VIRTUAL BRAINSTORMING

By

Pepper Hedden, JD and LCDR Susan McCrary, USN, Ret.

Brainstorming is effective, fast, intellectually stimulating, and also introduces an element of play, which lowers stress levels associated with high-risk problem solving environments.

Virtual brainstorming is essentially a virtual meeting with a specific focus. Supported by the right software, this is a very appealing technique, particularly when (1) participants most likely to have expertise or knowledge in the topic are far flung and (2) bringing them together would be costly or too slow. However, absent the right software, face-to-face brainstorming is still a viable technique and studies suggest it is equal in terms of ideas generated.

Which of these two brainstorming methods analysts use—face-to-face or virtual—depends primarily on the geographic proximity of the ‘right’ participants and the expertise of the facilitator(s) chosen to lead the exercise. Below, we briefly discuss tutorials, empirical research, and the use of Virtual Brainstorming to generate ideas. For more information, refer to Heuer and Pherson, Structured Analytic Techniques (2010), which is reviewed in this issue of IAFIE NEWS.

**ONLINE TUTORIALS**

In Heuer and Pherson’s discussion of the origins of this technique (2010), we discovered Facilitate.com, which facilitates meetings and trains facilitators. We were able to download free tutorials, including a white paper.

- **Running a Brainstorm Session in Virtual Space** (Sampson).
- **Virtual Brainstorming: A New Approach to Creative Thinking** (Young, 2009).
- **75 Tips for Getting Great Results from Virtual Meetings**.

From these tutorials, we discovered that the methodology and challenges are common to all virtual meetings, but additional face-to-face brainstorming rules must be applied. Sessions can be quickly and inexpensively set up using a session wiki or web meeting software; however, participants must be comfortable using the technique, so additional resources for instructional support may be required. The most striking feature is the amount of preparation and intense involvement required of the facilitator of any virtual brainstorming session.

Virtual brainstorming may not be the best technique for the analytical exercise for several reasons. There are unique challenges and tasks to be addressed and reconciled prior to and during a virtual meeting. For example, during the meeting, the facilitator is responsible for keeping the meeting on track and keeping participants fully engaged in the process. However, participants can be distracted by email, phones and other interruptions. Since online facilitators may not be able to assess body language for disengagement (e.g., they cannot ‘see’ what else participants may be doing), they may not know there is a need to regain the interest of participants who become distracted during the exercise.

Additional (selected) considerations identified in the tutorials include:

- Software must be selected and logistical support must be negotiated for the facilitator(s), assistant(s), and participants.
- All participants must have (and be comfortable using) the same software, so up-front training may be required.
- An assistant is required to deal with glitches, so that the flow of ideas will not be interrupted and the facilitator will be able to remain focused on the analysis rather than the technology or the logistics.
From the Chair

The 6th Annual Conference in Ottawa included four comments that made me remember why IAFIE is necessary. The first was from one of the Canadian attendees who was a first-time attendee at an IAFIE conference. “I learned so much,” she told me, “it was great.” She’s now a believer. The second was from Bill Sondervan, from University of Maryland, which hosted the 5th Annual Conference. Bill told the attendees at the law enforcement education workshop that his school’s program got a major kick-start by having its president attend last year’s conference and get to see what intelligence education is all about.

The third was one of our essay contest winners, another first-time attendee. He said, “I’m a sponge, I’m just soaking it all up.” The final comment was from an institutional member who said “I think IAFIE’s work is really important and I want to do whatever we can to help.”

Conferences inform, conferences support networking, and conferences educate. Talking to people, I was impressed by the breadth and depth of the knowledge of our attendees. I also came way from it feeling re-energized about IAFIE, about its mission and about its future. For example, this issue of the newsletter contains the report of the Honor Society group. Please read that so that we can come to some decisions about IAFIE’s role regarding an honor society. We are also beginning work on an intelligence bibliography, with Dr. Cathryn Thurston (NDIC), Walter Flaschka (Old Miss) and Kris Pollard serving on the committee. More news on this should be available in the not-too-distant future. Also, the Educational Practices Committee is expanding to include additional members who are interested in working on the intelligence studies standards/model/accreditation issue. Members are encouraged to get involved in this important effort.

This year’s conference was a result of the hard work of IAFIE Events Chair Jim Lightfoot; Communications Chair Nadia Diakun Thibault; and Liaison Director John Pyrik. They were assisted by IAFIE Executive Assistant Heather Tate, Vice Chair Greg Moore, and photographer extraordinaire Michael Thibault. American Military University once again generously sponsored the conference dinner.

Next year, we’re bringing the IAFIE conference back to the Washington DC area and it should have the largest turnout ever. We’re starting to plan the exact place, date, speakers, etc. If you have any ideas for any of these and/or want to get involved, give a shout!

Marilyn Peterson
IAFIE Chair

From the Editor

Relocating from a Monday evening event in Manhattan to a Tuesday morning IAFIE 2010 workshop at the University of Ottawa was “door-to-door convenient. I rode public transit and only walked 3 short city blocks. Since I arrived an hour early, I had time to imbibe gourmet coffee, extract Canadian money from the ATM, plug in my laptop and catch up on the morning news.

As a result, I was able to relax and fully immerse myself in learning more about analysis. Good thing, too, since I spent my summer ‘vacation’ teaching three graduate courses on that topic! A small group of scholars chose not to take those courses, but they did start a weekly Supper Club, where we met to discuss nonprofit use of analysis, especially the Structured Analytical Techniques (SAT) discussed by Heuer & Pherson (2010), whose book is reviewed in this issue.

The newsletter was delayed a few weeks while I received my cochlear implant. I am finally a bionic woman, but my new symbiotic triggers alarms on all sorts of security gates. I will have to train it, but I certainly look forward to hearing you!

--katherine.shelfer@att.net
METHOD ASSESSED

Group Processes & Intergroup Relations published a study, *Idea Production in Nominal and Virtual Groups: Does Computer-Mediated Communication Improve Group Brainstorming?* This study tested the belief that “computer-mediated communication” (virtual brainstorming) enhanced idea production in brainstorming groups. One group used computer-mediating communication software that displayed to group participants the ideas as generated by others. The other group generated ideas without seeing what their teammates were posting.

The experiment found little evidence to support the hypothesis that being able to enter ideas at will, while also reading ideas of other group members, results in mutual stimulation, especially in larger groups. Both groups generated the same number of ideas, redundant ideas, and irrelevant ideas. According to this study, this outcome may be attributable to the high distraction level of the online display of ideas. The conclusion is that computer-mediated communication does not lead to enhanced creative generation of ideas.

METHOD IN USE

In 2009, President Obama initiated the SAVE Award program that asks federal employees to submit ideas to “save money and perform better” in their departments. Ideas are judged by the OMB. The site, which is (http://www.whitehouse.gov/save-award) powered by IdeaScale, follows all the rules outlined in the tutorials. The application combines asynchronous virtual brainstorming with nominal group technique (NGT). The description of the program, its goals, and the criteria for idea generation are clearly explained. Participants submit ideas and can view and vote on them. Continuing engagement is accomplished by posting the winners and describing how their ideas were implemented.

CONCLUSIONS

A technology-based tool/technique is not always the best choice. Face-to-face brainstorming is very simple. Anyone with some good-sized Post-ItS, some black Sharpies, a room and minimal training can be an effective facilitator if they adhere to the the ‘7 rules and 12 steps’ of a good brainstorming session. The rules are simple and the mutual stimulation level is high.

One great advantage of face-to-face brainstorming is that ideas are spread on a vertical surface for contemplation, instead of in a list. When participants are able to visually ‘connect the dots’, this can spur the development of fresh ideas. Ideas on Post-Its can also be arranged and rearranged into categories or flows that bring out further ideas.

Group members tend to stay focused and remain engaged throughout the process, as outside distractions can be monitored and minimized. The fruits of participants’ labors are more immediately apparent. Perhaps the most important advantage is that the facilitator can identify and work with individuals who are hesitate to contribute by interacting with them to draw out their ideas and/or minimize the negative impact of dominant personalities.

Virtual brainstorming, on the other hand, is highly ‘up-front’ intensive, with many variables that a highly skilled facilitator must address prior to and during the meeting. The facilitator has the difficult job of keeping everyone engaged without seeing them and cannot control outside distractions, such as reading and answering email, discussed in the section above. The study shows that there is no advantage to virtual brainstorming in terms of idea generation. However, the technique appears to be gaining traction. In 2009, IBM asked several major corporations and universities, including Manpower, Northeastern University and Raytheon, to test its Virtual Collaboration for Lotus Sametime, a virtual, 3D meeting place and got highly favorable feedback. (IBM, 2009)

This software resembles Second Life with avatars moving through a virtual meeting space. All the features of face-to-face brainstorming are available (e.g., Post-Its on a wall that can be contemplatated and rearranged) and with practice the highly appealing display distraction factor should dissipate. Further, with reusable process planning and practice, virtual brainstorming may eventually overtake face-to-face brainstorming, because wikis are particularly well-suited to display a list of the ideas generated and information about how these ideas have been implemented (or why they weren’t) can be retroactively inserted. This helps analysts articulate and preserve knowledge of process as well as knowledge of outcomes.

At this time, however, the facilitator, or analyst, is still responsible for considering each technique and deciding which of the two will be best suited to the analytical task.

REFERENCES


IAFIE 2010
CONFERENCE RECAP

For those who were unable to attend IAFIE 2010 --and for those who wish to share IAFIE conference presentations with others-- this brief recap lists presentations that have now been uploaded to the IAFIE website. This recap also includes Session Reports on two issues: accreditation and the establishment of an international Intelligence Studies honor society.

These (bulleted) presentations are now available on IAFIE’s website, https://iafie.site-ym.com/?2010Conference

- **2010 Accreditation and Certification of Intelligence Studies/Education Programs.** James Ramsay, Accreditation Coordinator, Homeland Security Defense and Education Consortium Association (HS-DECA) discussed Issues and Challenges in Outcomes-based Intelligence Education & Accreditation; and Greg Moore, Department Chair and Director, Center for Intelligence Studies, Notre Dame College, United States discussed IAFIE Moving Forward with the Development of Intelligence as an Academic Discipline. [Report follows on page 10]

- **2010 Bridging the Cultural Divide.** Steven Strang, Officer in Charge, Intelligence Research & Development, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Canada, Ethnography and Assessment: Teaching Anthropological Approaches in Intelligence Analysis.

- **2010 An Honor Society for Intelligence Studies?.** Todd Wiggen, Chief, OpIntel School, U.S. Coast Guard, United States, Moderator, Toward an Intelligence Studies Honor Society. [Report follows on page 12]

- **2010 What students and teachers ought to know about Intelligence Law.** Erik Jens, School of Intelligence Studies, National Defense Intelligence College, United States. Panel Discussion: What Students and Teachers Ought To Know About Intelligence Law.

- **2010 Intelligence Community Resource to Support Academia.** Aaron Hywarren, Canada Department of National Defence: The Security and Defence Forum and the Policy Officer Recruitment Programme.

- **2010 Integrating Business and Intelligence Education.** Jonathan Calof, Associate Professor in International Business, University of Ottawa, Canada, Teaching and Research in Competitive Intelligence.
• 2010 Alternative Learning - How can gaming and simulation fit in the classroom? Jonathan Lockwood, Director, Training Education and Program Development, Department of Homeland Security, United States, (a) How to Employ Gaming and Simulations in the Traditional and Online Classroom Environments; and (b) Simulation Document; and Andrew Harter, Intelligence Officer, DJS1 Team Lead Methodology and Capabilities, DIOCC, Gaming and Simulation in the Classroom.

• 2010 Teaching Law Enforcement Intelligence. Bill Smith, IAFIE Membership Chair, and Adjunct Professor, University of Maryland University College, United States; Judy Staniulis, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Canada, Teaching Intelligence in Law Enforcement: Understudy Program for Intelligence Analysts; and William (Bill) Sondervan, Professor/Director, University of Maryland University College, United States, Criminal Justice Administration and Affiliated Programs.

Best Paper Award winners (l-r): Keith Lambaunas, American Military University (undergraduate category); Zoltán Peterecz, Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest, Hungary) (graduate category); and Morten Hansen, European Security Institute (professional category)
CONFERENCE REPORT:
Accreditation Highlights

The plenary sessions included one on Accreditation and Certification of Intelligence Studies/Education Programs which included presentations by Dr. James Ramsay, Homeland Security Defense and Education Consortium Association, Accreditation Coordinator and Dr. Greg Moore, IAFIE Vice Chairman and Professor at Notre Dame College (Cleveland, OH).

Dr. Ramsay’s remarks were on the “Issues and Challenges in Outcomes-Based Education and Accreditation”. He noted that some of the main challenges were:
1. Creating and preserving degree integrity (reduce threat from diploma mills),
2. Enhance and preserve professional credibility, and
3. Maturation as a profession.

He stated that challenge 2 requires a specialized body of knowledge, partnerships with all constituent groups and academia, standards subject to peer review, and, ultimately, specialized accreditation. Maturation as a profession also requires barriers to entry & clear operational boundaries, professional associations, peer reviewed research, graduate degrees, professional credentialing and possibly licensing.

Dr. Ramsay explained that “accreditation” is a process of external quality review used by higher education to scrutinize colleges, universities and educational programs for quality assurance.” It helps to ensure a baseline level of quality, reliability, and validity in academic programs and allows educational and programmatic flexibility with inherent accountability. He said, however, that institutional accreditation alone is insufficient to guarantee program quality.

He also said that the only recognition available to accrediting organizations is either from the U.S. Department of Education or the CHEA, Council for Higher Education Association. Further, he noted that accreditation should be:
• Be outcomes-based, data driven and enable programs to continuously improve.
• Be discipline specific, and yet flexible enough to include most responsibilities of entry-level professionals.
• Be program specific, and integrate program specific characteristics and constituent needs.
• Enable construction of a model curriculum for new programs.

Model Curricula should suggest the core academic areas and specific outcomes for each area for a given discipline and should suggest learning (or competency) levels for each outcome or core area (see Bloom’s taxonomy). The benefits of a model curriculum are that it can offer ready advice and a functional template to aspiring programs, is more focused than accreditation standards regarding what is actually taught, and provides a roadmap to continuously improve the field by continuously improving the outcomes that define a discipline.

He suggested that IAFIE’s educational practices committee form a standards group to develop a set of flexible, outcomes-based standards (KSAs) desired by employers and constituents, needed by practitioners, and geared to the level of the degree program (associates, undergraduate or graduate). Following that, accreditation standards and protocols might be developed.

Dr. Moore asked, “How does a functioning practice become an academic discipline? What will it take to win recognition as an academic discipline?” He then answered that question with a laundry list of activities, including “doctorates in intelligence studies, a body of literature, intelligence theory, the emergence of experts in the field, the emergence of scholarly organizations on intelligence studies and research, research, research.”

The immediate task, he noted, was to define intelligence studies and intelligence education. The former, he opined, is the academic discipline of theoretical and applied intelligence. Then, a model undergraduate program should be developed (see his presentation on IAFIE web site for details on this). He said its goal should be “to produce generalists with solid critical thinking and communications skills who have a basic understanding of the intelligence process and cycle.”

He also noted that “Ultimately, if ‘intelligence studies’ does become an academic discipline the following issues will have been resolved:
• A definition of intelligence studies will be in place (possible definition: The study of the theory and practice of applying information gathered by both open and clandestine methods for the purpose of strategic planning, criminal investigation, and policy implementation by governments, law enforcement agencies, and business)
• A process of scholarship (research and publication) will have gotten underway
• Graduate degrees will be awarded in the discipline; doctorates in particular - Ph.D.’s in order to give the discipline legitimacy (perhaps doctorates of practice as well)
• A body of academicians will have emerged to prepare future generations of scholars and practitioners

He said that IAFIE should start to come to terms with the issues and ended with the comment, “It’s time to get off the listserv and into the trenches.” (If you are interested in participating in this, contact Chair Marilyn Peterson, Vice Chair Greg Moore or Educational Practices Committee Chair David Gray and get involved.)

Ottawa’s Revolving Restaurant.
CONFERENCE REPORT:

INTERNATIONAL HONOR SOCIETY FOR INTELLIGENCE STUDIES

For several months leading up to the IAFIE annual conference, an *ad hoc* committee explored the concept of an Intelligence Studies Honor Society. The exploration culminated in a conference session in Ottawa in which resulted in the basic foundation of the society.

Under the working title of Sigma Rho Psi (“SPY”), the basic construct of the society is underway. The purpose of an Intelligence Studies Honor Society is to provide mentorship to students desiring to enter the intelligence field, recognize academic achievement in the field, exploit networking opportunities, and give students and professionals an opportunity to present or publish papers. In recognition that intelligence coursework often is a multidisciplinary discipline, related disciplines such as National Security, Homeland Security and Law Enforcement/Criminal Justice programs may also be recognized within Sigma Rho Psi.

Qualifications for initiation to the honor society can fall into multiple categories: Associates, Bachelors, Graduate and Professional. Eligible programs must be located at regionally accredited institutions. At current time, intelligence studies programs are not certified in any official way, therefore regional accreditation is the primary standard that should be utilized. In addition, chapters may be formed at both “brick and mortar” institutions and on-line/distance learning institutions.

A two year program must result in the awarding of an Associate’s Degree, with the student having completed one year (50%) of the program and, at minimum, three intelligence-related courses (9 credits). Minimum grade point average (GPA) requirements would consist of a 3.2/4.0 overall GPA and a 3.5/4.0 GPA within the discipline.

A four year program must result in the awarding of a Bachelor’s Degree in an Intelligence-related discipline or a minor within an intelligence related discipline. Students must have completed their sophomore year (two years) and have completed four intelligence related courses (12 credits). As with the Associate’s program, the minimum GPA requirements would consist of a 3.2/4.0 overall GPA and a 3.5/4.0 GPA within the discipline.

For graduate students, the program must result in the awarding of a Master’s or Doctoral degree, with a minimum of four intelligence related courses (12 credits), and a thesis or dissertation with an intelligence focus or component. As with the other programs, the minimum GPA requirements would consist of a 3.2/4.0 overall GPA and a 3.5/4.0 GPA within the discipline. During the conference discussion, there existed some hesitancy to include graduate certificate programs for honor society recognition. However, this option does remain open for discussion. For those students that are attending non-US institutions, equivalent academic standards would apply.

In order to build an immediate cadre of alumni, there is discussion to allow graduates of an intelligence program to apply as individual initiates, which would require the submission of transcripts to verify eligibility. In addition, chapters would have the opportunity to initiate “honorary” members from working professionals in the field. Faculty members that teach in an intelligence related field but may not have an intelligence related degree would also be given an opportunity to join.

Chapters would have to be formed at institutions of higher learning, with qualifications verified by faculty advisors. Selection of members could be either through application by the student to the chapter or via faculty nomination. Alumni and Faculty initiates would need to be approved via a national board or officer construct. Multiple schools in a small geographic area could form a single chapter to be fed by each institution.

In reference to a national board, there are several models that could provide a suitable organizational structure. The primary suggestion is a national officer corps with the chair (President) serving on the IAFIE Board. In this situation, the honor society would begin as an entity under IAFIE. This would allow a national meeting in conjunction with IAFIE each year. Officers could include a Chair (president), past president, president-elect, secretary-treasurer and committee chairs.

Growth and funding would determine future structure and whether the society could eventually stand on its own two legs. This may include permanent, funded staff in the future. Expenses would include the annual conference, certificates and pins, staff, and publications. A one-time initiation fee would provide the primary source of funding, with conference fees providing some additional funding.

The formation of an International Intelligence Studies Honor Society has sparked interest within IAFIE. The research conducted by the ad hoc committee, combined with the discussion at the annual meeting in Ottawa, demonstrates that it is a feasible endeavor. The way forward is to determine if this is a project that IAFIE would want to promote, appoint a permanent committee, and continue the development of a structure for eventual formation of Sigma Rho Psi (or whatever name is eventually used).

Respectfully Submitted,

Lcdr Todd C. Wigen, USCG
Chief, Intelligence Training Branch
Yorktown Training Center
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It is impossible to read everything that has been written on any given topic. Book reviews can be used to help readers construct and prioritize their reading lists.

**BOOK REVIEWS**

Useful book reviews for general audiences can be written by anyone; however, authors of signed reviews prepared for scholarly and professional audiences must meet certain minimum standards.

Summative reviews are very tightly constrained overviews that include little--if any--discussion of related works. Writers are expected to have a general knowledge of the topic.

Evaluative reviews assess ‘quality’ attributes such as currency, relevance, validity, etc.). Since writers are trusted to accurately position the subject of the review in its appropriate context, they are expected to have a working knowledge of the topic and be familiar with the existing literature on the topic.

To ensure these standards are met, reviews intended for academic/professional audiences are submitted through gatekeepers (editors). In most cases, editorial approval is simply a filtering process designed to ensure a minimum standard of care, including copyediting if necessary. In other cases, reviews are themselves reviewed prior to publication. This provides an additional layer of quality assurance, particularly where access to publication space is competitive and/or editors lack the relevant domain expertise to make an informed publication decision. Also, where peer review is the norm, the publisher’s legal liability is minimized and retractions are rarely required.

*IAFIE NEWS* includes the writer’s credentials, so that readers can self-manage their expectations of writing ‘quality’ and writer ‘credibility’.

**What Book Reviews Include**

In Motta-Roth’s study, 60 academic book reviews in linguistics, chemistry, and economics were analyzed for rhetorical structure and for the communicative goal of the genre, that of evaluating knowledge production. While she noted distinct discipline-specific differences, she was able to define four rhetorical stages of the scholarly review, which follow:

- **Introduce.** This includes defining the general topic, suggesting a target audience, discussing the author, making generalizations, and inserting the item being reviewed into the field.

- **Outline.** This includes describing how the item is organized, e.g., reporting the topic headings and subheadings and identifying extra-text (supplemental) material, if any.

- **Highlight.** This includes extracting a section of the item for more focused evaluation.

- **Recommend/Disqualify.** The reviewer can choose to (a) recommend, (b) recommend despite stated shortcomings, or (c) disqualify the item for stated reasons.

**Why Write a Book Review?**

It is common for experienced writers to prepare and publish reviews to cooperatively lighten heavy reading loads and provide examples for novice authors to follow. Instructors assign reviews of intelligence works to provide their students with purposeful writing practice. Students gain a deeper knowledge of the literature, strengthen their critical thinking skills, and polish their writing skills. Published book reviews also provides writers with valuable authorship/scholarship credits.

**How To Publish Your Book Reviews**

As shown by the two examples in this issue of *IAFIE NEWS*, length of the review is not what decides whether a review is published. Longer works on complex/multiple topics tend to receive longer reviews, while shorter works on single topics tend to receive shorter reviews. There is room--and need--for both.

*IAFIE NEWS* is an appropriate venue for publishing both summative and evaluative reviews of longer works--e.g., articles, technical reports, books, etc. While the use of ‘friendly’ reviewers is common, ‘arms-length’ reviews are normal for scholarly/professional publications. In addition to members of the intelligence community, reviewers for *IAFIE NEWS* currently represent analysts, marketing/media managers, lawyers, and professional librarians.

**REFERENCES**


**EDITOR’S PICKS**

- Reviews of the following picks were located using the PROQUEST™ Social Science Journal Database:

---

To submit items for review, book reviews for publication consideration, share research tips, reading topics/lists, offer suggestions, contribute blog buzz, and provide links to interesting resources in all languages and formats, please e-mail the editor:
This small (7 X 8 inch) but powerful handbook is a tabbed, easy-reference piece with 14 sections delineating the techniques used in national security analysis. The authors, Richards J. Heuer and Randolph H. Pherson, are both retired Central Intelligence Agency professionals with numerous previous writing credits, the best-known of which is Heuer’s Psychology of Intelligence Analysis. That work suggested mitigating biases and mindsets by using structured analytic technique. This follow-on piece shows about fifty of these techniques in a format that is easily followed.

The first three sections of the book (Introduction, Building a Taxonomy and Selecting Structured Techniques), set the stage for the techniques themselves. The techniques are then divided into eight categories:

- Decomposition and Visualization (10 techniques)
- Idea Generation (7 techniques)
- Scenarios and Generators (5 techniques)
- Hypothesis Generation and Testing (7 techniques)
- Assessing Cause and Effect (7 techniques)
- Challenge Analysis (7 techniques)
- Conflict Management (2 techniques)
- Decision Support (5 techniques)

The book ends with chapters on collaboration, evaluation of techniques and a vision of the future.

The book is a compilation of methods previously published by these authors and others, with the addition of some new or re-vamped techniques. It breaks each technique down into a structure of: when to use it, value added, potential pitfalls, the method, examples and origins. Those origins include works such as Morgan Jones The Thinker’s Toolkit (1998), and training materials from both the Central Intelligence Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency*. To some degree, its value is that it presents each of these methods in a concise manner while not ignoring those who have written on the methods before, providing references the reader can return to for more detailed explanations and examples.

Newer material includes customer checklist, indicator validation, simple hypothesis generation, and quadrant crunching, all attributed to Randolph Pherson.

The idea for the book was announced by Heuer in his presentation to the IAFIE Annual Conference in Monterrey, CA in 2008 (Heuer was presented with a Lifetime Achievement Award at that conference). That concept was expanded when Heuer entered into a collaboration with Pherson and they reached out to professionals across the field. Numerous references in the book show contributions from varied sources such that the book becomes almost a community project rather than a personal one. The research done to show the origins and interpretations of the techniques also reflects the work of the community.

The lack of an index is noted, as well as that of a comprehensive list of references at the end. However, the last page is a fold-out graphic view of all the techniques and shows their inter-relationships. A companion workbook, possibly with case studies, would also be helpful. It is believed that this will be available at a later date.

This book is a significant step forward in demystifying analysis done in the intelligence community and making its methods available to a wider audience. It should be a part of every intelligence professional’s bookshelf.

Marilyn B. Peterson, CFE, CAMS
JMITC Senior Instructor, HCL 5
Analysis Pilot Program

[Note: Prior to joining DIA in 2006, Marilyn spent 26 years as a law enforcement analyst, trainer and analyst manager. She currently manages a multi-agency threat finance training initiative on behalf of the Department of Defense.]

* The specific documents are not referenced by name and it is uncertain if they are not named at the request of the issuing agencies or this was the choice of the authors. Neither document contains classified information, nor are their titles classified.
Book Review:
The Dark Arts of Business: Elicitation
by Wayne Taylor

Please do not be deceived by the size of this book (9 x 6 x .02 inches). It is well worth more than its very reasonable price. Why?

As Wayne puts it, “[w]hen performed properly, the information is obtained [through elicitation] so fluidly that the individual with whom you are conversing has no idea of your true intentions or why they are sharing the information so freely.” (pp. 6-7). His book’s value comes from walking us through elicitation, dealing with both its theory and its practical aspects.

Elicitation is the key to the first rate acquisition of primary (human) intelligence. Ethical elicitation is not the same as interviewing. Both elicitation and traditional interviewing deal with the same goal, but the former is mostly an art and the other more of a science. And they complement each other, so both are necessary.

Since it is a short and pithy work, I will forgo giving you additional tastes of it. Taste it yourself; you will not be disappointed.

I highly recommend it for those educating others on CI, as well as on other forms of intelligence. For them, it should be a required text to help students master what should be a required skill.

John J. McGonagle
Managing Partner, The Helicon Group
Email: jjm@helicongroup.com

[Note: John is also a Fellow and past winner of the Meritorious Award of the Society of Competitive Intelligence Professionals and he has taught at Lehigh, Kutztown, and DeSales Universities.]

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

TRAINING INSTRUCTORS

Department: Department Of Defense
Agency: Defense Intelligence Agency
Job Announcement Number: H09-DX-026331-02-C

Salary Range: $60,989.00 - $113,007.00 /year
Open Period: …to 27 October 2010
Series & Grade: IA-1712-B03/B03

Duties: develops, prepares and manages course material for assigned blocks of instruction; conducts classroom instruction; and provides training assistance to instructors/writers responsible for designing courses and training support materials and tests. Required: Previous assignment as an operations/operational support professional to a special mission unit or sensitive intelligence platform; or related Instructor/Educator experience; and possess working knowledge of adult learning theory. Highly Desired: Experience working with or in support of signature reduction or identity management organizations; and Graduate of a Joint Operations Support Technician Course (or similar HUMINT-related training courses that provide a background in operational support to special/sensitive mission units) or equivalent HUMINT operational support experience.

To Apply: Navigate to http://diajobs.dia.mil. Click the button marked “Vacancies and Employment” and apply online before the Vacancy Announcement’s closing date.

Contact: Civilian Operations Division, Defense Intelligence Agency, Fort Meade, MD 20755, Phone: 202-533-0934.

ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

International Security Studies, Department of International Security Studies, United States Air Force Air War College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, AL (US)

Salary: $70,000 to $110,000.
1st round review Begins: 15 Oct 2010

Duties: Teach Graduate Seminars; advise students, serve the institution, develop curriculum and participate in war gaming and national security exercises. Requires: PhD in International Relations, Political Science, or related field, regional expertise in Latin America/South America, academic teaching experience, and a suitable publication record relevant to area studies and international relations/comparative politics.

To apply: submit a letter of application, a curriculum vitae, and 3 three references with full contact information to: 42 FSS/FSMC Civilian Personnel, Attention: AD Program, 50 LeMay Plaza South, Bldg 804, Maxwell AFB AL 36112.

Contact: Colonel Peter McCabe, Chair, Department of International Security Studies, Air War College, 325 Chennault Circle, Maxwell AFB AL, 36112-6427, or email peter.mccabe@maxwell.af.mil or phone at 334-953-3523; or email mark.conversino@maxwell.af.mil or phone at 334-953-7099.
New Members Welcomed

Since May 1, 2010, IAFIE has welcomed 31 new members, including a new institutional member and 6 representatives of institutional members. The 16 new full memberships represent national and state government agencies, military and law enforcement, higher education, and private sector organizations. There are also 8 new student members.

New Institution Member
- Dr. Ruben Arcos, Catedra Servicios de Inteligencia

New Representatives of Institutional Members:
- DIA/JMITC: MAJ Richard Greenslit, Instructor; and Dr. Gary Ryan, Program Manager/Instructor
- Batelle: Gordon Mahn, a Research Analyst 3
- DIO: LTCOL Barham Ferguson; Mick Percy; and Kellie Austin

New Full Members:
- Dean Baratta; and Dr. Dennis Bellafiore
- Bill Brown, Intelligence Analyst RCMP (CA); and Ana Leaua, Romanian Intelligence Service
- William D. Patterson, Program Specialist, DHS (US); COL Robert W. Freniere, Team Lead, DIA(US); Gregory McCormick, Superintendent AFOSI (US); and Keith Lambaunas, AMTI, USCG (US)
- Gregory Thomas, Intelligence Analyst Supervisor, PA State Police (US); and Tim Mascall, Director, IP Crime Unit

New Full Members: (continued)
- Lisa C. Dawson
- Todd Sears, RJITF
- Rishi Kuthiala, Account Specialist, Specialty Risk Service LLC; and Brooke Ann McNierney, Senior Research Associate, Alidade Incorporated
- Dr. James Ramsay, Professor and Coordinator - Homeland Security Program, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (US); and Melissa Rogers, Adjunct Faculty, Monmouth University (US)

New Student Members:
- Malcolm Fabio; Randall Caleb H Heard; Nadia Teodori; Hossain Sazzad; Lindy Smart; and Nangyalai Wardak
- Victoria Fisher Steffes, a Research Assistant at the University of Wisconsin
- Junichi Hiramatsu, a Ph.D student at Takushoku University; and Anne Marie Alojipan, an activity assistant

News and Notes

WASHINGTON D.C. CHAPTER MEETING
IAFIE and IALEIA
(International Association for Law Enforcement Intel Analysts)

Date and Time: Tuesday, 14 September 2010 at 3 p.m.

LOCATION: (JUST OFF THE DULLES TOLL ROAD)
THE EXCHANGE
PERSON ASSOCIATES, LLC
1890 PRESTON WHITE DR., SUITE 200
RESTON, VIRGINIA 20191 USA

Mr. Charlie Allen, featured speaker

Charlie Allen is a legend in the Intelligence Community, spent many years in critical posts with CIA, DoD. Most recently, and prior to his retirement from federal service last year, he served as the senior intelligence officer in the Department of Homeland Security. Following a popular established format, Mr. Allen will be interviewed as though he were on a TV talk show. Mr. Randy Pherson, will serve as interviewer, asking probing questions based on his knowledge of Charlie’s past intelligence adventures and also on input provided by chapter officers. Following 45 minutes of interviewing, the floor will be opened up for questions from all participants. At the end of the formal proceedings, a chapter business meeting will be held. Attendees DO NOT need to be paid-up IAFIE members to register, and they are free to depart at the end of Mr. Allen’s interview if they wish. Please spread the word about this event and bring as many of your friends and co-workers as possible. This promises to be a terrific follow-on the IAFIE Annual Conference held in Ottawa in May.

To register (and for more information), contact:
William C. Spracher, EdD
COL, USA, Ret
Vice Chair, IAFIE Washington Area Chapter
(202) 231-4193
william.spracher@dia.mil