

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

**AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2E-3,
VOLUME 2**



17 DECEMBER 2012

Incorporating Change 1, 6 AUGUST 2014

Intelligence

***E-3 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
(Brig Gen Donald J. Bacon)

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 training personnel performing intelligence duties in E-3 units. This publication applies to Regular Air Force (RegAF), Reserve and Air National Guard (ANG) intelligence personnel supporting E-3 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.

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. Procedures.	3
1.3. Evaluation Instructions.	3
1.4. Additional Training.	4
1.5. Unsatisfactory Performance.	4
Chapter 2—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS	5
2.1. General.	5
Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations.	5
2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluations.	6
2.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations.	8
Chapter 3—EVALUATION CRITERIA	9
3.1. General.	9
3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.	9
Table 3.1. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.	9
3.3. Specialized Evaluation Criteria.	14
Table 3.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria.	14
Table 3.3. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria.	17
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION	19

Chapter 1

GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. General. This volume provides intelligence evaluators (IE) 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 and this publication.

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. ACC/A2 will notify AF/A2DF of any significant trends in waiver correspondence if such correspondence indicates the need to readdress policy and guidance.

1.2. Procedures.

1.2.1. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified IE, the examinee must have successfully completed (verified by applicable AF Form 4381) all duty position required Mission Qualification Training (MQT) or Specialized Training (ST) requirements outlined in AFI 14-2E-3, Volume 1, *E-3 Unit Intelligence Training*. (T-2)

1.2.2. IEs will use the evaluation criteria contained in Chapter 3 to conduct 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 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. (T-3)

1.2.4. Conduct and document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment in conjunction with local events (e.g., actual deployment briefing, post-mission debrief) to the maximum extent possible. When it is impossible to conduct an evaluation in a realistic environment, evaluations may be conducted via an alternate method (e.g., 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-3)

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. Evaluation Instructions. Standards and performance parameters are contained in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, and this publication. 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. Use the general area/sub-area grades in AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level. (T-3)

1.3.1. 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 evaluator will be a blank AF

Form 4381, not the one completed on the individual during MQT/ST. The gradesheet elements specific to E-3 intelligence tasks are found in attachments 3 and 4 of AFI 14-2E-3 Volume 1. (T-3)

1.3.2. IE judgment must be exercised when the wording for general evaluated areas is subjective and when specific situations are not covered. (T-3)

1.4. 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-3)

1.5. 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 a mission qualification evaluation (INIT MSN or MSN), they will not perform mission duties unsupervised until remedial actions are accomplished. If an examinee receives a Q-3 on a specialized evaluation, they will not perform specialized duties until remedial actions are accomplished, but they can perform mission duties unless specifically restricted. (T-2)

Chapter 2

EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

2.1. General. The intelligence evaluation must include the areas listed in this chapter as depicted in Table 2.1, *Intelligence Evaluations*. (T-2)

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations.

SUBJECT	INIT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE
Knowledge Evaluations				
E-3 Weapons Systems Academics	R	R	---	---
Threat Knowledge	R	R	---	---
Friendly and Neutral Weapons Systems	R	R	---	---
Visual Recognition (VR)	R	R	---	---
Personnel Recovery (PR)	R	R	---	---
Force Protection Intelligence (FPI)	R	R	---	---
Command and Control (C2) Above Wing-Level in the Area of Responsibility (AOR)	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 Briefing	R	R	---	---
Changeover Briefing	R	R	---	---
Deployment Briefing	R	R	---	---
Air Tasking Order/Air Control Order/Special Instructions (ATO/ACO/SPINS) and Other Tasking Documents	R	R	---	---
Intelligence Support to Mission Planning	R	R	---	---
Mission Package Construction	R	R	---	---
Support to Electronic Warfare	R	R	---	---
Mission Briefing	R	R	---	---
Step Briefing	R	R	---	---
Mission Tracking	R	R	---	---
Debriefing	R	R	---	---
Intelligence Reports	R	R	---	---
Specialized Task Evaluations				
Instructional Ability	---	---	R	---
Evaluator Ability	---	---	---	R
Note: Gradesheet elements for each area are included in AFI14-2E-3, 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

2.2. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluations.

2.2.1. Knowledge Evaluation. Knowledge evaluations will be conducted as part of the initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations to test the examinee's understanding of E-3 systems and capabilities, threat knowledge, friendly and neutral weapons systems, VR, PR, FPI, and C2 above wing-level. Examinees will complete a knowledge test from the unit's master question file (MQF) for mission qualification evaluation subject areas. Examinees will take a separate VR test. Both examinations will be recorded on the AF Form 4350. Knowledge examinations may also be required during specialized qualification evaluations. Research, analysis and dissemination (RAD) and intelligence preparation of the operational environment (IPOE) 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)

2.2.2. Performance Task Evaluation. Units may use evaluation materials provided by MAJCOM/A2s or may assemble evaluation materials themselves using current intelligence, unit tasking and AOR scenarios. Units must apply operational risk management principles to evaluations conducted during exercises or deployments. The following guidelines are provided to assist in constructing evaluation materials: (T-2)

2.2.2.1. Situation displays. 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 14-2(MDS), Volume 3 that will challenge 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 exercise will include both geographic coordinates and Military Grid Reference System (MGRS) coordinates. Evaluate the examinee's ability to convert coordinates between geographic coordinates (DD/MM/SS) and MGRS (NNAAAXXXXXX); and also from geographic coordinates to decimal minutes (DD/MM.mm). 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*.

2.2.2.1.1. Manual Order of Battle. 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 symbolology is used. The examinee must be able to identify critical elements of the table of organization and equipment for the OB being used.

2.2.2.1.2. Automated Order of Battle. 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.

2.2.2.2. Intelligence Briefings. Briefings should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, intelligence reports, and imagery. Other sources that are used to evaluate other mission areas may also be used. Evaluated briefings include: threat briefings, initial situation briefing, situation briefing, changeover briefings, deployment briefing, mission briefing, and step briefing.

2.2.2.3. Air Tasking Order, Airspace Control Order and Special Instructions and Other Tasking Documents. Scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials will be used for this purpose. Provide enough information that the examinee's unit is not the sole unit tasked on the ATO. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in identifying and breaking out the elements of ATO/ACO/SPINS to include unit tasking, air space control, PR and intelligence information. As applicable, personnel should be evaluated on other types of tasking requests they may face in particular theaters.

2.2.2.4. Intelligence Support to Mission Planning. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials will be used. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in planning, coordinating and conducting the entire mission planning process. Provide enough information to evaluate the examinee's ability to analyze the tactical problem/scenario, threat considerations, terrain, and weather, route/avenue(s) of approach recommendation(s), as appropriate. Evaluate proficiency in identifying and plotting unit tasking. Specific pieces of information should be purposefully omitted to evaluate the examinee's ability to define intelligence gaps and submit requests for information. Information for the situation briefing should be assembled from information provided by the evaluator; message traffic, and intelligence reports.

2.2.2.5. Mission Package Construction. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials will be used. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in obtaining necessary mission materials including geospatial information and services to build mission materials. Demonstrate proficiency in utilizing mission planning software to construct mission packages. Evaluate ability to assist in building different fly-away kits.

2.2.2.6. Support to Electronic Warfare. Scenario or actual contingency/exercise materials will be used. Evaluate examinee's ability to analyze all source information to characterize adversary electronic emitters of interest. Ensure data from the Detailed Emitter Report (DER) obtained during Electronic Combat Officer (ECO) debriefing is used. The DERs should be completed via appropriate intelligence systems IAW local guidance. The IE may assume the role of a simulated Electronic Support Team (EST) to field recommended database changes. Grade the examinee's use of applicable intelligence systems, use ability to decipher valid Passive Detection System (PDS) data and properly identify fields requiring PDS database updates.

2.2.2.7. Mission Tracking. Use scenario or actual exercise to allow examinee to flight follow missions in execution. Ensure opportunity exists to evaluate examinee's proficiency to keep abreast of ongoing missions and upcoming debriefs. Examine debrief forms to see that information has been filled in to maximum extent prior to engine shut

down. Present simulated situation where aircraft is diverted. Ensure systems are used if available to aid examinee in monitoring progress of ongoing missions.

2.2.2.8. Debriefing. Conduct aircrew debriefings following actual flying missions whenever possible. The evaluator may construct inject cards or coordinate with aircrew 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 control the debriefing, ask amplifying questions and recognize irrelevant information. Conduct ECO debriefing following actual flying missions whenever possible. Grade the examinee's ability to extract relevant information regarding electronic signatures observed as well as any conflicts, ambiguities or omissions.

2.2.2.9. Intelligence Reports. Construct mission reports (MISREP) and intelligence reports (INTREP) using information provided in the aircrew debriefing. Complete reports IAW theater intelligence reporting directives.

2.3. Specialized Qualification Evaluations.

2.3.1. External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer Evaluation. EIT trainer evaluations will consist of a knowledge examination and a performance task evaluation and be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Upon completion of profile EIT 1 and one or all of the remaining profiles outlined in AFI 14-2E-3, Volume 1, the EIT trainer will demonstrate knowledge of the information presented by successfully completing a test based on the questions from the master question file (85 percent minimum to pass), as applicable. The EIT trainer will also be evaluated on their ability to present training in each applicable profile. Evaluators will give the examinee no less than 4 hours notice of the subject matter or briefing topic for the evaluation. (T-3)

2.3.1.1. In certain circumstances it may be beneficial to qualify an individual to conduct training in more than one individual EIT event at a time. The individual must complete the specific training identified for the event and be evaluated on the task or briefing element by an IE. Document the evaluation in coordination with AF/A2 approved processes regarding online documentation. The individual must maintain currency and be reevaluated periodically for the subject matter according to AFI 14-2E-3, Volume 1. (T-2)

2.3.1.2. Subsequent evaluations may be conducted as part of the periodic mission evaluation. All applicable EIT and MSN areas must be evaluated.

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

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. General. Evaluation Standards. The evaluation criteria in this chapter are divided into two sections: Mission Qualification and Specialized evaluation Criteria. Use all sections of criteria applicable to the events performed on the evaluation. (T-2)

3.2. 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.

Table 3.1. 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.
VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in VR test.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Failed to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in VR test.
THREAT BRIEFING	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough delivery. Tailored threat briefing to the capabilities of the E-3 airframe, avionics and countertactics. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced. Fielded questions correctly.
Q-	Presentation somewhat lacking in quality but all required areas were covered. Minor omissions, recovered when prompted. Some comparisons of threat to E-3, but not many. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant. Provided extraneous information.
U	Threat was not tailored to E-3 capabilities. 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 E-3 mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
SITUATION DISPLAYS (Includes MANUAL and AUTOMATED OB)	
Q	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 MGRSs. 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	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.
INITIAL 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. Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. 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 and IPOE concepts. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Understood and provided detailed information tailored to the audience. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, redundant.
U	Failed to use checklist. Content poorly organized, not tailored appropriately. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of IPOE concepts. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or impact information may have. Negative impact on mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
SITUATION BRIEFING	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items since last update, and well-tailored analysis relevant to audience. Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. 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 and IPOE concepts. 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. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification/security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, redundant.
U	Failed to use checklist, follow local procedures. Content not tailored appropriately. Confusing. Omitted key areas. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of IPOE concepts. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or impact information may

	have. Negative impact on mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
CHANGEOVER BRIEFING	
Q	Well planned, appropriate checklist usage, addressed relevant areas. Demonstrated clear understanding of significant events or shortfalls to pass 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 the audience. Correctly annotated event log, identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Omitted no more than one key area/issue at changeover, was able to recover with prompting or minimal assistance. Errors due to extenuating circumstances (e.g., relocation, attacks) vs. poor planning.
U	Failed to use checklist. Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Deficiencies not due to extenuating circumstances. Inability to recover even with minor prompting. Omissions would have affected next shift. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
DEPLOYMENT BRIEFING	
Q	Professionally delivered, well organized, clear. Effective use of checklist and followed local procedures. Tailored, relevant content. Easily understood by audience. Effective use of visual aids. Classification appropriate for audience. Identified key points including synopsis of military and political situation generating the deployment, and enemy activity and force disposition in AOR and along deployment route. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Fielded questions correctly. Correct classification/security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with 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 may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
ATO/ACO/SPINS AND OTHER TASKING DOCUMENTS	
Q	Demonstrated ability to access the correct ATO/ACO/SPINS and any changes. Correctly extracted mission tasking, airspace control measures, personnel recovery and other information relevant to unit or tasking. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Some errors or delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize or impact mission planning timeline. Accomplished tasks but needed minimal assistance.
U	Errors, omissions or delays in extracting information that could have impacted mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.

INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO MISSION PLANNING	
Q	Effective use of checklist. Used appropriate research and analysis techniques in reviewing the ATO/ACO/SPINS or other tasking documents, unit IPOE, target acquisition, threat considerations, tactics, terrain, and weather, target imagery, route/avenue(s) of approach recommendation(s), as appropriate. Correctly identified and plotted unit tasking. Recognized information gaps and submitted requests for information through appropriate channels. Situation briefing was effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Appropriate level of detail, covered all applicable items. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Required some assistance, but no impact on mission planning functions. Briefing could be better prepared or organized. Some difficulty with use of mission materials. Minor omission of intelligence information required for mission; however nothing that was critical to mission planning.
U	Failed to use checklist. Poor understanding of the requirements or lack of adequate mission materials delayed mission planning timeline. Major omissions of information critical to the planning cycle. Organization or lack of preparation seriously impacted understanding of the briefing. Incorrect classification.
MISSION PACKAGE CONSTRUCTION	
Q	Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. 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 mission area threats and hazards as well as ingress and egress factors to consider. Materials neat and well organized. Considered all factors that could impact successful mission accomplishment. Provided thorough analysis of terrain, threats, route, combat air patrol (CAP) area(s) and/or mission area. 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 and identifying and ordering requirements. Corrected when prompted.
U	Failed to use checklist and follow local procedures. 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 mission materials. Incorrectly plotted threats. Did not know how to request information. Did not provide analysis of threats, route, CAP or mission area. Incorrect classification.
SUPPORT TO EW	
Q	Coordinated post mission DER with the EST IAW local procedures. Integrated all-source analysis tools and databases with DERs from E-3 PDS intercepts. Demonstrated proficiency in analysis of adversary electronic emitters with regards to E-3 system performance utilizing appropriate automated Intel systems. Provide recommendations to Electronic Support Team Chair on reprogramming of E-3 PDS databases. Use approved procedures to implement database changes IAW prescribed local timelines, formats and requirements.
Q-	Some errors/delays in extracting information that did not jeopardize/impact E-3 PDS mission integration. Completed tasks IAW local guidance, required some assistance.
U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Deficiencies not due

	to extenuating circumstances. Inability to recover even with minor prompting. Displayed faulty or limited knowledge of relevant analytical techniques utilizing automated intel systems. Failed to follow approved procedures IAW local guidelines.
MISSION BRIEFING	
Q	Effectively used checklist and followed local procedures. 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, en route, mission area, egress, divert airfields, and appropriate PR considerations. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods, sources, IPOE concepts. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Correctly identified significant events, issued threat update codes. Correct classification/security markings on all products. Fielded questions correctly.
Q-	Presentation somewhat lacking in quality but all required areas were covered. Minor omissions or errors but recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant. Provided extraneous information.
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. Poor understanding of IPOE concepts. Fabricated information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of E-3 mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
STEP BRIEFING	
Q	Well organized and concise; presented relevant facts in timely fashion and IAW local requirements. Appropriate for the particular mission. Identified, analyzed and highlighted changes and updates since mission briefing. Correct classification.
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 E-3 mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
MISSION TRACKING	
Q	Used all resources (systems, operations, command post, onboard datalink) to track progress of missions. Well organized to receive information during various stages. All relevant mission information pre-filled on debriefing forms. Aware of all cancelled or diverted missions. Made provisions for debrief at diverted location via personnel or other electronic means. All personnel had access to mission tracking and could quickly interpret information to derive mission status.
Q-	Did not utilize resources well. Made updates to tracking mechanism with prompting, not proactive. All personnel could not quickly derive mission status. Debrief forms not pre-filled with mission information.
U	No mechanism for effectively updating status of missions. Most personnel not capable of interpreting or updating mission status. Unaware of cancelled missions. Completely missed an update or passed on erroneous information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of E-3 mission capabilities. No plans for contacting divert locations for mission status and reporting information.

DEBRIEFING	
Q	Thoroughly prepared and was able to extract pertinent mission results in timely manner. Assembled and brought requisite materials for use to the debriefing. Quickly identified time-sensitive information and ensured prompt dissemination as applicable. Controlled the debriefing, asked amplifying questions, and recognized irrelevant information. Collected all significant intelligence with sufficient detail to accomplish reporting requirements IAW checklists and theater directives. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Debrief 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 checklist. Not prepared, didn't have materials for debriefing. 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	Clearly written with target audience in mind. Summarized all pertinent information available and included an initial level of tactical analysis with minimal to no extraneous info. Properly formatted. Met reporting timelines. Produced report IAW checklists and theater directives. Correctly identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced. Appropriate knowledge of US Message Text Format (USMTF), if required.
Q-	Missed timeline but still delivered quality intelligence report. Delay due to extenuating circumstances. A minor problem with clarity, organization or formatting; but pertinent information was included. Working knowledge of USMTF, but required some assistance.
U	Did not complete report within prescribed timelines. Report was not in format required by theater intelligence reporting directive. Failed to use checklist. Incomplete or inaccurate report. Writing skills was confusing or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination (e.g., not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). No knowledge of USMTF. Incorrect classification.

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

Table 3.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria.

EIT 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.
EIT VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in VR test.
Q-	Not applicable
U	Failed to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in VR test.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY - GENERAL	
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 SYSTEMS	
Q	Determined appropriate threat training requirements. Used Air Force Tactics Techniques and Procedures (AFTTP) 3-1.Threat Guide as the primary reference for training. Tailored threat training to the unit’s MDS, mission specific requirements and appropriate audience (e.g., aircrew, security forces). Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2E-3 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.
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 14-2E-3 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 effectiveness. Incorrect classification/security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – COLLECTION AND REPORTING	
Q	Determined appropriate collection and reporting training requirements. Included aircrew originated reports (e.g. In-flight Report), intelligence-generated reports (e.g., MISREP, INTREP) and essential elements of information. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently, made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2E-3 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.
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 14-2E-3 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 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 some areas seriously detracted from effectiveness. Incorrect classification/security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Determined appropriate VR training requirements. Included enemy/adversary, friendly, and neutral aircraft, surface threat, ground equipment and naval vessel recognition features. Incorporated all aspects/angles, theater-specific paint schemes/national markings, and various configurations along with the name or numerical designator of all enemy/adversary/friendly/neutral weapons systems presented. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2E-3 Volume 3. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Effectively fielded, accurately answered and/or quickly retrieved answers to questions/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification/security markings on all products.
Q-	Information correct, but not effectively tailored to the specific audience. Small deficiencies in subject matter knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, training requirements or items to include in training. 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 14-2E-3 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 effectiveness. Incorrect classification and/or security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – PERSONNEL RECOVERY	
Q	Determined appropriate PR training requirements. Coordinated with tactics, aircrew flight equipment (AFE) 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 14-2E-3 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.
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, AFE and SERE personnel. Missed applicable items from AFI 14-2E-3 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 some areas seriously detracted from 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 14-2E-3 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.
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 14-2E-3 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 effectiveness. Incorrect classification and/or security markings.

Table 3.3. 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 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.
--	--

LARRY D. JAMES, Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Surveillance,
and Reconnaissance

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

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

AFI 11-2E-3, Volume 2, *E-3 Aircrew Evaluation Criteria*, 23 February 2012

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 14-205, *Geospatial Information and Services*, 5 May 2010

AFI 14-2E-3, Volume 1, *E-3 Unit Intelligence Training*, 17 December 2012

AFI 14-2E-3, Volume 3, *E-3 Unit Intelligence Procedures*, 17 December 2012

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

AFI 36-2208, *Military Personnel Record System*, 30 August 2006

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

AFTTP 3-1. Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide*, 2 May 2014 (S)

Air Force Records Disposition Schedule (RDS)

MIL STD 2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbolology*, 17 November 2008

FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, *Operational Terms and Graphics*, 21 September 2004

Adopted Forms

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

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

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

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

Abbreviations and Acronyms

A2—Directorate of Intelligence

ACC—Air Combat Command

ACO—Airspace Control Order

AF—Air Force

AFE—Aircrew Flight Equipment

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
ATO—Air Tasking Order
CAP—Combat Air Patrol
C2—Command and Control
DER—Detailed Emitter Report
ECO—Electronic Combat Officer
EIT—External Intelligence Training
EST—Electronic Support Team
FPI—Force Protection Intelligence
IAW—In Accordance With
IE—Intelligence Evaluator
INIT EIT—Initial Mission Qualification EIT Evaluation
INIT MSN—Initial Mission Qualification Evaluation
INTREP—Intelligence Report
IPOE—Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment
MAJCOM—Major Command
MGRS—Military Grid Reference System
MISREP—Mission Report
MQF—Master Question File
MQT—Mission Qualification Training
MSN—Mission Evaluation
OB—Order of Battle
OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility
PDS—Passive Detection System
PR—Personnel Recovery
RAD—Research, Analysis and Dissemination
SERE—Survival, Evasion, Resistance and Escape
SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer
SPINS—Special Instructions
ST—Specialized Training

T-2—Tier 2

T-3—Tier 3

USMTF—US Message Text Format

VR—Visual Recognition