC identify “red lines” to identify RRL implementation pitfalls.

**Recommendation 5.** That NETC expand the investment of learning technologies to leverage private sector innovation, technological solutions, and emerging educational advances.

**Training Effectiveness and Fleet Integration**

OPNAVINST 5450.336C tasks NETC with evaluating the training effectiveness it provides the Fleet. While NETC has measures in place, we observed these efforts are only moderately successful. NETCINST 1540.2A, NETC Training Effectiveness Program, identifies the process in which the Fleet can provide feedback to improve the quality of formal courses throughout the NETC enterprise, yet NETC consistently receives statistically insignificant survey feedback from the Fleet. The low response rate negatively impacts NETC’s ability to leverage Fleet inputs to improve curricula. Although NETC recently revised its training effectiveness instruction, the revision did not substantially address this shortfall. We believe one possible explanation for low survey response rates may be that the surveys are voluntary, vice mandatory. OPNAVINST 5300.8C, Coordination and Control of Personnel Surveys, states, “all surveys of Navy Sailors, including those exempted from approval under this instruction, must ... be voluntary...”

While NETC has a process in place to leverage Fleet expertise in Human Performance Requirements Reviews (HPRRs), NETC has not been successful in engaging the Fleet for post-training assessments. We believe there may be untapped sources of metrics and data through which NETC could assess training effectiveness.

**Recommendation 6.** That NETC explore casualty report (CASREP) data, equipment fail rates, spare parts usage, tech assist frequency, and other metrics to unveil possible ties to Navy training.

USFF is designated as the executive agent for RRL; however, this does not mean NETC will be removed altogether. Both NETC and USFF serve as co-chairs of the RRL Executive Steering Committee, and both
will have a voice in assessing the effectiveness of BL and communicating that voice to the Fleet Commanders Review Council.

The quality of the physical training environment also plays a significant role in providing effective training. NETCINST 1540.1E, Impaired Training and Education Reporting Policy and Reporting Procedures, provides guidance on how to report training and education impairments regarding personnel, equipment, facilities, curricula, and ammunition. The Impaired Training and Education Report (ITER) is NETC’s rough equivalent to the Fleet’s CASREP. ITERs communicate training issues to NETC from each learning site through their applicable LC. The ITER describes the deficiency and how it impacts training completion.

The NETC ITER Program is tracked using the “Serena” database. The Serena tracking tool itself is outstanding and provides complete details on ITER initiation and status. NETCINST 1540.1E states there should be a response for every ITER transmitted; responding to ITERs is the responsibility of the Training Program Coordinator assigned to each LC. Even though an effective tracking mechanism exists, NETC does not effectively assign responsibility for ITER resolution. While NETCINST 1540.1E states the ITER should be resolved at the lowest level in the chain of command, we do not believe all ITERs are receiving proper attention (and resolution) by senior levels of the NETC staff. During our visit, we reviewed the Serena database and we observed several ITERs still open from FY11.

Curriculum Development and Review
NETC seeks and receives Fleet input into the development of new curricula through various processes, as codified in multiple NETC instructions and Naval Education and Training Manuals (NAVEDTRA). During our visit, NETC N7 Dam Neck staff self-reported that current curriculum development and revision only loosely follows NAVEDTRA 130B, Task Based Curriculum Development Manual Developers Guide, and NAVEDTRA 131B, Personnel Performance Profile Based Curriculum Development Manual Manager’s Guide processes. NETC N7 Dam Neck staff also self-reported that the implementation of RRL has taken time away from routine tasks, such as revising instructions and NAVEDTRAs. While we recognize the urgency of RRL efforts, we also recognize there are unintended consequences to written guidance becoming outdated. Developing curricula contrary to the governing instruction creates opportunities for confusion, misalignment, and waste of valuable resources.

NAVEDTRA 133, Human Performance Requirements Review Management Manual, outlines Navy’s management of HPRRs, and NETC N74 is assigned as the organization’s lead to monitor LC performance regarding HPRRs. Even though the requirements of NAVEDTRA 133 have been temporarily suspended due to RRL implementation, we observed the tracking of HPRR chits has been inconsistent across the NETC enterprise. NAVEDTRA 133 describes the use of a HPRR plan of actions and milestones (POA&M) to track HPRR chits to final adjudication and states that these can be found on the LC’s HPRR Community of Practice page on the Navy Knowledge Online website. NETC N7 Dam Neck staff also self-reported that the implementation of RRL has taken time away from routine tasks, such as revising instructions and NAVEDTRAs. While we recognize the urgency of RRL efforts, we also recognize there are unintended consequences to written guidance becoming outdated. Developing curricula contrary to the governing instruction creates opportunities for confusion, misalignment, and waste of valuable resources.

The Serena database is relatively new and has potential for tracking all necessary training administration functions. LCs could benefit from a feedback tool to alert them on open HPRR action chits. While it is NETC’s responsibility to ensure the LC and other subordinate commands abide by current guidance, we
believe NETC could reduce the length of time to institute changes in course material by establishing a feedback process from NETC to LCs by inquiring into the specific status of HPRR action chits.

As required by NAVETRA 133A, Training Requirements Review Management Manual, NETC N7 Dam Neck has a process in place to revise learning content, typically due to a triggering event or a change in practice. Additionally, NETC has other mechanisms in use to measure training effectiveness, as required by NAVETRA 135C, Navy School Management Manual:

- Testing Program
- Instructor Evaluation Program
- Student Critique Program
- Training Quality Indicators Review
- Course Review Program requiring a Formal Course Review every 3 years
- NETC Training Feedback Program

Developing and reviewing course material for Fleet training is challenging. We observed it has been more difficult because of the increased workload demands of RRL implementation.

**Recommendation 7.** That NETC revise NAVETRA 133 to include the use of the Serena database to manage HPRRs.

**Recommendation 8.** That NETC develop a Serena feedback tool and revise NAVETRA 133 to alert applicable LCs on open HPRR action chits.

**Student Management**

The Corporate Enterprise Training Activity Resource System (CeTARS) is the authoritative repository for course information in the Navy. The data residing in CeTARS includes, but is not limited to, the course description, pre-requisites, skill awards, Course Master Schedule, training locations, and, if required, an Annual Class Schedule. The use of CeTARS is critical to the implementation and management of training, and it supports the production management operations of the Navy Total Force supply chain.

The NETC enterprise effectively uses CeTARS to manage scheduling, enrollment, and course completion for all formal courses. When a Sailor completes a formal course, CeTARS data is updated and this completion will update other databases to identify the Sailor has completed the course and provides the necessary skill awards to their training jacket. This is a good program and should be incorporated in more of the various databases that the Navy uses to track Sailors’ training and career education. While NETC and subordinate commands utilize CeTARS effectively, we believe there is room for improvement in utilizing the data to manage the Navy’s student supply chain.

Managing student throughput across the NETC enterprise (>30,000 students per year) is a complex endeavor. It is further compounded by the fact that although NETC is responsible for managing this supply chain, NETC does not control all of the factors necessary to make large-scale improvements. During our visit, we reviewed the previous 5 years’ worth of data regarding students “awaiting instruction” (AI) and students “awaiting transfer” (AT); in each of these statistics, lower is better. Essentially, the fewer number of students awaiting instruction or transfer equates to a more efficient process. The NETC student AT percentage showed slight improvement over the previous 5 years, dropping from an average of 8.5 percent of students to 6.3 percent of students from 2010 to 2015. We believe this data shows that the Navy has become more efficient at getting Sailors from the schoolhouse
to the Fleet. On the other hand, the AI data shows a worsening trend during the same 5-year period. Specifically, the percentage of NETC students awaiting instruction increased from an average of 13.7 percent in 2010, to an average of 17.9 percent in 2015. In 2015, the Navy was less efficient in getting students through their training pipeline than in 2010.

To address this challenging issue, the Navy created multiple cross-functional teams and invested in a commercial software program to help manage the supply chain; however, the data shows the issue has gotten worse. Greater efficiency in getting Sailors through the training pipeline equates to an increase in readiness in the Fleet. RRL will partially address this AI issue, but just how much is unknown. Of note, the 5-year trend in AI exists in all but one of NETC’s LCs, the CID, which has consistently reduced its AI percentage since 2010.

**Recommendation 9.** That NETC investigate unique CID actions and factors contributing to AI improvements, and consider applying lessons learned to the NETC enterprise.

**Staff Organization and Location**
The majority of the NETC staff are located at NETC HQ at NAS Pensacola; however, the NETC N7 staff is located at Dam Neck. The NETC organizational chart is indicated in Figure 3.

![NETC Staff Organization Chart](image)

*Figure 3. NETC Staff Organization Chart*

The NETC N7 Dam Neck team is a group of talented, dedicated professionals; but, throughout our inspection, we observed the geographic separation of NETC N7 Dam Neck created barriers to communication with HQ, productivity, and unity of effort. During our short visit to Virginia, we were unable to see evidence of NETC N7 Dam Neck personnel interacting with Fleet stakeholders. Instead, we found an organization that seems to be removed from the Fleet and Type Commanders. Barriers
exist between Pensacola and Dam Neck, and these “seams” become more pronounced during times of stress and/or change, precisely as the staff is experiencing now with the uncertainties of RRL implementation.

NETC’s mission is to train and educate the Fleet, so we recognize that proximity to a portion of the Fleet may be advantageous; however, when we look at the NETC organization holistically, we believe that due consideration should be given to consolidating the staff into one location.

**Recommendation 10.** That NETC consider consolidating NETC HQ and NETC N7 Dam Neck into a single location.

**Navy Enlisted Advancement System**

NETPDTTC is NETC’s subordinate command responsible for administering the Navy Enlisted Advancement System exam. The fundamental purpose of the rating exam is to provide an objective way to differentiate Sailors’ level of rating knowledge. This information is then combined with other factors to determine a final multiple, which aids in determining enlisted promotion. A secondary benefit of the process is that it incentivizes Sailors to increase their technical knowledge.

Each rating exam is generated with a combination of rating-specific technical questions and professional military education questions. NETPDTTC generates approximately 250,000 rating exams annually, and these exams are reviewed periodically to eliminate obsolescence, ensure accuracy, and balance focus across the rating. During our visit, we observed part of an Advancement Exam Rating Review, a weeklong review led by NETPDTTC staff and supplemented by approximately 10 senior enlisted personnel from the Fleet. We observed this process to be sound, and it should be continued for all ratings.

While Sailors complete the exams manually with pencils, the exams are graded by electronic scanning machines. Some additional aspects of the rating exam process are also now executed electronically. Specifically, the Enlisted Advancement Worksheet is now available online; NETC estimates this modernization effort will lead to $10.5M in savings over five years. Completed exams are also now scanned and stored digitally, to support issue resolution such as statistical outliers and fraud identification. NETPDTTC leadership has declined to move toward electronic testing, citing studies that showed switching to electronic testing would induce significant cost increases, security issues, and IT infrastructure requirements in the Fleet.

Because NETPDTTC is a high performing organization, we observed that NETC staff spends little time in oversight of this organization. While we do not question this leadership decision, we believe there may be untapped information residing within NETPDTTC that may be applied to NETC’s training effectiveness assessments.

**Recommendation 11.** That NETC utilize NETPDTTC advancement exam data as a possible tool to evaluate training effectiveness.

**Voluntary and Non-Traditional Education Programs**

OPNAVINST 5450.336C tasks NETC with executing responsibilities for DANTES by providing logistics, administration, and fiscal services. Deputy Secretary of Defense Memorandum dated 2 September 2015 directs the transfer of DANTES responsibility from the Office of the Secretary of the Navy to the Defense Human Resources Activity (DHRA). A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was subsequently signed on 30 December 2015, formalizing the transition of DANTES functions, funding, and personnel to DHRA.
from the Department of Navy. Realignment of personnel, resources, and funding will be effective at the beginning of FY18. By every measure, DANTES is fulfilling its mandate.

NETC is also tasked with administering the Navy’s Voluntary Education Program (VEP). VEP consists of the Advanced Education Voucher Program, Graduate Education Voucher Program, Tuition Assistance Program, Navy College Program for Afloat College Education, United Services Military Apprenticeship Program, Olmstead Scholarship Program, and several other officer programs to include Federal Executive Fellowships, International Military Colleges, NATO Defense College, Seminar XXI, and supporting naval officer students studying at foreign military institutions. Navy’s VEP also administers 45 Navy College offices worldwide.

NETC governance of the Navy VEP is outlined in NETCINST 1560.3, Navy Volunteer Education Programs, and we observed the program to be effective. However, the pre-decisional FY17 budget submission includes a reduction in funding from $137.8M (FY16) to $130.8M (FY17). To achieve this budget reduction, NETC is considering closing 20 Navy College offices. This action would eliminate 54 full-time equivalent (FTE) counselor positions, reassign 22 FTEs to stand-up a new Virtual Education Center initiative, and reassign 8 FTEs to serve as regional education advisors. This proposal constitutes a significant change from the face-to-face counseling being provided, a hallmark of the Navy VEP Program. Navy College office counselors have traditionally served as front-line advocates supporting the professional and personal development of Sailors, as well as representing Navy interests and supporting the effective use of limited funds.

Navy College offices also provide classrooms for colleges and universities supporting base populations, as well as hosting sites for Defense Language Aptitude Battery, Scholastic Aptitude Test, Graduate Record Examination, College Level Examination Program, Joint Military Professional Education, and other testing functions. NETC is evaluating alternatives for test support and assessing whether the potential closure of CONUS Navy College offices would result in non-compliance with DoDI 1322.25, Voluntary Education Programs, and Presidential Executive Order 13607, Establishing Principles of Excellence for Educational Institutions Serving Service Members, Veterans, Spouses, and Other Family Members.

Recommendation 12. That NETC consider alternatives before closing Navy College offices, as they provide a valuable resource to Fleet Sailors.

International Student Training
NETC assigns NETSAFA responsibility for international student training. Functionally, NETSAFA serves as the Navy’s Executive Agent for international education and training. In this capacity, it completes, coordinates, and oversees training plan development and execution; programs training; and executes quota control, student management, training bills and reimbursement, course costing, and disclosure coordination. Essentially, NETSAFA serves as a broker connecting students and courses while coordinating the transaction. NETSAFA coordinates with Department of State, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Combatant Commanders, OPNAV, SYSCOMs, and NIPO. NETSAFA also provides oversight on all aspects of the Security Assistance Training Program, including relationships with 152 countries and over 14,000 students in 500 courses annually. No deficiencies were noted.

Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Oversight
The Naval Service Training Command Officer Development Division (NSTC-OD) manages Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps (NROTC) and related officer development programs. The NROTC Program is
compliant with DoDI 1215.08, Senior Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) Programs. NSTC-OD oversees 63 NROTC units and unit consortiums at 77 host schools, including 89 cross-town institutions.

We observed NETC working closely with USFF to address potential NROTC security concerns following the Chattanooga active shooter incident. NETC and USFF ensured that all NROTC units reviewed and/or revised their individual Emergency Action Plans (EAPs) and conducted active shooter scenario tabletop exercises. These exercises involved other university/college security forces and local law enforcement representatives. All NROTC unit host colleges or universities have mass notification systems and mass warning procedures and processes in place.

The NROTC Program curriculum is congruent with the Officer Professional Core Competencies Manual (August 2015) which aligns NROTC and USNA curricula requirements for Naval Science and Officer Development. GMT requirements are completed at the unit during monthly drill periods and NROTC Midshipmen complete training cruises while on active duty each summer. We are concerned that NROTC Midshipmen may lack a functional understanding of the Navy Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program since host colleges or universities handle all investigative, legal, and victim support functions in the event of an incident during the school year.

**Recommendation 13.** That NETC ensure NROTC units provide SAPR training to NROTC Midshipmen prior to their embarkation on summer cruises.

**Strategic Planning**

On paper, NETC’s strategic planning process, depicted in Figure 4, is one of the best we have seen. In the past, it has been utilized to produce not only a strategic 10-year vision, but also an annual written product with actionable, integrated business plans. However, this process is currently suspended. While we recognize there are existing uncertainties associated with RRL, we observed the NETC workforce becoming increasingly frustrated with either fluid or non-existent policy. Many expressed they were uncomfortable “building the airplane while in flight.” The uncertainty comes at a time when the command can least afford inefficiencies; and, those furthest away from Pensacola expressed the most frustration.
Recommendation 14. That NETC recommence the strategic planning process at the earliest opportunity.

Continuity of Operations
NETC’s Continuity of Operations (COOP) plan is not fully compliant. Although the NETC COOP plan is thorough and executable, there is no evidence that NETC has exercised their COOP plan on an annual basis or published an after-action report, as required by OPNAVINST 3030.5B, Navy Continuity of Operations Program and Policy.

Deficiency 1. NETC does not exercise its COOP plan annually and publish lessons learned. Reference: OPNAVINST 3030.5B paragraph 7.a(1)(k).

Total Force Management
Without a Shore Manpower Requirements Determination (SMRD), it is difficult for the Navy to properly resource appropriate manpower to NETC requirements; additionally, it is difficult for the outside agencies to analyze the projected impact of MHA reductions accurately.

We concur with Commander, NETC’s risk assessment regarding MHA reductions, as outlined in Figure 5.
“Coupled with cuts taken in recent years, the 25% MHA cut severely impacts NETC’s ability to support the Fleet. The increased workload anticipated as NETC takes the lead in Sailor 2025 RRL exacerbates the problem of a smaller workforce. Loss of positions results in significant impact to work production resulting in reduced capacity to research and provide mitigations for systemic and emergent training production issues and overload of other positions resulting in noticeable product development delays. There will be delayed management actions, increased time to address fleet issues, and delays in the timeliness of projects such as revising governance, training assessments, and curriculum management. Lower quality responses and late responses are anticipated. The MHA cuts will severely impact our ability to meet OPNAV mandated requirements.”

Figure 5. Citation: NETC Command Brief, dated 12 January 2016

Deficiency 2. NETC has not conducted an SMRD, as required by OPNAVINST 1000.16L, Navy Total Force Management Policies and Procedures.

Civilian Human Resources

NETC's end-to-end recruitment time for new hiring actions is 177 days, far exceeding the Navy’s goal of 80 days. Additionally, NETC averages 61 days to complete a request for personnel action, exceeding the Navy’s goal of 25 days. Insufficient communication between NETC echelon 2 HR staff and OCHR Stennis is a significant contributing factor to these delays. OCHR Stennis expects NETC's HR staff to prioritize hiring actions and communicate those priorities; however, this communication has not been occurring.


NETCINST 5310.1B, HQ Staff Total Force Manpower Management Program, delineates an integrated strategy for attaining a total force structure toward meeting the NETC mission in the most effective, efficient, and economical manner possible. The instruction states that the Total Force Management Utilization Board (TFMUB) “will review all requests for military, civilian, and contractor resource requirements for the NETC HQ Staff.” NETC DCHR staff self-reported they do not follow these guidelines.

Recommendation 15. That NETC review and update NETCINST 12575.1A.

Recommendation 16. That NETC review the DON Major Commands Hiring Scorecard on a recurring basis and brief NETC leadership using metrics regarding hiring processes.

Recommendation 17. That NETC prioritize hiring actions and communicate those priorities to OCHR Stennis.

Recommendation 18. That NETC staff either follow NETCINST 5310.1B and utilize TFMUB, or revise the instruction accordingly.
Recommendation 19. That NETC review and update position descriptions to reflect changes in duties and actual work being performed.

Training

Civilian Training
SECNAVINST 12410.25, Civilian Employee Training and Career Development, and the DON Civilian Human Resources Manual task organizations with the responsibility of establishing and aligning civilian employees’ training and career development programs. Mandatory civilian training was not completed by all NETC civilian personnel, as required by SECNAVINST 12410.25 and OCHR guidelines. Mandatory civilian training completion percentages for FY14 and FY15 were 12 percent and 14 percent, respectively.

Deficiency 3. NETC civilian supervisors have not completed Merit System Principles Basics for Hiring Managers and Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act mandatory training, as required by Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) memorandums dated 26 December 2012 and 4 June 2014.

Military Training
FY14 and FY15 mandatory GMT was not completed by all military personnel. Fleet Training Management Planning System records indicated FY15 GMT completion rate was 72 percent.

Equal Employment Opportunity
NETC leadership demonstrates continued support for the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Program. FY15 policy statements were properly communicated and disseminated to all employees, managers, and supervisors throughout the NETC workforce; and the policy statements are posted on NETC bulletin boards throughout the command. The NETC EEO Officer has direct access to the Commander, and holds periodic meetings.

NETC processed eight informal EEO complaints and six formal EEO complaints in 2015. The most common bases for complaints were reprisal, sexual discrimination (female), age, and disability. Examples include allegations of harassment (non-sexual), unwarranted disciplinary actions to include terminations, promotion/non-selection, reasonable accommodation, and terms and conditions of employment. These issues were similar to those of FY14. All complaints were processed within regulatory timeframes. In FY15, there were eight Alternate Dispute Resolutions (ADRs) requested and four were resolved using the DON ADR Center of Excellence. In an effort to ensure investigations were completed within 180 days, NETC obtained contract investigators. All investigations were completed within the required 180-day period.

NETC processed 24 reasonable accommodation requests in 2015 in an average of 73 days, which exceeds the DON completion requirement of 30 days.
FACILITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY CONSERVATION, AND SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Facilities Management

Training and Education Infrastructure
The NETC N4 team is effectively capturing, consolidating, and ranking the wide array of Manpower, Personnel, Training, and Education infrastructure requirements. With input and feedback from the warfare enterprises and systems commands, this process ensures transparency and clear definition of need as the Region Mission Integration Groups and Shore Mission Integration Group make difficult decisions regarding military construction and Special Project programming in a very resource-constrained environment.

NETC Headquarters Building Management
At NETC HQ, employees utilize an intranet web-enabled trouble ticket capability, augmented by a traditional telephonic trouble desk to report facility issues. Several respondents to the Pre-Event Survey indicated concerns with roofs; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; and mildew. A NAVFAC Southeast roofing expert had evaluated building 628 in mid-January 2016 and was developing a prioritized list of repair projects to correct noted deficiencies. The NETC N4 and Building Manager have fostered strong relationships with NAS Pensacola Public Works Department (PWD) and base safety, and the roofing repairs are expected to be efficiently awarded with a delivery order from PWD’s roofing indefinite delivery indefinite quantity contract.

Repair and Maintenance of Training Device Support Equipment
As a training enterprise, NETC and its subordinates operate and maintain a large number of training devices (e.g. simulators), many of which include dedicated cooling and other support equipment. This equipment is defined as Class 3 property, and does not fall under the funding responsibility of Commander, Navy Installation Commands, who repairs and maintains other building systems, including electrical, heating, ventilation and cooling. Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Acquisition and Procurement) has laid out policy regarding construction work, which is limited to NAVFAC or those commands with specific construction contracting delegation authority when effecting repairs on equipment generally associated with building systems. When NETC Class 3 support equipment requires repair or maintenance, NETC generally routes requests to the local NAVFAC office for execution; however, at some locations, the available capacity in maintenance shops or multiple award contracts does not support the timely award of these critical repairs.

Environmental Readiness
Due to the nature of their operations focused on policy, education, and training, NETC HQ’s environmental program deals primarily with office-based activities, with limited hazardous materials, and is well managed. NETC does not use or have responsibility for petroleum storage or a Hazardous Waste accumulation area. Other environmental program responsibilities are handled by the host installation, NAS Pensacola and NAS Oceana-Dam Neck Annex.

High Risk Training

High Risk Training Policy and Reporting
NETCINST 5100.13B, NETC High-Risk Safety Training Program, requires the use of a residual Risk Assessment Code (RAC) when screening courses for inclusion into the HRT Program. This is contrary to OPNAVINST 1500.75C, Policy and Governance for Conducting High-Risk Training, which requires that
each course (e.g. Visit, Board, Search & Seizure, Rescue Swimmer, Fire Fighting, etc.) be assessed using an initial RAC to hedge against failed controls, and resultant harm to students, instructors, or equipment. By using residual risk, NETC may mask severity of risk and designate a course as non-HRT when instead it should be designated HRT in the event a control fails, is not met, or cannot be employed.

**Deficiency 4.** NETC High Risk Training safety policy does not align with Navy policy on the definition and identification of HRT. Reference: OPNAVINST 1500.75C, Enclosure 1, paragraph 14.a.

NETC HRT Policy requires that only Class A and B mishaps be reported in the Web-Enabled Safety System (WESS), though Navy instruction requires all reportable and recordable mishaps, including Class C and D mishaps, to be reported in WESS.

**Deficiency 5.** NETC HRT Safety Policy does not align with OPNAVINST 5102.1D or NETCINST 5100.1B CH-1, Naval Education and Training Command Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual, on the reporting requirements of Class C and D mishaps. References: OPNAVINST 5102.1D, Chapter 3, paragraph 3700.1; NETCINST 5100.1B CH-1, Enclosure 5, paragraph 3.b.2.

High Risk Training Oversight

NETC owns the curriculum for the course entitled “Navy Security Force Sentry.” This course is not included in the HRT Program, and does not receive oversight from NETC N7 Dam Neck. This course meets the definition of an HRT course due to a single event – weapons qualification – during the course of instruction. Since the student’s parent command already schedules and conducts proficiency gun shoots, the classification of this course as High Risk could be avoided if relevant weapons qualification was a prerequisite for the student to enroll in the course.

**Deficiency 6.** NETC course “Navy Security Force Sentry” is not covered under the NETC HRT Safety Program. References: OPNAVINST 1500.75, paragraph 5.b; NETCINST 1500.1B, paragraph 6.a.

**Recommendation 20.** That NETC change the curriculum of Navy Security Force Sentry to require weapons qualification as a prerequisite for the course.

Safety and Occupational Health

NETC is performing limited Safety and Occupational Health (SOH) oversight of their subordinate commands and was unable to demonstrate reviews of subordinate self-assessments; however, they provide their “top five” subordinate command roll up to the Naval Safety Center.

**Deficiency 7.** NETC is not reviewing self-assessments of subordinate commands. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, Navy Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual, paragraphs 0204.d and 0302.e.

NETCINST 5100.1B CH-1 states, “formal training courses require that we implement elements of the Navy’s SOH Programs in OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1 (i.e., personal protective equipment (PPE), hearing conservation, respiratory protection, lead compliance, electrical safety, and medical surveillance).” However, the NETC instruction subsequently refers to industrial hygiene (IH) surveys. An IH survey typically only lists health-specific aspects of occupational health programs, elements, and hazards. None of the physical hazards associated with fall, electrical safety, machine guarding, or PPE such as safety glasses, hard hats, or foot protection, are covered by IH surveys.
Deficiency 8. NETC 5100.1B CH-1 does not include all information required to identify SOH Program requirements properly. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraphs 0204.b and 0206; 29 CFR 1910 Sections 132, 133, 135, 136, 137, and 138.

Although some SOH elements are included in course curriculum reviews, there is no formal holistic safety review of curricula to ensure all safety elements comply with OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1. In addition, baseline safety risk assessments are not consistently conducted during the course pilot. Examples are the Electrician’s Mate and Paint courses. Not all risks posed to students have been thoroughly covered in these assessments. Basic PPE is included, but there are no physical hazards identified such as machine guarding and flammable materials/atmosphere.

Deficiency 9. NETC provides insufficient review of SOH Program elements for existing formal (non-HRT) courses. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraph 0206.e; NAVEDTRA 135C, Chapter 5.4.

Deficiency 10. NETCINST 5100.1B CH-1 does not contain guidance for curriculum development personnel to conduct required risk assessments. Reference: NAVEDTRA 136, NETC Integrated Learning Environment Course Development and Life-Cycle Maintenance, Chapter 5, Section 8 (Note).

Deficiency 11. Safety reviews of all courses do not include all required SOH-specific elements and programs, or guidance on which references should be used to verify all program elements have been satisfied. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraph 206.e; NAVEDTRA 135C, Appendix F.

Deficiency 12. NETCINST 5100.1B CH-1 does not have amplifying guidance to clarify what constitutes a reasonable element of risk needing safety review, or risk assessment guidance for all formal classes. Reference: NAVEDTRA 136, Chapter 5, Section 8 (Note).

Deficiency 13. Two courses involving security and vessel boarding, search and seizure are conducted in NETC-owned indoor firing ranges, but hazards involving toxic metals (dust and airborne) have not been included. Furthermore, the most recent high-risk safety training (HRST) evaluation did not identify that clean-up operations were missing from the IH survey, even though this is a checklist item for HRST inspections.

Deficiency 14. NETC formal class and HRT for SRF-BASIC/CIN A-830-0018 and NCB-VBSS TT/CIN A-830-0395 do not list any occupational health hazards on the risk assessment. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1 0204.a, 0204.b, and 0206.e.

Safety and Occupational Health Management Evaluations
Although NETC relies primarily on host installation safety departments for workplace inspections, there is limited oversight to ensure NETC workplaces are safe. NETC does not consistently conduct its own Safety and Occupational Health Management Evaluations (SOHMEs) site visits. Instead, NETC performs virtual SOHMEs, which cover primarily Enterprise Safety Application Management System (ESAMS)-related documentation and questions concerning respiratory and fall protection, but do not cover the common and core installation management safety functions as required. Only NETC sites delivering HRT courses are visited for follow-ups of virtual SOHMEs. As a result, workplace inspections are not conducted onsite, as required. NETC does not have SOH experts in fall protection, rappelling, electrical safety, and rifle range safety, which presents risk to personnel and quality of oversight.

Deficiency 15. NETC SOHME does not comply with requirements outlined by instruction. References: OPNAV5100.23G CH-1, paragraphs 0303 and 0901.
**Deficiency 16.** NETC does not conduct oversight of echelon 3 commands to ensure operations and working conditions are sufficient to protect NETC personnel. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraph 0901.b.

**Traffic Safety**
While NETC reports traffic safety mishaps into ESAMS, it does not report all mishaps in WESS as required. WESS is the mechanism designated by instruction to report motor vehicle mishaps, so this system must be used. All mishaps reported in ESAMS must be exported and confirmed in WESS, as required by OPNAVINST 5102.1D, Navy and Marine Corps Mishap and Safety Investigation, Reporting, and Record Keeping Manual.

**Deficiency 17.** NETC does not confirm that traffic safety mishap data reported in ESAMS is importing into WESS. References: OPNAVINST 5102.1D, Chapter 3, paragraph 3700.1; NETCINST 5100.1B CH-1, Enclosure 5, paragraph 3.b.2.

**Energy Conservation Program**
NETC’s Energy Conservation Program is not fully compliant. While the NETC Building Energy Monitor is appointed in writing and regularly attends NAS Pensacola Energy Conservation Working Group meetings, he does not conduct inspections using the checklist in the Navy Building Energy Monitor Guide.

**Deficiency 18.** NETC’s Building Energy Monitor is not performing required inspections. Reference: NASPCOLAINST 4100.2h, paragraph 2.
SECURITY PROGRAMS AND CYBERSECURITY/TECHNOLOGY

The Security Programs and Cybersecurity and Technology Team used survey and focus group responses, document review, and face-to-face interviews to assess the following areas:

- Information Security
- Personnel Security
- Industrial Security
- Physical Security and Antiterrorism/Force Protection
- Operations Security
- Counterintelligence Training and Support
- Cybersecurity
- Personally Identifiable Information
- Insider Threat

Command Security Overview

Overall, NETC security responsibilities are divided between four key personnel (three civilian, one military) who work in two separate directorates within NETC. NETC N7 Dam Neck and CID have points of contact with collateral duties supporting the security program. The Command Physical Security/Antiterrorism Officer (ATO) is a commissioned officer (Lieutenant) who works in N4 (Logistics); the Command Security Manager (CSM), and two subordinates, work in N1 (Administration). Of note, none of the civilian security personnel at NETC are classified as 0080 or 0086 occupational series.

NETC security personnel are responsible for Information, Personnel, Industrial, and Physical Security matters, including subordinate command oversight as delineated in SECNAV M-5510.36, Department of the Navy Information Security Program Manual, and SECNAV M-5510.30, Department of the Navy Personnel Security Program Manual.

NETC has one directive that constitutes the vast majority of the command’s security policies, NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C, Naval Education and Training Command Staff Information and Personnel Security Instruction. This instruction does not have all required elements of a command security instruction, as required by SECNAV M-5510.36 and SECNAV M-5510.30.

Examples of missing elements include chain of command relationships, applicable Security Service Agreements (SSAs), procedures for internal and subordinate security reviews/inspections, internal procedures for reporting and investigating the loss/compromise of classified material, and Industrial Security.

Many command processes related to security are not easy to locate or are not codified in formal instructions, which makes it difficult for NETC to enforce desired security behaviors by command personnel and visitors. Some examples of processes that fall into these categories include command check-in/checkout, Industrial Security, formal definition of command restricted areas, and review of information intended for public release.
Deficiency 19. The NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not meet the minimum required elements of a command security instruction. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A; SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C.

Deficiency 20. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not adequately delineate unique command security requirements. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 1.

Recommendation 21. That NETC update the command organization chart to show the CSM has direct access to the Commander, as required by SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 2-3, paragraph 2.

Information Security

The NETC Information Security Program is not fully compliant with governing directives. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not have all required information security elements of a command security instruction, as required by SECNAV M-5510.36 and SECNAV M-5510.30.

NETCSTAFFINST 3070.2A, Operations Security, requires enforcement of a 100 percent shred policy for the destruction of all office-generated paper; this policy applies to items generated by NETC personnel and those received from outside sources.

The NETC EAP is contained in NETCSTAFFINST 5500.1B, Naval Education and Training Command Headquarters Antiterrorism and Emergency Action Plans. Their EAP meets the minimum requirements of CNICINST 3440.17, Navy Installation Emergency Management Program Manual. The EAP also meets the minimum requirements for an emergency plan for the protection of classified information, which is required by SECNAV M-5510.36.

Deficiency 21. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not cite and append SSAs. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2d.

Deficiency 22. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not clearly establish procedures for the review of classified information prepared by the command, to include sources of security classification guidance commonly used. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2j.

Deficiency 23. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not describe procedures for internal and subordinate command reviews and inspections. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2e.

Deficiency 24. NETC does not have a written MOA or SSA with another command that performs security functions in support of their command or staff. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36 Section 2-10.

Deficiency 25. NETC does not ensure civilian personnel whose duties significantly involve the handling, creation, or management of classified information have those duties documented on performance evaluations. References: DoDM 5200.01, Volume 1, Enclosure 2, paragraph 7h; SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 2-2, paragraph 2k; SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2.1, paragraph 5h.

Deficiency 26. The CSM does not maintain liaison with the command’s Public Affairs Officer (PAO) and OPSEC Officer to ensure that proposed press releases and information intended for public release are subjected to a security review. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 5, paragraph 1a; OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5n(3); SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-2, paragraph 1h.

Deficiency 27. NETC is not maintaining records of annual security refresher training. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 4-8.
Deficiency 28. NETC echelon 3 subordinate commands have not provided security self-inspection results. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-11.

Deficiency 29. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C to align with destruction requirements stated in NETCSTAFFINST 3070.2A, Operations Security.

Personnel Security
The NETC Personnel Security Program is not fully compliant with SECNAV M-5510.30. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not contain all the required personnel security elements of a command security instruction, as required by SECNAV M-5510.30.

Deficiency 31. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not identify areas within the command authorized for general visiting, as well as areas that are off-limits to visitors. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(5).

Deficiency 32. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not formulate guidelines for foreign travel briefings and identify the individual responsible for the briefing/debriefing. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(6).

Deficiency 33. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not assign responsibilities for final preparation of investigation requests. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(8).

Deficiency 34. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not establish procedures for documenting clearance and command access in the Joint Personnel Authentication System (JPAS). Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(9).

Deficiency 35. NETC does not have an SSA or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place with the sponsoring commands on at least one classified contracts, to provide Information and Personnel Security support for contractors located on site. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-10; SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 2-11.

Recommendation 22. That NETC revise the classified material destruction procedures found in NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C to align with destruction requirements stated in NETCSTAFFINST 3070.2A, Operations Security.

Recommendation 23. That NETC update its command security instruction, NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C, to document current policy and procedures for revocation and retrieval of Common Access Cards (CAC) from departing contractors, foreign nationals and government civilians.

Recommendation 24. That NETC’s CSM and N1 review and correct civilian position descriptions for clearance and sensitivity determinations to include sensitivity designation letters.

Industrial Security
The NETC Industrial Security Program is not compliant with SECNAV M-5510.36.

NETC is required to have an industrial security policy in place, as stipulated in SECNAV M-5510.36, which states “Commanding Officers shall establish an industrial security program if their command engages in
classified procurement with U.S. industry, educational institutions or other cleared U.S. entities, both at the prime and sub-level, ... or when cleared DoD contractors operate within areas under their direct control. Command security procedures shall include appropriate guidance... to ensure that classified information released to industry is safeguarded.” Additionally, NETC does not provide industrial security oversight to lower echelon commands.

Deficiency 36. NETC does not have command-specific industrial security processes formally codified in an Industrial Security Program directive. NETCSTAFFINST 5510.1C does not meet the requirements for an industrial security instruction. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 11-1 and Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2k.

Deficiency 37. NETC does not assign CORs to classified contracts or apply contractual oversight to classified contracts. References: DoDI 5000.72, DoD Standards for Contractual Officer Representative (COR) Certification, paragraph 3c; SECNAV M-5510.36, Sections 2-6 and 11-1.

Deficiency 38. NETC’s Contract Security Classification Specifications (DD Form 254) do not include the requirement to include and support Counterintelligence awareness reporting and training on all classified contracts. Reference: DoDI 5240.06, Counterintelligence Awareness and Reporting (CIAR), paragraph 2c.

Deficiency 39. NETC does not have documentation to demonstrate appointed CORs, who process classified contracts, meet the standards for certification as a COR. Reference: DoDI 5000.72, paragraph 3c.

Physical Security and Antiterrorism/Force Protection
NETC’s Antiterrorism Force Protection (ATFP) Program is compliant with OPNAVINST F3300.53C, Navy Antiterrorism Program. NETC’s Physical Security Program is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 5530.14E (CH-2), Navy Physical Security and Law Enforcement Program.

NETC provides limited Physical Security/ATFP oversight of its lower echelon commands through the execution of AT Program Assessments. These reviews are conducted virtually; we recommend on-site assessments to yield the best results.

NETCSTAFFINST 5500.1B, Naval Education and Training Command Headquarters Antiterrorism and EAPs, requires revision to clarify command policies and correct several minor errors. Specific examples include the addition of a section to document the command’s Restricted Areas in building 628, and the addition of a section to document command’s process/procedure to provide oversight of lower echelon commands concerning ATFP and Physical Security.
The NETC HQ building has four rooms with Secret Internet Protocol Router Network to process classified information. These rooms meet the definition of a Level One Restricted Area, as defined in OPNAVINST 5530.14E (CH-2); and NTTP 3-07.2.3, Law Enforcement and Physical Security. Therefore, these rooms must be reported, controlled, and checked per OPNAVINST 5530.14E (CH-2).

NETC’s physical security and defense-in-depth relies heavily on their use of an automated Intrusion Detection System and electronic Access Control System. NETC uses locally issued badges for access control vice the CAC. The CAC is the standard DoD credential to be used by military, civilian, and contractor personnel to gain entry into spaces.

Deficiency 42. NETC has not designated its restricted areas in writing to the NAS Pensacola Commanding Officer. References: OPNAVINST 5530.14E (CH-2), Enclosure (1), Article 0210, paragraphs g(1) and g(6).

Deficiency 43. NETC has not appropriately posted its restricted areas. References: OPNAVINST 5530.14E (CH-2), Enclosure (1), Article 0210, paragraph g(6); NTTP 3-07.2.3, Appendix W, Section W.1.

Deficiency 44. NETC has not designated its restricted areas in writing to the NAS Pensacola Commanding Officer. References: OPNAVINST 5530.14E (CH-2), Enclosure (1), Article 0210, paragraphs g(1) and g(6).

Recommendation 25. That NETC update NECTSTAFFINST 5500.1B to include Physical Security and ATFP inspection/oversight provisions for both NETC HQ and lower echelon commands.

Recommendation 26. That NETC conduct onsite ATFP and Physical Security inspections of its subordinate commands vice virtual reviews.

Operations Security

The Operations Security (OPSEC) Program at NETC is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security, and DoDD 5205.02E, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program. NETC has a formal OPSEC Program under the supervision of a properly trained and qualified OPSEC Officer. NETC conducts required OPSEC training to assigned personnel, but does not conduct specialized training for personnel involved in public release of information. NETC has a current OPSEC instruction and Critical Information List (CIL) approved by the Commander. The CIL provides the NETC workforce, contractors and subordinate commands unclassified, but sensitive information that, if compromised, would endanger national security or security of DON personnel and families at Navy Installations. Despite observed compliance in many areas, we found that the OPSEC Program is not operationalized and requires implementation of the program across the NETC workforce.
NETC does not review contracts for OPSEC elements (as appropriate), or provide oversight of subordinate command OPSEC Programs, as required by OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security. NETC does not share the responsibility of reviewing intended public releases of information with the OPSEC program manager, the PAO, CSM, web administrators, and other officials as required by DoD 5205.02-M, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program Manual.

The current NETC CIL is general, but does cover the command's specific critical information. A more detailed and coordinated CIL would provide clearer guidance regarding the nature of information requiring protection. At a minimum, the CIL should account for all sensitive information that may be resident at HQ, to include subordinate command sensitive programs, critical infrastructure, and acquisition.

Deficiency 45. NETC OPSEC Officer has not conducted an annual assessment of the command's OPSEC Program. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5e.

Deficiency 46. NETC does not coordinate with other OPSEC Program Managers/Assistants at NAS Pensacola to implement OPSEC awareness, training, and assessments. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5i.

Deficiency 47. NETC does not ensure classified and unclassified contract requirements properly reflect OPSEC responsibilities. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 6, paragraphs 1a and 2c; OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5d.

Deficiency 49. The NETC CIL is not disseminated throughout the command so all personnel know what information is deemed critical by the Commander and requires protection. Reference: DoDM 5205.02-M, Appendix 1 to Enclosure 3, paragraph 2a(5).

Recommendation 28. That NETC modify their public release review process to include the OPSEC Officer, CSM, web administrators, PAO, and other officials designated by the Commander who also share responsibility for the release of information.

Recommendation 29. That NETC re-examine the CIL, using the OPSEC process in DoDM 5205.02-M, Appendix 1 to Enclosure 3, to ensure the command's critical information is captured at the necessary level of fidelity to meet its OPSEC requirements.

Recommendation 30. That NETC include the industrial security personnel into the command's OPSEC collaboration processes.

Recommendation 31. That NETC expand attendance of the OPSEC working group to include the CSM, PAO, Contracting Officer, CORs, and Legal Officer.

Counterintelligence Training and Support
NETC Counterintelligence (CI) training and support is not compliant with DoDD 5240.06, Counterintelligence Awareness and Reporting (CIAR). CI training to NETC personnel is provided by statements included in an orientation package provided to all new accessions via electronic media; this method of delivery is contrary to requirements found in DoDD 5240.06. Additionally, the current NETC
training material has not been reviewed by the local NCIS Field Office. NETC has not conducted required annual CI training in a number of years.

**Deficiency 50.** Commander, NETC did not provide CI awareness training to personnel within 30 days of initial assignment or employment to NETC, and every 12 months thereafter. References: DoDD 5240.06, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3a, 3b.

**Deficiency 51.** Commander, NETC did not ensure NCIS reviewed the command-generated CI training material. Reference: DoDD 5240.06, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3b(1).

**Deficiency 52.** NETC records for the completion of CI awareness training do not contain all the required elements. Reference: DoDD 5240.06, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3d.

**Deficiency 53.** NETC does not maintain CI awareness training records for five years. Reference: DoDD 5240.06, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3e.

**Cybersecurity**

The NETC Cybersecurity Program is compliant. NETC has a dedicated IT staff performing the Cybersecurity mission. All programs are well managed with superior oversight of subordinate echelon.

**Personally Identifiable Information**

The NETC Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Program is not fully compliant. The appointed PII coordinator is located at the Region Legal Service Office Southeast (RLSO SE) in Jacksonville, Florida, and is assigned to support NETC as the command’s Legal Officer. The PII coordinator’s permanent attachment to RLSO SE introduces complications to the execution of required PII duties, thereby limiting oversight at both NETC HQ and at subordinate commands. For example, the PII coordinator does not receive computer equipment and support from NETC; this precludes the PII coordinator from having direct access to NETC command share drives and internal portals.

The command does have a Privacy Act Team (PAT) designated in writing, but it is not functional. [b] [7](e)

**Deficiency 54.** NETC does not provide comprehensive oversight of the PII Program at lower echelon commands, to include staff assistance visits or program evaluations. Reference: SECNAVINST 5211.5E, paragraph 7h.

**Deficiency 55.** NETC does not have an effective PAT to identify ways to prevent inadvertent release of PII and to establish best business practices. Reference: SECNAVINST 5211.5E, paragraph 30a(2).

**Deficiency 56.** NETC does not maintain an auditable record of PII semi-annual spot checks for HQ and subordinate commands for the required 3 years. Reference: ALNAV 070/07, Department of the Navy (DON) Personally Identifiable Information (PII) Annual Training Policy, paragraph 1b.

**Deficiency 57.** [b] [7](e)
**Insider Threat**

We examined NETC’s compliance with the DON Insider Threat Program (ITP) per SECNAVINST 5510.37, DON Insider Threat Program. Since the Navy is still in the process of implementing the ITP, the items reported in this section constitute a high-level summary of our security findings at NETC.

Following a review of the command security programs reported in previous sections, we performed a horizontal examination of our findings to identify seams in day-to-day security practices. Personnel at NETC are generally aware of their surroundings and are knowledgeable of general security requirements.

We observed the following items of interest in day-to-day security during our inspection:

- Compliance with regulations: NETC lacks an Industrial Security Program. The purpose of an Industrial Security Program is to ensure industry complies with all government and Navy security regulations during the conduct of classified work. A properly running industrial security program provides necessary accountability and oversight to our industry partners in the execution of classified work.
- NETC’s OPSEC Program appears compliant on paper, but is not operationalized; it is ineffective in practice. A concerted command effort to educate, employ and enforce protective measures to safeguard the command’s unclassified but sensitive information is required.
- NETC is not conducting CI training at the required periodicities per DoDD 5240.06.
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT/COMPLIANCE PROGRAMS

The Resource Management/Compliance Programs Team assessed 21 programs and functions. Our findings reflect inputs from survey respondents, onsite focus group participants, document review, direct observation, and face-to-face personnel interviews.

The following programs and functions are considered to be well administered and in full compliance with applicable directives:

- Casualty Assistance Calls Officer
- Command Individual Augmentee Coordinator/Deployment Health Assessment
- Command Managed Equal Opportunity
- Comptroller/Financial/Contract Management
- Government Commercial Purchase Card
- Government Travel Charge Card
- Hazing Training and Compliance
- Inspector General Functions
- Managers' Internal Controls
- Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
- Physical Readiness Program
- Transition Assistance Management Program
- Voting Assistance Program

We observed that a significant lack of integration of NETC N7 Dam Neck with HQ staff in Pensacola was a common theme with several non-compliant programs. NETC N7 Dam Neck personnel have not been fully integrated into NETC administrative and personnel management programs such as SAPR, Suicide Prevention, and others. For example, with the suicide prevention coordinator located in Dam Neck, we noted that robust program elements were in place in Dam Neck; but those same program elements were not in place at HQ in Pensacola.

**Recommendation 32.** That NETC fully integrate NETC N7 Dam Neck staff into NETC administrative and personnel management programs.

The following programs were found to be not compliant:

**Individual Medical Readiness**

The Individual Medical Readiness (IMR) Program is not compliant with SECNAVINST 6120.3 CH-1, Individual Medical Readiness. There was no system in place for regular monitoring or reporting of service member IMR status to the NETC Commander, no process for timely completion of Periodic Health Assessments, and no tracking or oversight of subordinate echelon 3 medical readiness. During our inspection, we were able to assist the command IMR point of contact in re-establishing Medical Readiness Reporting System access and facilitate contact with the readiness coordinator at the branch medical clinic, but much work in this area remains.

**Deficiency 58.** Commander, NETC does not have an effective program to monitor and achieve IMR goals. Reference: DoDI 6025.19, Enclosure (2), paragraph 6b.
Deficiency 59. Commander, NETC is not briefed periodically on NETC’s IMR status to ensure required evaluations, assessments, and other medically related actions are accomplished to improve individual and overall unit readiness. References: DoDI 6025.19, Enclosure (2), paragraphs 4b and 6a.

Legal/Ethics Program
All military personnel in the legal office are embedded at NETC through billets that belong to RLSO SE. The Force Judge Advocate’s office handles all issues traditionally associated with an echelon 2 command, while the Office of General Counsel (OGC) attorneys handle fiscal, contracts, civilian personnel law, and some ethics matters. There is a highly collaborative relationship between the Force Judge Advocate’s office and the OGC attorneys and staff who work cooperatively to advise the Commander and enterprise. However, although OGC provides the command with civilian personnel law support, OGC counsel is not always notified by HR when issues involving civilian personnel law arise. This negatively affected NETC’s Ethics Program in the command’s failure to review “OGE Form 450: Confidential Financial Disclosure Report” (OGE 450) files in a timely manner and to conduct required annual ethics audit. Aside from these problems, the legal staff proactively looks for opportunities to provide ethics training to NETC staff and to provide one-on-one training for Flag and front office staff.

Deficiency 60. Commander, NETC did not conduct annual internal ethics audits for past two years. Reference: VCNO Ltr 5370 Ser N09/14U100501 of 6 January 2014; VCNO Memo 5370 Ser N09/15U10059 of 17 March 15.

Deficiency 61. NETC ethics counselors did not review OGE 450 files within 60 days. Reference: 5 CFR 2634.605, paragraph b.

Freedom of Information Act Program
The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program is not compliant with SECNAVINST 5720.42F, DON Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program. FOIA reports for 2013 and 2014, the command FOIA tracker, and a random sampling of FOIA files were reviewed. The case log revealed a backlog of 14 cases that failed to meet the mandated 20-day response time and one case that was over 500 days old. The FOIA administrator has not received training in 4 years.

Deficiency 62. Fourteen FOIA cases are past the filing deadlines. Reference: SECNAVINST 5720.42F, paragraph 11b.

Victim Witness Assistance Program
The Victim Witness Assistance Program (VWAP) is not compliant with OPNAVINST 5800.7A, Victim Witness Assistance Program (VWAP). A review of the NETC VWAP indicates it has been neglected and needs to be strengthened. OPNAVINST 5800.7A outlines VWAP responsibilities for echelon 2 commands that include ensuring administrative procedures and programs are implemented and maintained, regular inspections are conducted, ensuring subordinates actively support the program, and that the echelon 2 command supports the regional commander. Appointment letters for the Command’s Victim Witness Assistance Coordinator (VWAC) and those at subordinate commands were out of date. Information, points of contact, and subordinate command appointing letters were also out of date.

Deficiency 63. Commander, NETC is not conducting required echelon 2 oversight inspections of subordinate commands’ VWAP responsibilities. References: OPNAVINST 5800.7A, paragraph 8b, 8c, and 8d.

Personal Property Management
NETC is not compliant with DoD and DON personal property policies and procedures.
Defense Property Accountability System (DPAS) is the program of record and was identified as an area of concern in DON’s Risk and Opportunity Assessment for FY13. In 2013, Commander, NETC requested an audit to verify that the command had effective internal controls and oversight in place to ensure that personal property was accurately accounted for in DPAS. The audit was finalized in September 2014, and found that sufficient internal controls and oversight were not in place to ensure effective NETC Personal Property Management. Specifically, the Commander could not be assured that personal property managers (PPMs) maintained supporting financial documentation to verify acquisition date and total cost; used DPAS as the sole inventory management tracking system as required by NETCINST 7320.1A, Personal Property Policies and Procedures; removed and documented personal property assets from DPAS when assets were transferred-out, disposed, missing, or lost; had DPAS training and working accounts; and performed annual physical inventories as required by NETCINST 7320.1A. In addition, PPMs who were not located with their assets did not provide timely updates to reflect changes in property records. As a result, NETC did not have an accurate and current personal property inventory, which may have resulted in inaccurate financial statement reporting. Since the audit was finalized, only one item has been corrected.

The assigned PPM was not available for interview. The individuals interviewed could not provide evidence that the program was actively managed. There was no alternate manager assigned, no inventory plan, no training records available for review, and no formally established procedures for custodian turnover. When the Managers’ Internal Control PPM assessable unit was reviewed, there were indications that risks and deficiencies were not being accurately reported. NETCINST 7320.1A was last updated in February 2008, and the last physical inventory conducted was in October 2014.

**Deficiency 64.** NETC does not have an established procedure for personal property custodian turnover. Reference: SECNAVINST 7320.10A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 7d.

**Deficiency 65.** NETC has not developed proper PPM inventory plans. References: DoDI 5000.64, Enclosure (3), paragraph 11; SECNAVINST 7320.10A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 4b, and paragraph 7d.

**Deficiency 66.** NETC has no codified process to link acquisition and personal property management. References: DODI 5000.64, Enclosure (2), paragraph 2; DoD Regulation 7000.14-R Volume 4, Chapter 6, paragraph 060104; SECNAVINST 7320.10A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 2d and 7a.

**Records Management**

The Records Management Program is not compliant with SECNAVINST 5210.8E, DON Records Management Program. The Records Manager (RM) is also the CSM and his time is split between these duties. Most of his time is devoted to security instead of records management responsibilities, which may explain why the program is not compliant with the governing directive. Specifically, NETC does not have a required file plan, does not perform required self-assessments, does not have a process to inform senior leaders of their records management responsibilities during check-in/checkout, and does not have a functional vital records plan.

All commands are required to create a file plan, which incorporates categorization of all records with disposition schedules indicating how long each category of records should be retained. The RM was unable to provide this file plan. SECNAVINST 5210.8E requires RMs to conduct command self-assessments every three years. The Self-Assessment Checklists should be completed and sent to OPNAV/DNS-5 via the chain of command. NETC’s last self-assessment was completed 2 April 2015. There were no prior self-assessments to demonstrate compliance with the three-year requirement, and
review of the checklist provided revealed that despite answering the questions positively the functions were not actually completed. NETC has failed to establish safeguards against the removal or loss of records and make requirements and penalties known to agency officials and employees as required by US Code. Commands are required to brief incoming senior leaders of the importance of maintaining all their emails and citing policy restrictions on removal of material documents such as email. Additionally, commands are required to develop and maintain a checkout process for departing personnel and maintain a check-in/checkout log of all departing senior personnel. NETC has no such log. NETC provided a check-in/checkout record, but this record does not reflect the dates of check-in/checkout or initials or signature of departing personnel regarding counseling on record retention. Finally, every command is required to have a Vital Records plan incorporated in its COOP plan. NETC’s RM reported that the Vital Records plan is incorporated in the COOP plan, but it could not be verified during the inspection.

**Deficiency 67.** NETC does not have a file plan, has not demonstrated organization of command records, and has not conducted an annual inventory or triannual self-assessment. References: SECNAVINST 5210.8E, Enclosure (6), paragraphs 5 and 6.

**Deficiency 68.** NETC does not have a records check-in/checkout process for senior personnel. Reference: SECNAVINST 5210.8E, paragraph 5u.

**Deficiency 69.** NETC does not have a Vital Records plan. Reference: SECNAVINST 5210.8E, Enclosure (6), paragraph 6l.

**Sexual Assault Prevention and Response**

The SAPR Program is not compliant with governing directives. SAPR training is required for military, civilians, and for civilians who supervise service members by DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Sexual Assault Prevention and Response; and OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Navy Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program. This training has not been completed. Additionally, command indoctrination training is not conducted for newly reporting NETC staff. FY14 SAPR training was 30 percent for military, 81 percent for civilians, and zero for civilian supervisors of military. FY15 SAPR training compliance ranged from 51 percent for military service members, 36 percent for civilians, to zero for civilian supervisors of military. Bystander intervention training compliance was 92 percent for military members. NAVINSGEN observed that NETC HQ in Pensacola did not complete or document the required SAPR training as required. Of note nearly all of the documented and required SAPR training for NETC was completed by NETC N7 Dam Neck.

NETC has not conducted formal watchstander training for personnel who stand Front Desk watch to ensure proper response to reports of sexual assault (SA) per DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, SECNAVINST 1752.4B, and OPNAVINST 1752.1C. Watchstanders receive the same SAPR GMT and regularly scheduled SAPR training. While this general training may introduce them to resources such as the SAPR intranet page, watchstanders do not receive specific training in responding to incoming reports of SA and direct referral of SA victims to a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC) or SAPR Victim Advocates (VA). Response protocols and prepared SAPR checklists should be placed in a watchstander binder to aid watchstanders. We recommend personnel complete this training prior to being assigned to the watchbill to ensure watchstander ability to respond to reports of SA properly. During our visit, 16 of 18 (89 percent) of staff duty officer watchstanders and the three (100 percent) front desk staff received watchstander training from the NAS Pensacola SARC and NETC point of contact. Commanders or Commanding Officers (CO) have specific responsibilities in SA victim response and care, such as attendance at Sexual Assault Case Management Group meetings. If authority to act as
Commander is going to be delegated - for instance to the Chief of Staff (as CO of enlisted troops) for enlisted victims - this should be established in writing and communicated to personnel throughout the command in accordance with SECNAVINST 1752.4B and DoDI 6495.02 CH-2. Commander, NETC had not been briefed by the SARC or Staff Judge Advocate (SJA), as required by DoDI 6495.02 CH-2 and SECNAVINST 1752.4B. Commander, NETC and the Chief of Staff received the SARC and Military Rule of Evidence 514 privilege briefs during our visit.

Individuals with key roles in the SAPR Program were not appointed in writing, formally trained, or certified prior to assuming their assigned roles as required by DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, SECNAVINST 1752.4B, and OPNAVINST 1752.1C. One SAPR VA was appointed in writing and advertised as a SAPR VA in the command newsletter and supported GMT training, but was not Department of Defense Sexual Assault Advocate Certified (D-SAACP). This SAPR VA attended training in December 2015 and has a D-SAACP application pending at the National Organization of Victim Assistance (NOVA) as of 11/4/2015. A second SAPR VA was not appointed in writing, however, is trained and D-SAACP certified. The command does not have the required number of unit VAs as required by DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, SECNAVINST 1752.4B, and OPNAVINST 1752.1C. There were no reports of SA at NETC HQ for over three years, and there is no evidence that NETC incorrectly handled any SA cases as a result of the noted administrative discrepancies.

Commander, NETC did not conduct the one time required review of the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) of all permanently assigned and newly transferred personnel to determine if any service member has any documented field code 91 (FC 91) entries, as required by NAVADMIN 025/15, Updated Guidance for the Inclusion and Command Review of Information on Sex-Related Offenses in Personnel Service Records. Commanders, COs, and officers in charge are required to review all documents in FC 91 for all newly reporting personnel within 30 days of checking aboard, in accordance with OPNAVINST 1752.1C. NETC completed a review of all staff records during our visit and incorporated the OMPF screening for all newly reporting personnel as part of the check-in process.

The SAPR point of contact has primary responsibilities as PAO. It may be appropriate for the position be held by an individual with fewer competing requirements to ensure full programmatic compliance with directives.

**Deficiency 70.** NETC did not conduct formal SAPR training required for military, civilians, and for civilians who supervise service members. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (10), paragraph 1b, 2, 3e, and f; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (3), paragraph 2d and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2b; and OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 22f, Appendix 2B (page 2B-3), and Chapter 10.

**Deficiency 71.** NETC did not conduct formal watchstander training for Staff Duty Officers and Quarterdeck staff, to ensure proper response protocols are in place to respond to reports of SA. References: DoDI 6490.01 CH-2, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3a and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2d; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (3), paragraph 2c (1), Enclosure (5), paragraph 3a, and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2d.

**Deficiency 72.** Commander, NETC did not properly delegate authority to act as the Commander regarding SA victim response and care. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (9); SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (9).

**Deficiency 73.** Commander, NETC did not receive the required SARC briefing within 30 days of assuming command. References: DoDI 6495.02 Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; DoDI 6495.02 CH-2,
Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15a, and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1).

**Deficiency 74.** Commander, NETC did not receive the required MRE 514 privilege brief from the SJA. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15b, and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1).

**Deficiency 75.** Commander, NETC did not designate a minimum of two fully trained and DSAAC-P certified VAs from within the command to ensure a sufficient number of trained and certified unit SAPR VAs are designated for 24/7 response. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (6), paragraphs 1g and 1g(17)(a); SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (6), paragraphs 1g and 1g(17)(a); OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15l, and Appendix 2B (page 2B-2).

**Deficiency 76.** Commander, NETC did not conduct the required one-time mandatory review of each service member’s OPMF by 3 April 2015 for notation of sex-related offenses. Reference: NAVADMIN 025/15 January 2015.

**Deficiency 77.** Commander, NETC did not conduct a command review of all NAVPERS 1070/887 or FC 91 documents in OPMF for permanently assigned personnel. References: OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15ab, and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1).

**Recommendation 33.** That NETC establish command indoctrination for all newly reporting staff and incorporate SAPR.

**Recommendation 34.** That NETC add the SAPR point of contact or VA to the command check-in sheet for newly reporting staff.

**Recommendation 35.** That SAPR Program material be placed in frequented areas or command spaces in the command.

**Suicide Prevention**

The Suicide Prevention Program is not compliant with OPNAVINST 1720.4A, Suicide Prevention Program. Management of the NETC Suicide Prevention Program lapsed for several months, but has been rejuvenated with the appointment of a new Suicide Prevention Coordinator in late FY15.

There was no evidence of Suicide Prevention training completion in FY14 for military, civilians, and full-time contractors. FY15 training compliance was 91 percent for military, 5 percent for civilian staff, and zero for full-time contractors. FY16 training for military is 15 percent. FY16 required Suicide Prevention training for civilians and full-time contractor personnel has not been conducted. Additionally, command indoctrination training has not been completed for newly reporting NETC staff. NAVINSGEN observed that NETC HQ Pensacola did not complete or document the required Suicide Prevention training. Of note, nearly all of the documented and required Suicide Prevention training for NETC was completed by NETC N7 Dam Neck.

Staff Duty Officers (SDO) and Quarterdeck “Front Desk” staff are not formally trained in how to respond to suicide-related behavior calls to ensure proper response to reports of suicide related behavior, as required by OPNAVINST 1720.4A. Watchstanders receive suicide prevention GMT and regularly scheduled Suicide Prevention training. While this general training may introduce them to resources such as the Suicide Prevention intranet page, watchstanders do not receive specific training in responding to incoming reports of suicide related calls to provide a rapid response. Focused watchstander training would ensure readiness to respond appropriately in the event of a suicide related behavior call. Response protocols are placed in the SDO watchstander binder to aid watchstanders,
however, there are no response protocols at the Quarterdeck. Suicide Prevention training should be added to the watchstander Personnel Qualification Standards and personnel complete this training prior to being assigned to the watchbill or Quarterdeck.

**Deficiency 78.** NETC did not complete required Suicide Prevention training for military, civilians, and full-time contractors. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5a (1), 6h (3), Enclosure (3), paragraph 1.

**Deficiency 79.** NETC did not conduct required watchstander and Duty Officer training to ensure proper crisis response protocols are in place for suicide-related behavior calls. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A paragraphs 5b(1), 5c, Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 10 and 11.

**Deficiency 80.** NETC has not regularly published messages to provide Suicide Prevention guidance and information, and has not incorporated Suicide Prevention as a part of life skills and health promotion training. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraphs 5a (2, 3) and 6h (4), and Enclosure (3), paragraph 2.

**Deficiency 81.** Commander, NETC did not publish a written Suicide Prevention and Crisis Intervention plans and a Safety plan that incorporates identification, referral, and access to treatment and follow-up procedures for personnel who indicate a heightened risk of suicide. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5b(1), and Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 6, 9, and 11.

**Deficiency 82.** Commander, NETC did not appoint in writing the Suicide Prevention Coordinator (SPC) and Assistant SPC. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraphs 5e, and 6h(2).

**Recommendation 36.** That NETC publish a Suicide Prevention instruction to ensure compliance with requirements described in OPNAVINST 1720.4A.

**Recommendation 37.** That NETC incorporate Suicide Prevention training in command indoctrination.

**Recommendation 38.** That NETC add the SPC to the command check-in sheet for newly reporting staff.

**Recommendation 39.** That the SPC be located at NETC HQ in Pensacola.

**Recommendation 40.** That the SPC be listed as Key Personnel in the NETC newsletter and on the command homepage.

**Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Program**

The NADAP Program is not compliant with OPNAVINST 5350.4D, Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention. NETC has attempted to mitigate this by establishing an MOU with NAS Pensacola to be included in their larger Urinalysis Program; however, this MOU was only recently established in January 2016. Prior to January 2016, there is no documentation that demonstrates compliance with Urinalysis Program requirements. NAS Pensacola’s Urinalysis Program coordinator can assist with program logistics, but an MOU does not relieve the command of its responsibility to oversee program requirements and execute functions that only the command can fulfill.

**Deficiency 83.** NETC does not conduct a Urinalysis Program that includes a minimum of monthly testing, unit sweeps, random testing, and yearly testing for all personnel. Reference: OPNAVINST 5350.4D, Enclosure (2), paragraph 2.
Navy-Wide NETC Responsibilities

Sexual Assault Prevention
NETC is assigned specific Navy-wide SAPR Program responsibilities per OPNAVINST 1752.1C. These responsibilities include ensuring that sexual assault prevention training and education strategy and program support the Navy’s overall SAPR Program; developing and accessing awareness, bystander intervention, and sexual assault prevention training; developing and ensuring leadership SAPR training is tailored to supervisory responsibilities; and informing stakeholders and driving policy, training, and resourcing improvements. We found that NETC is meeting all of its requirements.

Suicide Prevention
OPNAVINST 1720.4A assigns specific Navy-wide responsibilities to NETC for Suicide Prevention. These responsibilities include providing GMT and similar annual training, training for both officer and enlisted basic accession points and leadership courses, and rate specific training for hospital corpsmen, religious program specialists, and masters-at-arms. NETC is meeting the requirements as identified in governing directives, with exceptions identified in this report.

Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
NETC is tasked with the following specific Navy-wide responsibilities per OPNAVINST 5350.4D: providing education programs in alcohol and drug abuse prevention to officers and enlisted personnel in the accession and training programs; providing alcohol and drug abuse education and prevention curricula to all Navy personnel and in GMT; conducting the random Urinalysis Program for all Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Midshipmen; and providing OPNAV (N135) quarterly data on all drug and alcohol prevention education and training conducted. During our inspection, NETC was able to demonstrate that NETC N7 Dam Neck and NETC’s subordinate commands are fulfilling these requirements.

Physical Readiness Program
NETC is tasked with specific Navy-wide responsibilities outlined in OPNAVINST 6110.1J, including: developing and maintaining training courses for Command Fitness Leaders; conducting physical fitness assessments on all members attending school greater than 10 weeks in duration; ensuring all recruits meet or exceed physical readiness standards by completion of recruit training; and establishing a physical fitness program at all schools, regardless of duration. We found that NETC is fulfilling all of their responsibilities as outlined in the governing instruction.
SAILOR PROGRAMS
The NAVINSGEN Command Master Chief engaged various leadership groups, both junior and senior. Separate meetings were held with key program managers to get a sense of the career management programs throughout the command. Brilliant on the Basics programs were reviewed and behavior associated with good order and discipline was closely observed. Overall, command morale and perceptions of quality of life (QOL) were noted to be average. Enlisted Sailors displayed proper military bearing and maintained a professional appearance.

Command Sponsorship Program
The Command Sponsorship Program is in compliance with OPNAVINST 1740.3C, Command Sponsor and Indoctrination Programs. The command has a designated coordinator responsible for assigning sponsors to inbound military members. The Sponsor Coordinator has a system in place to ensure Sailors complete required Fleet and Family Support Center training before they are assigned Sponsorship duties, and maintains certificates of completion. The administrative team does a good job of tracking the orders, assigning the Sponsor, and sending hardcopy Welcome Aboard Packages.

Recommendation 41. That NETC update the Welcome Aboard Package delivery mechanism by creating an electronic version of the packages and a link on the command web page.

Command Indoctrination Program
The Command Indoctrination Program is not compliant with OPNAVINST 1740.3C. A check-in sheet is used in place of command indoctrination, however, none of the mandatory training items listed in the instruction are included on the check-in sheet, to include Navy Pride and Professionalism.

Deficiency 84. NETC does not have an effective Command Indoctrination Program. Reference: OPNAVINST 1740.3C, Enclosure 2, Appendix 2.

Recommendation 42. That NETC update new personnel check-in sheet to include required points of contact for the mandatory training topics listed in OPNAVINST 1740.3C.

Career Development Board
The NETC Career Development Board Program is compliant with OPNAVINST 1040.11D, Navy Enlisted Retention and Career Development Board. The oversight of echelon 3 commands is thorough. The Command Career Counselor is familiar with the requirements, and provides advice and training to subordinate commands.

Sailor Recognition Programs
The Sailor Recognition Program is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 1700.10M, Sailor of the Year Program. NETC’s instruction requires updating due to the FY16 incorporation of the Center for Personal and Professional Development into NETC N7 Dam Neck. The enterprise Sailor of the Year Program is compliant and feeds directly into the Shore Sailor of the Year Program.

Deficiency 85. The Sailor Recognition Program is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 1700.10M.

CPO 365
The Chief Petty Officer’s Mess is actively engaged in CPO 365. The Force Master Chief provides oversight and supplemental guidance to the enterprise, supporting Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy (MCPON) Guidance. Leadership training is a priority, and the program is in line with the MCPON’s vision for leadership training throughout the enlisted ranks.
APPENDIX A: Summary of Key Survey Results

PRE-EVENT SURVEY
In support of the Commander, NETC Command Inspection held from 25 January to 5 February 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted an anonymous online survey of active duty military and DON civilian personnel from 2 December to 8 January 2016. The survey produced 172 respondents (46 military, 126 civilian). According to reported demographics, the sample represented the NETC workforce with a 3.5 percent margin of error at the 99 percent confidence level. Selected topics are summarized in the sections below. A frequency report is provided in Appendix C.

Quality of Life
QOL was assessed using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is worst and 10 is best. The overall NETC average QOWL, 6.92, was slightly higher than the historical echelon 2 average, 6.71 (Figure A-1). The overall NETC average QOHL, 9.02, was higher than historical echelon 2 average, 8.05 (Figure A-2).

Figure A-1. Distribution of QOWL from the pre-event survey. The x-axis lists the rating scale and the y-axis represents the number of survey respondents. Response percentages for ratings are shown at the base of each bar. Counts for each rating are shown above each bar. The most frequent rating is shown in blue.
Figure A-2. Distribution of QOHL ratings from the pre-event survey. The x-axis lists the rating scale and the y-axis represents the number of survey respondents. Response percentages for ratings are shown at the base of each bar. Counts for each rating are shown above each bar. The most frequent rating is shown in blue.

The perceived impact of factors on the QOWL rating is summarized in Table A-1. Factors of potential concern were identified by distributional analyses, where 20 percent negative responses served as a baseline. Three factors listed in Table A-1 were significantly higher overall than this baseline. Civilian respondents more often identified advancement opportunities, command climate, and quality of workplace facilities as negative impacts on QOWL than military respondents (see highlighted percentages in the “Military” and “Civilian” columns of Table A-1). Both military and civilian respondents identified training opportunities as a negative impact on QOWL.

Table A-1. Negative Impacts on Quality of Work Life Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work hours/schedule</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Perceived impact of assessed factors on QOWL rating based on negative versus aggregate positive and neutral response. Low percentages are "better." Overall values in bold are significantly different than a 20% baseline; higher values in bold indicate significant differences between subgroups.
Although “Leadership Support” overall may not have been significantly higher than the baseline, the follow-on question asked those respondents who reported a negative to elaborate on their response. The dominant themes expressed were a general lack of guidance, communication up and down the chain of command, and the desire for a clear vision provided by their leadership. Examples of participant’s comments include: “Leadership will not engage and provide clear direction.” “My supervisor rarely speaks to me.” “Manifest the vison. Goals are too ethereal and unrealistic.”

The “Awards and Recognition” factor also included a follow-up question for those who reported a negative impact. The main themes included favoritism, equity of awards, and focus of the program is on the military. The theme for focus on the military was best summed by this comment; “When civilians retire or transfer, the typical award is a letter of commendation or appreciation from the 2-star.”

The command Equal Opportunity (EO) Program had a follow-up question for those who reported a negative impact as well. The main theme focused on hiring processes. Participants commented that it is NETC’s practice to not promote from within the organization. This comment best sums up the responses; “Some managers put the word out to their branch that current employees should not apply for a position that would be a promotion, because that manager will not hire from within.” Additionally and related to EO, participants were asked about Command Climate resolutions. Those who reported a negative impact were asked to expand on their response. The general theme of participants’ comments was that NETC does not address the difficult issues. Some examples of comments include: “Very little is done to address command climate issues.” “Issues are not resolved; they are minimized or told they are forming focus groups to develop an action plan. The plan is never discussed or promulgated.”

The last question on the survey asks participants to submit comments about other impacts on their QOL. The single most mentioned impact concerned the hiring process. Here are a few comments of note: “Civilian personnel hiring process takes too long.” “Still can’t figure out what HRO does in support of the staff.” “The recruiting process for civilians is pathetic.”

Overall, participants had a very positive response to all the QOHL. 

**Mission Tools and Resources**

Table A-2 lists aggregate strongly disagree and disagree response percentages to survey questions probing the adequacy of tools and resources that support the mission. Items of potential concern were identified by distributional analyses, where 20 percent negative responses served as a baseline. Though there are factors that were above the 20 percent baseline, they were not statistically significant. There were two areas where the inadequacies approached a significant percentage of respondents in resources; people (26 percent) and training (27 percent). Again, no percentages listed in Table A-2 were significantly different than the 20 percent baseline.
Table A-2. Tools and Resources to Accomplish the Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspace</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; supplies</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Aggregate strongly disagree and disagree (Inadequate) response percentages to perceptions on the adequacy of mission tools and resources. Smaller percentages are “better.” There were no statistically significant factors.

Job Importance and Workplace Behaviors

Table A-3 shows other items that respondents reported were impacts to QOWL. Most notable were a significant percentage of respondents that reported they perceived significant impacts related to HR. The top three impacts concerned HR. This is also represented in the comment section at the end of the survey as noted above.

Table A-3. Other Items That Respondents Reported Significantly Impacts QOWL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DON civ recruitment process is responsive</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>SD+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRSC provides timely, accurate responses</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>SD+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local HRO provides timely, accurate responses</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>SD+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication down the COC is effective</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>SD+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism is occurring at my command</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>SA-A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Response type: SD+D indicate the degree respondents Strongly Disagreed or Disagreed with a statement. Smaller percentages are “better.” All the above were significantly different from 20% baseline.
Appendix B: Summary of Focus Group Perceptions

On 20 January and 1 February 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted focus groups with various active duty military (8) and civilian personnel (41) for a total of 49 participants. Each focus group was scheduled for 60 minutes and included one facilitator and two note takers. The facilitator followed a protocol script: (a) NAVINSGEN personnel introductions, (b) brief introduction to the NAVINSGEN mission, (c) privacy, non-attribution, and basic ground rules statements, (d) participant-derived list of topics having the most impact on the mission, job performance, or QOL, and (e) subsequent discussion of participant-derived topics with an emphasis on refinement and understanding of perceived impact. Focus group participants were asked to characterize as major, moderate or minor the impact on the mission, job performance, and/or QOL for each topic using a standardized Impact Matrix shown in Matrix B-1. Note takers transcribed focus group proceedings, which were subsequently coded by the NAVINSGEN staff to protect the confidentiality of participants.

Matrix B-1. Command Inspection Impact Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Negative | - Severe negative impact on command climate or quality of life  
- Unable to accomplish a mission or task  
- Accepted substantial risk to accomplish an assigned mission or task  
- Deferred key mission readiness tasks  
- Clearly violates law or regulation (e.g., Title 10, U.S.C, 32 CFR) or Navy policy | - Negatively impacts the mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major Impact requirements | - General distractor that does not meet the Moderate impact standard |
| Positive | - Outstanding aspect of command climate or quality of life | - Positively impacts mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major Impact requirements | - General positive effect that does not meet the Moderate impact standard |

Table B-1 lists focus group topics that were expressed as a major impact on the mission, job performance, or QOL in at least two groups. The overall tone of the focus groups was positive.
Table B-1. Participant-Derived Focus Group Topics Expressed as a Major Impact on the Mission, Job Performance, or QOL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning/Manpower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Knowledge &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/Corporate Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Descending order of the number of focus group/interview topics that were expressed as a major impact on the mission, job performance, and/or quality of life in at least three military or civilian groups; colored arrows indicate active duty military () or civilian (). An arrow pointing up indicates a positive impact. An arrow pointing down is a negative impact.

**Leadership**

Leadership was the most mentioned topic impacting the QOWL. Comments from participants indicated both positive and negative impact on QOWL. There were differences noted between NETC HQ Pensacola and NETC N7 Dam Neck. Sailor 2025 was a major contributing factor in these differences. Participant comments from NETC HQ Pensacola were all positive. Comments included: “is awesome!” “Never seen him upset in any fashion, but he holds you accountable and lets his captains do their job.” “They do not know me” (Referring to both and leadership). “If leaders are not familiar with their employees, how do they tap into the right talent?” “I would like to see non-performers held accountable.” Looking for leadership guidance on Sailor 2025.” “No strategic plan for 2025.” “We are disconnected.” “We are marching to different drums.” “Geography has been and is a factor.”

**Manning/Manpower, Humans Resources, Hiring Process, and Workload**

Manning/manpower, HR, hiring process, and workload are four related concerns participants often discussed together. The primary focus of the concerns of the participants is influenced by the MHA reduction. Comments concerning manning included “…there are too few people to get the job done.” “Navy is taking away jobs, but not reducing mission requirements.” “People are working off the clock to get things done because of their dedication and passion for the job.” “Work and the mission is still being done, we just have fewer people.” “Position descriptions are not being expanded to cover the new work they are doing.” The MHA “cuts doesn’t help morale, people will not leave, but, there may higher incidences of sick leave as a result of the higher stress.” Discussions regarding personnel cuts often led to discussion about Human Resource support (HR). HR is “making mistakes in the processing of within grade increases” and “retirement packages.” “…a backlog at Stennis – expect 120 days (to hire) – should be 90.” “Customer service is non-existent – they send you to a website.” “When you submit something to them (HR), there is no follow-up or updates provided. The individual is responsible for checking back on the status of submissions.”
Participant comments concerning workload also focused on the requirement of “Audit Ready.” Specifically, “Audit ready is a big workload driver.” “Contractors don’t know the system we use for audit ready.” Also, Sailor 2025 is driving impacts on workload. “Sailor 2025 is contributing to the high workload.” “Things are sliding right.” “Sailor 2025 is directly impacting the workload.”

**Professional Knowledge and Development**
Participants’ discussions centered around two distinct areas. The first area of concern was professional development. Participants commented on the lack of training for professional development. This is best summed up with the following comments: “No training or professional development which results in no upward mobility.” “You expect to grow so you can promote, but nothing is offered.” “Submit a training request and they will say there is no money.” “IDPs are perceived as a dream sheet.” Some participants indicated that they were unaware of IDPs.

The second area discussed was mandatory certification for audit ready. Most participants indicated they felt it is a waste their time. They commented on the 80 hours of required training in two years to be excessive. Additionally, they thought that there was no flexibility in the timeline given the high workload and fewer people to get the job done.

**Internet/Corporate Tools**
Participants discussed their issues with Navy Marine Corps Intranet and computer hardware. Most comments concerned slow connectivity and computer often not responding to user input. Submitting tickets take time away from their work. Also, when they go to website to submit a ticket, often, the website provides a message stating that due to the high volume of calls, please check back later.

Participants also commented on the transition from the Standard Accounting and Reporting System to Standard Accounting Budgeting Reporting System (SABRS). They reported that the process was not smooth. They commented that the conversion to SABRS “is not ready for the way Navy conducts business.” Problems noted in comments include “…billing is messed up.” “(Transition) - too fast to meet this audit requirement.” “System isn’t ready for Navy break outs.” “System to go manual resulting in too much work.” “We are going backwards.” “Should be going to newer technology.” “Politically driven.” “Why deal with the new system when I can retire.”
Appendix C: Survey Response Frequency Report

Numerical values in the following tables summarize survey responses to forced-choice questions as counts and/or percentages (%). Response codes are listed below in the order that they appear.

SD  Strongly Disagree
D  Disagree
N  Neither Agree nor Disagree...
A  Agree
SA  Strongly Agree

-  Negative
N  Neutral
+  Positive

N  Never
R  Rarely
S  Sometimes
F  Frequently
A  Always
Military & Civilian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best), please rate your Quality of Work Life (QOWL). QOWL is the degree to which you enjoy where you work and the availability of opportunities for professional growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
<td>8.72%</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
<td>9.88%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
<td>21.51%</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>16.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the factors below, please indicate whether they have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on your QOWL rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best), please rate your Quality of Home Life (QOHL). QOHL is the degree to which you enjoy where you live and the opportunities available for housing, recreation, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the factors below, please indicate whether they have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on your QOHL rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of home</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the school for dependent children</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the childcare available</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; dining opportunities</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to spouse employment</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical/dental care</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My command gives me sufficient time during working hours to participate in a physical readiness exercise program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My current workweek affords enough time to complete mission tasks in a timely manner while maintaining an acceptable work-home life balance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My position description is current and accurately describes my functions, tasks, and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I work more hours than I report in a pay period because I cannot complete all assigned tasks during scheduled work hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Human Resource Service Center provides timely, accurate responses to my queries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My (local) Human Resources Office provides timely, accurate responses to my queries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DON civilian recruitment process is responsive to my command's civilian personnel requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last performance evaluation cycle, my supervisor provided me with feedback that enabled me to improve my performance before my formal performance appraisal/EVAL/FITREP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am satisfied with the overall quality of my workplace facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My command is concerned about my safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command has a program in place to address potential safety issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My job is important and makes a contribution to my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_______ is occurring at my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternization</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tools and resources are adequate to accomplish the command’s mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspace</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have adequate leadership guidance to perform my job successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication down the chain of command is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication up the chain of command is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My performance evaluations have been fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The awards and recognition program is fair and equitable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military and civilian personnel work well together at my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My command’s Equal Opportunity Program (EO - to include Equal Employment Opportunity & Command Managed Equal Opportunity) is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command adequately protects my personal information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My superiors treat me with respect and consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command attempts to resolve command climate issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have adequate time at work to complete required training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you supervise Department of the Navy (DON) civilians?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When did you receive civilian supervisory training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;12mos</th>
<th>1-3 yrs</th>
<th>&gt;3 yrs</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>