

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

**AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-2E-8,
VOLUME 2**



18 APRIL 2013

Incorporating Change 1, 5 AUGUST 2014

Intelligence

**E-8 UNIT INTELLIGENCE EVALUATION
CRITERIA**

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available 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)

Supersedes: AFI14-2E-8V2,
12 December 2008

Pages: 22

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.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This document has been completely revised and must be thoroughly reviewed. Guidance pertaining to waiver, supplements, and volume changes were updated to be consistent with the rest of the series. Terminology was changed to accurately reflect evaluation criteria vs. grading criteria. Table 2.2, Intelligence Evaluations - GEOINT Analyst, was added to reflect differences from the Operations Intelligence evaluations. Evaluation criteria tables were updated.

Chapter 1—GENERAL INFORMATION	3
1.1. General.	3
1.2. Waivers.	3
1.3. Procedures.	3
1.4. Evaluation Instructions.	3
1.5. Additional Training.	4

1.6.	Unsatisfactory Performance.	4
Chapter 2—EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS		5
2.1.	General.	5
2.2.	Evaluation Cycle.	5
Table 2.1.	Intelligence Evaluations - Operations Intelligence.	5
Table 2.2.	Intelligence Evaluations - GEOINT Analyst.	6
2.3.	Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation.	6
2.4.	Specialized Qualification Evaluations.	8
Chapter 3—EVALUATION CRITERIA		10
3.1.	General Evaluation Standards.	10
3.2.	Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria.	10
Table 3.1.	MQT Evaluation Criteria – Operations Intelligence.	10
Table 3.2.	Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria - GEOINT Analyst.	15
3.3.	ST Evaluation Criteria.	16
Table 3.3.	External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria.	16
Table 3.4.	Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria.	19
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION		20

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. The examinee must satisfactorily demonstrate the ability to perform required duties safely and effectively. All evaluations will be conducted IAW the provisions of AFI 14-202, Volume 2, and this publication. (T-2)

1.2. Waivers. MAJCOM/A2 will courtesy-copy ACC/A2 regarding all subordinate unit 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.

1.3. Procedures.

1.3.1. Prior to any formal evaluation conducted by a qualified IE, the examinee must have successfully completed all duty position required Mission Qualification Training (MQT) or Specialized Training (ST) requirements outlined in AFI 14-2E-8, Volume 1, *E-8 Unit Intelligence Training*. (T-2)

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

1.3.3. Prior to commencing 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)

1.3.4. Conduct evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Chapter 5. Document evaluations IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Chapter 7. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment in conjunction with local events (e.g., actual deployment briefing or post-mission aircrew 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 (i.e., simulated, staged, or by verbal examination) in order to complete the evaluation. Document the reasons and type of alternate method used in the Comments section of the AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*. (T-3)

1.3.5. 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)

1.4. 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, Chapter 5. Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IEs will determine the overall qualification level (also found in AFI 14-202, Volume 2, Chapter 5). (T-3)

1.4.1. The IE will use the AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet* to assist in grading the individual areas during the evaluation. The grade sheet elements specific to E-8 intelligence tasks are found in Attachments 3 through 5 of AFI 14-2E-8 Volume 1. (T-3)

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

1.5. 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)

1.6. 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 evaluation (MSN or initial (INIT) 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 all areas listed in this chapter as they relate to the examinee's duty position and as depicted in Tables 2.1, Intelligence Evaluations—Operations Intelligence and/or Table 2.2, *Intelligence Evaluations - Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT) Analyst*. (T-2)

2.2. Evaluation Cycle. Periodic evaluations will be conducted on a 20-month cycle. Evaluations expire on the last day of the 19th month following the month in which the task phase was successfully completed. The individual will enter the eligibility window 14 months after the INIT MSN/MSN eval (6-month period prior to expiration date). Extensions may be granted by the SIO IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. (T-2)

Table 2.1. Intelligence Evaluations - Operations Intelligence.

TITLE	INIT MSN	MSN	EIT	IE
Knowledge Evaluations				
Threat Knowledge	R	R		
Friendly and Neutral Weapons Systems	R	R		
Personnel Recovery Academics	R	R		
Performance Task Evaluations				
Threat Briefing	R	R		
Situation Displays	R	R		
Manual Order of Battle (OB)	R	R		
Automated OB	R	R		
Changeover Briefing	R	R		
Deployment Briefing	R	R		
Initial Situation Briefing	R	R		
Situation Briefing	R	R		
Air Tasking Order (ATO)/Air Control Order (ACO)/Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Target Acquisition (RSTA) Annex/Special Instructions (SPINS) and other tasking documents.	R	R		
Collection Deck Breakout	R	R		
Intelligence Support in Mission Planning				
Mission Planning Briefing	R	R		
Step Briefing	R	R		
Near Real-Time Mission Support	R	R		
Debriefing	R	R		
Intelligence Reports	R	R		
Specialized Task Evaluations				
Instructional Ability			R	
Evaluator Ability				R
Note: Grade sheet elements for each area are included in AFI14-2E-8, 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

Table 2.2. Intelligence Evaluations - GEOINT Analyst.

AREA TITLE	INIT MSN	MSN	IE
Knowledge Evaluation			
GEOINT Data Attributes Analysis (GDAA)	R	R	
Performance Task Evaluations			
Imagery Analysis and Products	R	R	
Ground Moving Target Indicator (GMTI) Analysis and Products	R	R	
Specialized Task Evaluations			
Evaluator Ability			R

Note: Grade sheet elements for each area are included in AFI14-2E-8, 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

2.3. Intelligence Mission Qualification Evaluation.

2.3.1. Knowledge Evaluation. Knowledge evaluations will be conducted as part of the initial and periodic mission qualification evaluations to test the examinee's understanding of threat knowledge, friendly and neutral weapons systems, Personnel Recovery (PR), and GDAA (content is dependent on the examinee's position as either Operations Intelligence or GEOINT Analyst). Examinees will complete a knowledge test from the unit's master question file (MQF) for mission qualification 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) and intelligence preparation of the operational environment (IPOE) involves knowledge intelligence personnel should be applying throughout all areas of performance task evaluations and will be evaluated as subsets of each applicable performance task. (T-2)

2.3.2. Performance Task Evaluation. Use MAJCOM/A2 and/or unit-developed evaluation materials based off of 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 are provided to assist in constructing evaluation materials: (T-2)

2.3.2.1. Operations Intelligence Mission Qualification Tasks.

2.3.2.1.1. 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 14-2E-8, 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, FM 1-02, *Operational Terms and Graphics*.

2.3.2.1.1.1. 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.

2.3.2.1.1.2. 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.

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

2.3.2.1.3. ATO/ACO/RSTA Annex/SPINS and other tasking documents. Scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials may be used for this purpose. Provide enough information that the examinee's unit is not the sole unit tasked in the ATO and RSTA Annex. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in identifying and breaking out the elements of ATO/ACO/RSTA Annex/SPINS. Include unit tasking, supported missions, air space control, personnel recovery SPINS, and Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance platform tasking.

2.3.2.1.4. Collection Deck Breakout. Scenario, actual contingency or exercise materials may be used for this purpose. Ensure the opportunity exists to evaluate the examinee's proficiency in identifying and breaking out the elements of the collection deck. Include mission taskings and locations, reporting information and essential elements of information (EEI).

2.3.2.1.5. Near Real-Time Mission Support. Use scenario or actual exercise to allow examinee to flight follow missions in execution and maintain situational awareness. 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 tasked missions.

2.3.2.1.6. 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 debriefing. Ensure there is enough activity to represent the typical level of detail for a threat scenario commensurate with unit AOR tasking.

2.3.2.1.7. Intelligence Reports. Construct mission reports (MISREPs) or other applicable intelligence reports using information provided in debriefings. Complete reports IAW theater intelligence reporting directives.

2.3.2.2. GEOINT Analyst Mission Qualification Tasks.

2.3.2.2.1. Imagery Analysis and Products. Actual contingency or exercise materials may be used for this purpose. Examinee should be provided with a variety imagery to analyze and disseminate to a specified requester in a timely manner. Examinee should have access to all necessary resources

2.3.2.2.2. GMTI Analysis and Products. Actual contingency or exercise materials may be used for this purpose. Examinee should be provided with a variety of GMTI data (Near Real Time and Historical) to exploit and provide analysis to the requester in a timely manner. Examinee should have access to all necessary resources.

2.4. Specialized Qualification Evaluations.

2.4.1. External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer Evaluation. EIT trainer evaluations will consist of a knowledge examination and a performance task evaluation that will be conducted IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 2. Upon completion of profile EIT 1 and applicable profiles outlined in AFI 14-2E-8, 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)

2.4.1.1. 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. The individual must maintain currency and be reevaluated periodically for the subject matter according to AFI 14-2E-8, Volume 1.

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

2.4.2. 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 ST 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.

Chapter 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

3.1. 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)

3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria. The following evaluation criteria (Table 3.1 and 3.2) apply to tasks associated with the duty positions or work centers in which personnel maintain mission qualifications.

Table 3.1. MQT Evaluation Criteria – Operations Intelligence.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answers at least 85% of questions in test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable.
U	Failed to correctly answer at least 85% of the questions.
THREAT BRIEFING	
Q	Briefing effectively organized and professionally presented in a logical sequence. Clear understanding of research methods and sources and IPOE concepts. Effective use of visual aids. Concise yet thorough delivery. Tailored threat briefing to the capabilities of the E-8 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-8, but not many. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant. Provided extraneous information.
U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Threat was not tailored to E-8 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-8 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, <i>Common Warfighting Symbology</i> and US Army Field Manual/US Marine Corps Reference Publication, FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, FM 1-02, <i>Operational Terms and Graphics</i> . Correctly extracted geographic coordinates and MGRSSs. 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 produced.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered when prompted with no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing poorly organized, hard to follow and redundant.
U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. 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 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	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Failure to 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 the impact information may have. Negative impact on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
CHANGEOVER BRIEFING	
Q	Well planned, appropriate checklist usage, addresses relevant areas. Demonstrated clear understanding of significant events or shortfalls to pass on to next shift. Shows ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Quickly identifies significant information and rapidly disseminated to appropriate audience. Correctly annotated message traffic log, identifies significant events and issued threat update codes (TUCs). Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Omitted no more than one key area/issue at changeover, was able to recover with prompting or minimal assistance. Errors due to extenuating circumstances (e.g. relocation, attacks) vs. poor planning.
U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Deficiencies not due to extenuating circumstances. Inability to recover even with minor prompting. Omissions would have affected next shift. Missed significant information or failed to disseminate information to proper audience. Poor understanding of /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. Classification appropriate for audience. Hit key points including synopsis of military and political situation generating the deployment, host nation information, enemy activity, force disposition within AOR including deployment route, personnel recovery issues and reporting instructions. 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 and no significant impact on mission. Needs improvement in organization or delivery.
U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Poorly organized, not tailored. Confusing. Omitted key areas/critical information. Significant lack of analytical ability. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
ATO/ACO/RSTA ANNEX/SPINS AND OTHER TASKING DOCUMENTS	
Q	Demonstrated ability to access applicable ATO/ACO/RSTA Annex/ /SPINS and any changes. Correctly extracted mission tasking, airspace control measures, combat search and rescue data 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 jeopardized mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
COLLECTION DECK BREAKOUT	
Q	Demonstrated ability to locate and access applicable Collection Deck and any changes. Correctly extracted mission taskings and locations, reporting information, EEIs and other information relevant to unit or tasking. Correct classification/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 and applying information that could have jeopardized mission planning. Unable to accomplish tasks without significant intervention. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO MISSION PLANNING	
Q	Clearly understood mission tasking and was able to address all factors relevant to the mission. When appropriate, provided logical route and orbit recommendations. Well organized and fully prepared. Made appropriate selection and effective use of planning materials and resources. Provided all mission materials in correct quantities and of sufficient detail. Materials neat and well organized. Considered all factors that could impact successful mission accomplishment. Provided thorough terrain analysis with respect to threats, airfields, and route and orbit area. Identified shortfalls in information, recommendations for production/information requests. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions or errors that did not seriously impact mission planning. Able to recover with minor prompting.
U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Poorly organized or unprepared. Made errors or omissions that could have prevented an effective mission. Displayed faulty or limited knowledge of factors relevant to the mission. Improper use of mission planning tools or materials. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Poor understanding of capabilities/limitations of unit assets and/or the impact information may have on the mission. Fabricated information. Incorrect classification.
MISSION PLANNING 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, enroute, orbit area and appropriate PR considerations. Demonstrated ability to identify gaps in information that had potential impact on the mission. Clear understanding of research methods and sources and IPOE concepts. Showed ability to discriminate irrelevant information. Demonstrated understanding of capabilities and limitations of unit assets when conducting analysis. Correctly annotated message traffic log, identified significant events and relayed TUCs. 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 and no significant impact on mission. Needs

	improvement in organization or delivery. Briefing hard to follow, somewhat redundant. Provided extraneous information.
U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Very confusing or redundant. Major gaps in information, unable to recover even with prompting. Significant lack of analytical ability. Unable to conduct basic research. Fabricated information. Demonstrated lack of understanding of E-8 mission capabilities. Incorrect classification.
STEP BRIEFING	
Q	Professionally delivered, well organized and concise. Well planned/prepared and appropriate checklist usage. Tailored, relevant content presented in timely fashion. Appropriate for the particular mission. Provided PR data for aircrew. Reminded aircrew to sanitize uniform. Fielded questions promptly and correctly. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Minor omissions, recovered with prompting- not proactive. Omissions would not have affected mission effectiveness.
U	Poorly organized, confusing. Omitted key areas/critical information. Significant lack of analytical ability. Poor understanding of E-8 mission capabilities. Passed dated information. Incorrect classification.
NEAR REAL-TIME MISSION SUPPORT	
Q	Used all resources (e.g. systems, operations, command post, onboard datalink) to track progress of missions. Well prepared to receive information during various stages. All relevant mission information pre-filled on debrief 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-8 mission capabilities. No plans for contacting divert locations for mission status and reporting information.
DEBRIEFING	
Q	Thoroughly prepared and extracts pertinent mission results in timely manner. Assembled and brought requisite materials for use to the debriefing. Quickly identified perishable 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. Correctly annotated event log. Identified significant events. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Somewhat redundant in questions or failed to ask some amplifying questions that would have enhanced detail of information gathered. Some minor mistakes and some difficulty following the aircrew terminology through the debriefing. Missed some details that should be identified for inclusion in a Mission Report (MISREP).

U	Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Not prepared. Disjointed flow. Failed to identify perishable information. Completely missed debrief. Not enough detail to accomplish reporting requirements. Errors in the reconstruction would have significantly impacted the MISREP. Unable to complete tasks without significant supervision or intervention. Incorrect classification.
INTELLIGENCE REPORTS	
Q	Thoroughly prepared, appropriate checklist usage. Able to summarize and distribute pertinent, validated mission information/results in timely manner. Clearly written with target audience in mind. Met reporting timelines. Properly formatted with correct classification and security markings on all products produced. 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. Minor problems 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. Poor planning or preparation and/or inadequate checklist usage. Incomplete or inaccurate report. Writing skills complicated meaning of information or omitted critical information. Incorrect dissemination (e.g. not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). No knowledge of USMTF, if applicable. Incorrect classification.

Table 3.2. Mission Qualification Evaluation Criteria - GEOINT Analyst.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION: GEOINT DATA ATTRIBUTES ANALYSIS	
Q	Correctly answers at least 85% of questions in test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable for knowledge evaluation.
U	Fails to correctly answer at least 85% of the questions.
IMAGERY ANALYSIS AND PRODUCTS	
Q	Demonstrating proficiency in developing, coordinating and disseminating an imagery product. Accurately fulfilled imagery product request and performed analysis. Annotated imagery properly. Properly utilized imagery viewers for exploitation and reference purposes. Delivered product IAW local timelines, format and content.
Q-	Missed timeline but still delivered quality product. Delay due to extenuating circumstances. Minor problems with clarity, organization or formatting, but pertinent information was included.
U	Did not complete analysis and/or product within prescribed timelines. Product was not in format required. Incomplete or inaccurate information. Incorrect dissemination (e.g., not sent to the correct users through appropriate channels). Unable to properly use imagery viewers. Incorrect classification.
GMTI ANALYSIS AND PRODUCTS	
Q	Provided GMTI product satisfying as many EEIs within a given timeline. Ability to

	provide correct type of GMTI product using multiple analysis tool sets. Delivered product IAW local timelines, format and content.
Q-	Missed timeline but still delivered quality product. Delay due to extenuating circumstances. Minor problems with clarity, organization or formatting, but pertinent information was included.
U	Did not complete analysis and/or product within prescribed timelines. Unable to satisfy EEIs. Unable to properly use analysis tool sets. Product was not in format required. Incomplete or inaccurate information. Incorrect classification.

3.3. ST Evaluation Criteria. The following grading criteria apply to duty positions in which personnel maintain specialized qualifications (e.g., EIT Trainer, IE).

Table 3.3. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria.

KNOWLEDGE EVALUATION	
Q	Correctly answers at least 85% of questions in test based on MQF.
Q-	Not applicable for knowledge evaluation.
U	Failed to correctly answer at least 85% of the questions.
VISUAL RECOGNITION	
Q	Correctly identified 85% of all items in visual recognition test.
Q-	Not applicable for knowledge evaluation.
U	Fails to identify correctly at least 85% of all items in visual recognition test.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY - GENERAL	
Q	Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively and modify training to audience. 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.
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 - THREATS AND COUNTERMEASURES	
Q	Determined appropriate threat training requirements. Used AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide as the primary reference for training. Tailored threat training to the E-8 mission specific requirements and appropriate audience (e.g. aircrew, security forces, etc). Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2E-8 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, 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-8 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 C&R training requirements. Included aircrew originated reports (in-flight report, etc.), intelligence-generated reports (MISREP, Intelligence Report, etc.) and EEs. Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all applicable items from AFI 14-2E-8 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-8 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 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-8 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 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-8 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/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-8 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-8 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/security markings.
INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY – FORCE PROTECTION INTELLIGENCE	
Q	Determined appropriate Force Protection Intelligence (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-8 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-8 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/security markings.
---	---

Table 3.4. 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.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization of evaluation. Did not adversely affect the evaluation. Minor errors or omissions in evaluation records. Comments were incomplete or slightly unclear.
U	Inability to effectively communicate evaluation procedures to the examinee. Did not plan evaluation efficiently and/or made poor decisions that adversely affected the evaluation process. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from evaluator effectiveness. Did not complete required forms or records. Comments were invalid, unclear, or did not accurately document performance. Incorrect classification.

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

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

- 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 14-2E-8, Volume 1, *E-8 Unit Intelligence Training*, 18 April 2013
- AFI 14-2E-8, Volume 3, *E-8 Unit Intelligence Procedures*, 18 April 2013
- AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013
- AFI 36-2201, *Air Force Training Program*, 15 September 2010
- AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records*, 1 March 2008
- AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, 29 November 2007
- AFTTP 3-1.General Planning, *General Planning and Employment Considerations*, 6 February 2014 (S)
- AFTTP 3-1.JSTARS, *Tactical Employment—E-8C JSTARS*, 20 May 2011 (S)
- AFTTP 3-1.Threat Guide, *Threat Reference Guide*, 2 May 2014 (S)
- MIL STD 2525C, *Common Warfighting Symbolology*, 17 November 2008
- FM 1-02/MCRP 5-12A, *Operational Terms and Graphics*, September 2004

Adopted Forms

- AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*
- AF Form 4349, *Record of Intelligence Evaluation*
- AF Form 4350, *Special Task Certification and Recurring Training*
- AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*

Abbreviations and Acronyms

- ACC**—Air Combat Command
- ACO**—Airspace Control Order
- AFE**—Aircrew Flight Equipment
- AFI**—Air Force Instruction
- AFMAN**—Air Force Manual
- AFPD**—Air Force Policy Directive
- AFTTP**—Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures
- ANG**—Air National Guard

AOR—Area of Responsibility

ATO—Air Tasking Order

EI—Essential Elements of Information

EIT—External Intelligence Training

FPI—Force Protection Intelligence

GDA—GEOINT Data Attributes Analysis

GEOINT—Geospatial Intelligence

GMTI—Ground Moving Target Indicator

I—In Accordance With

IE—Intelligence Evaluator

INIT—Initial

INTREP—Intelligence Report

IPOE—Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment

JSTARS—Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (also Joint STARS)

MAJCOM—Major Command

MGRS—Military Grid Reference System

MISREP—Mission Report

MQF—Master Question File

MQT—Mission Qualification Training

MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation

OB—Order of Battle

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility, Officer Performance Report

PR—Personnel Recovery

RAD—Research, Analysis, and Dissemination

RSTA—Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Target Acquisition

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

Terms

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

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