



Department of Defense MANUAL

NUMBER 3115.11

March 24, 2015

Incorporating Change 1, Effective September 8, 2016

USD(I)

SUBJECT: DoD Intelligence and Security Training Standards

References: See Enclosure 1

1. PURPOSE. In accordance with the authority in DoD Directive (DoDD) 5143.01 and the guidance in DoD Instruction (DoDI) 3115.11 (References (a) and (b)), this manual assigns responsibilities and provides intelligence and security standards and procedures for the validation, design, development, maintenance, assessment, and delivery of DoD intelligence and security training for DoD personnel.

2. APPLICABILITY. This manual applies to OSD, the Military Departments (including the Coast Guard at all times, including when it is a Service in the Department of Homeland Security by agreement with that Department), the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) and the Joint Staff, the Combatant Commands, the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Defense Agencies, the DoD Field Activities, and all other organizational entities within the DoD (referred to collectively in this manual as the “DoD Components”).

3. RESPONSIBILITIES. See Enclosure 2.

4. PROCEDURES

a. Enclosure 3 identifies the overarching framework for assuring workforce capability is directly supported through the definition of relevant and validated learning requirements.

b. Enclosure 4 identifies an instructional design model using the plan, analyze, design, develop, implement, and evaluation phases for DoD intelligence and security training as a standardized and repeatable process.

c. Enclosure 5 identifies the basic instructor certification to ensure all DoD intelligence and security training is conducted by instructors using a standardized and repeatable process.

d. Enclosure 6 identifies the accreditation criteria for the DoD intelligence and security training institutions and certification programs.

e. Enclosure 7 identifies the standards for training evaluation to ensure all DoD intelligence and security training is continually evaluated.

5. INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUIREMENTS. The Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification, referred to in paragraphs ~~3e~~1d(2), 1d(4), and 4c of Enclosure 2, *paragraph 4 of Enclosure 3, paragraph 4 of Enclosure 4, paragraph 5 of Enclosure 5, and paragraph 4 of Enclosure 7* of this manual, has been assigned report control symbol DD-INT(A,SA)2252 ~~and~~ in accordance with ~~DoD Manual 3305.02-Volume 1 of DoD Manual 8910.01~~ (Reference (c)). *The expiration date of this information collection is listed in the DoD Information Collections System at <https://eitsdext.osd.mil/sites/dodiic/Pages/default.aspx>.*

6. RELEASABILITY. **Cleared for public release.** This manual is available on ~~the Internet from~~ the DoD Issuances Website at <http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives>.

7. EFFECTIVE DATE. This manual is effective March 24, 2015.



Michael G. Vickers
Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence

Enclosures

1. References
2. Responsibilities
3. DoD Intelligence and Security Learning Requirements Standard
4. DoD Intelligence and Security Instructional Systems Design Standard
5. DoD Intelligence and Security Instructor Certification Standard
6. DoD Intelligence and Security Accreditation Requirements and Standard
7. DoD Intelligence and Security Training Evaluation Standard

Glossary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ENCLOSURE 1: REFERENCES.....5

ENCLOSURE 2: RESPONSIBILITIES.....6

 UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE (USD(I)).....6

 UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY (USD(P)).....6

 UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS
 (USD(P&R)).....6

 DoD COMPONENT HEADS AND COMMANDANT OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD
 (USCG).....7

 CJCS.....7

ENCLOSURE 3: DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY LEARNING REQUIREMENTS
STANDARD.....8

 INTRODUCTION.....8

 IMPLEMENTATION.....8

 LEARNING REQUIREMENTS MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE.....9

 Establish Learning Requirements.....9

 Perform Gap Analysis.....10

 Identify and Inform Learning Solutions.....10

 Implement Learning Solutions.....11

 Assess Impact.....11

 INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT.....11

ENCLOSURE 4: DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS
DESIGN STANDARD.....12

 INTRODUCTION.....12

 IMPLEMENTATION.....12

 INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN GUIDANCE.....13

 Analysis.....13

 Design.....14

 Development.....15

 Implementation.....15

 Evaluation.....16

 INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT.....17

ENCLOSURE 5: DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY INSTRUCTOR CERTIFICATION
STANDARD.....18

 INTRODUCTION.....18

 IMPLEMENTATION.....18

IMPLEMENTATION IMPLEMENTING GUIDANCE.....	18
CRITERIA FOR BASIC DoD INSTRUCTOR CERTIFICATION	19
Subject Matter Expertise.....	19
Qualifications.....	19
Demonstrate Content Proficiency and Delivery	20
Supervised Instruction	21
Certification Assessment	21
INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT	21
ENCLOSURE 6: DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARD	23
INTRODUCTION	23
ACCREDITATION FOR AN INSTITUTION	23
ACCREDITATION FOR A CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	23
ENCLOSURE 7: DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY TRAINING EVALUATION STANDARD.....	24
INTRODUCTION	24
IMPLEMENTATION.....	24
TRAINING EVALUATION GUIDANCE	24
Level I - Reaction and Satisfaction.....	24
Level II - Learning and Performance.....	25
Level III - Application and Behavior.....	25
Level IV - Results	26
INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT	26
GLOSSARY	27
PART I: ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	27
PART II: DEFINITIONS.....	27
FIGURES	
1. Learning Requirements Management Standard.....	9
2. Basic Level Instructor Qualifications	20
3. Instructor Observation and Evaluation Checklist	21

ENCLOSURE 1

REFERENCES

- (a) DoD Directive 5143.01, "Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)),” October 24, 2014
- (b) DoD Instruction 3115.11, "DoD Intelligence Human Capital Management Operations,” January 22, 2009, as amended
- ~~(c) DoD Manual 3305.02, "DoD Collection Management (CM) Accreditation and Certification,” November 21, 2012~~
- (~~dc~~) DoD Manual 8910.01, Volume 1, "DoD Information Collections Manual: Procedures for DoD Internal Information Collections,” June 30, 2014
- (~~ed~~) Deputy Secretary of Defense Memorandum, "Training in International Security and Foreign Disclosure Support to International Programs,” October 22, 1999
- (~~fe~~) DoD Directive 5124.02, "Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)),” June 23, 2008
- (~~gf~~) DoD Instruction 1400.25, Volume 250, "DoD Civilian Personnel Management System: Civilian Strategic Human Capital Planning (SHCP),” November 18, 2008
- (~~hg~~) DoD Instruction 3305.02, "DoD General Intelligence Training,” November 28, 2006, as amended
- (~~ih~~) DoD Instruction 3305.09, "DoD Cryptologic Training,” June 13, 2013
- (~~ji~~) DoD Instruction 3305.10, "Geospatial Intelligence (GEOINT) Training,” July 3, 2013
- (~~kj~~) DoD Instruction 3305.11, "DoD Counterintelligence (CI) Training,” March 19, 2007, as amended
- (~~lk~~) DoD Instruction 3305.13, "DoD Security Education, Training, and Certification,” February 13, 2014
- (~~ml~~) DoD Instruction 3305.14, "Joint Intelligence Training (JIT),” December 28, 2007, as amended
- (~~nm~~) DoD Instruction 3305.15, "DoD Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Training,” February 25, 2008, as amended
- (~~on~~) DoD Instruction 3305.16, "DoD Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT) Training,” June 12, 2008
- (~~po~~) Intelligence Community Directive Number 610, "Competency Directories for the Intelligence Community Workforce,” September 1, 2008
- (~~qp~~) Section 300.103(c) of Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations
- (~~rq~~) Section 102 of Public Law 107-296, "Homeland Security Act of 2002,” November 25, 2002
- (~~sr~~) Institute for Credentialing Excellence, "National Commission for Certifying Agencies: Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs,” 2004
- (~~ts~~) Institute for Credentialing Excellence, "ICE 1100 – Quality Standard for Assessment-Based Certificate Programs,” 2009¹

¹Available for purchase at <http://www.credentialingexcellence.org/p/cm/ld/fid=15>

ENCLOSURE 2
RESPONSIBILITIES

1. UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE (USD(I)). The USD(I):

a. Ensures that sustainment requirements for institutional accreditation, as required to satisfy the DoD Components' implementation plans, are identified and included in planning, programming, budgeting, and execution actions.

b. Reviews resource requests for training programs upon budget submission and provides additional guidance as needed.

c. Ensures training institutions are compliant with the guidelines, processes, procedures, and requirements described in the enclosures of this manual.

d. Ensures the DoD Intelligence Training and Education Board:

(1) Maintains insight into the status, or progress on adherence to approved training standards.

(2) Establishes the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification requirements in accordance with the procedures in Reference (c) ~~and Volume 1 of DoD Manual 8910.01 (Reference (d))~~, including a program review ensuring alignment with current national and department goals and objectives.

(3) Convenes working groups to develop or revise data collection requirements.

(4) Establishes and updates reporting formats and schedules for the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification.

2. UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY (USD(P)). The USD(P) oversees security training and foreign disclosure support to international programs pursuant to Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum (Reference (~~ed~~))

3. UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS (USD(P&R)). The USD(P&R):

a. In accordance with DoDD ~~5124.21~~ 5124.02(Reference (~~fe~~)):

(1) Incorporates intelligence and security certification designations into the management of intelligence and security professionals.

(2) Captures and incorporates requirements for intelligence and security certifications in personnel and manpower databases under USD(P&R) authority.

b. In accordance with Volume 250 of DoDI 1400.25 (Reference (g)), incorporates intelligence and security certification programs and progress in meeting goals into the Strategic Human Capital Planning and congressional reports.

4. DoD COMPONENT HEADS AND COMMANDANT OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD (USCG). The DoD Component heads and the Commandant of the USCG:

a. Implement policies, procedures, standards, and requirements within their Component as specified in this manual.

b. Ensure DoD intelligence and security schoolhouses achieve and sustain institutional accreditation in accordance with Enclosure 6 of this manual.

c. Annually report to the USD(I) on the progress of Component program compliance with the training standards of this manual in the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification.

5. CJCS. In addition to the responsibilities in section 4 of this enclosure, the CJCS monitors effectiveness of the intelligence and security training, certification, and professional development programs to support joint military intelligence requirements.

ENCLOSURE 3

DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY LEARNING REQUIREMENTS STANDARD

1. INTRODUCTION. The DoD intelligence and security learning requirements standard defines the overarching framework for assuring workforce capability is directly supported through the definition of relevant and validated learning requirements. This standard:

- a. Establishes a structured process for the development, validation, and implementation of learning requirements to ensure that all applicable learning solutions are mission-aligned, effectively planned, optimally resourced, and efficiently executed.
- b. May supplement or complement Component policy within the respective DoD intelligence and security training institutions.

2. IMPLEMENTATION

a. DoD intelligence and security functional managers, designated training councils, and training institutions implementing functional areas defined in References (hg) through (en) (referred to collectively in this manual as the “DoD functional managers”):

(1) Manage requirements consistent with the guidance in this manual and other applicable DoD intelligence and security guidance to meet their functional and organizational mission needs.

(2) Share content of learning solutions as broadly as possible except where limited by federal law, DoD policy, or security classification.

(3) Facilitate maximum use of Defense Intelligence Enterprise and Defense Security Enterprise-wide architecture and common standards for learning technology. Existing programs will be leveraged in regard to content, processes, and technology use to the maximum extent possible. The DoD intelligence and security communities will maximize use of approved common storage and tagging criteria for all learning content, regardless of delivery medium, to ensure searchability and share-ability.

b. The DoD functional managers are responsible for the compliance, execution, and oversight of this manual. The DoD functional managers may process learning requests by evaluating evidence of differences between current capability and the capability standards in creating prioritized validated requirements.

(1) To effectively prioritize validated learning requirements, DoD functional managers require a shared understanding of:

(a) A common framework and language for defining DoD workforce capabilities required to fulfill the mission and the associated competencies, knowledge, and skills critical to the successful execution of those capabilities.

(b) Current skill capability levels compared to expected and required capability levels.

(2) Learning management provides prioritized, validated learning requirements to the DoD intelligence and security learning functions.

(3) The DoD intelligence and security training management functions participate in gap analysis, coordinating with DoD functional managers and their respective training councils, parallel to the learning requirements validation process. The validated requirements are then translated into action plans, coordinated with existing learning assets to identify shared resources and services and allocate resources to develop learning solutions.

c. The DoD intelligence and security training functions that support the development and delivery of learning, including intelligence and security schoolhouses and DoD Component training assets, are responsible for assuring systemic process integration with the learning requirements established by the respective DoD functional managers.

d. The standard in this enclosure provides the framework for linking workforce capability and related learning requirements to the DoD intelligence and security instructional design standard outlined in Enclosure 4 and the DoD intelligence and security training evaluation standard outlined in Enclosure 7 of this manual.

3. LEARNING REQUIREMENTS MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE. DoD functional managers and DoD Components should use the framework described in this section (see Figure 1) when establishing learning requirements management processes.

Figure 1. Learning Requirements Management Standard

Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5
Establish Learning Requirements	Perform Gap Analysis	Identify and Inform Learning Solutions	Implement Learning Solutions	Assess Impact (repeat phases as necessary)

a. Establish Learning Requirements

(1) DoD functional managers and components will define key indicators of workforce effectiveness, reflect utilization, performance, and capability of a workforce and the impact on mission attainment. This can be done with a review of previous learning requirements, needs assessment, or through another analysis method. Analysis must be based on validated needs and data driven with solutions supported by data.

(2) Each DoD functional manager and DoD Component will conduct DoD Intelligence and Defense Security Enterprise-wide assessment of mission-based capabilities to identify mission-based competency requirements for each functional area. The assessment must identify functional or work requirements in terms of associated competencies and proficiency level requirements.

(a) Review the assessment results in light of mission need, changing priorities, or perishability of the information.

(b) Align the assessment with the appropriate competency directory in accordance with Intelligence Community Directive 610 (Reference (po)). Conduct assessments in accordance with section 300.103 of Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (Reference (gp)).

b. Perform Gap Analysis. Paragraphs 3b(1) and (2) provide guidance for DoD Components to evaluate the differences between current capability and the capability standards. Where necessary, DoD functional managers and components perform root cause analysis to ensure learning requirements are based on well-identified gaps in knowledge, skills, or attributes necessary to meet mission objectives.

(1) Establish an internal Competency Gap Assessment Report to internally assess and report processes on current and projected competency gap information, for selected mission-essential workforce capabilities to present internal findings to the DoD functional manager and components.

(a) The Competency Gap Assessment Report must identify and document:

1. Functions, occupations, positions, and jobs assessed.
2. Process for collecting and analyzing competency gaps.
3. Competency gap information.

(b) The Competency Gap Assessment Report will be a critical consideration for establishing new or modified learning requirements and in evaluating ad hoc requests for additional learning solutions.

(2) The procedure associated with paragraphs 3b(1)(a) and 3b(1)(b) will be determined by the involved DoD functional manager and components. Competency gap assessments must be conducted in accordance with Reference (po).

c. Identify and Inform Learning Solutions. DoD functional managers disseminate the capability standards and the competency gap results to ensure alignment of concept development, design, and delivery of learning solutions. The learning management functions support the DoD functional managers and components, working in coordination with training

assets to inform learning solutions and ensure the appropriate subject matter expertise is engaged.

d. Implement Learning Solutions. DoD functional managers and components design solutions to ensure success and limit unintended consequences while implementing the learning solutions. Enclosure 4 of this manual contains details on this process.

e. Assess Impact. In addition to performing gap analysis, the DoD functional manager and components using a stakeholder group as advisors will assist in this assessment process. This group - comprised of learners, cohorts, instructors, supervisors, leaders, and those who may benefit from the learners' training and education - monitors and evaluates the impact of the learning solution to ensure alignment with the learning requirements and overall performance improvement. The impact is assessed for the effectiveness of the learning solution in the transfer of knowledge to the learner and the effectiveness of the requirement in closing the identified competency gap.

(1) DoD training institutions and component training assets must assess the effectiveness of the learning solution as a means of knowledge transfer. Enclosure 7 provides details of the training evaluation process.

(2) DoD functional managers and components must assess the effectiveness of the requirement in closing the identified competency gap through oversight and a validation that will ensure:

(a) The content delivered at training institutions and through DoD Component training assets is aligned with their mission and meets the learning requirements.

(b) The learning solutions delivered at training institutions and through DoD Component training assets achieve the required capabilities.

4. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT

a. USD(I) will provide specific requirements for the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification. Information will be reported semi-annually in support of the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification.

b. Progress and compliance to this standard are reviewed as part of the USD(I) triennial staff assistance visits (SAVs) with each schoolhouse. Best practices identified during a SAV will be shared for the benefit of all members of the DoD intelligence and security communities.

ENCLOSURE 4

DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS DESIGN
STANDARD

1. INTRODUCTION. The DoD Intelligence and Security Instructional Systems Design (ISD) standard defines the overarching framework for crafting learning content by following a methodology for designing instruction. This standard applies to all training institutions within the DoD intelligence and security communities. The standard supplements any component policy that may already be in use within the respective DoD intelligence and security training institutions. This standard excludes informal learning.

2. IMPLEMENTATION. DoD schoolhouses and programs responsible for the training of the DoD intelligence and security workforce:
 - a. Develop policies consistent with the criteria in this standard and References (kg) through (on) to meet their organizational mission needs.

 - b. Use ISD to develop instructional specifications to ensure quality of instruction that learners use to meet specified performance goals.

 - c. Create processes and procedures to plan, analyze, design, develop, implement, manage, and evaluate instruction.

 - d. Develop and implement procedures to manage the learning functions, to include operational control and direction of support functions, administrative functions, instructional system development functions, and delivery of evaluating instruction and learning platforms consistent with this manual and applicable DoD policy issuances.

 - e. Develop and implement a support function to maintain all parts of ISD.

 - f. Develop and implement an administrative function for day-to-day processing and record keeping, as well as long-term accountability.

 - g. Develop and implement an effective solution set to bring instruction to the learner population.

 - j. Develop and implement an evaluation function to gather feedback data (refer to the training evaluation standard outlined in Enclosure 7 of this manual).

 - i. Implement and share learning content as broadly as possible except where limited by federal law, Departmental policy, or security classification. Learning content will be visible, accessible, and deliverable by the DoD intelligence and security workforce as appropriate.

j. Share learning resources (i.e., course content, skill refinements, competencies, best practices, instructors).

k. Use DoD intelligence and security community-wide architecture and standards to facilitate reusability of content, processes, and technology. The DoD intelligence and security workforce will establish common storage and tagging criteria for all learning content, regardless of delivery medium, to ensure searchability and share-ability.

3. INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN GUIDANCE. New instruction, or significant revision of an existing formal instruction, should follow a process that includes, at a minimum, the five phases of instructional design: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation.

a. Analysis. During the analysis phase, the designer identifies the learning problem, the goals and objectives, the learner's needs, existing knowledge, and other relevant characteristics. The designer determines who must be trained, what must be trained, when training will occur, and where the training will take place. The products of this phase are the foundation for all subsequent development activities. To facilitate this:

(1) Identify and define the target population characteristics, including current level of performance in the area such as what the target population already knows and can do and what the job requires them to know and do.

(2) Develop a task list (objectives to accomplish).

(3) Select appropriate techniques for determining broad learning outcomes based on the needs assessment findings and any established competencies.

(4) Determine scope and learning and non-learning outcomes from the needs assessment.

(5) Analyze characteristics of the learning environment, considering the specific organizational mission needs.

(6) Assess the usefulness, applicability, and benefits of existing training or instructional materials, if available.

(7) Establish criteria for selecting the learning solution and, based on the criteria, select the appropriate learning solution or approach, such as instructor-led or eLearning.

(8) Assess the benefits of using existing and emerging technologies as an element of the recommended solution.

(9) Assess the benefit of presenting learning content in more than one instructional modality, especially to allow for completion by individuals who cannot be physically present.

(10) Determine training constraints and alternatives.

(11) Implement formative evaluation plans with process and product evaluations.

b. Design. The design phase ensures the systematic process of specifying learning objectives that guide development of the training program. The course look and feel, graphic design, user-interface, and content are also determined. The design phase is driven by the analysis phase deliverables and concludes with such items as storyboards, prototypes, or blueprints that guide the development process. To facilitate this the designer must:

(1) Write learning outcomes and specific learning objectives that are clearly tied to the results of the analysis phase, which are clearly understood by all stakeholders (i.e., learners, cohorts, instructors, supervisors, and leadership) and that are measurable.

(2) Use an appropriate educational taxonomy (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy) before the development of instructional content and methods for assessing student performance levels.

(3) Define and sequence the learning content and strategies.

(4) Select the appropriate instructional methods and media.

(5) Select or refine available instructional materials.

(6) Design a learning solution that reflects an understanding of the diversity of learners.

(7) Select delivery methods and instructional strategies that support the established learning objectives.

(8) Ensure compliance with copyright and industrial property laws (i.e., trademark, industrial designs, and geographic indications of source).

(9) Determine whether the learning solution or approach contains or would benefit from an eLearning capability. If so:

(a) Determine media items (reusable and new) and identify any new or reusable materials.

(b) Ensure the solution is deliverable for an organization's existing learning technology architecture.

(c) Comply with organizational guidance for life-cycle management of distributed learning content.

(10) Present justification or rationale whether formal training (e.g., classroom instruction, seminars) is preferable to informal training solutions (e.g., job performance aids and

support, on-the-job instruction, programmed text, coaching,) or if a combination is recommended.

(11) Develop evaluation and select appropriate mechanism to support the learning solution.

(12) Construct reliable and valid assessments for each learning objective.

c. Development. The development phase builds on the previous two phases to create a complete learning platform with instructional content, activities, associated learning materials, and evaluation of student achievement. Development is the actual creation or production of the content and learning materials based on the design phase. Steps include:

(1) Determine key elements to produce training materials and courseware.

(2) Choose learner activities.

(3) Select the delivery method(s) and content, performance aids, checklists, and any media such as software and video.

(4) Prepare lesson materials, plus an instructor and student guide.

(5) Finalize instruction and materials based on instructor or designer validation. To facilitate this:

(a) Develop materials that support the content analyses, proposed technologies, delivery methods and instructional strategies.

(b) Produce instructional materials (e.g., student guides, experiential exercises, media and script, and handouts) in a variety of delivery formats, as appropriate.

(c) Write associated student guide materials.

(d) Organize an instructional package including, at a minimum, the instructional materials, assessments, and course management information (e.g., instructor guide and lesson plans).

(e) Identify appropriate training venue(s).

d. Implementation. During the implement phase, the overall plan is put into action and a procedure for training the learner and instructor is developed. The instructional system and materials are presented under normal operating conditions and constraints. A learning management plan is created to identify instructor qualifications, train the trainers as needed, identify the learning setting, identify target population, finalize the sequence of how a learning activity will be executed, conduct the training, and document any deviations from the learning management plan requiring adjustment.

(1) Deliver at least one pilot session of the instructional materials. Include extensive feedback (formative evaluation) from participants (i.e., topic subject matter experts, target audience learners, customer, supervisor, leadership, and ISD professionals) and an assessment of the learning outcome.

(2) Analyze the results of the pilot and revise instructional materials and programs as required.

(3) Deploy instructional management systems, including systems for documenting learner progress and content maintenance.

(4) Observe health, safety, and special needs requirements.

(5) If learning solution or approach contains eLearning, conduct beta test of implementation environment including interoperability and accessibility before implementing.

(6) Train instructors and any other staff associated with the delivery of the instruction.

(7) Schedule classrooms for instruction with necessary equipment such as computers for students, instructor station, vehicles, etc. If instruction is outside an agency schoolhouse, secure the instructional venue with necessary equipment.

e. Evaluation. Evaluation is an ongoing and systematic determination of relevance, effectiveness, and value of a learning solution. The learning solution is assessed through consideration of specific criteria against a set of established standards. The evaluation ensure stated goals of the learning meet the organization need and therefore should be defined in the planning phases of ISD. Evaluation links learning objectives to learner outcomes, ties learning to organizational activities, relates learning to job performance, and provides quality control and continuous improvement. To facilitate this the instructor must:

(1) Select techniques for evaluating and assessing the instruction and its effectiveness.

(2) Use the formative and summative evaluation as a guide to revise products and programs as needed.

(3) Review learning goals, objectives, and content at least every 3 years or when major revisions to governing doctrine, policies, or procedures occur to ensure relevancy, currency, and adequacy. Review content to correct inaccuracies and weaknesses, while maintaining cutting edge instructional delivery methods with associated technology.

(4) Capture and monitor relevant data about learner performance and take action as required.

(5) Write an evaluation plan for measuring learner performance on the achievement of learning objectives.

(6) If a learning approach includes eLearning, select techniques for evaluating and assessing the accuracy of the delivery media and technology.

(7) Create a plan for developing, implementing, maintaining, evaluating, and revising the learning solution and coordinate with external agencies as required.

4. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT. DoD intelligence and security schoolhouses and programs must collect and report information concerning adherence to or progress toward implementation of this manual. Specific enduring requirements, as well as those relevant to fiscal year priorities will be identified and prescribed through the USD(I). Information will be reported semi-annually in support of the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification. Further review of progress and compliance to this standard will be exercised as part of the USD(I) triennial SAVs with each institution. Best practices identified during an SAV will be shared for the mutual benefit of all members of the DoD intelligence and security communities.

ENCLOSURE 5

DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY INSTRUCTOR CERTIFICATION STANDARD

1. INTRODUCTION. The DoD Basic Instructor Standard Certification provides guidelines for DoD intelligence and security training components and institutions. The framework establishes guidelines for instructor and faculty development, evaluation, and certification to complement existing instructor development and certification programs. This standard supplements any DoD Component policy that may already be in place within the respective DoD intelligence and security training institutions.

2. IMPLEMENTATION. DoD intelligence and security schoolhouses and programs responsible for intelligence and security training of the DoD intelligence and security workforce will develop policies consistent with the criteria in this manual and References (hg) through (on) to meet their organizational mission needs, certification, recertification, and continuing education that address:

- a. Organizational requirements for instructor development, evaluation, and certification. At a minimum, include criteria for basic DoD intelligence and security instructor certification and instructor professional conduct.
- b. Instructor qualification criteria leading to certification including traditional and distributed learning formats as applicable.
- c. Required subject matter certifications where applicable (e.g., language, weapons qualifications).
- d. Recertification procedures.
- e. Advanced instructor certification procedures.
- f. Instructor peer mentoring and professional development.
- g. Guidelines and methods for observing and evaluating instructor classroom performance and performance review frequency.
- h. Waiver procedures.
- i. Instructor continuing education requirements.

3. IMPLEMENTING GUIDANCE. When a school's criteria for attaining initial level certification meet basic DoD instructor standards, a qualified instructor meeting the organization-specific school's certification requirements will concurrently receive basic DoD instructor

certification. DoD Components performing instructor certification may allow reciprocal recognition of an individual's previous teaching certification. Such mutual recognition does not imply an individual who transfers between DoD education and training institutions has license to commence teaching immediately at a new school. Rather, it means an individual's certification is to be acknowledged as a starting point in preparing to operate in the new institution's specific environment and in accordance with its policies and directives.

a. Current instructors and school administrators identified as meeting their school's first-level instructor certification will be granted basic DoD instructor certification by their local component.

b. Former instructors must meet an individual school's recertification requirements prior to being granted basic DoD instructor certification.

c. Certified instructors are required to meet each school's recertification regimen, to include meeting evaluation standards on a periodic basis and adhering to an annual continuous learning schedule. Continuous learning events may include, but are not limited to, attending instructional conferences, building and conducting seminars on selected topics, or completing education and training courses. The periodicity of recertification will factor in the DoD Component's faculty requirements and staff development strategy. Full-time faculty should recertify annually.

4. CRITERIA FOR BASIC DoD INSTRUCTOR CERTIFICATION. All instructors teaching courses or portions of courses (e.g., units, blocks, modules) in DoD education and training institutions are to be certified or in the process of obtaining certification at the Basic DoD Instructor level or above. The criteria to achieve basic DoD instructor certification are:

a. Subject Matter Expertise. Instructors must possess expertise in the field being taught. DoD training facilities will identify the best possible candidates as instructors and conduct an annual operational needs statement for each course of instruction based on the student audience they are tasked to teach. An operational needs statement contains information on what the academic facility requires to promptly and precisely complete the assigned tasks. This will ensure the DoD training facility maintains a solid reputation for academic excellence and employs a professional unit capable of challenging students while fostering professional growth and development.

b. Qualifications

(1) At a minimum, an instructor must achieve the basic instructor skill sets and competencies outlined in Figure 2 of this enclosure.

(2) Instructors may either complete a basic instructor course within the first 6 months of teaching or obtain an institutional waiver if an individual has successfully completed previous instructor courses meeting the basic instructor competencies.

(3) Instructors must attend a basic instructor course before teaching any course (or portion thereof) without supervision unless an appropriate school official grants a waiver.

Figure 2. Basic Level Instructor Qualifications

<p>Instructors must have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Knowledge of adult learning principles• Knowledge of the instructional systems design process• Knowledge of distance learning and delivery mechanisms*• Knowledge of basic course and curriculum evaluation• Face-to-face presentation skills to include integration with appropriate teaching methods**• Basic classroom management skills• Basic assessment of student learning skills and skills in the delivery of adequate feedback• Basic facilitation skills• Awareness of learning transfer <p>Instructors must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Able to implement teaching methods from an instructional design model appropriate to the lesson• Able to manage students during instructional delivery• Able to write lesson plans following an instructional design model• Able to converse constructively with students for performance feedback• Able to establish guided discussions with students during lesson delivery using open-ended questions• Able to sequence lessons or lesson topics to build to the learning objective <p>*This competency is required because some DoD schools start their instructors teaching in a distance learning environment immediately.</p> <p>**Face-to-face can mean any opportunity for learning where the learner and instructor are co-located.</p>
--

c. Demonstrate Content Proficiency and Delivery. Before teaching, instructors must demonstrate content proficiency. Instructors may either complete the current version of the course, or in approved circumstances, a portion of the course as a student. Completion includes online and classroom portions of a hybrid course, or an earlier version of the course or portion that is substantially similar to the current course. Instructors may be exempt from taking a course as a student if they have gained sufficient knowledge of course content through activities such as substantial participation in a course's design and development.

d. Supervised Instruction. Instructors must successfully teach a course (or portion) under the supervision of a fully qualified instructor unless an appropriate school official grants a waiver. Figure 3 provides a list of items to look for when observing or assessing an instructor in the classroom or in the particular environment called for as a course or class requirement.

e. Certification Assessment. Instructors are formally assessed using their home Component's instructor assessment and certification process. Assessment criteria must include the applicable list of items in Figure 3. Assessment serves as the capstone for certification at the basic DoD instructor level and is followed by a combination of recurring formative and summative assessments systematically administered throughout the instructor's tenure.

Figure 3. Instructor Observation and Evaluation Checklist

A sample list of items to look for when observing instructors:

Instructional Materials

- Prepares classroom (e.g., rosters, sign-in sheets, notebooks, handouts)
- Is familiar with classroom, building layout, emergency procedures, etc.
- Is familiar with and adheres to institutional security procedures
- Is familiar with equipment, technology, and platform props
- Prepares audio visual material that is high quality, clear, easy to read
- Provides case studies and readings that are appropriate to class

Delivery Skills

- Presents and communicates clearly
- Clearly communicates lesson objectives
- Explains relevance of learning objectives to students
- Enthusiastic about subject matter
- Engages audience
- Asks and answers questions
- Ensures student learning
- Manages classroom
- Has good communication skills (e.g., eye contact, gestures, facial expressions, voice)
- Manages time well
- Follows the lesson plan and deviates from lesson when appropriate or necessary
- Demonstrates effective use of applicable instructional delivery
- Can informally and formally assess learning (e.g., questions, cases, exercises)

Subject Matter Expertise

- Demonstrates command of material

5. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT

a. DoD intelligence and security schoolhouses and programs must collect and report information concerning adherence to or progress toward implementing this standard. Specific enduring requirements, as well as those relevant to fiscal year priorities will be identified and prescribed through the USD(I). Information will be reported semi-annually in support of the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification.

b. Further review of progress and compliance to this standard will be exercised as part of the USD(I) SAVs with each institution. Best practices identified during a SAV will be shared with all members of the DoD intelligence and security communities.

ENCLOSURE 6

DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARD

1. INTRODUCTION. The two fundamental purposes of accreditation are to ensure the quality of the institution or certification program and to assist in the improvement of the institution or certification program. Accreditation applies to both institutions and certification programs. This standard applies to all programs within the DoD intelligence and security training components. The standard supplements any DoD Component policy that may already be in place within the respective DoD intelligence and security training institutions.

2. ACCREDITATION FOR AN INSTITUTION

a. All DoD institutions providing formal training to the DoD intelligence and security workforce must be accredited using this standard. Bodies that conduct institutional accreditation are national or regional in scope and consider the characteristics of all aspects of education and training institutions. An institutional accrediting body gives attention not only to the offerings of the institutions it accredits, but to other institutional characteristics such as student personnel services, financial status, administrative structure, facilities, and equipment.

b. To be accredited, institutions must meet the published standards and the associated criteria of a U.S. Secretary of Education-recognized accrediting agency, such as the Council on Occupational Education or Federal Law Enforcement Training Academy in accordance with section 102 of Public Law 107-296 (Reference (fq)). Institutions sponsoring accreditation processes related to certification initiatives may require additional requirements to meet the standards and associated criteria.

c. The institution sponsoring the accreditation process must inform the accrediting organization of any security clearance requirements.

3. ACCREDITATION FOR A CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

a. Certifications developed in accordance with this manual must be accredited and maintain accreditation to ensure quality as described in the Standards for the Accreditation of Certification Programs and the Quality Standard for Assessment-Based Certificate Programs (References (sr) and (ts)).

b. Certification programs must meet the published standards of the nationally recognized certification accreditation body, the National Commission for Certifying Agencies (NCCA), to become accredited. The application process and establishment of candidacy for NCCA accreditation are described in References (sr) and (ts).

ENCLOSURE 7

DoD INTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY TRAINING EVALUATION STANDARD

1. INTRODUCTION. The DoD training evaluation standard establishes guidelines for DoD intelligence and security training. The standard provides a basic framework for program evaluation standards within the DoD intelligence and security training communities to complement existing programs. This standard applies to all programs within the DoD intelligence and security training components. The standard supplements any DoD Component policy that may already be in place within the respective DoD intelligence and security training institutions.

2. IMPLEMENTATION. DoD intelligence and security schoolhouses and programs responsible for intelligence and security training of the DoD intelligence and security workforce will:

a. Develop policies in accordance with the guidance in this enclosure and DoD intelligence and security policy in References (~~hg~~) through (~~en~~) to meet their organizational mission needs.

b. Develop and implement processes and procedures for evaluating training, consistent with this enclosure and applicable DoD intelligence and security policy in References (~~hg~~) through (~~en~~).

3. TRAINING EVALUATION GUIDANCE. The responsible training organization consults with senior management, executives, and high level leaders to establish purpose and use of metrics. Learners, instructors, and staff clarify and determine expected results and outcomes of the learning or training program. Graduates are also a good source of data to consider.

a. Level I - Reaction and Satisfaction. Level I focuses on the instructor, course methodology, training facility, and other items the training program is required to assess. Primary input is from the learner's reaction to the training program that provides insights into the learner's individual perception of the quality and effectiveness of training and other instructional delivery components. Other aspects on which to collect information include engagement, involvement, and interest in the learning intervention coupled with applicable relevance to the job. One point shown to influence attendee engagement in a training event is the supervisor's involvement prior to attendance and the supervisor following up after completion. An additional data point that can be used in follow-up evaluation is a planned action statement of how the learner commits to apply the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAO) or use of the information, behavior, and skills on the job.

(1) All training programs must offer learners the opportunity to provide student reaction feedback.

(2) Data will be collected on a 5-point scale using anchors of “Strongly Agree” and “Strongly Disagree”.

(3) The instrument to measure student reaction feedback must contain the following common questions to allow for standardization across the DoD intelligence and security learning components:

(a) “Overall, I am satisfied with this learning event.”

(b) “My knowledge, skills, and abilities improved as a result of this training.”

b. Level II - Learning and Performance. Level II measures the training program ability to achieve its targeted outcomes for the learner to gain the KSAOs together with the confidence to apply newly acquired KSAO and commitment to apply new KSAO on the job. Learning and performance focus evaluation is critical to achieving desired learning outcomes and is vital when a training program has occupational certification requirements or specific job performance standards that must be achieved. All DoD intelligence and security learning components require these standards for Level II evaluations:

(1) All formal training programs require valid and reliable student assessment evaluation strategies to measure student learning, as well as student performance, and confidence as a result of the training program. Given the difficult nature of the specific KSAOs employed and targeted by the various learning components, a standardized approach to conducting evaluation is neither feasible nor practical. As a means for standardizing approaches to learning and performance evaluation, all learning components will include the following “self-efficacy of learning” questions as part of their learning and performance evaluation method:

(a) “I am confident in my ability to use what I have learned.”

(b) “My knowledge, skills, and abilities improved as a result of this training.”

(2) Data will be collected on a 5-point scale using anchors of “Strongly Agree” and “Strongly Disagree”.

c. Level III - Application and Behavior. Level III measures and tracks the graduate’s ability to apply what was learned in the training environment to direct application of gained skills and knowledge to the work environment. Perspective of both the graduate and supervisor or manager of the graduate is requested. Specific questions request feedback on the training content and other training aspects such as process and systems to reinforce, monitor, encourage, and reward critical behaviors or attitudes on the job. Questions also require feedback regarding encouragement for continuing on-the-job learning or self-education. The planned action developed in the reaction and satisfaction phase is used as a comparison and contrast vehicle. Level III provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of a given training program on an individual’s specific job requirements, job context, and environment. For Level III evaluations:

(1) All formal training programs are required to conduct application and behavior evaluations. Graduates providing evaluation input should have completed the subject program 3 to 9 months before being selected to provide input. Feedback during this process is elicited not only from the graduate but also the graduate's supervisor or manager.

(2) All methods used to measure application of learned knowledge and skills will include this common question: "I was able to use what I learned."

(3) Data will be collected on a 5-point scale using anchors of "Strongly Agree" and "Strongly Disagree".

(4) It is highly encouraged, but not required, that application and behavior assessments conducted on training programs use objective measures (i.e., actual rate of error reduction by an individual, actual increase in number of products created) when possible.

d. Level IV – Results. Level IV focuses on measuring the impact of a given training program on organizational results. The results of Level IV evaluations are the most useful metrics to assess the value of a given training program. However, conducting Level IV evaluations is complex, and it is highly encouraged that all organizations, where appropriate, attempt to align the most critical, formal training programs to address targeted organizational results within their respective components.

4. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND OVERSIGHT

a. DoD intelligence and security schoolhouses and programs must collect and report information concerning adherence to or progress towards implementation of this standard. Specific enduring requirements, as well as those relevant to fiscal year priorities will be identified and prescribed through the USD(I). Information will be discussed periodically in support of the Annual Report of Intelligence and Security Training, Education, and Certification.

b. Further review of progress and compliance to this standard will be exercised as part of the USD(I) triennial SAVs with each institution.

GLOSSARY

PART I. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CJCS	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
DoDD	DoD Directive
DoDI	DoD Instruction
ISD	instructional system design
KSAO	knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics
NCCA	National Commission for Certifying Agencies
SAV	staff assistance visit
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USD(I)	Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence
USD(P)	Under Secretary of Defense for Policy
USD(P&R)	Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness

PART II. DEFINITIONS

These terms and their definitions are for the purpose of this manual.

assessment. Any systematic method of obtaining information from tests and other sources. An assessment is used to draw inferences about characteristics of people, objects, or programs.

educational taxonomy. A classification system based on an organizational scheme. A set of carefully defined terms, organized from simple to complex and from concrete to abstract, provide a framework of categories into which one may classify educational goals.

eLearning. The use of digital technology to manage and deliver instructional solutions.

evaluation. An ongoing and systematic determination of relevance, effectiveness, and value of a learning solution.

functional manager. The designated DoD advisor for an area defined as an enterprise-wide intelligence or security activity or set of intelligence or security activities characterized by specific skill sets, data sources, tasking, collection, processing, exploitation, analysis, and dissemination processes requiring specialized training, equipment, or unique applications of training or skills.

learning. A cognitive or physical process in which a person assimilates information and temporarily or permanently acquires or improves skills, knowledge, behaviors, and attitudes.

learning objective. A clear and measurable statement of the behavior or performance that the learner must master in order to determine that the desired learning has occurred.

learning outcome. A statement of broad goals explaining what the student or learner is supposed to know. It may express new or changed behaviors after the completion of training that will close or bridge the identified performance gap.

summative evaluation. Measures the absolute or relative value or worth of the instruction and occurs only after the instruction has been formatively evaluated and sufficiently revised to meet the standards of the designer.