

**BY ORDER OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE**

**AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2AFSOF,
VOLUME 2**



23 DECEMBER 2014

Intelligence

***AFSOF UNIT INTELLIGENCE
EVALUATION CRITERIA***

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available for download on the e-Publishing website at www.e-publishing.af.mil.

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: AFSOC/A2

Certified by: AF/A2D
(Mr. Kenneth K. Dumm)

Supersedes: AFI14-2AFSOF/PRV2,
01 June 2009

Pages: 26

This publication implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, and is consistent with Air Force Instruction (AFI) 14-202, Volume 2, *Standardizations and Evaluations*. This publication establishes the minimum standards for training and qualifying all personnel performing intelligence operations in Air Force Special Operations Forces (AFSOF) units. This publication applies to all Regular Air Force (RegAF), Reserve and Air National Guard (ANG) intelligence personnel supporting AFSOF operations. The National Guard Bureau (NGB) is considered a major command (MAJCOM) for the purposes of this instruction. This publication requires the collection and or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974 authorized by the Privacy Act of 1974 Privacy Act System of Records Notice F011 AF AFMC B, Patriot Excalibur, 5 U.S.C. 552a(b) of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, these records contained therein may specifically be disclosed outside the DoD as a routine use pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(b)(3) as follows: The DoD Blanket Routine Uses set forth at the beginning of the Air Force's compilation of systems of records notices also apply to this system. Ensure that all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with (IAW) Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. This publication may be supplemented, but all supplements are to be coordinated through the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) prior to certification and approval. Refer recommended to the OPR using AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*. Route AF Forms 847 through the appropriate functional chain of command. The authorities to waive wing/unit level

requirements in this publication are identified with a tier (“T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3”) number following the compliance statement. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate tier waiver approval authority, or alternately, to the publication OPR for non-tiered compliance items.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This instruction has been completely revised and must be reviewed in its entirety.

Chapter 1—INTRODUCTION	3
1.1. General.	3
1.2. Waivers.	3
1.3. Responsibilities.	3
1.4. Procedures.	3
1.5. Grading Instructions.	6
1.6. Additional Training.	6
1.7. Unsatisfactory Performance.	6
Chapter 2—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS	8
2.1. General.	8
2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation.	8
2.3. External Intelligence Trainer (EIT) Evaluation.	10
2.4. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation.	10
Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations.	10
Chapter 3—EVALUATION CRITERIA	13
3.1. General Grading Standards.	13
3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.	13
Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.	13
3.3. Specialized Qualification Grading Criteria.	20
Table 3.2. External Intelligence Trainer Grading Criteria.	20
Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Grading Criteria.	20
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION	22

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. General. This volume outlines the basic policy and guidance for AFSOF intelligence personnel in the execution of the intelligence standardization and evaluation (Stan/Eval) program specific to qualification in a duty position within an AFSOF unit. It provides intelligence evaluators and examinees with procedures and evaluation criteria to be used during periodic evaluations. Unit-level guidance may expand upon the basic procedures contained in this AFI, but in no case will it be less restrictive.

1.2. Waivers. MAJCOM/A2s will courtesy-copy AFSOC/A2 regarding all waiver requests and responses. AFSOC/A2 will notify AF/A2DF of significant trends in waiver correspondence if such correspondence indicates the need to readdress existing policy and guidance.

1.3. Responsibilities.

1.3.1. AFSOC/A2, in addition to Lead Command and MAJCOM responsibilities outlined in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, shall convene an intelligence standardization and evaluation working group annually to review this instruction, AFSOF unit standardization and evaluation policies, and procedures for AFSOF. Working group participants will include applicable active representatives with reserve participants coordinated through AFRC/A2F.

1.3.2. Unit Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO). In addition to duties outlined in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, the SIO shall ensure rigorous trend analysis by chairing a Standardization/Evaluation Board (SEB) to address positive and negative trends in training and evaluations. (T-3)

1.3.2.1. Develop written guidance for the conduct of SEBs.

1.3.2.2. Conduct an SEB at least annually.

1.3.2.3. Submit SEB minutes to HQ AFSOC/A2F within 30 calendar days of SEB. AFRC units route SEB minutes through AFRC/A2F. Substantive data and trends are forwarded to HAF/A2 and appropriate MAJCOM partner A2s.

1.3.3. Stan/Eval Program Manager (Chief of Unit Intelligence Stan/Eval, as applicable). In addition to duties outlined in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, the Stan/Eval Program Manager shall organize and participate in the SEB. Develop courses of action (COA) to correct negative training and evaluation trends making recommendations to the SIO. Establish and document procedures to monitor COA progress until negative trends are resolved. (T-3)

1.4. Procedures.

1.4.1. At a minimum, AFSOF personnel shall undergo a periodic mission (MSN) evaluation at least every 24 months. (T-1)

1.4.2. Unit Stan/Eval shall:

1.4.2.1. Monitor and provide oversight on individual periodic evaluation due dates and eligibility windows to ensure periodic evaluations are scheduled in a timely manner. (T-2)

1.4.2.2. Document all evaluations on AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, and maintain examinations until AF Forms 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*, and trend analysis are complete. (T-3)

1.4.2.3. Document all Master Question File (MQF) question reviews and forward updated questions to HQ AFSOC/A2F. (T-3)

1.4.2.4. Ensure all unit intelligence members will have access to MQFs. Closed book tests will be used to evaluate, as a minimum, knowledge of the mission and duty position-specific role in the mission. (T-3)

1.4.2.5. All evaluations shall include a written exam administered as a pre-requisite for the performance based portion of the evaluation. (T-3)

1.4.2.6. Conduct 100% accountability of all hardcopy exams during monthly inventories and document inventory results. (T-3)

1.4.2.7. Ensure all examination materials are clearly marked "Controlled Item-Test Material" on the top and bottom of each page of the exams as well as on cover sheets and each exam will also be labeled with a unique control number IAW AFI 36-2605, Chapter 5. (T-3)

1.4.2.8. All classified exams will be marked IAW The Intelligence Community Classification and Control Markings Implementation Manual, V2, Edition 1 (Version 2.1), 5 January 2009 and Executive Order 12958, as amended. (T-3)

1.4.2.9. Test Compromise. If an exam was/could have been compromised, the SIO will notify the unit commander who will determine if a Command-Directed Investigation into the facts and circumstances is appropriate direct an investigation to document the underlying facts and circumstances. (T-3)

1.4.2.10. Transfer of Qualification Training and Evaluation Record. Stan/Eval shall transfer training and evaluation records to members when they depart the unit of assignment during a permanent change of station (PCS) or permanent change of assignment (PCA). If the databases being used to track training/certification do not allow for inter-command transfer, upon PCS or PCA, members shall hand carry hard-copy evaluation records to their gaining organization. When circumstances prevent the ability to hand-carry records, the losing unit will mail the records to the gaining unit. Upon retirement or separation, Stan/Eval will give the record and all its contents to the member. (T-3)

1.4.2.11. Maintain a record to document the disposition of training and evaluation records. Disposition documentation will be maintained for 12 months. (T-3)

1.4.3. A SPOT evaluation is the SIO's tool to audit processes rather than individuals. Stan/Eval will use SPOT evaluations to assess adherence to written guidance or TTP implementation, for example. Stan/Eval will develop written guidance on SPOT evaluation procedures. SPOT evaluations will be documented in Memos for Record (MFRs). (T-2)

1.4.4. No-Notice evaluations have two categories: SIO-directed or random. All no-notice evaluations will be reported in SEB minutes. (T-3)

1.4.5. SIO-Directed No-Notice Evaluations. SIO-directed no-notice evaluations assess an intelligence professional's qualification(s) after another individual observes routinely substandard performance or one-time performance that jeopardizes the mission. The observer will submit an MFR to Stan/Eval, recommending a SIO-Directed no-notice evaluation. The Chief of Stan/Eval shall review the recommendation and forward to the SIO for approval. If the recommendation is approved, Stan/Eval will conduct the no-notice evaluation as soon as reasonable. Once the evaluation is complete, the Intelligence Evaluator (IE) will determine an appropriate rating/course of action IAW AFI 14-202V2, Chapter 5, and document on AF Form 4350. (T-2)

1.4.6. Random No-Notice Evaluations. Random no-notice evaluations assess the unit's daily performance and training effectiveness, IAW AFI 14-202V2, paragraph 5.2.3.3. Each year Stan/Eval shall conduct random no-notice evaluations of a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the unit's total number of qualified intelligence personnel measured at the beginning of each calendar year. Stan/Eval will randomly select members to be evaluated each month or as required to meet the minimum 10%. All qualified intelligence personnel are eligible for no-notice evaluations regardless of the time since their last evaluation. Results of random, no-notice evaluations will be documented on Stan/Eval Memorandum for Records (MFRs). If a member elects, before the evaluation is conducted, to use the random no-notice evaluation to satisfy the requirement for a periodic evaluation; the IE will also document the evaluation on AF Form 4350. (T-2)

1.4.7. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified Intelligence Evaluator (IE), the examinee must have completed all mission qualification training (MQT) or specialized training requirements, as outlined AFI 14-2AFSOF, Volume 1, *AFSOF Unit Intelligence Training*. Additionally, the examinee should have on file an AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, from an Intelligence Qualification Trainer for each area listed in Table 2.1., *Intelligence Evaluations*. The gradesheets can be filed in the individual's qualification training record or in the on-line documentation system. (T-2)

1.4.8. IEs shall use the evaluation criteria contained in this volume for conducting all intelligence evaluations. To ensure standard and objective evaluations, intelligence evaluators will be thoroughly familiar with the prescribed evaluation criteria.

1.4.9. Prior to commencing, the IE will brief the examinee on the evaluation conduct, purpose, requirements and applicable criteria. The examinee shall accomplish required planning in accordance with the duty position being evaluated. The examinee shall provide the IE a copy of necessary data or materials. (T-3)

1.4.10. Required areas for evaluation are shown in Table 2.1., *Intelligence Evaluations*. Evaluations should take place in conjunction with peacetime, home station aircrew training events to the maximum extent possible. When it is impossible to evaluate a required area in a peacetime training event (e.g., actual deployment briefing or debriefing), examinations may be conducted via an alternate method (i.e., simulated, staged, or by verbal examination) in order to complete the evaluation. The evaluator shall use the AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, to assist in the completion of the AF Form 4350.

1.4.11. The IE shall thoroughly debrief all aspects of the evaluation. This debrief shall include the examinee's overall rating, specific deviations, area grades assigned (if other than qualified) and any required additional training. (T-3)

1.5. Grading Instructions. The IE shall compare examinee performance for each area accomplished during the evaluation with the standards provided in this volume and assign an appropriate grade for the area. Derive the overall intelligence evaluation grade from the area grades based on a composite for the observed events and tasks IAW this instruction. Grading will be conducted in the following manner: (T-2)

1.5.1. IEs shall use the grading criteria in this volume to determine individual area grades. IE judgment must be exercised when the wording for general graded areas is subjective and when specific situations are not covered. IEs will be expected to use their personal experience and knowledge in the assessment of examinee performance and determination of overall grade. Discrepancies or issues with grading or unsatisfactory performance will be resolved by the SIO.

1.5.2. General Criteria. The following general grading criteria applies to grading individual items:

1.5.2.1. Qualified (Q). Performance is correct. Quickly recognizes and corrects errors.

1.5.2.2. Qualified with discrepancies (Q-). Performance is safe, but indicates limited proficiency, makes errors of omission or commission.

1.5.2.3. Unqualified (U). Performance is unsafe or indicates lack of knowledge or ability.

1.6. Additional Training. Intelligence Evaluators are responsible for recommending additional training as necessary. Document any additional training and completion IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-2)

1.7. Unsatisfactory Performance. Examinees receiving an overall unqualified grade (“Q-3”) shall be placed in supervised status until recommended additional training is completed and/or a reevaluation is successfully accomplished. If an examinee receives a “Q-3” on a mission evaluation, the examinee may not perform mission duties or specialized duties unsupervised until remedial actions are accomplished. If an examinee receives a “Q-3” on a specialized evaluation, the examinee may not perform specialized duties until remedial actions are accomplished, but may perform mission duties unless specifically restricted. (T-2)

1.7.1. Upon the initial failure of either the written examination or performance based evaluation, the intelligence evaluator will determine remedial training required. Upon the second failure of either the written or performance based evaluation, a Standardization/Evaluation and Training Review Board (STRB) will be convened to determine a course of action. (T-3)

1.7.2. Conduct STRB. Unlike SEBs which address programmatic stan/eval issues, STRBs are convened to address an individual’s issues (e.g. failed examinations, failed evaluations, failure to attain/maintain proficiency or failure to progress). (T-3)

1.7.3. STRBs shall include a training representative, stan/eval representative and the supervisor. (T-3)

1.7.4. Stan/Eval shall compile STRB minutes with recommendations for remedial training and/or other courses of action and forward to the SIO for review and final approval. (T-3)

1.7.5. Stan/Eval shall file approved STRB minutes in the member's training and evaluation record (soft copy). (T-3)

1.7.6. The person responsible for the majority of an individual's qualification training should not perform the initial qualification evaluation for that same individual. Recurring evaluations may be performed by any certified IE.

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1. General. Intelligence personnel must complete initial and periodic evaluations to attain and maintain their qualification IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Evaluations typically consist of two areas: knowledge and task evaluation. Evaluations must include all required areas as depicted in Table 2.1. All evaluations will be graded using the criteria in Chapter 3. (T-1)

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation. The evaluation must be documented in the individual's qualification training record or in the on-line documentation system. (T-2)

2.2.1. Knowledge Evaluation. Knowledge evaluations will be conducted as part of the initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations to test the examinee's understanding of AFSOF concepts and operations. Examinees will complete a knowledge test from the unit's master question file (MQF) covering mission qualification evaluation subject areas. Examinations will be recorded on the AF Form 4350. Research, analysis and dissemination (RAD) and intelligence preparation of the operational environment (IPOE) involves knowledge intelligence personnel should be applying throughout all areas of performance task evaluations and will be evaluated as subsets of each applicable performance task. (T-2)

2.2.2. Task Evaluation. Units shall assemble materials using current intelligence, unit tasking and area of responsibility (AOR) scenarios that incorporate all appropriate evaluation requirements from Table 2.1. Deployments are prohibited from being used in the evaluation process. (Real world contingencies may provide a unique opportunity to conduct an evaluation; however, factors beyond the control of the examinee and IE may preclude its successful completion). The following guidelines are provided to assist in constructing evaluation materials: (T-2)

2.2.2.1. Order of Battle (OB). This section includes both manual and automated OB.

2.2.2.1.1. **(Manual)** The number of coordinates in the OB plotting exercise should be of sufficient volume to be challenging, yet not so overwhelming that the time taken is beyond that necessary to determine proficiency. Examinee should have a variety of threats/items to plot to ensure correct symbology is used. The exercise may include both geographic coordinates (geocoords) and Military Grid Reference System (MGRS) coordinates. The scenario may include erroneous information to mirror the fog of war by including intentionally incorrect coordinates or types of threats for that particular AOR, thereby allowing the Intelligence Evaluator to assess the examinee's ability to identify errors and question the validity of information. When using a scenario developed by the examinee, OB coordinates listed on Mission Evaluation Worksheet will be evaluated by the IE for accuracy. The examinee may use MIL STD 2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbology*, for reference.

2.2.2.1.2. **(Automated)** Examinee should be provided with a variety of OB sources from which to pull data. When using an examinee-developed scenario, evaluate the examinee's ability to develop and save threat files, insert accurate data, load, update, and purge data to ensure quality control of the displayed data and question the information's accuracy for a particular AOR. Ensure the opportunity exists for the examinee to be evaluated on his or her ability to manipulate the OB displays and print

using the intelligence support systems available. Evaluate the examinee's ability to convert coordinates between geocoords to MGRS and DD/MM/SS to DD/MM.mm.

2.2.2.2. Intelligence Briefings. Briefings should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, intelligence reports, imagery, and other sources that are used to evaluate the mission areas may be used to fulfill this requirement. Evaluated briefings shall include all information tasked in the graded areas list on Table 2.1. (i.e. changeover, pax/deployment, battlestaff, mission/alert, and step briefings).

2.2.2.3. Air Tasking Order (ATO)/Airspace Control Order (ACO)/Special Instructions (SPINS)/Air Support Request (ASR)/Special Tactics Support Request (STSR). Scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials may be used for this purpose. Provide enough information that the examinee's unit is not the sole unit tasked in the tasking mechanism. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's ability to break out the ATO with and without the assistance of automated mission planning tools. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in identifying and breaking out the elements of ATO/ACO/SPINS/ASR/STSR to include but not limited to unit tasking, air space control, landing zone/drop zone (LZ/DZ), and personnel recovery (PR) information.

2.2.2.4. Mission Planning. Actual contingency planning or exercise materials and imagery may be used. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in planning, coordinating and conducting the entire mission planning process.

2.2.2.5. Mission Tracking. Scenario, actual contingency or exercise communication tools and agency contact information will be provided by the evaluator. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in using whatever communication means necessary chat tools such as MIRC to monitor mission execution, communicate with other agencies and coordination centers and document communication. In addition, ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in monitoring blue force tracking feeds and filter relevant threat information from national intelligence broadcasts as required/available.

2.2.2.6. Debriefing. Debriefings should be conducted with aircrew and/or battlefield airman whenever possible. The evaluator may construct inject cards or coordinate with aircrew and/or battlefield airman to identify a particular threat scenario for the debriefings. Ensure there is enough activity to represent the typical level of detail for a threat scenario commensurate with unit AOR tasking. Grade the examinee's ability to control the debriefing, ask amplifying questions and recognize irrelevant information.

2.2.2.7. Intelligence Reports. All applicable reports (e.g., mission reports (MISREPs) and intelligence reports (INTREPs)) should be constructed using information provided in the debriefing. MISREPs and INTREPs should be completed IAW MAJCOM/theater intelligence reporting directives.

2.2.2.8. Geospatial Data Management. In order to accomplish the task evaluation scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials may be used. Actual systems should be available to replicate process of disseminating appropriate geospatial information and services (GI&S) products to tasking unit. Provide a variety of tasking units and scenarios to demonstrate different product type, resolution, and timeliness requirements.

2.2.2.9. Terrain Analysis Scenario. Actual contingency or exercise materials may be used. Evaluate the examinee on his or her ability to analyze detailed terrain data, correctly identify potential threats/hazards to the mission, accurately position targets/objective areas and facilities elevated on the terrain, effectively utilize 360-degree azimuth/elevation masks for access analysis, and disseminate analysis to appropriate users.

2.2.2.10. Special Tactics Commander's Back Brief. Briefing should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; previous briefings given; message traffic, intelligence reports, imagery, and other sources that are used to evaluate other mission areas may be used to fulfill this requirement.

2.3. External Intelligence Trainer (EIT) Evaluation. EIT evaluations should consist of a knowledge examination and a task evaluation and should be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. The EIT should demonstrate knowledge of the information presented by successful completion of a test based on the questions from the master question file (85 percent minimum to pass). The EIT should also be evaluated on his or her ability to present training in each applicable sub-category (threat knowledge, visual recognition (VR), collection & reporting (C&R), Personnel Recovery (PR) and force protection (FP). Evaluators should give the examinee no less than 4 hours' notice of the subject matter or briefing topic for the evaluation. (T-2)

2.3.1. In certain circumstances it may be beneficial to certify an individual to conduct training in one or more individual EIT events (e.g. C&R) at a time. The individual must complete the specific training identified for the event and be evaluated on the task or briefing element by an Intelligence Evaluator. Document the evaluation in the on-line documentation system. The individual must maintain currency for the subject matter according to AFI 14-2AFSOF, Volume 1, *AFSOF Unit Intelligence Training*.

2.3.2. Subsequent EIT evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation.

2.3.3. Grade all EITs using the criteria in Chapter 3.

2.4. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation. IE evaluations shall be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Individuals will be qualified to be IEs upon successful completion of the intelligence evaluator specialized training, IE evaluation and endorsement by the SIO. IEs shall be graded using criteria in Chapter 3. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. (T-2)

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations.

<p>R = Required area of evaluation INIT MSN = Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation MSN = Mission Qualification Evaluation EIT = External Intelligence Trainer Qualification Evaluation IE = Intelligence Evaluator Qualification Evaluation</p>

AREA TITLE	Gradesheet Requirements (Pre-INIT MSN)	INIT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE
KNOWLEDGE EVALUATIONS					
Unit MQF Test		R	R	R	
Visual Recognition Test		R	R	R	
TASK EVALUATIONS					
Unit Weapon Systems Academics	R	R	R	R	
Mission Intelligence Coordinator (MIC) Roles and Responsibilities	R	R	R		
Tasking, Collection, Processing, Exploitation and Dissemination (TCPED)	R	R	R		
Mission Control Element (MCE)	R	R	R		
SOF-Distributed Ground System (DGS)	R	R	R		
Supported Unit (SU)	R	R	R		
Intel Integration in Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection (FP)	R	R	R	R	
AOR Threat Training/AOR Visual Recognition	R	R	R	R	
Personnel Recovery/Recovery Operations	R	R	R	R	
Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief (HADR)	R	R	R	R	
Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Integration	R	R	R	R	
Research, Analysis and Dissemination (RAD)	R	R	R	R	
Intelligence Support to Theater Operations	R	R	R	R	
External Intelligence	R	R	R	R	
Order of Battle	R	R	R	R	
Changeover Briefing	R	R	R	R	
PAX Briefing/Deployment Briefing	R	R	R	R	
Battlestaff Update Briefing	R	R	R	R	
ATO/ACO/SPINS/ASR/STSR/RSTA/SCI RSTA	R	R	R	R	
Mission Planning	R	R	R	R	

Mission Briefing/Alert Briefing	R	R	R	R	
Step Briefing	R	R	R	R	
ST Commanders Back Brief	R	R	R		
Mission Tracking	R	R	R	R	
Debriefing	R	R	R	R	
Intelligence Reports	R	R	R	R	
Geospatial Data Management	R	R	R		
Terrain Analysis	R	R	R		
MIC Procedures	R	R	R		
MIC Communications	R	R	R		
Kinetic Employment Considerations	R	R	R		
Safety of Flight	R	R	R		
Target Analysis/Target Significance	R	R	R		
SOF RPA Missions	R	R	R		
Intelligence Systems	R	R	R		
Instructional Ability				R	
Evaluator Ability					R

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. General Grading Standards. The evaluation criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: mission qualification and specialized qualification evaluation criteria. Use all sections of criteria applicable to the events performed on the evaluation. Where major areas are divided into sub-areas, only one grade will be assigned to the major areas. Annotate discrepancies in sub-areas in the comments section of the AF Form 4350. (T-2)

3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. The following criteria (Table 3.1) apply to mission qualification evaluations.

Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answered at least 85% of questions in test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Failed to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in visual recognition test.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Failed to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in visual recognition test.
ORDER OF BATTLE	
Q	Without the use of automated intelligence support systems and IAW Military Standard 2525C and US Army Field Manual FM 1-02 " <i>Operational Terms and Graphics</i> ," accurately plotted all threats/items within .5 nm of center point of coordinates on a tactical pilotage chart (TPC) or larger scale chart, consistently used correct OB symbology, identified inconsistencies or errors in OB. Plotted to appropriate level of detail with respect to unit requirements. Accurately maintained OB to unit specifications, including classification and currency. Correct classification and security markings on all products. // Demonstrated proficiency in using applicable intelligence support systems to maintain orders of battle, including current as of times and classification. Able to input OB manually with zero typographical errors. Successfully downloaded, printed, exported and displayed data. Correctly converted geocoords and MGRS coordinates. Able to manipulate data, display appropriate threat rings and perform terrain masking analysis. Able to utilize applicable tools to aid in mission planning. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Plotted 95% of the order of battle within .5 nm of center point of coordination a TPC (or larger scale chart), the remaining 5% within 1 nm on a TPC (or larger scale chart). Minor inconsistencies in symbology, corrected with little prompting. Required some assistance, but no impact on mission success.

U	Errors would have significantly impacted mission success. Unable to identify errors or inconsistencies in OB. Unable to complete tasks without significant supervision or intervention. Incorrect classification. Required significant assistance. Lacked proficiency in operating intelligence support systems to the detriment of mission success. Incorrect classification.
CHANGEOVER BRIEFING	
Q	Well planned, appropriate checklist usage, addressed relevant areas. Demonstrated clear understanding of significant events or shortfalls to pass on to next shift. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Quickly identified significant information and rapidly disseminated to appropriate audience. Correctly annotated event log, identified significant events and issued PUC/TUCs. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Omitted no more than one key area/issue at changeover, was able to recover with prompting or minimal assistance. Errors due to extenuating circumstances (e.g. relocation, attacks, etc.) vs. poor planning.
U	Failed to use checklist. Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Deficiencies not due to extenuating circumstances. Inability to recover even with minor prompting. Omissions would have affected next shift. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of capabilities or limitations of unit assets or impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
PAX BRIEFING/DEPLOYMENT BRIEFING	
Q	Professionally delivered, well organized, clear. Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Tailored, relevant content appropriate for audience. Easily understood by audience. Effective use of visual aids. Classification appropriate for audience. Identified key points including synopsis of military and political situation generating the deployment, and enemy activity and force disposition in AOR and along deployment route. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Poorly organized, not tailored. Confusing. Inappropriate classification. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information. Poor understanding of capabilities or limitations of unit assets or impact information may have negative impact on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
BATTLESTAFF UPDATE BRIEFING	

Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Covered all applicable items. Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Effective use of visual aids. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Understood and provided detailed information tailored to the audience. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Poorly organized, not tailored. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
ATO/ACO/SPINS/ASR/STSR BREAKOUT	
Q	Demonstrated ability to access correct ATO/ACO/SPINS/ASR/STSR as appropriate and any changes. Correctly extracted mission tasking and other information relevant to unit or tasking. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or impact intelligence mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that could have impacted mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
MISSION PLANNING	
Q	Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Coordinated activities with operators IAW local procedures. Demonstrated proficiency in individual duty position responsibilities. Clearly understood mission tasking and was able to address all factors relevant to the mission. Logical route recommendations and target/objective area analysis. Well organized and fully prepared. Made appropriate selection and effective use of planning materials and resources. Provided all mission materials in correct quantities and of sufficient detail. Materials neat and well organized. Considered all factors that could impact successful mission accomplishment. Provided thorough terrain analysis with respect to threats, route and target/objective area. Identified shortfalls in information, recommendations for production/information requests. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions or errors that did not seriously impact mission planning. Able to recover with minor prompting.

U	Failed to use checklist or follow local procedures. Poorly organized or unprepared. Made errors or omissions that could have prevented an effective mission. Displayed faulty or limited knowledge of factors relevant to the mission. Improper use of mission planning tools or materials. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of capabilities or limitations of unit assets may have negative impact on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
MISSION BRIEFING/ALERT BRIEFING	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items such as: takeoff, ingress/infiltration, landing zone/drop zone, target/objective area, egress/exfiltration, terrain, convoy route, asymmetric events/threats, and appropriate PR considerations. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Correctly annotated message traffic log and identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Presentation somewhat lacking in quality but all required areas were covered. Minor omissions or errors but was able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Failed to follow local procedures or use checklist. Very confusing or redundant. Major gaps in information, unable to recover with prompting. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Fabricated information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of unit mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
STEP BRIEFING	
Q	Well organized and concise; presented relevant facts in timely fashion. Appropriate for the particular mission. Highlighted changes and updates since mission briefing/ST team in-brief. Correct classification and security markings on all products. Effectively used checklist or followed local procedures.
Q-	Made updates with prompting- not proactive. Omissions would not have affected mission effectiveness.
U	Completely missed an update or passed on erroneous information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of unit mission capabilities. Incorrect classification. Failed to use checklist or followed local procedures.
SPECIAL TACTICS COMMANDER'S BACK BRIEF	

Q	Professionally delivered, well organized, clear. Followed local procedures or effectively used checklist or local procedures. Tailored, relevant content appropriate for commander. Responsive to the commander's questions. Easily understood by audience. Effective use of visual aids. Classification appropriate for audience. Hit critical mission execution points. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Failed to follow local procedures or use checklist. Poorly organized, not tailored. Confusing. Inappropriate classification. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information. Poor understanding of capabilities or limitations of unit assets or impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
MISSION TRACKING	
Q	Demonstrated ability to access correct servers and chat windows and communicate effectively with other PR agencies and coordination centers to support/monitor missions. Correctly logged communication with theater and national participants. Demonstrated proper chat etiquette. Demonstrated ability to monitor blue force tracking feeds and filter relevant PR/threat information from national intelligence broadcasts as required/available. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Some errors or delays in accessing correct servers and chat windows, communicating with other PR agencies and coordination centers, and accessing/filtering BFT feeds/national intelligence broadcasts that did not jeopardize or impact mission support/monitoring. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Errors, omissions or delays in accessing correct servers and chat windows, communicating with other PR agencies and coordination centers, and accessing/filtering Blue Force tracker (BFT) feeds/national intelligence broadcasts that could have jeopardized mission support/monitoring. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Poor chat etiquette. Incorrect classification.
DEBRIEFING	
Q	Thoroughly prepared and was able to extract pertinent mission results in timely manner. Followed local procedures or effectively used checklist. Quickly identified perishable information. Controlled the debriefing, asked amplifying questions and recognized irrelevant information. Collected all significant intelligence with sufficient detail to accomplish reporting requirements IAW checklists and theater directives. Identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered.

U	Failed to follow local procedures or use checklist. Not prepared. Disjointed flow. Failed to identify perishable information. Completely missed a debrief. Not enough detail to accomplish reporting requirements. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE REPORTS	
Q	Clearly written with target audience in mind. Summarized all pertinent information available with minimal to no extraneous info. Properly formatted. Met reporting timelines. Produced report IAW checklists and theater directives. Identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Missed timeline but still delivered quality intelligence report. Delay due to extenuating circumstances. Minor problems with clarity, organization, or formatting, but pertinent information was included.
U	Did not complete report within prescribed timelines. Failed to use checklist. Incomplete or inaccurate report. Writing skills complicated meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination (e.g. not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). Incorrect classification.
GEOSPATIAL DATA MANAGEMENT	
Q	Disseminated the correct GI&S products to the correct tasking unit(s) within the appropriate timelines, at the required resolution (or explained continued efforts to do the same), and over the appropriate system(s). Confirmed receipt of the products. Classification appropriate for audience. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Omitted no more than one key area, was able to recover with prompting or minimal assistance. Errors due to extenuating circumstances (i.e. systems outage) vs poor planning.
U	Failed to follow local procedures. GI&S products were incorrect and/or did not meet tasking unit requirements of resolution and timeliness. Failed to confirm receipt of the products. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
TERRAIN ANALYSIS	
Q	Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. Able to effectively analyze detailed terrain data and correctly identify potential threats/hazards to the mission. Accurately positioned target/objective area and facilities elevated on the terrain. Utilized 360-degree azimuth/elevation masks for accurate access analysis. Disseminated analysis appropriately and expeditiously. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Needed minimal assistance when analyzing detailed terrain data. Identified all significant threats/hazards to the mission; incorrectly identified minor threats/hazards which would not have impacted the mission.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Complete lack of analytical ability. Failed to identify significant threats/hazards that would impact mission success. Inaccurate/unsafe access analysis. Unable to disseminate analysis to appropriate users in a timely manner. Incorrect classification.
MIC PROCEDURES	

Q	Correctly configured intelligence workstation for mission execution. Demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of takeoff, handoff, handback, and landing procedures. Demonstrated satisfactory understanding of MIC roles during aircraft transit. Correctly demonstrated the MIC role during SIGINT Prime, IMINT Prime, target talk-on, and dynamic targeting.
Q-	Committed minor errors, omissions or deviations, which detracted from effective mission accomplishment. Able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Failed to initialize and configure intelligence workstation for mission execution. Committed errors, omissions or procedural deviations that jeopardized mission accomplishment.
MIC COMMUNICATIONS	
Q	Verified all crewmembers understand mission tasking. Communicated in a clear, concise and efficient manner. Demonstrated satisfactory understanding in using Clear Comm, Wave, Secure Phone, Microsoft Outlook, and mIRC.
Q-	Communication with the crew was sometimes unclear. Slow to prioritize tasks, timelines slightly off. Committed minor errors, omissions or deviations from the use of Clear Comm, Wave, Secure Phone, Microsoft Outlook, and mIRC. Able to correct with minimal assistance.
U	All crewmembers did not understand mission tasking. Situational awareness was lost and no corrective action taken. Did not communicate effectively. Unable to prioritize tasks and create timelines. Unable to effectively use Clear Comm, Wave, Secure Phone, Microsoft Outlook, and mIRC.
TARGET ANALYSIS/TARGET SIGNIFICANCE	
Q	Demonstrated satisfactory knowledge in assessing, reviewing HVI/target historical threat reporting and message traffic.
Q-	Demonstrated ability to locate major portions of HVI/target historical threat reporting and message traffic. Committed minor errors or omissions in assessing HVI/target historical threat reporting and message traffic.
U	Failed to locate HVI/target historical threat reporting and message traffic. Unable to accurately assess HVI/target historical threat reporting and message traffic.
INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	
Q	Correctly configured intelligence workstation for mission execution. Effectively used software applications to build mission planning products. Applied IPOE; selected and retrieved relevant planning materials and resources based on the tasking and essential elements of information (EEI).
Q-	Committed minor errors, omissions or deviations, which detracted from effective workstation use but did not jeopardize mission accomplishment. Able to recover with minor prompting.

U	Failed to initialize and configure intelligence workstation for mission execution. Committed errors, omissions or deviations that jeopardized mission accomplishment. Selected extraneous or irrelevant planning materials and resources.
---	---

3.3. Specialized Qualification Grading Criteria. The following grading criteria apply to duty positions in which personnel maintain specialized qualifications (e.g. External Intelligence Trainer, Intelligence Evaluator). (T-2)

Table 3.2. External Intelligence Trainer Grading Criteria.

EXTERNAL INTELLIGENCE TRAINER (EIT)	
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY	
Q	Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all objectives. Effectively fielded and accurately answered questions from audience. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Able to quickly retrieve answers/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inability to communicate instruction to the audience effectively. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification.
EIT KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answered at least 85% of questions in test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable.
U	Failed to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
EIT VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in visual recognition test.
Q-	Not applicable.
U	Failed to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in visual recognition test.

Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Grading Criteria.

INTELLIGENCE EVALUATOR SPECIALIZED TRAINING	
EVALUATOR ABILITY	
Q	Demonstrated ability to evaluate effectively. Planned evaluation efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all objectives. Completed appropriate evaluation records accurately. Adequately assessed and recorded performance. Comments were clear and pertinent. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization of evaluation. Did not adversely affect the evaluation. Minor errors or omissions in evaluation records. Comments were incomplete or slightly unclear.

U	Inability to effectively communicate evaluation procedures to the examinee. Did not plan evaluation efficiently and/or made poor decisions that adversely affected the evaluation process. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from evaluator effectiveness. Did not complete required forms or records. Comments were invalid, unclear, or did not accurately document performance. Incorrect classification.
---	---

ROBERT P. OTTO, Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence,
Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

Attachment 1**GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION*****References***

AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, 29 November 2007

AFI 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, 10 March 2008

AFI 14-202, Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules* 10 March 2008

AFI 14-2AFSOF, Volume 1, *AFSOF Unit Intelligence Training*, TBD

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013

AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013

Prescribed Forms

No forms are prescribed in this publication.

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*, 22 September 2009

AF Form 4349, *Record of Intelligence Evaluation*, 10 March 2008

AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*, 10 March 2008

AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, 10 March 2008

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACO—Airspace Control Order

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

AFSOC—Air Force Special Operations Command

AFSOF—Air Force Special Operations Forces

ANG—Air National Guard

AOR—Area of Responsibility

ASR—Air Support Request

ATO—Air Tasking Order

BFT—Blue Force tracker

BMC—Basic Mission Qualified

C&R—Collection and Reporting
CMR—Combat Mission Ready
COA—Courses of Action
CSAR—Combat Search and Rescue
DGS—Distributed Ground System
DZ—Drop Zone
EI—Essential Elements of Information
EIT—External Intelligence Trainer
EPA—Evasive Plan of Action
FP—Force Protection
GEOCOORDS—Geographic Coordinates
GI&S—Geospatial Information and Services
HADR—Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief
HQ—Headquarters
HHQ—Higher Headquarters
IAW—In Accordance With
IE—Intelligence Evaluator
IFTU—Intelligence Formal Training Unit
INIT—Initial (Evaluation)
ISR—Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance
LZ—Loading Zone
MAJCOM—Major Command
MCE—Mission Control Element
MDS—Mission Design Series
MFR—Memorandum for Record
MGRS—Military Grid Reference System
MIC—Mission Intelligence Coordinator
MQT—Mission Qualification Training
MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation
NGB—National Guard Bureau
OB—Order of Battle
OPLAN—Operations Plan

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
PAX—Passengers
PCS—Permanent Change of Station
PCA—Permanent Change of Assignment
PR—Personnel Recovery
Q—Qualified
RAD—Research, Analysis and Dissemination
RPA—Remotely Piloted Aircraft
RSTA—Reconnaissance Surveillance and Target Acquisition
SCI— Sensitive Compartmented Information
SEB—Stan/Eval Board
SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer
SORN—System of Record Notice
SPINS—Special Instructions
ST—Special Tactics
Stan/Eval—Standardization and Evaluation
STRB—Stan/Eval and Training Review Board
STSR—Special Tactics Support Request
SU—Supported Unit
T-2—Tier 2
T-3—Tier 3
TCPED—Tasking, Collection, Processing, Exploitation and Dissemination
TPC—Tactical Pilotage Chart
TTP—Tactics, Techniques and Procedures
U—Unqualified
VR—Visual Recognition

Terms

Basic Mission Capable (BMC)—The status of AFSOF intelligence personnel who have satisfactorily completed MQT, are qualified in the unit mission but do not maintain CMR status.

Certification—Procedure used to document competency in a particular task. Not interchangeable with “qualification,” which requires Form 4350 documentation.

Combat Mission Ready (CMR)—The status of AFSOF unit intelligence personnel who have satisfactorily completed MQT and maintain qualification and currency in the appropriate tasks and knowledge required by AFI 14-2AFSOF, Volume 1.

Currency—A measure of how frequently and/or recently a task is completed. Currency requirements should ensure intelligence personnel maintain a minimum level of proficiency in a given event.

External Intelligence Trainer (EIT)—Current and qualified (BMC or CMR) intelligence personnel who have completed the EIT specialized training and maintain currency as an EIT. Only EITs may conduct unsupervised intelligence training for operators.

External Intelligence Trainer Evaluation—An evaluation that certifies and maintains external intelligence trainer qualification of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member as an external intelligence trainer (i.e., INIT EIT and RQ EIT) as directed in AFI14-2AFSOF, Volume 1. The designator for the external intelligence trainer evaluation is “EIT” as used with the AF Form 4349 and AF Form 4350.

External Intelligence Training—Intelligence training given by intelligence personnel to operators or other non-intelligence AFSC personnel.

Initial Evaluation—The first evaluation of any type for a duty position (e.g., INIT MSN, INIT EIT).

Intelligence Evaluator (IE)—Current and qualified (BMC or CMR) intelligence personnel who have completed the IE specialized training. Only IEs may conduct intelligence qualification (mission or specialized) evaluations (initial or periodic).

Intelligence Evaluator (IE) Evaluation—An evaluation that certifies and maintains intelligence evaluator qualification of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member as an intelligence evaluator (i.e., INIT IE and RQ IE) as directed in AFI14-2AFSOF, Volume 1. The designator for the intelligence evaluator evaluation is “IE” as used with the AF Form 4349 and AF Form 4350.

Intelligence Qualification Trainer—Intelligence personnel designated by the SIO to conduct qualification training for other intelligence personnel. Intelligence Qualification Trainers must meet requirements as outlined in AFI 14-202, Volume 1.

Mission Qualification Evaluation (MSN)—An evaluation that certifies and maintains the qualification (BMC or CMR) of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member (i.e., INIT MSN, RQ MSN). The MSN is administered to ensure the individual’s ability to support full mission planning and employment in accomplishing the unit’s operational mission as directed by AFI 14-2AFSOF, Volume 1. The designator for the mission qualification evaluation is “MSN” as used with the AF Form 4349 and AF Form 4350.

Mission Qualification Training (MQT)—Training required to qualify intelligence personnel to perform their specific unit mission in an assigned position. AFI 14-2AFSOF, Volume 1 prescribes minimum MQT requirements.

Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO)—The SIO is the highest-ranking Air Force officer holding the 14N3 or 14N4 AFSC or Series 0132 Civilian serving in an Air Force intelligence position. The SIO's authority extends to all directly subordinate units. Installations with intelligence activities in different chains of command will have separate SIOs. In this capacity, the SIO

provides senior guidance on all policy development, interpretations, and applications. Further, the SIO serves as the chief advisor and mentor for AF intelligence officers, enlisted and civilians (as appropriate) in terms of career development and progress.

Specialized Qualification Evaluation—An evaluation that certifies and maintains the specialized qualification of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member for a particular skill or duty position. Specific types of specialized qualification evaluations are identified in AFI 14-2AFSOF, Volume 1.

Specialized Training—Training in any skills necessary to carry out the unit's assigned mission that is not required for every AFSOF intelligence specialist. Specialized training is accomplished after Mission Qualification Training and after the member has attained BMC or CMR status, and is in addition to BMC or CMR requirements.

Tier 2 (T—2)—Non-compliance has the potential to create moderate risk of mission or program degradation or failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the MAJCOM/CC level, but may not be delegated lower than MAJCOM Director.

Tier 3 (T—3)—Non-compliance has a relatively remote potential to create risk of mission or program degradation or failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the Wing/DRU/FOA CC levels.

Unit Operators—Individuals assigned/attached to an operational unit (e.g., aircrew, special tactics operators, para rescue, etc.).