

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

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



5 NOVEMBER 2014

Intelligence

**CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER
(CRC) 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: ACC/A2

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

Pages: 18

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 CRC units. This publication applies to all Regular Air Force (RegAF), Air Force Reserve (AFR) and Air National Guard (ANG) intelligence personnel supporting CRC operations. ANG will be considered functionally as a major command (MAJCOM) for the purposes of this instruction. This Instruction requires collecting and maintaining information protected by the *Privacy Act of 1974*, System of Records Notices (SORN) F033 AF B, *Privacy Act Request File*, and F036 AF PC Q, *Personnel Data Systems (PDS)*, apply. This AFI may be supplemented at any level, but all supplements that directly implement this publication must be routed to Air Combat Command (ACC)/A2 for coordination prior to certification and approval. Refer recommended changes and questions about this publication to the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*; route AF Forms 847 from the field 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. 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 located in the Air Force Records Information Management System.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. General. This volume provides guidance for the CRC intelligence standardization and evaluation (Stan/Eval) program. With the cited references, it establishes the procedures and criteria for evaluating intelligence personnel during the knowledge and task phases of initial (INIT) and periodic evaluations. All evaluations will be conducted IAW the provisions of AFI 14-202, Volume 2, and this publication. These procedures are the minimum and can be supplemented with unit-level written guidance. Unit-level guidance will not be less restrictive.

1.1.1. References. The primary references for CRC intelligence operations are AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 1, *Control and Reporting Center (CRC) Unit Intelligence Training*; AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3, *Control and Reporting Center (CRC) Unit Intelligence Procedure*; Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (AFTTP) 3-1.General Planning, *General Planning and Employment Considerations*; AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide and Countertactics Manual*; AFTTP 3-1.TACS, *Theater Air Control System (TACS)*; AFTTP 3-1.CRC, *Tactical Employment—Control and Reporting Center*; and this instruction.

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

Chapter 2

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. Introduction. The unit intelligence Stan/Eval function provides commanders a tool to validate intelligence personnel readiness. Standardization ensures that mission design series (MDS)-specific intelligence training programs support combat operations based upon proven tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) and are in accordance with established safety standards. When administered in a consistent manner using prescribed performance standards, evaluations serve a two-fold function: ensure that individual intelligence personnel achieve and maintain their combat mission ready (CMR) status in accordance IAW AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 1, and that the training program continues to meet operational requirements. (T-2)

2.2. Senior Intelligence Officer (SIO). The conduct and composition of the unit Stan/Eval program is directed by and resides under the supervision/responsibility of the unit SIO IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-2)

2.3. Intelligence Evaluators (IE). The evaluation portion of the Stan/Eval Program is administered by IEs at the unit level. Only qualified IEs will conduct unsupervised intelligence evaluations. (T-2)

2.3.1. IEs will conduct and document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. An examinee must have successfully completed all duty position required Mission Qualification Training (MQT) or Specialized Training (ST) requirements outlined in AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 1, *CRC Unit Intelligence Training* prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified IE.

2.3.2. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment and in conjunction with local events (e.g., actual deployment briefing or post-mission debrief) to the maximum extent possible. When it is impossible to conduct evaluations in a realistic environment, use an alternate method (e.g., simulated, staged, or verbal examination). Document the reasons for and type of alternate method used in the comments section of the AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*.

2.3.3. IEs will use the evaluation criteria contained in Chapter 4 to conduct all intelligence evaluations. To ensure standard and objective evaluations, IEs will be thoroughly familiar with the prescribed evaluation criteria.

2.3.4. Prior to beginning an evaluation, the IE will brief the examinee on the conduct, purpose, requirements and applicable criteria of the evaluation. The examinee will accomplish required planning IAW the task being evaluated.

2.3.5. The IE will compare examinee performance for each area accomplished during the evaluation with the evaluation criteria provided in this volume and assign an appropriate evaluation grade for the area. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level.

2.3.6. The IE will use the AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, to assist in grading the individual areas during the evaluation. The form used by the IE will be a blank AF Form 4381, not the one completed by the trainer during MQT/ST. The gradesheet elements

specific to CRC intelligence tasks are found in attachments 3 and 4 of AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 1. Record the completion and results of evaluator evaluations on the AF Form 4350.

2.3.7. In addition to the guidance provided by this publication, IEs will be expected to use their personal experience and knowledge in the assessment of examinee performance.

2.3.8. The IE will thoroughly debrief all aspects of the evaluation with the examinee. This debrief will include the examinee's overall rating, specific deviations, area grades assigned (if other than qualified) and any required additional training.

2.4. Additional Training. IEs are responsible for recommending additional training at their discretion. Document any additional training and completion IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-2)

2.5. Unsatisfactory Performance. Examinees receiving an overall qualification level 3 ("Q-3") 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 an evaluation, they will not perform duties related to the evaluated task unsupervised until remedial actions are accomplished. (T-2)

Chapter 3

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

3.1. General. The intelligence evaluation must include the areas listed in this chapter as depicted in Table 3.1., Intelligence Evaluations. Evaluations will take into account the assigned duty position. (T-2)

Table 3.1. Intelligence Evaluations.

SUBJECT	INIT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE
Knowledge Evaluations				
CRC Weapons Systems Academics	R	R	---	---
Threat Knowledge	R	R	---	---
Friendly and Neutral Weapons Systems	R	R	---	---
AOR Command and Control (C2) Structure	R	R	---	---
Personnel Recovery (PR)	R	R	---	---
Force Protection Intelligence (FPI)	R	R	---	---
Mission Principles and Engagements	R	R	---	---
Performance Evaluations				
Threat Briefings	R	R	---	---
Situation Displays	R	R	---	---
Manual Order of Battle (OB)	R	R	---	---
Automated OB	R	R	---	---
Initial Situation Briefing	R	R	---	---
Situation Update Briefing	R	R	---	---
Changeover Briefing	R	R	---	---
Deployment Briefing	R	R	---	---
Air Tasking Order (ATO)/Airspace Control Order (ACO)/Special Instructions (SPINS) and Other Tasking Documents	R	R	---	---
Intelligence Support to Mission Planning	R	R	---	---
Mission Materials Construction	R	R	---	---
Mission Briefing	R	R	---	---
Step Briefing	R	R	---	---
Debriefing	R	R	---	---
Intelligence Reports	R	R	---	---
Specialized Task Evaluations				
Instructional Ability	---	---	R	---
Evaluator Ability	---	---	---	R
Notes:				
Gradesheet elements for each area are included in AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 1. Passing criteria for any knowledge evaluation is 85% of answers correct.				
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

3.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluations.

3.2.1. Knowledge Evaluation. Conduct knowledge evaluations as part of the initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations to test the examinee's understanding of CRC systems and capabilities, threat knowledge, friendly and neutral weapons systems, PR, FPI, and AOR C2 structure. Examinees will complete a test from the unit's master question file (MQF) for knowledge evaluation subject areas. Examinations will be recorded on the AF Form 4350. Knowledge examinations may also be required during specialized qualification evaluations. Research, analysis and dissemination (RAD) involves knowledge intelligence personnel should be applying throughout all areas of the performance task evaluations and will be evaluated as subsets of each applicable performance task. (T-2)

3.2.2. Performance Task Evaluation. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials in conjunction with current intelligence, unit tasking and area of responsibility (AOR) scenarios. Units must apply operational risk management principles to evaluations conducted during exercises or deployments. The following guidelines assist the IE in conducting evaluations: (T-2)

3.2.2.1. Situation displays. Evaluate the examinee's ability to use intelligence systems to construct, post, update, and maintain quality situation displays based on unit mission and the AOR. Determine the examinee's decision-making abilities to choose the best medium to use for the creating the display. The situation for which the display is being built should contain enough data for the examinee to make decisions on the best medium to use for the creating the display. Include a large variety of items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3, that challenges the examinee to conduct research and analysis to determine the relevance of the data to the situation. The number of items to be plotted should be of sufficient volume to be challenging, yet not so overwhelming that the time taken is beyond that necessary to determine proficiency. The scenario may include erroneous information to mirror the fog of war by including intentionally incorrect coordinates or types of threats for the particular AOR, thereby allowing the IE to assess the examinee's ability to identify errors and question the validity of information. The examinee should use MIL-STD-2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbolology* and US Army Field Manual/US Marine Corps Reference Publication, FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, *Operational Terms and Graphics*.

3.2.2.1.1. Manual OB. The number of OB items in the plotting exercise will be of sufficient volume to have a variety of threats to plot to ensure correct symbology is used. The examinee must be able to identify critical elements of the table of organization and equipment for the OB being used.

3.2.2.1.2. Automated OB. Examinee should be provided with a variety of OB sources from which to pull data. Evaluate the examinee's ability to develop and save threat files, insert accurate data, update and purge data to ensure quality control of the displayed data and question the information's accuracy for a particular AOR.

3.2.2.2. Intelligence Briefings. Evaluate the examinee's ability to prepare and present briefings. Briefings should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, intelligence reports, and other intelligence materials. Other sources that are used to evaluate other mission areas may also be used. Evaluate the research and analysis skills related to briefing preparation. Evaluated briefings include threat, initial situation, situation update, changeover, deployment, mission, and step.

3.2.2.3. ATO/ACO/SPINs and other tasking documents. Evaluate the examinee's ability to obtain, identify, and extract applicable elements of tasking documents. Use scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials. Provide enough information that the examinee's unit is not the sole unit in the tasking mechanism. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to identify unit tasking, supported missions, air space control, personnel recovery SPINS, CRC information and intelligence related information and to breakout unit information and ISR platform tasking without the assistance of automated mission planning tools.

3.2.2.4. Intelligence Support to Mission Planning. Evaluate the examinee's ability to provide intelligence support to mission planners. Use scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials. Evaluate the examinee's knowledge of unit mission planning process. Provide enough information to evaluate the examinee's ability to analyze the ATO/ACO/SPINs breakout, plot unit tasking, and derive specified and implied intelligence requirements (including mission materials). The IE will determine the examinee's ability to analyze operating area threats and terrain. Specific pieces of information should be purposefully omitted to evaluate the examinee's ability to identify intelligence gaps and any assessments of likely answers to the gaps.

3.2.2.5. Mission Materials Construction. Evaluate the examinee's ability to provide mission materials. Use scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to identify and obtain geospatial information and services (GI&S) products to build mission materials and the use of mission planning software to construct mission packages.

3.2.2.6. Debriefing. Evaluate the examinee's ability to participate in and extract pertinent information of intelligence value during a post-mission debriefing. Participate in actual mission crew debriefings whenever possible. The IE will construct inject cards or coordinate with mission crews 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. Evaluate the examinee's ability to prepare for a debriefing; identify time-sensitive information and disseminate it appropriately and expediently. The IE will determine the examinee's ability consult appropriate post mission products; ensure thorough and accurate information collection; and identify key points and develop intelligence by asking amplifying questions relevant to the mission. The examinee will be able to prioritize questions to focus on priority intelligence.

3.2.2.7. Intelligence Reports. Evaluate the examinee's ability to develop and transmit intelligence reports (INTREPs), intelligence summaries (INTSUMs), Daily Intelligence Summaries (DISUMs), situation reports (SITREPs), and Joint Spectrum Interference Resolution (JSIR) reports, and other intelligence reports. Evaluate the examinee's

knowledge of theater reporting directives. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to analyze and extract information from various reports containing intelligence-related information. Generate intelligence reports using computer and/or manual information systems; and validate accuracy and completeness of reports.

3.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations.

3.3.1. External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer Evaluation. Evaluate the examinee's ability to apply instructional concepts and methods and provide training IAW minimum standards to fulfill EIT requirements. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based on current intelligence, unit tasking, and AOR scenarios. EIT trainer evaluations will consist of a knowledge examination and performance task evaluations based on the EIT Trainer training profiles in AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 1. Record the completion and results of EIT Trainer evaluations on the AF Form 4350. The IE will determine the examinee's knowledge of the information presented during EIT by successfully completing a test based on the questions from the unit. The IE will also determine the examinee's ability to present training in each applicable profile. (T-2)

3.3.2. IE Evaluation. Evaluate the examinee's ability to perform intelligence evaluations. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials. Record the completion and results of evaluator evaluations on the AF Form 4350. The IE will determine the examinee's ability to describe evaluation criteria, grading procedures, and evaluation form preparation for an evaluation based on the IE training profiles in AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 1. Provide scenarios for intelligence evaluations, objectivity issues, and techniques for conducting evaluations. (T-2)

Chapter 4

EVALUATION CRITERIA

4.1. General Evaluation Standards. The evaluation criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: MQT and ST evaluation criteria. Use all sections of criteria applicable to the events performed on the evaluation. (T-2)

4.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation criteria apply to tasks associated with the duty positions or work centers in which personnel maintain mission qualifications. (T-2)

Table 4.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answered at least 85% of questions in a test based on the MQF.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Failed to answer at least 85% of the questions correctly.
SITUATION DISPLAYS (Includes MANUAL and AUTOMATED OB)	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Correctly determined the proper medium, including type and scale, for creating the best situation display. Researched and analyzed data for accuracy, inconsistencies, and relevance to the situation. Used manual and automated processes to accurately plot all threats/items within 0.5nm of center point of coordinates. Consistently used correct symbology IAW MIL-STD-2525C and FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A. Correctly extracted geographic coordinates and Military Grid Reference System and/or Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM). Plotted to appropriate level of detail with respect to unit requirements. Successfully downloaded, printed, exported and displayed data. Able to manipulate data, display appropriate threat rings and perform terrain masking analysis. Demonstrated ability to convert various coordinate formats. Accurately maintained situation display to unit specifications, including classification and currency. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Did not select the absolute best medium for creating the situation display. Did not fully research and analyze data resulting in some minor irrelevant items to be included. Plotted 95% of the data within 0.5nm of center point of coordinates, the remaining 5% within 1nm. Minor inconsistencies in symbology, corrected with little prompting. Needed little assistance with coordinate conversions.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Errors would have significantly impacted mission success. Unable to identify errors or inconsistencies in data. Unable to complete tasks without significant supervision or intervention. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE BRIEFINGS (includes Threat, Initial Situation, Situation Update, Changeover, Deployment, Intelligence Support to Mission Planning, Mission, and Step)	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Briefing well organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail and covered all applicable items. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough delivery. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential

	impact on the mission. Demonstrated knowledge of research methods, and information sources. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Provided detailed information tailored to the audience. Demonstrated knowledge of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. Content poorly organized, confusing, and key areas omitted. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor knowledge of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have. Negative impact on the mission. Fabricated information. Unable to accurately field questions. Incorrect classification.
ATO/ACO/SPINS AND OTHER TASKING DOCUMENTS	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Accessed correct tasking documents and any changes. Correctly determined unit tasking, airspace control, CRC information and intelligence related information. Able to breakout unit tasking from tasking documents using manual and automated techniques and tools. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or impact mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local procedures. Errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that could have affected mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
MISSION PLANNING	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Knowledgeable on CRC mission planning processes. Used appropriate research and analysis techniques in reviewing the ATO/ACO/SPINS and derived specified and implied intelligence requirements. Correctly identified and plotted unit tasking/Large Force Employment (LFE). Effectively analyzed operating area threats and terrain; and coordinate with operations to recommend mission routes. Recognized information gaps and assessed likely answers to the gaps. Mission briefing was effectively organized and professionally presented. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Required some assistance, but no impact on mission planning functions. Some difficulty with use of mission materials. Minor omission of information or errors that did not seriously impact mission planning. Mission briefing could be better prepared or organized. Able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Failed to use checklists or follow local procedures. Poorly organized or unprepared to support mission planning. 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 knowledge of capabilities

	or limitations of unit assets may have negative impact on the mission. Poor organization or lack of preparation seriously affected audience understanding of the mission briefing. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
MISSION MATERIALS CONSTRUCTION	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Demonstrated knowledge and proper use of mission planning materials. Accurate portrayal of objective threats and hazards as well as ingress and egress factors to consider. Tailored mission materials to the type of mission being planned and target/objective area. 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. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Errors or minor omissions in mission materials which would not preclude mission accomplishment. Minor problems in organizing mission materials. Corrected when prompted.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local procedures. Major omissions or errors which would have affected mission. Poor knowledge of mission requirements or sources for mission materials. Chose incorrect scales or views in mission materials for target/objective area. Incorrectly plotted objective area threats. Did not know how to request information or target materials. Incorrect classification.
DEBRIEFING	
Q	Used checklists and followed local procedures. Thoroughly prepared and was able to extract pertinent mission results in timely manner. Prepared to debrief. Assembled and brought requisite materials for use to the debriefing. Quickly identified perishable information and ensured prompt dissemination as applicable. Asked amplifying questions, and recognized irrelevant information. Collected all significant intelligence with sufficient detail to accomplish reporting requirements. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Intel portion of the debriefing took too long. Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered. Slow in dealing with time-sensitive information.
U	Failed to use checklists and follow local procedures. Not prepared, didn't have materials for debrief. Disjointed flow. Failed to identify perishable information. Completely missed a debriefing. Lost control of the debriefing. Not enough detail to accomplish reporting requirements. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE REPORTS	
Q	Used checklists and followed local/theater procedures. Knowledgeable of theater reporting directives. Summarized all pertinent information available and included an initial level of tactical analysis with minimal to no extraneous info. Properly formatted. Met reporting timelines. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
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	Failed to use checklists and follow local/theater procedures. Did not complete report within prescribed timelines. Report was not in format required by theater reporting

	directive. Incomplete or inaccurate report. Writing skills confused meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination. Incorrect classification.
--	--

4.3. Specialized Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation criteria apply to tasks associated with the duty positions in which personnel maintain specialized qualifications.

Table 4.2. EIT Trainer Evaluation 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. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
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. Incorrect classification.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – THREAT KNOWLEDGE	
Q	Determined appropriate threat training requirements. Used AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide as the primary reference for training. Tailored threat training to the unit’s mission specific requirements and appropriate audience (e.g., mission crew, security forces). Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3, <i>Unit Intelligence Procedures</i> . Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training
U	Inaccurate information. Did not use AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide as the primary reference for training. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall 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. Incorrect classification and/or security markings
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – COLLECTION AND REPORTING	

Q	Determined appropriate collection and reporting training requirements. Included intelligence-generated reports (e.g., INTREP, SITREP, JSIR) and essential elements of information (EIs). Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3 and the appropriate theater reporting directive. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or reporting directives. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Did not use appropriate theater reporting directive as the primary reference for training. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, or reporting directives. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification and/or security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – PERSONNEL RECOVERY	
Q	Determined appropriate PR training requirements. Coordinated with tactics and survival, evasion, resistance and escape (SERE) personnel. Provided academic instruction on PR operational support processes. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or coordination process. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Did not coordinate with tactics and SERE personnel. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, or sources. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification and/or security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – FORCE PROTECTION INTELLIGENCE	
Q	Determined appropriate FPI training requirements. Included intelligence principles

	and procedures for FPI; summary of hostile forces in AOR and other hot spot areas; examples of hostile forces' tactics and weapons employment; FPI resources; Terrorist Threat Levels; and unit FPI considerations. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or FPI resources. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Somewhat slow in fielding, answering and/or retrieving answers/amplifying data. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inaccurate information. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3. Lack of subject matter knowledge. Could not field, answer or correctly retrieve answers to questions/amplifying data. Used inappropriate reference materials. Overall inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, or sources. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification and/or security markings.

Table 4.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria.

INTELLIGENCE EVALUATOR PROFICIENCY	
Q	Demonstrated ability to evaluate effectively. Planned evaluation efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all objectives. Displayed thorough knowledge of evaluation criteria, grading procedures and evaluation documentation preparation. Completed appropriate evaluation records accurately. Adequately assessed and recorded performance. Comments were clear and pertinent. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge regarding unit procedures, evaluation requirements or documentation. 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 evaluation criteria, grading procedures and evaluation documentation preparation. 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

- AFI 13-1CRC, Volume 2, *Ground Command and Control Systems Standardization/Evaluation Program - Modular Control System Evaluation Criteria*, 27 October 2009
- 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 14-2CRC, Volume 1, *Control and Reporting Center (CRC) Unit Intelligence Training*, 5 November 2014
- AFI 14-2CRC, Volume 3, *Control and Reporting Center (CRC) Unit Intelligence Procedures*, 5 November 2014
- AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013
- AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008
- AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, 29 November 2007
- AFTTP 3-1.CRC, *Tactical Employment—Control and Reporting Center*, 23 August 2013 (S)
- AFTTP 3-1.General Planning, *General Planning and Employment Considerations*, 2 February 2012
- AFTTP 3-1.TACS, *Theater Air Control System (TACS)*, 1 February 2013
- AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide and Countertactics Manual*, 3 December 2012 (S)
- Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS)*
- MIL-STD-2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbolology*, 17 November 2008
- US Army Field Manual/US Marine Corps Reference Publication, FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, *Operational Terms and Graphics*, 21 September 2004

Adopted Forms

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

Abbreviations and Acronyms

- ACC**—Air Combat Command
- ACO**—Airspace Control Order
- AF**—Air Force
- AFI**—Air Force Instruction

AFMAN—Air Force Manual
AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive
AFTTP—Air Force Tactic, Techniques, and Procedures
ANG—Air National Guard
AOR—Area of Responsibility
ACO—Air Control Order
ATO—Air Tasking Order
CMR—Combat Mission Ready
C2—Command and Control
CRC—Command and Reporting Center
DISUM—Daily Intelligence Summary
EEI—Essential Elements of Information
EIT—External Intelligence Training
FPI—Force Protection Intelligence
GI&S—Geospatial Information and Services
IAW—In Accordance With
IE—Intelligence Evaluator
INIT MSN—Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation
INTREP—Intelligence Report
INTSUM—Intelligence Summary
JSIR—Joint Spectrum Interference Resolution
LFE—Large Force Employment
MAJCOM—Major Command
MQF—Master Question File
MQT—Mission Qualification Training
MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation
OB—Order of Battle
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
PR—Personnel Recovery
RAD—Research, Analysis and Dissemination
SERE—Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape
SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer

SITREP—Situation Report

SPINS—Special Instructions

ST—Specialized Training

TACS—Theater Air Control System

TTP—Tactics, Techniques and Procedures

UTM—Universal Transverse Mercator

Terms

Tier 2 (T-2)—Non-compliance may degrade mission or program effectiveness or efficiency and has potential to create moderate risk of mission or program 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 may limit mission or program effectiveness or efficiency and has a relatively remote potential to create risk of mission or program failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the Wing/DRU/FOA/CC level.