



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555
June 30, 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Learned W. Barry, Controller
Office of the Controller

FROM: Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT AND THE USE OF
EVALUATION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH
(OMB CIRCULAR A-117)

In response to your June 19, 1980 memorandum, attached is our submission for the annual NRC report on Management Improvement Initiatives as required by OMB Circular A-117.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H.R. Denton".

Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures:
As stated

8011180333

FISCAL YEAR 1980
RESOURCES FOR EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

NRC Office: NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

Date of submission: JUNE 30, 1980

Check one: Current year estimate
 Previous year update*

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT AND EVALUATION FUNCTION	RESOURCES		RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL Name, Title, Address, Telephone Number
	Obligations (Thousands of dollars)	Staff Years (FTE)	
1. Management Evaluation NRR REORGANIZATION ^{1/}		1	
2. Program Evaluation (Personnel) (Contracts & Grants) Brief Description	() ()		
3. Productivity Measurement Brief Description			
4. Other Management Improvement Brief Description			
TOTAL RESOURCES:		1	

^{1/} SEE ATTACHED ORGANIZATIONAL CHART AND FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION

* Actual resources for the previous year should be submitted only if they differ by more than 10 percent from the previously reported estimates for that year. (For Info Only)

(2) in the absence of a plan which satisfies the requirements of paragraph (1), there exists a State, local, or utility plan which provides reasonable assurance that public health and safety is not endangered by operation of the facility concerned.

A determination by the Commission under paragraph (1) may be made only in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. If, in any proceeding for the issuance of an operating license for a utilization facility to which this subsection applies, the Commission determines that there exists a reasonable assurance that public health and safety is endangered by operation of the facility, the Commission shall identify the risk to public health and safety and provide the applicant with a detailed statement of the reasons for such determination. For purposes of this section, the term "utilization facility" means a facility required to be licensed under section 103 or 104(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(b) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101(a), such sums as may be necessary shall be used by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to—

(1) establish by rule—

(A) standards for State radiological emergency response plans, developed in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and other appropriate agencies, which provide for the response to a radiological emergency involving any utilization facility,

(B) a requirement that—

(i) the Commission will issue operating licenses for utilization facilities only if the Commission determines that—

(I) there exists a State or local radiological emergency response plan which provides for response to any radiological emergency at the facility concerned and which complies with the Commission's standards for such plans under subparagraph (A), or

(II) in the absence of a plan which satisfies the requirements of subclause (I), there exists a State, local, or utility plan which provides reasonable assurance that public health and safety is not endangered by operation of the facility concerned, and

(ii) any determination by the Commission under subclause (I) may be made only in consultation with the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and other appropriate agencies, and

(C) a mechanism to encourage and assist States to comply as expeditiously as practicable with the standards promulgated under subparagraph (A) of this paragraph,

(2) review all plans and other preparations respecting such an emergency which have been made by each State in which there is located a utilization facility or in which construction of such a facility has been commenced and by each State which may be affected (as determined by the Commission) by any such emergency,

(3) assess the adequacy of the plans and other preparations reviewed under paragraph (2) and the ability of the States involved to carry out emergency evacuations during an emergency referred to in paragraph (1) and submit a report of such

assessment to the appropriate committees of the Congress within 6 months of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(4) identify which, if any, of the States described in paragraph (2) do not have adequate plans and preparations for such an emergency and notify the Governor and other appropriate authorities in each such State of the respects in which such plans and preparations, if any, do not conform to the guidelines promulgated under paragraph (1), and

(5) submit a report to Congress containing (A) the results of its actions under the preceding paragraphs and (B) its recommendations respecting any additional Federal statutory authority which the Commission deems necessary to provide that adequate plans and preparations for such radiological emergencies are in effect for each State described in paragraph (2).

(c) In carrying out its review and assessment under subsection (b) (2) and (3) and in submitting its report under subsection (a)(5), the Commission shall include a review and assessment, with respect to each utilization facility and each site for which a construction permit has been issued for such a facility, of the emergency response capability of State and local authorities and of the owner or operator (or proposed owner or operator) of such facility. Such review and assessment shall include a determination by the Commission of the maximum zone in the vicinity of each such facility for which evacuation of individuals is feasible at various different times corresponding to the representative warning times for various different types of accidents.

SEC. 110. (a) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 101(a), such sums as may be necessary shall be used by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to develop, submit to the Congress, and implement, as soon as practicable after notice and opportunity for public comment, a comprehensive plan for the systematic safety evaluation of all currently operating utilization facilities required to be licensed under section 103 or section 104(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(b) The plan referred to in subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the identification of each current rule and regulation compliance with which the Commission specifically determines to be of particular significance to the protection of the public health and safety;

(2) a determination by the Commission of the extent to which each operating facility complies with each rule and regulation identified under paragraph (1) of this subsection, including an indication of where such compliance was achieved by use of Division 1 regulatory guides and staff technical positions and where compliance was achieved by equivalent means;

(3) a list of the generic safety issues set forth in NUREG 0410 (including categories A, B, C, and D) for which technical solutions have been developed;

(4) a determination by the Commission of which technical solutions for generic safety issues identified in paragraph (3) of this subsection should be incorporated into the Commission's rules and regulations; and

(5) a schedule for developing a technical solution to those generic safety issues listed in NUREG 0410 which have not yet been technically...

"Utilization facility."

42 USC 2133, 2134.

Rules

X

X

42 USC 2134

Review of plans

Report to congressional committees.

Attachment 2

GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETING IPE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. IPE representatives understand that some questions are not fully applicable and welcome a short comment when that situation exists. Program evaluation as used here does not include technical evaluation in the engineering sense. Many replies are subjective and judgmental.
2. General guidance for answering the questions:
 - A. Organization
 - 1-4 Address program evaluation and resources you associated with that function in the reply to the OMB Circular A-117
 - 5 CON will attach NRC organization chart
 - 6 Use a salary/benefit factor of \$35,600
 - 7 Self-explanatory
 - 8 All entries budgeted, unless you know it was set aside as described by law
 - B. Reasons for Conducting Evaluation
 - 9-14 Self-explanatory
 - C. Number and Kind of Evaluations in FY 1980
 - 15-18 Self-explanatory
 - 19 Cite public law for legislatively mandated set asides if any. NRR Public Law 96-295 dated June 30, 1980. Prepare succinct statement, CON will attach copy of law.
 - D. Products and Uses
 - 20-30 Self-explanatory
 - E. Externally Conducted Evaluations
 - 31-40 Self-explanatory
 - 41 Copy of RFP required if applicable
 - F. Monitoring Externally Conducted Evaluations
 - 44-50 Self-explanatory
 - 50-53 Examples of contracted program evaluation efforts, if any.



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

INSTITUTE FOR PROGRAM
EVALUATION

A QUESTIONNAIRE: FEDERAL PROGRAM EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

This questionnaire is to provide input to the Institute for Program Evaluation of the U. S. General Accounting Office (GAO) for compiling a description of program evaluation efforts within the Federal government. Specifically, we are seeking information about how particular evaluation units carry out their activities and how evaluation results are used. This information will assist the GAO in meeting its evaluation responsibilities expressed in title VII of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Program evaluation, for purposes of this questionnaire, is defined as a formal assessment through objective measurements and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which Federal programs (or their components) achieve their objectives or produce other significant effects used to assist management and policy decisionmaking. This definition essentially is the same as that found in OMB Circular A-117 (March 23, 1979).

Many of the questions can be answered quickly, either by circling numbers or checking boxes; a few questions will require a short written answer. We do not expect you to have to spend much time consulting records or working up figures. Depending on the complexity of your evaluation activities, we believe you can complete the questionnaire in 1 to 3 hours.

Because it was necessary to use a standardized instrument to gather information, some questions may not fit your unique situation. In those instances, please respond with answers most appropriate for you, and whenever necessary, clarify your answers with written comments.

Throughout the questionnaire there are numbers in parentheses opposite the questions. These simply are to expedite key punching. Please disregard them.

Please complete the questionnaire and mail it back in the return envelope within 10 days. If the return envelope is lost, the correct return address is:

U. S. General Accounting Office
221 Courtland Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30043

If you have any questions, please call either Bill Ball in our Atlanta Regional Office, (PTS) 242-4616, or Christine Fossett at GAO Headquarters in Washington, D.C., (202) 275-3581.

We need your help to accumulate information for an accurate and complete description of Federal program evaluation activities. Please return your completed questionnaire as soon as possible.

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
Institute for Program Evaluation
A QUESTIONNAIRE: FEDERAL PROGRAM EVALUATION ACTIVITIES
(code 974535)

September 1980

DEPARTMENT/AGENCY: _____ (6-7)

BUREAU/SUB-UNIT: _____ (8-9)

Head of Evaluation Unit:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: () _____

THIS FIRST SET OF QUESTIONS IS CONCERNED WITH YOUR ORGANIZATION
AND ITS EVALUATION STAFF AND RESOURCES.

1. Please indicate the total number of professional staff (full time equivalent) in your evaluation unit at the beginning of the past three fiscal years, and your best estimates for the next three fiscal years. (Indicate the total number on-board, including ceiling and non-ceiling personnel. If your evaluation unit was not or will not be in existence, enter N/A.)

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Actual total number of professional staff</u>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Estimated total number of professional staff</u>
1978	_____ (10-12)	1981	_____ (13-15)
1979	_____ (16-18)	1982	_____ (19-21)
1980	_____ (22-24)	1983	_____ (25-27)

2. For the professional staff on-board in your evaluation unit as of September 1, 1980, please indicate the total number of positions and the journeyman grade level by the titles/series used for your unit's positions.

Titles/Series	Total Number of Positions	Journeyman Grade Level
Program Analyst (345)		(28-32)
Management Analyst (343)		(33-37)
Operations Research Analyst (1515)		(38-42)
Mathematician (1520)		(43-47)
Statistician (1530)		(48-52)
Social Science Analyst (101)		(53-57)
Economist (110)		(58-62)
Psychologist (180)		(63-67)
Other (please specify)		(68-72)

Case ID _____ (1-3)
 Card 02 (4-5)

3. Please specify the total number of your full-time professional staff on-board as of September 1, 1980, by the highest degree each holds in the following categories:

Major	Highest Degree					
	BS/BA	MS/MA	PHD/MD	LLB/JD	OTHER	
Social Sciences						(6-15)
Public or Business Administration						(16-25)
Mathematics or Statistics						(26-35)
Medicine						(36-45)
Law						(46-55)
Engineering/Operations Research						(56-65)
Other (please specify)						(66-75)

4. Please think about the activities being carried out in your evaluation unit during FY 1980. Estimate the percent of time that your entire professional staff devote to each of the following activities (column should total 100%):

Activities	Percent of Time
Overall planning and administration for the evaluation unit	% (6-8)
Carrying out evaluations with internal staff	% (9-11)
Preparation for externally conducted evaluations (RFP, selection and contract negotiation and execution)	% (12-14)
Monitoring externally conducted evaluations	% (15-17)
Dissemination and/or utilization of evaluation information	% (18-20)
Other (please specify)	% (21-23)
TOTAL	<u>100 %</u>

5. Please attach to this questionnaire an organizational chart showing where and to whom within your agency your evaluation unit reports. Also attach an organizational chart for your evaluation unit, if available.

6. What are the total resources, including salaries, contracts, grants, travel, ADP, printing, etc. for FY 1979, FY 1980 and FY 1981 for your evaluation unit? (Include total resources, regardless of the source of funds.)

Actual FY 1979	\$ _____	(24-31)
Anticipated Actual FY 1980	\$ _____	(32-39)
Projected FY 1981	\$ _____	(40-47)

Case ID (1-3)
 Card 04 (4-5)

7. Please estimate the percent of the total evaluation resources (indicated in question 6) devoted to each of the following categories: (Columns should total 100 percent.)

Categories	FY 1979	FY 1980	FY 1981	
Personnel (salaries and benefits for internal staff)	%	%	%	(6-14)
Contracts	%	%	%	(15-23)
Grants	%	%	%	(24-32)
Federal agency cooperative agreements	%	%	%	(33-41)
Internal staff costs, excluding salaries and benefits, associated with conducting and managing evaluations (travel, ADP, etc.)	%	%	%	(42-50)
Costs associated specifically with dissemination and utilization of evaluation information (printing, seminars, etc.)	%	%	%	(51-59)
Other (please specify)	%	%	%	(60-68)
TOTALS	<u>100 %</u>	<u>100 %</u>	<u>100 %</u>	

8. What percent of the total FY 1980 dollars (indicated in question 6) were made available through a "set aside" in legislation, the annual budget process in your agency, or some other allocation process or source?

Allocation Process or Source	Percent of FY 1980 Dollars	
"Set aside" in legislation	%	(69-71)
Budgeted in department's/agency's annual budget process	%	(72-74)
Other (please specify)	%	(75-77)
TOTAL	<u>100 %</u>	

THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS CONCERNS THE REASONS FOR CONDUCTING EVALUATIONS.

9. Given limited resources, evaluation units often must make decisions about which evaluations to undertake. Please briefly list the reasons or criteria your unit uses for choosing to do an evaluation.

_____ (6-13)

10. Evaluation units may conduct their evaluations internally and/or externally. For what reasons does your unit choose to conduct evaluations internally and/or externally?

Please briefly list the reasons for conducting evaluations internally.

_____ (14-21)

Please briefly list the reasons for conducting evaluations externally.

_____ (22-29)

11. Do you have a formal process, including a comparative cost analysis, for determining whether a program evaluation should be done externally or internally? (An example of such a formal process would be an agency's policies and procedures for acquiring commercial or industrial products and services in accordance with OMB Circular A-76, March 29, 1979.)

1. YES (30)
2. NO, but one is being developed
3. NO, one is not being developed

12. If yes to question 11, do you have written procedures?

1. YES (31)
2. NO, but they are being written
3. NO, none are being written

13. If there were no restrictions placed on you, in which of the following ways would you prefer to conduct a program evaluation: (Please check one.)

- 1. Internally (32)
- 2. Externally via a competitive contract
- 3. Externally via a sole source contract
- 4. Externally via a competitive grant
- 5. Externally via a sole source grant
- 6. Other (please specify):

14. What do you think are the advantages of using the strategy you prefer for conducting program evaluations (indicated in question 13). (33-40)

THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS CONCERNS THE NUMBER AND KIND OF PROGRAM EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED BY YOUR UNIT DURING FY 1980.

NOTE: When calculating the number of program evaluations:

--If you have large, multi-component evaluations, include each component as one program evaluation.

--If one program evaluation or one major component was conducted using both your evaluation unit and consultant services, include it only once, either as internal if your unit maintained the primary responsibility, or as external if the consultant had the primary responsibility.

Case ID _____ (1-3)
 Card 06 (4-5)

15. During FY 1980, how many program evaluations were started, on-going and completed which were conducted internally and externally? Please indicate the number of program evaluations started (beginning but not completed in FY 1980), on-going (continuing from previous years but not completed in FY 1980) and completed (ending in FY 1980 regardless of when started).

Conducted	Number of FY 1980 Program Evaluations			
	Started	On-going	Completed	
Internally				(6-14)
Externally by:				
Competitive contract				(15-23)
Sole source contract				(24-32)
Competitive grant				(33-41)
Sole source grant				(42-50)
Federal agency cooperative agreement				(51-59)

16. Please complete the following table showing the number and duration of program evaluations which were conducted internally and externally during FY 1980. Include all evaluations--started, on-going, and completed--during FY 1980.

Conducted	Number and Duration of FY 1980 Program Evaluations				
	Under 6 Months	6 to 12 Months	13 to 24 Months	More Than 2 Years	
Internally					(6-17)
Externally by:					
Competitive contract					(18-29)
Sole source contract					(30-41)
Competitive grant					(42-53)
Sole source grant					(54-65)
Federal agency cooperative agreement					(66-77)

17. Please complete the following table showing the number and cost of program evaluations which were conducted internally and externally during FY 1980. Include all evaluations--started, on-going, and completed--during FY 1980.

When estimating the total cost of an evaluation, include the total resources--regardless of funding source or fiscal year in which funds were obligated. If you have a cost accumulation system, please use it in calculating total costs of internal program evaluations. Otherwise, estimate using all costs associated with doing an internal evaluation (e.g., all salaries; personnel benefits and compensation; training; ADP; printing; travel; indirect costs; etc.). When estimating total costs of external program evaluations, include all costs associated with issuing, monitoring and using results of the contract/grant, as well as the actual cost of the contract/grant.

Conducted	Number and Total Costs of FY 1980 Program Evaluations				
	Under \$100,000	\$100,000 -499,999	\$500,000 -999,999	\$1,000,000 or Over	
Internally					(6-17)
Externally by:					
Competitive contract					(18-29)
Sole source contract					(30-41)
Competitive grant					(42-53)
Sole source grant					(54-65)
Federal agency cooperative agreement					(66-77)

18. Please complete the following table showing the number of program evaluations which had been legislatively mandated (required specifically by statute or officially by a Congressional committee), requested by OMB, top agency officials, or program personnel, and self-initiated by your evaluation unit. Include all evaluations--started, on-going, and completed--during FY 1980.

Source of Mandate or Request	Number of FY 1980 Program Evaluations
Legislation or Congressional Committee	(6-8)
OMB or Executive Order	(9-11)
Top Agency Official(s)	(12-14)
Program Personnel	(15-17)
Self-Initiated	(18-20)
Other (please specify)	(21-23)
TOTAL	_____

19. Please attach to this questionnaire a list of the legislatively mandated or "set-aside" evaluations for which your unit is responsible. Please include the Public Law citation mandating each evaluation, the title of the program and the title of the evaluation.

THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS CONCERNS THE PRODUCTS OF YOUR PROGRAM EVALUATIONS AND HOW THE RESULTS ARE USED.

20. How often do you prepare a listing of the program evaluations which are planned, on-going and completed by your unit? (Circle the number in one box for "planned," one box for "on-going" and one box for "completed".)

Frequency	Listing of Program Evaluations Which Are:		
	Planned	On-going	Completed
Monthly or more frequently	1	1	1
Every 2-3 months or quarterly	2	2	2
Every 4-6 months or semi-annually	3	3	3
Every 7-12 months or annually	4	4	4
Only when requested or for special purposes	5	5	5
Never	6	6	6

(24) (25) (26)

21. Approximately how many of your program evaluations (indicated in question 15) produced at least one of the following products during FY 1980? For each product, enter the number of internal and the number of external program evaluations which produced one or more products of that type.

Products	Number of FY 1980 Program Evaluations		
	Internal	External	
Technical reports			(27-32)
Non-technical reports			(33-38)
Letter reports to Congress			(39-44)
Oral briefings			(45-50)
Policy memos/directives			(51-56)
Other (please specify)			(57-62)
TOTALS	_____	_____	

22. To make your program evaluation results most effective, how often do you use each of the following dissemination and utilization strategies? (Circle one number for each strategy.)

Strategy	Always					Never					
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Involve user in planning the evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(63)
Involve user in doing the evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(64)
Involve user in drafting conclusions and recommendations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(65)
Notify potential users of document availability	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(66)
Routine mail-out of final document to many or all potential users	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(67)
Routine mail-out of only a summary to many or all potential users	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(68)
Provide oral briefing for potential users	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(69)
Provide seminar or training workshop for potential users	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(70)
Provide technical assistance for specific users	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(71)
Use national networks (professional association meetings, acquaintances, etc.) to inform potential users	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(72)
Other (please specify)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(73)

23. Various kinds of uses can be made of program evaluation results. In your judgment, how often are your unit's external program evaluation results used by program personnel, top agency officials and Congress in each of the five ways described below. (Circle one number in each box. If you have no basis to judge, circle 6 in that box.)

Case No. _____ (1-3)
Card 10 (4-5)

USER GROUPS

Uses of Evaluation Results	Program Personnel			Top Agency Officials			Congress(members or staff)												
	Always	Never	No Basis to Judge	Always	Never	No Basis to Judge	Always	Never	No Basis to Judge										
1. Act on specific recommendations resulting from the evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	(6-8)
2. Take specific action(s) based on information resulting from the evaluation other than the stated recommendations	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	(9-11)
3. Use evaluation results to reinforce prior thinking or reduce uncertainties (e.g., increase confidence to maintain a program "as is" or to go ahead with planned changes)	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	(12-14)
4. Use evaluation results to increase general knowledge about the topic of study or issues, or to see the problem differently	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	(15-17)
5. Use evaluation results symbolically or strategically to persuade others to support one's opinion or position	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	(18-20)

24. Please briefly list those factors or criteria which you think make the results of a program evaluation most useful for decision makers.

(21-28)

25. Approximately what percent of the program evaluations conducted by your unit in the past three years have had these "useful" criteria or factors present?

(29-31)

8

26. Some evaluation units employ very systematic procedures to get information about the extent to which program evaluation results are used, while others do not follow-up in any regular or consistent manner or not at all. How would you characterize your unit's procedures for "following up on" the uses of evaluation results by program personnel, top agency officials and Congress? (Circle one number for each user group.)

User Group	Systematic Follow-up Procedures		Non-systematic Follow-up Procedures			No Follow-up Procedures	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Program personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6	(32)
Top agency officials	1	2	3	4	5	6	(33)
Congress (members or staff)	1	2	3	4	5	6	(34)

27. Please briefly describe your unit's policy or procedure for "following up on" the uses of your evaluations.

(35-42)

28. In your judgment, how aware are you about the extent to which the results of your unit's program evaluations are used by program personnel, top agency officials, and Congress? (Circle one number for each user group.)

User Group	Personal Awareness of Extent of Use					
	Very Aware			Not Aware		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Program personnel	1	2	3	4	5	(43)
Top agency officials	1	2	3	4	5	(44)
Congress (members or staff)	1	2	3	4	5	(45)

29. In your judgment, how aware are program personnel, top agency officials and Congress of the results of your unit's program evaluations? (Circle one number for each user group.)

User Group	User Awareness of Evaluation Results					No Basis to Judge	
	Very Aware		Not Aware				
Program personnel	1	2	3	4	5	6	(46)
Top agency officials	1	2	3	4	5	6	(47)
Congress (members or staff)	1	2	3	4	5	6	(48)

30. Do you have any externally conducted evaluations?

1. YES (Continue with question 31.) (49)
2. NO (Go to question 54.)

THIS NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS CONCERNS THE PROCESS USED BY YOUR EVALUATION UNIT FOR EXTERNALLY CONDUCTED EVALUATIONS. THIS FIRST GROUP OF QUESTIONS ABOUT EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS CONCERNS THE RFP PROCESS.

31. How frequently are each of the following personnel involved in writing a Request for Proposal (RFP) for program evaluations to be conducted for your unit? (Circle one number for each personnel group.)

Personnel	Always					Never					
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Personnel in your evaluation unit	1	2	3	4	5						(50)
Program personnel	1	2	3	4	5						(51)
Top agency officials	1	2	3	4	5						(52)
Procurement personnel	1	2	3	4	5						(53)
Legal personnel	1	2	3	4	5						(54)
Other (please specify)											(55)

32. If more than one group is involved in preparing the RFP (see question 31), do they typically work separately on specific sections or issues, or do they work as a group in planning, discussing, etc.? (Please check one.)

1. Work separately (56)
2. Work as a group
3. Other (please specify)

33. How frequently is each of the following activities included in the preparation of an RFP for a program evaluation to be conducted for your unit? (Circle one number for each activity.)

Activities	Always					Never					
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Analyze legislation											(57)
Review evaluations of similar programs											(58)
Review previous evaluations of program to be evaluated											(59)
Visit program operations											(60)
Verify data availability											(61)
Prepare a specific evaluation design											(62)
Consult with potential users of the evaluation											(63)
Other (please specify)											(64)

34. How frequently do RFPs issued by your unit for program evaluations contain specifics on the following factors: (Circle one number for each factor.)

Factors	Always					Never					
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Cost range of the evaluation											(65)
A description of the program/project to be evaluated											(66)
A general description of the evaluation desired											(67)
A specific evaluation design to be carried out											(68)
How the evaluation results will be used											(69)
Reasons for conducting the evaluation											(70)
Deadlines for submission of reports											(71)
Requirements for distribution of findings											(72)
Weights for selection criteria											(73)
Other (please specify)											(74)

35. How frequently do you use each of the following sources in determining to whom RFPs will be sent for program ... tions conducted for your unit? (Circle one number for each source.)

Sources	Always					Never					
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Agency's or unit's bidders list											(6)
Bidders for previous RFPs											(7)
Known experts in the field											(8)
References and recommendations by others											(9)
Other (please specify)											(10)

36. How often do you advertise an RFP in the Commerce Business Daily?

Always					Never					
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
										(11)

37. How often do you use a formal point rating system to select a winning proposal?

Always					Never					
1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
										(12)

38. If you use a formal point rating system in evaluating proposals, how much weight do you typically give to the following factors when deciding which proposal to select? (Indicate the number of points on a 100 point scale that you would give to each factor.)

Factors	Number of Points	
Cost		(13-15)
Overall qualifications of organization		(16-18)
Qualifications of key personnel		(19-21)
Understanding of problem evidenced in proposal		(22-24)
Quality of proposed work or technical approach		(25-27)
Timeframe for completing work		(28-30)
Other (please specify)		(31-33)
TOTAL	<u>100</u>	

39. How frequently is each of the following personnel involved in selecting a winning proposal for a program evaluation to be conducted for your unit? (Circle one number for each personnel group.)

Personnel	Always					Never					
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Personnel in your evaluation unit											(34)
Program personnel											(35)
Top agency officials											(36)
Procurement personnel											(37)
Legal personnel											(38)
Other (please specify)											(39)
	1	2	3	4	5						

40. If more than one group is involved in selecting a winning proposal (see question 39), do they typically work separately on specific sections or issues, or do they work as a group in reviewing proposals, holding discussions, etc.? (Please check one.)

1. Work separately (40)
2. Work as a group
3. Other (please describe)

41. Please think of the RFPs prepared by your unit and select one which is fairly typical. Estimate the number of total staff-days (including staff both within and outside your evaluation unit) spent on each of the following activities in the RFP and award process (prior to monitoring):

Activities	Number of Staff Days Spent	
Drafting and issuing the RFP		(41-43)
Review and selection of winning proposal		(44-46)
Award process (negotiation and award of contract)		(47-49)
Other (please specify)		(50-52)
TOTAL		

42. How often are changes made in the following components of a proposal during negotiations after the winning proposal has been selected, and before the contract has been awarded? (Circle one number for each component.)

Components	Always					Never					
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Cost	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(53)
Key personnel	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(54)
Proposed tasks	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(55)
Timeframe	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(56)
Proposed products	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(57)
Other (please specify)											
_____	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(58)

43. A variety of different types of contract award mechanisms are employed to fund externally conducted program evaluations. How often does your evaluation unit employ the following types for sole source and for competitive contracts for external program evaluations? (Circle two numbers for each award mechanism, one for "Sole Source" and one for "Competitive".)

Award Mechanisms	Sole Source					Competitive					
	Always			Never		Always			Never		
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	
Firm-fixed-price	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(59-60)
Fixed-price with flexible pricing arrangements	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(61-62)
Labor hour contract	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(63-64)
Cost-reimbursement	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(65-66)
Award-fee/incentive fee	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(67-68)
Other (specify)											
_____	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	(69-70)

THE NEXT GROUP OF QUESTIONS CONCERNS THE WAY IN WHICH YOU MONITOR EXTERNALLY CONDUCTED EVALUATIONS.

44. Various groups have responsibility for monitoring program evaluations done by contractors and grantees. From the following list, please specify which groups have primary (major function), secondary (occasional), or no responsibility for monitoring the performance of external program evaluations conducted for your unit. (Circle the number in one box for each personnel group.)

Personnel	Responsibility			
	Primary	Secondary	None	
Personnel in your evaluation unit	1	2	3	(71)
Program personnel	1	2	3	(72)
Top agency officials	1	2	3	(73)
Procurement personnel	1	2	3	(74)
Legal personnel	1	2	3	(75)
Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3	(76)

45. If more than one group is involved in monitoring external program evaluations (see question 44), do they typically work separately on specific sections or issues, or do they work as a group reviewing work, discussing problems, etc.? (Please check one.)

1. Work separately (77)
 2. Work as a group
 3. Other (please describe)
-

46. Please think of the program evaluations you have had done externally and select one which is fairly typical. Estimate the total number of professional staff-days spent in your evaluation unit on each of the following monitoring activities for that typical evaluation:

Activities	Number of Staff-days
Internal preparation of written progress reports	(6-8)
Meetings in office(s) (evaluation unit's or consultant's)	(9-11)
Site visits to programs with consultants	(12-14)
Telephone or mail contacts	(15-17)
Reviewing consultant's self-progress reports	(18-20)
Reviewing and analyzing interim and final contractor reports	(21-23)
Other (please specify)	(24-26)
TOTAL	<u> </u>

47. What percentage of this monitoring time (indicated in question 46) is involved with the following:

Activities	Percent
Administrative and financial details or issues	% (27-29)
Substantive details or issues	% (30-32)
TOTAL	<u>100 %</u>

48. How many of the external program evaluations being completed during FY 1980 for your unit have been modified, at any time, formally (through contract/grant amendments requiring formal processing and execution), informally (through letters or memoranda of understanding or verbally), both formally and informally or not at all? (The column should total to the number of external evaluations which will be completed during FY 1980.)

Modifications	Number of External Evaluations
Formally modified	(33-35)
Informally modified	(36-38)
Both formally and informally modified	(39-41)
Not modified at all	(42-44)
TOTAL	<u> </u>

49. Please estimate how many of those external program evaluations that were modified (indicated in question 48) were changed in each of the following ways. (Enter the number of external evaluations modified formally, informally or both formally and informally for each change. If no evaluations were changed in the way stated, enter a zero.)

Changes	Number of Modified External Evaluations			
	Formally only	Informally only	Both	
Costs increased				(6-11)
Costs decreased				(12-17)
Timeframe lengthened				(18-23)
Timeframe shortened				(24-29)
Scope or substance of tasks changed				(30-35)
Number of tasks increased				(36-41)
Number of tasks decreased				(42-47)
Key personnel changed				(48-53)
Type or content of products changed				(54-59)
Number of products increased				(60-65)
Number of products decreased				(66-71)
Other (please specify)				(72-77)

50. Some evaluation units employ very formal, structured review procedures to assess the performance of contractors/grantees for their externally conducted evaluations, while others use informal, unstructured review procedures. How would you characterize the typical review procedures of your evaluation unit? (Please circle the most appropriate number.)

Primarily formal, structured review		Primarily informal, unstructured review		
1	2	3	4	5

(6)

51. Please give us the following information for, in your opinion, your unit's most successful external evaluation completed during FY 1979 or FY 1980:

Title of evaluation _____ (7-8)
Title of program (e.g., CETA) _____
Cost of contract _____ (9-16)
Duration of evaluation study (total number of full-time equivalent staff-years) _____ (17-18)
Criteria used in selecting this as "most successful" _____ (19-26)

Name and address of contractor _____ (27-30)

52. Please give us the following information for, in your opinion, your unit's least successful external evaluation completed during FY 1979 or FY 1980:

Title of evaluation _____ (31-32)
Title of program (e.g., CETA) _____
Cost of contract _____ (33-40)
Duration of evaluation study (total number of full-time equivalent staff-years) _____ (41-42)
Criteria used in selecting this as "least successful" _____ (43-50)

Name and address of contractor _____ (51-54)

53. Please give us the following information for an external evaluation completed during FY 1979 or FY 1980 which is fairly typical of those conducted for your unit:

Title of evaluation _____ (55-56)
Title of program (e.g., CETA) _____
Cost of contract _____ (57-64)
Duration of evaluation study (total number of full-time equivalent staff-years) _____ (65-66)
Criteria used in selecting this as "fairly typical" _____ (67-75)

Name and address of contractor _____ (76-79)

54. Finally, we are interested in any opinions or comments you may have about program evaluation in the Federal government. We would appreciate any comments you may have along the lines of:

- examples of exemplary evaluation management, studies or uses (anywhere at the Federal, state or local level);
- how Congressional authorization, appropriation and oversight processes have helped or hindered your evaluation efforts;
- specific problems which hinder the conduct and use of evaluations; and
- suggestions or recommendations for improving Federal evaluations.

(6-25)

THIS COMPLETES OUR SURVEY. PLEASE REMEMBER TO ATTACH INFORMATION REQUESTED IN QUESTIONS 5 AND 19.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT.

PERSON COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE:

NAME _____

TITLE _____

PHONE NUMBER () _____