

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

**AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2B-52,
VOLUME 2**



24 FEBRUARY 2012

Incorporating Change 1, 4 AUGUST 2014

Intelligence

***B-52 UNIT INTELLIGENCE EVALUATION
CRITERIA***

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

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

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: AFGSC/A2

Certified by: AF/A2D
(Brig Gen Mark W. Westergren)

Pages: 21

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 1, *Intelligence Training*, AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, and AFI 14-202, Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules*. This publication establishes the minimum Air Force standards for evaluating and qualifying personnel performing intelligence duties in B-52 units. This publication applies to Regular Air Force (RegAF), Reserve and Air National Guard (ANG) intelligence personnel supporting B-52 operations. The National Guard Bureau will be considered functionally as a major command (MAJCOM) for the purposes of this publication. 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 Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS) located in the Air Force Records Information Management System (AFRIMS). This AFI may be supplemented, but all supplements must be coordinated with the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) prior to certification and approval. Refer recommended changes to the OPR using the 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. See AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, for a description of the authorities associated with the tier numbers. 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. In order for units to have time to prepare for compliance, this publication becomes effective 60 days after the publication date.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This interim change adds risk factors, known as “tiers” to tasks assigned to organizations below major command (MAJCOM) level to depict the assessed risk of non-compliance. A margin bar (|) indicates newly revised material.

Chapter 1—GENERAL INFORMATION.	3
1.1. General.	3
1.2. Waivers.	3
1.3. Grading Instructions.	4
1.4. Additional Training.	4
1.5. Unsatisfactory Performance.	4
1.6. Documentation.	4
Chapter 2—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.	5
2.1. General.	5
2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation.	5
2.3. External Intelligence Trainer (EIT) Evaluation.	6
2.4. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation.	7
2.5. Nuclear Mission Support Evaluation:	7
2.6. Targeting/Weaponneering Specialized Training (TWST) Evaluation.	7
Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluation.	7
Chapter 3—EVALUATION CRITERIA	9
3.1. General Grading Standards.	9
3.2. General Grading Areas.	9
Table 3.1. General Grading Criteria.	9
3.3. Specialized Training Grading Criteria.	14
Table 3.2. External Intelligence Trainer Evaluation Grading Criteria.	14
Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Grading Criteria.	15
Table 3.4. Nuclear Mission Support Evaluation Grading Criteria.	15
Table 3.5. Targeting/Weaponneering Specialized Training Grading Criteria.	15
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION	17

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION.

1.1. General. This volume provides intelligence evaluators (IEs) and examinees with procedures and evaluation criteria to be used during knowledge and task phases of initial and periodic evaluations. All evaluations will be conducted IAW the provisions of AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, and this instruction.

1.1.1. Objective. The examinee must satisfactorily demonstrate the ability to perform required duties safely and effectively IAW applicable instructions and directives.

1.1.2. Waivers. AFGSC/A2 is the waiver authority for this publication. Submit waivers to AFGSC/A2 through MAJCOM/A2. AFGSC/A2 will notify AF/A2DF of any significant trends in waiver correspondence that may indicate a concern with policy and guidance.

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

1.2.1. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified IE, the examinee must have completed all Initial Qualification Training (IQT), Mission Qualification Training (MQT) and/or Specialized Training requirements, as outlined in AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1, *B-52 Unit Intelligence Training*. Additionally, the examinee must have on file a satisfactory gradesheet, AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet* (see Attachment 4 in AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1) from an intelligence qualification trainer or supervisor for each designated area listed in Table 2.1. The gradesheets will be filed IAW AF/A2 guidance regarding on-line documentation. (T-2)

1.2.2. IEs will use the evaluation criteria contained in Chapter 3 for conducting all intelligence evaluations. To ensure standard and objective evaluations, IEs will be thoroughly familiar with the prescribed evaluation criteria. (T-2)

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

1.2.4. Conduct evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Required areas for evaluation are shown in Table 2.1. Evaluations should take place in conjunction with peacetime, in-garrison events to the maximum extent possible. When it is impossible to evaluate a required area in a peacetime event (e.g., actual deployment briefing or post-mission aircrew debriefing), evaluations may be conducted via an alternate method (i.e., simulated, staged or by verbal examination) in order to complete the evaluation. Document the reasons and type of alternate method used in the Comments section of the AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*. (T-2)

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

1.3. Grading Instructions. Standards and performance parameters are contained in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, and this instruction. The IE will 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. These grades will be compiled by the IE to determine the overall qualification level. (T-2)

1.3.1. IEs will use the grading criteria in this instruction 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. (T-2)

1.3.2. General Criteria. The following general grading criteria will be used to grade individual items:

1.3.2.1. Q. Qualified. Performance is correct. Quickly recognizes and corrects errors.

1.3.2.2. Q-. Qualified with discrepancies. Performance indicates limited proficiency. Despite discrepancies/errors, performance does not jeopardize aircrew safety or commander's intent during mission execution. Errors of omission or commission are rapidly identified and corrected with minimal impact on mission accomplishment.

1.3.2.3. U. Unqualified. Performance indicates lack of knowledge or ability. Performance could compromise aircrew safety or mission accomplishment. Errors of commission or omission were not identified and/or corrected.

1.3.3. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level. IE judgment will be the determining factor in arriving at the overall qualification, based on the observed events and tasks IAW this instruction. (T-2)

1.3.3.1. Qualification Level 1 (Q-1). Performance demonstrates desired knowledge and proficiency. Limited discrepancies were identified and they were resolved in the course of the evaluation.

1.3.3.2. Qualification Level 2 (Q-2). Performance demonstrates ability but some additional training is required and/or a grade of unqualified was observed in a task.

1.3.3.3. Qualification Level 3 (Q-3). The member demonstrated an unacceptable level of safety, performance or knowledge. Examinee received an area grade of unqualified in any of the tasks identified by this volume.

1.4. Additional Training. IEs are responsible for recommending additional training at their discretion. Document any additional training to be performed IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, as supplemented. (T-2)

1.5. Unsatisfactory Performance. Examinees receiving an overall "Q-3" qualification will 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 (INIT MSN or MSN), that individual 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, that individual may not perform specialized duties until remedial actions are accomplished, but he may perform mission duties unless specifically restricted. (T-2)

1.6. Documentation. Evaluations will be documented on AF Form 4350 and in coordination with AF/A2 approved processes regarding online documentation. (T-2)

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.

2.1. General. Evaluations must include all required areas depicted in Table 2.1. If it is not possible to accomplish a required area in a realistic training environment in conjunction with local events, the IE may elect to evaluate the area by an alternate method (i.e., staged, simulated, verbally, etc.) in order to complete the evaluation. If the IE determines the required area cannot be adequately evaluated by an alternate method, an additional evaluation will be necessary to complete the requirements. (T-2)

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation.

2.2.1. Knowledge Evaluation. A comprehensive knowledge examination will be conducted as part of initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations (INIT MSN/MSN) to determine the examinee's knowledge in the required areas listed in AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1, Chapter 2. This includes, but is not limited to: B-52 systems and capabilities, threat knowledge, personnel recovery (PR), force protection and B-52 unit intelligence procedures. Evaluations in each knowledge category will be based on the unit's master question file (MQF). Examinees will take a separate visual recognition test. Research, Analysis and Dissemination (RAD) and Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment (IPOE) involve knowledge intelligence personnel should be applying throughout all areas of the evaluation and will be evaluated as a subset of each applicable graded area, as indicated on individual gradesheets. Examinations will be recorded on the AF Form 4350 IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Reference Table 2.1 for required knowledge examinations. (T-2)

2.2.2. Task Evaluation. Units may use evaluation materials provided by MAJCOM/A2 or may assemble evaluation materials themselves using current intelligence, unit tasking and Area of Responsibility (AOR) scenarios that incorporate all appropriate evaluation requirements from Table 2.1. Evaluations during exercises or deployments are not prohibited; however, units should apply operational risk management principles to the scheduling of the evaluation. **Note:** Real-world contingencies may provide a unique opportunity to conduct an evaluation; however, factors beyond the control of the examinee and IE might preclude its successful completion, and therefore, determination of applicability will be left to the discretion of the Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO). The following guidelines are provided to assist in constructing evaluation materials: (T-2)

2.2.2.1. Intelligence Briefings. The examinee should assemble briefings from information provided by the IE; message traffic, intelligence reports and imagery. Other sources that are used to evaluate other mission areas may also be used to fulfill this requirement. Evaluated briefings include: Mission planning cell (MPC) initial situation briefings, Feasibility and Capabilities (FEASCAP) briefing, pre-take off briefing, assumption of alert briefing, and step briefing.

2.2.2.2. Mission Planning Cell Support. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials may be used for this purpose. The examinee should provide adequate mission materials tailored to the target and assigned/alternate munitions. The number of tasked targets in a weaponeering exercise should be of sufficient volume to be challenging and should allow the IE to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in developing weaponeering

solutions. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in planning, coordinating and conducting the entire mission package construction process.

2.2.2.3. Mission Planning Process. Conduct mission planning observations during actual missions whenever possible. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in the use of automated systems used to support the mission planning. Observe the trainee's ability to plan, coordinate and provide intelligence support to the local mission planning process.

2.2.2.4. Combat Mission Folder Construction/Targeting Process/Weaponing. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials may be used for this purpose. The examinee should provide adequate mission materials tailored to the target and assigned/alternate munitions. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in planning, coordinating and conducting the entire combat mission folder construction process. The number of tasked targets in the targeting and weaponing exercises should be of sufficient volume to be challenging and should allow the IE to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in conducting the entire targeting process and developing weaponing solutions.

2.2.2.5. Reporting. Construct mission reports (MISREPs) using information provided in aircrew debriefings. Complete MISREPs IAW MAJCOM/theater intelligence reporting directives.

2.3. External Intelligence Trainer (EIT) Evaluation. EIT evaluations will be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, as supplemented. Only qualified EITs may conduct unsupervised intelligence training for aircrews, Security Forces, or other key agencies outside the intelligence flight. Upon completion of EIT training profiles, as outlined in AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1, the individual will be evaluated on the ability to present training in each applicable sub-category. The individual must also demonstrate knowledge of the information presented by successful completion of a test based on questions from the MQF (85 percent minimum score needed to pass). Evaluators will give the examinee no less than 4 hours' notice of the subject matter or briefing topic for the evaluation. (T-2)

2.3.1. The individual must complete the specific training identified for the event and be evaluated on the task or briefing element by an IE. Document the evaluation on the AF 4350 and IAW AF/A2 guidance regarding on-line documentation. The individual must maintain currency for the subject matter IAW AFI 14-B-52, Volume 1, and must be reevaluated periodically, as described in this instruction. (T-2)

2.3.2. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. All applicable EIT and MSN areas must be evaluated. (T-2)

2.3.3. An EIT receiving a grade of "U" or "with additional training" in any grading area must not be allowed to perform EIT duties unsupervised until additional training is accomplished. An EIT receiving a grade of "U" or "with additional training" in any grading area will result in an overall "Q-3" for the EIT evaluation. This restriction is placed in the Comments section and "yes" is marked in the Restrictions section of the AF Form 4350. (T-2)

2.3.4. EITs will be graded using the criteria in Chapter 3. (T-2)

2.4. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation. IE evaluations will be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, as supplemented. Upon completion of the IE specialized qualification profiles, successful IE evaluation and endorsement by the SIO, individuals will be qualified to be IEs. (T-2)

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

2.4.2. An IE receiving a grade of "U" or "with additional training" in any grading area will receive an overall "Q-3" for the IE evaluation. The individual must not perform IE duties until additional training is complete. This restriction is placed in the Comments section and "yes" is marked in Restrictions on the AF Form 4350. (T-2)

2.4.3. IEs will be graded using the criteria in Chapter 3. (T-2)

2.5. Nuclear Mission Support Evaluation: NMS evaluations will be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-2)

2.5.1. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. Evaluations will be conducted as a matter of course or via periodic method to ensure proficiency.

2.5.2. An individual required to support this mission receiving a grade of "U" in any graded area must not develop combat mission materials until additional training has been accomplished and the individual has been certified as "Q". (T-2)

2.5.3. Grade NMS using criteria in Chapter 3. (T-2)

2.6. Targeting/Weaponering Specialized Training (TWST) Evaluation. TWST evaluations will be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-2)

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

2.6.2. An individual required to support this mission receiving a grade of "U" in any graded area must not be permitted develop combat mission materials, mensurate points, or conduct weaponering tasks until additional training has been accomplished and the individual has been certified as "Q". (T-2)

2.6.3. Grade TWST using criteria in Chapter 3. (T-2)

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluation.

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						
AREA TITLE	INIT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE	TWST	NMS
Knowledge Evaluation (MQF Test)	R	R				
-- B-52 Systems Academics						
-- Intelligence Support to the						

Nuclear Mission						
-- AOR Threats						
-- AOR Visual Recognition						
-- Personnel Recovery Academics						
-- Intelligence Integration in Force Protection						
-- RAD and IPOE						
-- Combat Mission Folder Construction Academics						
-- Targeting Process						
Manual Order of Battle (OB)						
Automated OB	R	R				
ATO/ACO/SPINS/JIPTL Breakout	R	R				
MPC Initial Situation Briefing/ Assumption of Alert Briefing	R*	R*				
FEASCAP Briefing	R	R				
Mission Planning Cell						
Weaponneering	R	R				
Pre-Take Off Briefing	R	R				
Step Briefing	R	R				
Debriefing	R	R				
Intelligence Reports	R	R				
TWST 1 – MPC Materials					R	
TWST 2 – Point Mensuration					R	
TWST 3 - Weaponneering					R	
Instructional Ability			R			
Evaluator Ability				R		
Nuclear Mission Support						R
<p>Note: Gradesheets task elements for each area are included in AFI14-2B-2, Volume 1, Attachment 4. There is one Academics Gradesheet to record training and trainee performance for all the knowledge events. For each area, mark the appropriate information and record the training IAW AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1. Passing criteria for any knowledge evaluation is 85% of answers correct.</p> <p>* Either the MPC Initial Situation Briefing or Assumption of Alert Briefings may be evaluated; both are not required.</p>						

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. General Grading Standards.

3.1.1. The grading criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: General Grading Criteria and Specialized Training Grading Criteria. Use all sections for criteria applicable to the events performed on the evaluation. (T-2)

3.1.2. If major areas are divided into sub-areas, assign only one grade to each overall major area. Annotate discrepancies in sub-areas on the back of the AF Form 4350. (T-2)

3.1.3. Gradesheets in AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1 used by the trainer to document completed training should be used to assist the IE in determining the overall qualification. (T-2)

3.2. General Grading Areas.

Table 3.1. General Grading 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 at least 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.
MANUAL OB	
Q	Without the use of automated intelligence support systems and IAW Mil Standard 2525C, <i>Common Warfighting Symbology</i> and US Army Field Manual (FM) 1-02, <i>Operational Terms and Graphics</i> , accurately plotted all threats/items within .5nm 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 regard to unit requirements. Accurately used of DD/MM/SS vs. DD/MM.mm. Accurately maintained OB to unit specifications, including classification and currency. Applied correct classification and security markings used on all products generated.
Q-	Plotted 95% of the OB within .5nm of center point of coordinates on a TPC (or larger-scale chart), and the remaining 5% within 1nm on a TPC (or larger-scale chart). Minor inconsistencies in symbology, corrected with little prompting.
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. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
AUTOMATED OB	
Q	Demonstrated proficiency in using applicable intelligence support systems to

	maintain OB, including “current as-of” times and classification. Able to input OB manually with zero typographical errors. Successfully downloaded, printed, exported and displayed data. Able to manipulate data, display threat rings and perform terrain-masking analysis. Correctly converted geographic coordinates and Military Grid Reference System. Able to utilize applicable tools to aid in mission planning. Applied correct classification and security markings used on all products generated.
Q-	Required some assistance, but no impact on mission success.
U	Required significant assistance. Lacked proficiency in operating intelligence support systems to the detriment of mission performance. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
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 message traffic log, identified significant events and issued threat update codes (TUCs). Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Omitted no more than one key area/issue at changeover and 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. Displayed 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 limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information might have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
DEPLOYMENT BRIEFING	
Q	Professionally delivered, well organized, clear. Effective use of checklist or local procedures. Tailored, relevant content. Easily understood by audience. Effective use of visual aids. Classification appropriate for audience. Hit key points, including synopsis of military and political situation that generated 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 discern irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted, no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Failed to use checklist. 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. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information might have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
INITIAL SITUATION/SITUATION BRIEFING	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items, and well tailored analysis relevant to audience. Effective use of visual aids. Concise, yet thorough, delivery. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed ability to discern irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Quickly identified significant information and rapidly disseminated to appropriate audience. Fielded questions correctly. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Briefing poorly organized, hard to follow, somewhat redundant, but no impact on mission. Able to recover when prompted.
U	Failed to use checklist. Briefing very confusing, major omissions that would hamper audience understanding of the situation. Unable to recover. Major mission impact. 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 might have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
ATO/ACO/SPINS/JIPTL BREAKOUT	
Q	Demonstrated ability to access correct ATO/ACO/SPINS/JIPTL and any changes. Correctly extracted mission tasking, airspace control measures and other information relevant to unit or tasking. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or impact mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that could have jeopardized mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
MPC INITIAL SITUATION BRIEFING (I.E. FRAG DROP)	
Q	Sufficiently prepared, researched and delivered a briefing to operations and intelligence personnel that covered appropriate and necessary items. Items include, but are not limited to the following: Tactical scenario, fraged assets, Commander intent, target significance, tasked weapons, environmental considerations, threat considerations and recommended route. Clearly articulated and communicated key briefing items to the audience.
Q-	Committed errors in developing briefing materials. Marginally covered key threat and other intelligence data. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Errors, omissions or delays in developing and disseminating the briefing.

	Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings. Failed to clearly articulate and/or disseminate key threat information.
FEASCAP BRIEFING	
Q	Relayed appropriate target, weaponeering and threat information to audience. Clearly organized and professionally delivered, with appropriate visual aids and mission materials. Concise yet thorough. Clear understanding of target and primary threats. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Briefing could be better prepared or organized. Some difficulty with use of mission materials.
U	Failed to use checklist. Organization or lack of preparation seriously impacted audience understanding of the briefing. Poor understanding of the requirements or lack of adequate mission materials delayed mission planning timeline. Major omissions of information critical to the planning cycle. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
MISSION PLANNING CELL SUPPORT	
Q	Demonstrated clear understanding and proper use of mission planning materials. Chose scales and views appropriate for mission. Knew proper channels for requesting information or materials. Accurate portrayal of target, terminal area threats and hazards as well as ingress and egress factors to consider. 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 area. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Errors or minor omissions in mission materials which would not preclude mission accomplishment. Minor problems in organizing mission materials and identifying and ordering requirements. Corrected when prompted.
U	Major omissions or errors which would have impacted mission. Poor understanding of mission requirements or sources for mission materials. Chose incorrect scales or views for target. Incorrectly plotted target or threats. Did not know how to request information or target materials. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
WEAPONNEERING	
Q	Developed/chose correct weaponeering solutions. Successfully employed most current Joint Munitions Effectiveness Manuals software/tools. Appropriately referenced Joint Munitions Effects Manual (JMEM) data sources. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge and comprehension of weaponeering procedures. Did not adversely affect overall task accomplishment.
U	Did not understand how to use weaponeering reference materials/tools. Chose incorrect weaponeering solution. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
PRE-TAKE OFF BRIEFING	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical

	sequence. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items: takeoff, ingress, target area, egress, 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, identified significant events and issued TUCs. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated. Fielded questions correctly.
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 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 B-52 mission capabilities. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
ASSUMPTION OF ALERT BRIEFING	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items. 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, identified significant events and issued TUCs. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated. Fielded questions correctly.
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 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 B-52 mission capabilities. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
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. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
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 B-52 mission capabilities. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
DEBRIEFING	
Q	Thoroughly prepared and was able to extract pertinent mission results in timely manner. Quickly identified perishable information. Controlled the debrief,

	asked amplifying questions, and recognized irrelevant information. Collected all significant intelligence with sufficient detail to accomplish reporting requirements IAW theater directives. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered.
U	Failed to 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 information. Properly formatted. Met reporting timelines. Correctly annotated message traffic log, identified significant events and issued TUCs. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
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	Incomplete or inaccurate report. Writing skills confused meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination (e.g. not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.

3.3. Specialized Training Grading Criteria. The following grading criteria apply to duty positions in which personnel maintain specialized qualifications (e.g., External Intelligence Trainer, Intelligence Evaluator, and Targeting/Weaponizing Specialized Training).

Table 3.2. External Intelligence Trainer Evaluation Grading Criteria.

INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY	
Q	Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated and met all objectives. Effectively fielded and accurately answered questions from audience. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Able to quickly retrieve answers/amplifying data from reference materials. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
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 effectively communicate instruction to the audience. 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. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified at least 85% of all items in visual recognition test.
Q-	Not applicable

U	Fails to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in visual recognition test.
---	---

Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Grading Criteria.

EVALUATOR ABILITY	
Q	Efficiently and effectively leads and manages training presentations and discussions in order to meet training objectives. 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. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Minor problems in managing training presentation and discussions in order to meet training objectives. 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 lead and/or manage training presentations and discussions. Training objectives not met. 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. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.

Table 3.4. Nuclear Mission Support Evaluation Grading Criteria.

Q	Successfully received, collated, and developed requisite mission materials to support a representative B-52 nuclear mission. Provided thorough and timely support to operations personnel in developing, quality-controlling, and disseminating mission materials to local aircrews and planners. Flawlessly followed and adhered to security requirements and handling procedures. Judiciously followed checklists and procedures. Applied correct classification and security markings on all products generated.
Q-	Deficiencies in quality of mission materials. Minor problems in developing mission materials and following security and operations requirements. Mission materials not developed in a timely fashion.
U	Failed to use checklist. Failed to produce quality mission materials. Failed to meet mission material production timelines. Failed to meet security and handling requirements. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.

Table 3.5. Targeting/Weaponing Specialized Training Grading Criteria.

MISSION PLANNING CELL MATERIALS (TWST-1)
--

Q	Successfully and accurately analyzed (i.e. "broke out") ATO/ACO/SPINS. Successfully plotted a representative number of targets or other points to command standards for tolerance/error. Obtained in a timely fashion appropriate target materials for a representative mission. Provided timely and appropriate support to operations planning personnel.
Q-	Deficiencies in quality of mission materials. Minor problems in developing mission materials and following security and operations requirements. Mission materials not developed in a timely fashion.
U	Failed to produce quality mission materials. Failed to correctly analyze tasking documents (i.e. ATO/ACO). Failed to meet mission material production timelines. Failed to meet security and handling requirements. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
POINT MENSURATION (TWST-2)	
Q	Correctly and accurately received and validated and mensurated geographic points to support a representative mission. Successfully rendered mensurated points within command or national or theater standards. Explained the nature of point mensuration certification and the differences between local and National Geospatial Intelligence Agency certification.
Q-	Not Applicable
U	Failed to render/produce a representative number of mensurated points within local/national/theater standards/tolerance errors. Incorrectly classified materials or applied classification and security markings.
WEAPONNEERING (TWST-3)	
Q	Correctly and accurately developed weaponeering solutions. Upon receipt of tasking of a representative mission, developed weaponeering solutions for gravity (unguided), cluster and precision-guided munitions. Effectively employed and used JMEM software, developing accurate weaponeering recommendations. Solution/answers (i.e. probability of damage, other factors) are similar to those of highly trained personnel to within a degree of latitude of .05 percentage points of error. Accurately explained the basis for answers provided and inputs used in developing the answers.
Q-	Not Applicable
U	Failed to render/produce accurate weaponeering solutions. Unable to explain inputs used in weaponeering solutions and/or basis for inputs of the problems. Incorrect classification.

LARRY D. JAMES, Lt Gen, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Surveillance
and Reconnaissance

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

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013
AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, 29 November 2007
AFI 14-119, *Intelligence Support to Force Protection*, 15 August 2007
AFI 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, 10 March 2008
AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, 10 March 2008
AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1, *B-52 Unit Intelligence Training*, 24 February 2012
AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008
Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS)
MIL STD 2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbology*, 17 November 2008
US Army Field Manual, FM 1-02, *Operational Terms and Graphics*, 21 September 2004

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*
AF Form 4349, *Record of Intelligence Evaluation*
AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*
AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACO—Airspace Control Order
AFGSC—Air Force Global Strike Command
ANG—Air National Guard
AOR—Area of Responsibility
ATO—Air Tasking Order
BMC—Basic Mission Capable
CMR—Combat Mission Ready
EIT—External Intelligence Trainer
FEASCAP—Feasibility and Capabilities
FRAG—Fragmentary
IAW—In Accordance With
IE—Intelligence Evaluator
INIT—Initial (Evaluation)

INIT MSN—Initial Mission
INTREP—Intelligence Report
IQT—Initial Qualification Training
JIPTL—Joint Integrated Prioritized Target List
JMEM—Joint Munitions Effects Manual
MAJCOM—Major Command
MDS—Mission Design Series
MISREP—Mission Report
MPC—Mission Planning Cell
MQF—Master Question File
MQT—Mission Qualification Training
MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation
NMS—Nuclear Mission Support
OB—Order of Battle
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
OGI—Operations Group Intelligence
POL—Political
PR—Personnel Recovery
QUAL—Qualification (Evaluation)
Q—Qualified
QT—Qualification Training
RAD—Research, Analysis, and Dissemination
SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer
SPINS—Special Instructions
T-2—Tier 2
T-3—Tier 3
TWST—Targeting/Weaponneering Specialized Training
TPC—Tactical Pilotage Chart
TUC—Threat Update Code

Terms

Additional Training—Any training recommended to remedy deficiencies identified during an evaluation that must be completed by the due date. This training may include self-study, instruction, computer-based training or supervised tasks. Additional training must include

demonstration of satisfactory knowledge or proficiency to an IE, supervisor or trainer to qualify as completed.

Basic Mission Capable (BMC)—The status of intelligence personnel who have satisfactorily completed MQT, are qualified in the unit mission, but do not maintain the training frequency of those in CMR status. Personnel must be able to attain CMR currency status within 30 days, or as otherwise specified in the applicable AFI 14-2MDSv1.

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

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

Currency—A measure of how frequently and/or recently a task is completed. Currency requirements are intended to 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 aircrew.

External Intelligence Trainer Evaluation—An evaluation that qualifies 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 AFI 14-2MDS, 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 aircrew or other non-intelligence AFSC personnel.

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

Initial Qualification Training (IQT)—Training needed to qualify intelligence personnel for basic duties in an assigned position for a specific MDS, weapons system, intelligence organization, function or activity, without regard for a unit's specific mission.

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 qualifies and maintains IE qualification of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member as an IE (i.e., INIT IE and RQ IE) as directed in this volume. The designator for the IE 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.

Internal Intelligence Training Program (IITP)—The internal intelligence training program is a unit-developed and maintained program. It is intended to facilitate all personnel in maintaining

their qualifications and currencies. This volume provides a basic starting point for B-52 intelligence units and may be modified by the SIO based on the unit's requirements.

Internal Training Program Manager—The Internal Training Program Manager is appointed by the SIO to oversee the execution of the Internal Training Program.

Mission Qualification Evaluation (MSN)—An evaluation that qualifies and maintains the qualification (CMR or BMC) of the examinee. Includes evaluations that initially qualify and requalify an intelligence member (i.e., INIT MSN, RQ MSN). The mission qualification evaluation is administered to ensure the individual's ability to support full mission planning and employment in accomplishing the unit's operational mission. 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 needed to qualify intelligence personnel to perform their specific unit mission in an assigned position. AFI 14-2B-52, Volume 1, prescribes minimum MQT requirements.

Proficiency—The quality of having competence and a command of the fundamentals derived from practice and familiarity. A measure of how well a task is completed. An individual is considered proficient when he/she can perform tasks at the minimum acceptable levels of speed, accuracy, and safety.

Qualification Evaluation (QUAL)—An evaluation that determines the examinee's suitability for being awarded the Basic Qualification designation. The QUAL is administered to ensure basic qualification in support to the MDS, weapons system, organization, function or activity, and duty position of the intelligence professional. The designator for the qualification evaluation is "QUAL" as used with the AF Form 4349 and AF Form 4350.

Ready Intelligence Program (RIP)—Task requirements that apply to BMC and CMR intelligence personnel. The RIP outlines minimum CT requirements and is designed to focus training on capabilities needed to accomplish the B-52 unit's core tasked missions. The RIP establishes the minimum number of task requirements per training cycle for BMC and CMR qualified personnel. All intelligence personnel filling duty positions that are designated BMC or CMR will accomplish these requirements.

Recheck—A subsequent evaluation used to remedy a failed evaluation.

Requalification Evaluation—An evaluation administered to remedy a loss of qualification due to expiration of a required periodic evaluation, loss of currency exceeding 6 months (as specified in applicable AFI14-2XXv2) or a recheck following a failed evaluation.

Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO)—The SIO is the highest-ranking Air Force officer holding the 14N3 or 14N4 Air Force Specialty Code (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 qualifies 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 will be identified in AFI 14-2MDS, Volume 1.

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

Supervised Status—The status of a member who must operate under the supervision of either an instructor or a designated supervisor (as specified in the applicable AFI14-2MDSv2 qualified in that specific position). The evaluator determines when supervision is required. The type of supervisor, i.e., instructor or designated supervisor, is as specified in the applicable AFI14-2MDSv2, or as determined by the SIO.

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 commander level.