

Crew Performance Report

Behavioral evidence from a live bridge mission, produced by the Mission Analysis System

ENGAGEMENT

Sample Engagement (Composite)

MISSION

Meridian Relay (45 min)

EVIDENCE BASE

Role-labeled transcript + mission telemetry

CREW

Crew 7 of 21

BRIDGE

Bridge A, six stations crewed

REPORT TYPE

Crew-level, qualitative

READ THIS FIRST

This is an illustrative sample assembled from composite mission behavior. It shows the structure, tone, and evidence standard of a real report without describing any actual crew. In a delivered report, every observation traces to your crew's own transcript and telemetry.

How to read this report

Every observation in this report is qualitative and role labeled. We describe what was said and done at each station, not who the participants are as people. Each claim carries a confidence flag reflecting the strength of the underlying evidence. Where our recording or attribution was imperfect, we say so rather than guessing.

Statements about growth or comparison are directional only. This report is a record of one crew, on one mission, on one day. It is designed to start an informed conversation, not to label anyone.

What this report is not

This is not a personality profile, a diagnostic instrument, or a numerical score. During our current validation window we publish only qualitative, evidence linked observations. If a claim could not survive a skeptical reader asking to see the underlying transcript line, it does not appear here.

What happened on the bridge

Crew 7 flew Meridian Relay, a supply and rescue scenario with a mid mission reactor casualty that forces cross station coordination. The crew completed the primary objective and recovered the mission timeline after a coordination breakdown in the middle third of the mission. The story of this crew is the story of that breakdown and recovery.

Communication pattern

CONFIDENCE: HIGH

Through the first third of the mission, bridge communication ran almost entirely through the Captain, who issued direct orders and did not request input. Station to station traffic was minimal. Helm and Science began routing suggestions through Communications rather than raising them directly, a pattern that added a relay step to information the Captain needed quickly.

The reactor casualty changed the structure. Unable to direct every station at once, the Captain began repeating station reports back to the bridge. Lateral communication opened between Engineering and Helm, and the crew's coordination visibly reorganized around shared information rather than central direction.

SCIENCE: Contact bearing zero four zero is not responding to hails. Second time I'm seeing this.
CAPTAIN: Copy, not responding. Communications, confirm and log it. Helm, hold course.
ENGINEERING: If we reroute now I can hold power through the relay window.
CAPTAIN: Do it. Everyone, reactor is priority one until Engineering calls it stable.

Transcript excerpt, mid mission. In a delivered report, excerpts are selected to show the crew's actual coordination patterns at the moments they changed.

Decision timeline

CONFIDENCE: HIGH

PHASE	WHAT THE EVIDENCE SHOWS
OPENING	Roles adopted quickly after the pre brief. The Captain set tempo early. Stations acknowledged orders but volunteered little.
FIRST WARNING	Science flagged the unresponsive contact twice before acknowledgment. The first report was phrased as an observation and drew no response.
CASUALTY	The reactor event forced distributed problem solving. Initial response was fragmented, with two stations working the same problem unaware of each other.
RECOVERY	The Captain began closing the loop on station reports. Engineering and Helm coordinated directly. The crew recovered the timeline and completed the objective.

Role by role, from the transcript

Observations describe behavior at a station during this mission. They are not judgments of a person's character or ability. Premium engagements include a one paragraph narrative like these for every participant, written for the participant to read.

CAPTAIN // Drove tempo, learned to close the loop HIGH

Set direction quickly and kept the crew moving through ambiguity. Early pattern was command without input requests. The turn came at the casualty, when repeating station reports back to the bridge became the crew's coordination engine. The strongest single behavior on the bridge was also the one adopted latest.

HELM // Reliable execution, indirect voice HIGH

Executed course changes promptly and accurately throughout. Raised two navigation concerns via Communications rather than directly to the Captain. Both concerns were valid. The route they traveled cost the crew time.

SCIENCE // Saw it first, said it quietly HIGH

First to detect the mission's central anomaly, flagging it twice before acknowledgment. Persistence was polite but present. After the Captain began closing the loop, Science reports became the crew's primary planning input.

ENGINEERING // Proactive under casualty conditions HIGH

Volunteered the reroute plan unprompted at the moment of highest load, the mission's clearest example of initiative. Coordinated directly with Helm during recovery, forming the lateral link the crew had lacked.

COMMUNICATIONS // The unplanned relay MODERATE

Became an informal relay for other stations' concerns, which speaks to approachability and also signals that direct channels felt closed. Handled external hails consistently. Moderate confidence reflects segments where overlapping speech limited attribution.

OPERATIONS // Underloaded until late MODERATE

Low activity for the first two thirds of the mission, then effective support during recovery. The evidence cannot distinguish disengagement from a station not yet needed, so we present the pattern without interpretation.

What we did not observe

- ▶ No transcript evidence bears on written communication, one on one interactions off the bridge, or behavior outside mission conditions.
- ▶ Two brief segments of overlapping speech during the casualty could not be fully attributed and are excluded from evidence rather than guessed.
- ▶ One mission is one sample. Patterns here are hypotheses to explore in the debrief, not fixed traits.

Turning evidence into a conversation

Debrief prompts for this crew

- ▶ Science saw the anomaly first. What would have helped that warning land the first time it was raised?
- ▶ Two stations routed concerns through Communications instead of raising them directly. What made the direct channel feel closed?
- ▶ The crew's coordination improved when the Captain began repeating reports back. How could that habit start at mission open instead of mid crisis?
- ▶ Where does this same pattern show up for this team outside the simulator?

Methodology, briefly

The Mission Analysis System transcribes crew voice traffic and attributes each utterance to a bridge station using mission telemetry as ground truth, then pairs the role labeled transcript with scenario events. Our behavioral markers draw on the Crew Resource Management behavioral marker tradition and the Salas Big Five teamwork model, with Bloom's Taxonomy grounding the cognitive design of missions. Narrative text is generated under human review from the evidence record. Scoring style numerical claims are excluded during our current validation window.

Data handling

All audio and telemetry processing occurs locally on Mobile Space Adventures equipment inside the host building. No participant audio, video, or transcript data leaves the site. No recordings or personally identifiable information are retained after report delivery. Built for FERPA and COPPA compliance in school settings.

Disclosures

Mobile Space Adventures is not affiliated with NASA and does not act on behalf of NASA. MSA's measurement design draws on the Crew Resource Management behavioral-marker tradition and the Salas Big Five teamwork model. References to NASA-TLX cite a publicly available NASA workload instrument and are used solely to describe the basis of MSA's cognitive-workload measurement. MSA is not affiliated with or endorsed by the Christa McAuliffe Space Center. Missions run on the Starship Horizons simulation, licensed from its developer. Standards alignment references are alignment language, not endorsements by framework owners.

SEE THIS FOR YOUR OWN CREW

Book a 15 minute fit call at mobilespaceadventures.org/contact, call 512.997.8091, or email info@mobilespaceadventures.org. Based in Georgetown, TX.