91 976 SIFIE	LAB Sys Dev D Feb	ORATO TEN (L ELOPHE 88 NF	RY HOR AMPAS NT CEI PRDC-TI	KLDAD (U) N NTER S R-88-5	PRIORI AVY PE AN DIE	TIZAT RSONNI GO CA	LON AN EL RESI D H I	D ACCE Earch Nebeke	PTANCE AND R ET F F/G	E NL. 5/1	۶/ NL	1
	. •											
			date Broch Date Date Date Date									
												,
	91 976 SIFIE	11 976 LAB SYS DEV SIFIED FEB	11 976 LABORATOU SYSTEM (I DEVELOPM SIFIED FEB 88 NF	11 976 LABORATORY HOR SYSTEM (LANPRAS DEVELOPMENT CEI SIFIED FEB 88 NPRDC-TI	11 976 LABORATORY HORKLOAD SYSTEM (LAMPAS)(U) N DEVELOPMENT CENTER S ISIFIED FEB 89 NPRDC-TR-88-5 I I I	11 976 LABORATORY HORKLOAD PRIOR SYSTEM CLAMPASIOUN ARMY DE DEVELOPMENT CENTER SAN DE SIFIED FEB 98 NPRDC-TR-89-5 Image: Same set of the	11 976 LABORATORY MORKLOAD PRIORITIZAT SYSTEM (LAMPAS)(U) MAYY PERSONNI DEVELOPMENT CENTER SAN DIEGO CA SIFIED FEB 98 NPRC-TR-98-5 Image: State of the state of	11 976 LABORATORY HORKLOAD PRIORITIZATION AN SYSTEM (LAMPRS)(U) NAVY PERSONNEL RESI DEVELOPMENT CENTER SAN DIEGO CA D H ISIFIED FEB 88 NPRC-TR-88-5 Image: Image	11 976 LABORATORY MORKLOAD PRIORITIZATION AND ACCE SYSTEM (LAMPAS)(U) NAVY PERSONNEL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT CENTER SAN DIEGO CA D M NEBEKE SIFIED FEB 88 NPRDC-TR-88-5 Image: State of the st	11 976 LABORATORY HORKLORD PRIORITIZATION AND ACCEPTACL SYSTEM (LAMPAS) (U) NAVY PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER SANY DIEGO CA D H NEBEKER ET F SIFIED FEB 88 MPRDC-TR-88-5 FEB 88 MPRDC-TR-88-5 F/G Image: Signature of the second	11 976 LABORATORY HORKLOAD PRIORITIZATION AND ACCEPTANCE SYSTEM (LAMPAS)(U) NAMY PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER SAN DIEGO CA D H NEBKER ET AL. SIFIED FEB 98 NPRDC-TR-89-5 FIED FEB 98 NPRDC-TR-89-5 F/G 5/1 Image: State of the same st	11 976 LABDRATORY HORKLOAD PRIORITIZATION AND ACCEPTANCE SYSTEM (LAMPAS)(U) NAMY PERSONNEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER SAN DIEGO CA D M NEBKER ET RL. 1/2 SIFIED FEB 98 NPROC-TR-89-5 F/0 5/1 NL Image: Signature of the same same same same same same same sam



100/100

63333233

NAT ONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS - 1967 --------



Navy Personnel Research and Development Center

February 1988

San Diego, CA 92152-6800 TR 88-5



NPRDC TR 88-5

February 1988

LABORATORY WORKLOAD PRIORITIZATION AND ACCEPTANCE SYSTEM (LAWPAS)

Delbert M. Nebeker Amy L. Culbertson Richard C. Sorenson

Released by B.E. Bacon Captain, U.S. Navy Commanding Officer

and

James S. McMichael Technical Director

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center San Diego, California 92152-6800



Accession For	-
NTPS CRASH M DTHC TACH II Chronic acced III Juntification	
т. Т 12 даяр	i 1
and a start of the	
2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 -	
A-1	

1. 1955 C

	- 1
	NO.
	538
	22
WORK UNIT NO	
	53
тт	24
, project	
aid,	<u></u>
resources	
Space	
nagers	
f highest	
d also	
atory	
uated at	
and as a	
n and	
	$\langle \cdot \rangle$
	$\overline{\mathcal{A}}$
CATION OF THE PAGE	
FIED	
	1

		R	EPORT DOCUM	ENTATION PAGE			
TA REPORT SECU	TTY CLASSIFICATION	<u> </u>	······	16. NESTNICTIVE MAUKINGS			
UNCLASS	IFIED			2 DISTRIBUTION (AVAILABILITY OF BEE			
			,	Approved for r	whlte	relessor	
DECLASSIFICAT	10N / DOWNGRADING	SCHEDULE		distribution is u	inlimi	ted	
PERFORMING O	RGANIZATION REPOR			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPOR	TNUMBERIS	5)	
NPRDC T	R 88–5						
So NAME OF PERI	ORMING ORGANIZAT	ION	60 OFFICE SYMBOL	7. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZAT	TION		
Navy Pe	rsonnel R	lesearch and					
ADDRESS (CAY.	State and ZIP Code	er	Lode 41	7b ADDRESS /City, State and ZIP Code:			
San Die	go, CA 92	152-6800					
SDOOT	NING SPONSORING O	RGANIZATION	Bb OFFICE SYMBOL (if applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTI	FICATION NU	MBER	
Systeme	Command	wariare	SPAMAR OOF				
ADDRESS /Cry	State and ZIP Code,	<u></u>	J SFAWAR-005	10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
Room 86	6, Crysta	1 Plaza #5		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO PROJE	CT NO	TASK NO	WORK UNIT NO
Washing	ton, DC 2	0363-5100					
11 TITLE (include)		_		1	1		
LABORAT	ORY WORKL	OAD PRIORITI	ZATION AND ACC	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA	AWPAS)		
LABORAT 12 PERSONAL AUT Nebeker 130 TYPE OF REPO Technic. 16 SUPPLEMENTA	ocurry Classification) ORY WORKL(HORIS) , Delbert DRT al Report RY NOTATION	OAD PRIORITI: M.; Culbert: 136 TIME COVER FROM _87_	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb 1087 Dec	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT (Year. Mord), Day, 1988 February	AWPAS) rd C.	15 PAGE COL 60	NT
LABORAT 12 PERSONAL AUT Nebeker 130 TYPE OF REPO Technic. 15 SUPPLEMENTA	ocurry Classification) ORY WORKL(HORIS) , Delbert DRT al Report AV NOTATION	OAD PRIORITI: M.; Culbert: 136 TIME COVER FROM 87	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb to 87 Dec	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT (Your Month, Day 1988 February	AWPAS) rd C.	15 PAGE COU 60	NT
LABORAT 2 PERSONAL AUT Nebeker 130 TYPE OF REPC Technic 6 SUPPLEMENTAL 17 COSATI CODES FIELD	GROUP	OAD PRIORITI: M.; Culbert: 136 TIME COVER FROM _87	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb to 87 Dec	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT (Year Month, Day) 1988 February	number)	16 PAGE COU 60	
LABORAT 2 PERSONAL AUT Nebeker 3. TYPE OF REPC Technic 6 SUPPLEMENTAL 7 COSATI CODES FIELD 05	GROUP	OAD PRIORITI: M.; Culbert: 130 TIME COVER FROM _87_ SUB-GROUP	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb to 87 Dec 18 SUBJECT TERMS (COMMAN R & D projec merit predic	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT / Year Month, Day 1988 February on reverse if necessary and dentify by block t evaluation, R & 1 tion project sele	wPAS) rd C.	16 PAGE COU 60 ritization	n, project
LABORAT 2 PERSONAL AUT Nebeker 3. TYPE OF REPC Technic 6 SUPPLEMENTAL 7 COSATI CODES FIELD 05 9 ABSTRACT (Col	GROUP GROUP GROUP GROUP OI	OAD PRIORITI: M.; Culbert: 130 TIME COVER FROM 87 SUB-GROUP	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb to 87 Dec is subject terms reasoning R & D projec merit predic LAWPAS	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT / Year Month, Day 1988 February for reverse if necessary and density by block t evaluation, R & 1 tion, project sele	wPAS) <u>rd C.</u> <u>number</u> D prio ction,	16 PAGE COU 60 ritization decision	n, project aíd,
LABORAT Nebeker 13 TYPE OF REPC Technic Technic 5 SUPPLEMENTAL 17 COSATI CODES FIELD 05 19 ABSTRACT /Con Bec availab and Nava them in would be priority increase Workload the Navy reported decision evaluati	GROUP ORY WORKL HORISI , Delbert al Report al Report AN NOTATION GROUP 01 MINUS ON (WORSS) OI MINUS ON (WORSS) OI OI MINUS ON (WORKL) OI OI MINUS ON (WORKL) OI OI MINUS ON (WORKL) OI OI MINUS ON (WORKL) OI OI MINUS ON (WORKL) OI OI MINUS ON (WORSS) OI OI MINUS ON (WORSS) OI MINUS ON (WORSS) OI OI MINUS ON (WORSS) OI MINUS ON (WORS	OAD PRIORITI: M.; Culbert: 130 TIME COVER FROM 87 SUB-GROUP S	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb to 87 Dec R & D projec merit predic LAWPAS under scientific and D centers and mmand desires epting R&D pro e merit of pot hoices to outs ED goals throu Acceptance Sys and Developmen AWPAS as both discussed. In R&D organization	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT / Your Month, Day 1988 February 1988 February for reverse if necessary and davidy by block t evaluation, R & 1 tion, project sele technological tal laboratories, the a system that managiects. With such a system that managiects, and ide reviewers. Such ghout the organizational tem (LAWPAS) was put t Center. The resu an organizational a ssues concerning the tions are presented	wPAS) rd C. D prio ction, ent ex Commar gers c a syst ccept ch a s tion. ropose ilts o assess ne imp d. w	ritization decision decision decision ceeds the der of th can use to tem, R&D m projects system wou The Labo ed and eva of this pro- sment tool elementation	resources aid, resources assist anagers of highest ld also ratory luated at ocess are and as a on and
LABORAT PERSONAL AUT Nebeker Technic. Technic. COSATI CODES FIELD 05 PABSTRACT/Col Beca and Nava them in would be priority increase Norkload the Navy reported lecision 2 valuati DISTRIBUTION	GROUP GROUP GROUP GROUP OI GROUP OI MINUE ON REVIEWED WITHER AV NOTATION MINUE ON REVIEWED MINUE ON REVIEWED MINUE ON REVIEWED MINUE ON REVIEWED MINUE ON REVIEWED MINUE ON REVIEWED MINUE ON REVIEWED OI MINUE ON REVIEWED MINUE ON REVIEWED MI	OAD PRIORITI M.; Culberts	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb to 87 Dec To SUBJECT TERMS / Communic R & D project merit predic LAWPAS under/ scientific and D centers and mmand desires epting R&D pro- to ices to outs ED goals throu Acceptance Sys and Developmen WPAS as both discussed. In the R&D organization	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1988 February 1988 February 1988 february tevaluation, R & 1 tion, project sele technological tal laboratories, the a system that managiects. With such a system that managiects, and ide reviewers. Suc shout the organization tem (LAWPAS) was put tem organizational a ssues concerning the tions are presented 12 ADSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICAT	AWPAS) rd C. D prio ction, ent ex Commar gers co a syst ccept ch a s tion. ropose ults o assess ne imp d. w	ritization decision decision der of th can use to tem, R&D m projects system wou The Labo ed and eva of this pro- sment tool plementation	resources aid, resources e Space assist anagers of highest ld also ratory luated at ocess are and as a on and
LABORAT PERSONAL AUT Nebeker Jerve of Reformed Technic Technic SUPPLEMENTA COSATI CODES FIELD 05 PABSTRACT./Con Ben availab and Nava them in would be priority Increase Vorkload the Navy ceported lecision Palaction Norkload the Navy Costineution Norkload Tostnieution	GROUP ORY WORKLI HORISI , Delbert AN NOTATION GROUP Ol MINUS ON CENTRE CAUSE THE CAUSE THE CAUSE THE DE WITHIN AL WARFARE PRIORITIZ E ABLE TO Y, and def E THE CONST HERE UNLIMITED FONSIBLE INDOVIDUAL	OAD PRIORITI: M.; Culbert: 130 TIME COVER FROM 87 SUB-GROUP SUB-GROUP SUB-GROUP Cossery and identify by block in demand for se the Navy R&I e Systems Com zing and acce evaluate the fend their ch gruence of R& ization and A el Research a Che use of LA managers is JPAS in other TRACT	ZATION AND ACC son, Amy L.; a Feb TO 87 Dec TO 87 DE	EPTANCE SYSTEM (LA nd Sorenson, Richa 14 DATE OF REPORT TYPER Month, Dev 1988 February 1988 February for neverse if necessary and deviative by block t evaluation, R & 1 tion, project sele technological tale laboratories, the is a system that manage jects. With such a ential projects, and ide reviewers. Such ghout the organization tem (LAWPAS) was put t Center. The result an organizational a ssues concerning the tions are presented 21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICAT UNCLASSIFIED 22b TELEFHOME (include Area Code)	AWPAS) rd C. number D prio ction, ent ex Commar gers c a syst ccept ch a s tion. ropose ilts o assess ne imp d. ~	ritization decision decision decision ceeds the der of th can use to cem, R&D m projects system wou The Labo ed and eva of this pro- ment tool elementation	n, project aid, resources e Space assist anagers of highest ld also ratory luated at ocess are and as a on and

.

.....

Ъ.

UNCLASSIFIED

FOREWORD

Because the demand for scientific and technological talent exceeds the resources available within the Navy R&D centers and laboratories, the Commander of the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (COMSPAWAR) desires a system managers can use to assist them in prioritizing and accepting R&D projects. The Laboratory Workload Prioritization and Acceptance System (LAWPAS) was proposed and evaluated at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NAVPERSRANDCEN). The results of this process are reported here.

Appreciation is expressed to all senior and middle managers and principal investigators from NAVPERSRANDCEN who were involved in development of LAWPAS. We also express appreciation to Paul DeYoung for assistance with the data analysis.

B.E. BACON Captain, U.S. Navy Commanding Officer JAMES S. McMICHAEL Technical Director

い しいいいいいい

SUMMARY

Problem

Senior executives in the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) expressed concern about the R&D project acceptance process in the Navy R&D centers and laboratories. A system to assist R&D managers in evaluating and prioritizing potential projects is needed. With such a system, R&D managers would be able to evaluate the merit of potential projects, accept projects of highest priority, and defend their choices to outside reviewers. Such a system would also increase the congruence of R&D goals throughout the organization.

Purposes

The purposes of this project were to: (1) develop a method for capturing the project acceptance policy of Navy R&D managers; (2) develop a "predicted merit equation" based on this policy using a sample of active R&D projects; (3) evaluate the usefulness of this equation for aiding project acceptance decisions and establishing a work acceptance policy.

Method

Ratings of a random sample of projects active in FY86 were collected from attribute raters (middle managers) and merit raters (senior managers). Middle managers used archival information and descriptions of projects provided by principal investigators to complete rating forms designed for the Laboratory Workload Prioritization and Acceptance System (LAWPAS). Senior managers used a one-page project description (Form 1498) to rank order projects by overall merit. Senior managers were also asked what criteria they believed were important for evaluating potential R&D projects at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NAVPERSRANDCEN).

Results

Project information, attribute and merit raters' data, and multiple regression analyses are presented. The high reliability of the ratings allowed for the formation of regression equations with weighted dimensions for predicting potential merit of future projects.

Two equations were developed. The first equation was based on senior managers' ratings of overall merit. Important dimensions for predicting merit by this equation concerned whether the project focused on issues central to NAVPERSRANDCEN's mission, whether it had significant funding and was of funding type 6.3 (Advanced Development), and whether it focused on Navy issues. The second equation was based on middle managers' ratings of benefit/cost. Important dimensions in this equation are again concerned with whether the project's focus was central to NAVPERSRANDCEN's mission, whether the project's new central to NAVPERSRANDCEN's mission, whether the project's new central to NAVPERSRANDCEN's mission, whether the project's end-products were likely to "transition" to other R&D projects or the field, and whether the project was supported with 6.3 (Advanced Development) funding.

SALE DEPENDENCE

Conclusions and Recommendations

Dimensions important to prioritizing and accepting projects at NAVPERSRANDCEN were identified and combined into policy equations. These equations clarify what managers regard as important critieria for reviewing and accepting work at this organization.

The use of LAWPAS as both an organizational assessment tool and as a decision aid for managers is discussed. As a tool, the equations may be used proactively to predict the merit of potential R&D projects, and thereby assist in the project acceptance process. Issues concerning the implementation and evaluation of LAWPAS in other R&D organizations are also presented.

IN FRODUCTION	1
Problem Purposes Background	
METHOD	3
RESULTS	6
Project Data Attribute Rater Data Merit Rater Data Building the Policy Equation	
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
Interpretation of Policy Equations Benefits of LAWPAS Evaluation of LAWPAS Future Applications	
REFERENCES	19
DISTRIBUTION LIST	
APPENDIX A: ATTRIBUTE RATER QUESTIONNAIRE	A-0
APPENDIX B: PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR QUESTIONNAIRE	B-0
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE OF FORM 1498	C-0
APPENDIX D: VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE REGRESSION ANALYSES	D-0
APPENDIX E: CORRELATION MATRIX	E-0
APPENDIX F: PROPOSED PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET	F-0
APPENDIX G: PROPOSED PROJECT RATING FORM	G-0
APPENDIX H: INSTRUCTIONS FOR CALCULATING PREDICTED MERIT	H-0

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Distribution of LAWPAS Projects and Raters	6
2.	Funding Categories for Selected Projects	7
3.	Project Sponsors/Endorsers as Reported by the Principal Investigators	8
4.	The Various Settings Where Project End-products will be Used	9
5.	Questionnaire Dimensions Potentially Related to Project Merit	10
6.	Merit Raters' Self-report of Critical Dimensions for Evaluating Potential Projects	
7.	Variables Included in the Regression Analyses	
8.	Correlations Between Merit Criteria and Predicted Criteria	

INTRODUCTION

Problem

Senior executives in the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) expressed concern about the project acceptance process in the Navy R&D centers and laboratories. A system to assist R&D managers in evaluating and prioritizing potential projects is needed. With such a system R&D managers would be able to predict the merit of potential projects, accept projects of highest priority, and defend their choices to outside reviewers. Such a system would also increase the congruence of R&D goals throughout the organization.

Purposes

The purposes of this project were to: (1) develop a method for capturing the project acceptance policy of Navy R&D managers; (2) develop a "predicted merit equation" based on this policy using a sample of active R&D projects; (3) evaluate the usefulness of this equation for aiding project acceptance decisions and establishing a work acceptance policy.

Background

Navy R&D centers and laboratories provide the Navy community with in-house R&D relevant to solving operational problems. The R&D centers and labs are a significant asset in implementing our national maritime strategy. They have their antecedents in the Navy's development and testing organizations established during the last half of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. There now exist 12 Navy R&D centers and labs, each supporting a different area of research expertise. They "...are involved in all phases of research and technology and in all phases of the acquisition and maintenance process from concept formulation to in-service Fleet support" (Chief of Naval Material, 1980). They are devoted to providing the nation with "the best, most up-to-date, capable, and effective Fleet and Marine Corps forces which modern technology can provide for the resources available" (Department of the Navy, 1985).

In the past, the Navy R&D centers and labs have operated under normal constraints concerning the hiring of personnel, the contracting out of projects, and the distribution of funds from one fiscal year to the next. The hope has been that the constraints would be short-lived, allowing the center and labs to expand to meet the demands of the available workload. Unfortunately due to increasingly constrained federal fiscal resources, there is no reason to believe Navy R&D resources will expand. It is expected that the present constraints will increase, thus limiting the amount of work the centers and labs can assume.

These constraints have forced managers to reevaluate methods for achieving their organizational goals. One method for doing this is to accept only projects that are of highest priority and payoff to the organization. Thus the issue of specifying a project acceptance policy and process becomes critical.

Hundreds of project evaluation and selection models have been proposed and tested. Very few have been systematically implemented. Costello (1983) provides a review of many of these models, their methods and their shortcomings. Williams (1969) has categorized the models into three types based on their approach: (1) decision theory. (2) economic analysis, and (3) operational research. He concludes that the decision theory approach is optimal, for it allows the use of numerous evaluation factors simultaneously.

The decision theory approach asks decision makers to identify critical dimensions, factors, or criteria for evaluating potential R&D projects. Many research efforts have been concerned with these dimensions (Costello, 1983). The Defense Science Board (Department of Defense, 1981) suggests three such criteria:

1. Impact of opportunity. Mission value, technology impact on mission, pervasiveness of impact.

2. Technical risks. Maturity of technology, innovation potential.

3. System/operational concept risks. Mission risk, political environment, level of operational support.

Doherty and Seymour (1983) suggest seven dimensions:

1. Importance/necessity. Value of the project to the Navy.

2. Payoff. Value of the product to the Navy weighted against the resources required for R&D and implementation.

3. Timeliness. Urgency to complete the project, political requirements, etc.

4. Probability of success. Probability that the effort would be successful (not including the probability that results could be implemented).

5. Validity as R&D. Scientific research and development.

6. Link to other work. Planned or approved work dependent upon completion of this project.

7. Implementation. The difficulty of implementing project end-products.

In the decision theory approach, dimensions are identified and weights attached to the dimensions to allow the scoring of R&D projects (Williams, 1969). These scores can then be ranked, and the highest scoring projects accepted based on available resources. Thus by identifying and appropriately weighting critical dimensions for evaluating R&D efforts, managers may be able to predict the merit of potential work and thereby decide whether or not to pursue the effort. This process aids decision making under conditions of uncertainty (Costello, 1983).

Besides the optimizing of resources, other benefits are likely to result from systematic R&D project evaluation and acceptance procedures. An explicit statement by upper-level managers of what makes projects valuable clarifies for others the R&D goals of the organization. The values, judgments, and standards of senior management can thus be applied to project evaluation and acceptance decisions without senior managers' involvement in every decision (European Industrial Research Management Association, 1978). Having a systematic process of project selection also simplifies explaining R&D project portfolios to outside reviewers. The process can encourage communication between different groups within the organization, and assist the organization in reaching consensus concerning its goals (Sounder, 1975). Ideally, the development of a Laboratory Workload Prioritization and Acceptance System (LAWPAS) would result in the following:

1. Senior and middle managers' ideas regarding the relevant dimensions and weights for determining a project's merit would be captured in the policy equation.

2. Researchers could implement managers' policies in an economical and decentralized manner.

3. Once made explicit, the policy equation could be systematically evaluated and revised as necessary.

4. Projects could be evaluated using the policy equation at midyear, year-end. or milestone points.

5. If desired, the policy equations and minimum priority values or "cut scores" used to accept work could vary across different departments as well as across time as workload demands and resource availability fluctuate.

6. The whole process of work acceptance would be more systematic.

7. Increased discussion among organizational members concerning R&D goals and means to achieving these goals would result.

METHOD

The methodology for developing a Navy R&D center workload prioritization and acceptance system was tested at the Navy Personnel Research and Development Center (NAVPERSRANDCEN) during FY87. Center managers identified critical dimensions for the NAVPERSRANDCEN policy equation. The following eight steps summarize the procedure used in LAWPAS:

1. Identification of dimensions for evaluating R&D proposals.

The initial step was to establish a pool of dimensions for evaluating potential work at NAVPERSRANDCEN. Examples of dimensions critical in the R&D selection process were derived from past efforts devoted to characterizing R&D projects and products (Costello, 1983). In addition, senior managers were asked to provide dimensions they believed to be important in the R&D selection and evaluation process. The final pool of dimensions included those identified above plus the following unique items provided by NAVPERSRANDCEN senior managers:

a. <u>Sponsorship</u>. The organizational level or rank of the project sponsor and/or endorser.

b. Funding level. The amount and number of years of funding for the project.

c. <u>Type of Funding</u>. Research and development program element funds (6.1 - 6.5) versus reimbursable funds (program element code number 99000).

A project rating form having 29 items based upon the attributes of these dimensions was developed (Appendix A).

2. Selection of a sample of research projects.

A random sample of projects was used for data collection. The number of projects selected from each department was proportional to the number of projects funded in the department for FY86. Sixty-three projects were selected out of 178 R&D projects funded in FY86. Contracted projects and projects in support of R&D efforts were not chosen.

A principal investigator (PI) questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent out to all PIs for the selected projects requesting project information. This information was both factual (i.e., funding level, sponsors/endorser, start/end dates, etc.) and perceptual (impact of end-products, personnel affected by end-products, etc.).

3. Collection of project attributes ratings from middle managers.

Eighteen middle managers (GM/GS-13s and GM-14s) nominated by senior-level managers served as attribute raters. Senior managers were asked to select as raters managers with a broad range of experience and exposure to NAVPERSRANDCEN work. The number of attribute raters for each department was proportional to the number of people in each department.

Each attribute rater rated a group of 14 projects. The assignment of projects to groups, and groups to raters was random, except that in no case was an attribute rater asked to rate his/ber own project. The grouping and assignment were done in a way that guaranteed that each project was rated four times, once each by four different raters. This procedure was chosen to minimize the workload required of the attribute rater, yet allow reliable estimates to be generated for each project by all raters.

A meeting was held with all of the attribute raters to describe the project and discuss how to complete the questionnaires. Attribute raters received the completed principal investigator questionnaires and Form 1498s (Appendix C) and other documentation [Technical Development Plans (TDPs) and Plan of Action and Milestones (POA&M)] for all the projects they were asked to rate. Attribute raters completed one attribute questionnaire for each of the 14 projects.

4. Collection of overall merit ratings from senior managers.

Senior managers (Commanding Officer, Technical Director, Department Directors, and other GM-15s) rated the selected projects on their overall merit, taking into consideration the costs in pursuing the project and the benefits that would ensue. This procedure was designed to establish the relative merit of the projects as seen by these senior managers.

A comparison procedure was used to obtain the overall merit ratings. Three projects were eliminated prior to this rating process because upon closer examination they were found to be contractual efforts that did not involve research and development. One-page descriptions (Form 1498) for the 60 projects were placed in a stack in front of the merit rater. The rater was asked to sort the projects in one of two ways: (1) The rater could use the first project as the anchor for the middle category, and place all projects into categories of lower, equivalent, or higher merit compared to this first project; or (2) the rater could separate the projects into three merit categories of low. medium, and high. The merit rater used whichever procedure was personally most meaningful. Upon separating the 60 projects into three categories, each rater then separated the projects within each category again, using the same procedure. This process was continued until the merit rater felt the projects were adequately sorted and could no longer separate the projects into additional categories. Categories of projects were assigned ranks, with all the projects that were in the same category receiving the same number. Projects with the lowest merit received the rank of one. 2222

لالالكيكيك

After completing the sorting procedure, merit raters were asked what dimensions they felt were important in evaluating the merit of potential R&D projects at NAVPERSRANDCEN.

5. Estimation of attribute raters' ratings for all items for all projects.

The Ward-Jennings technique (1979) was used to estimate the attribute raters' ratings for those projects they did not rate. This procedure estimated the rating of all projects as if the raters had rated all projects on all 29 items. It provided a complete set of ratings for all projects by all raters, without having to require that each rater complete 63 questionnaires.

6. Creation of a policy equation.

The policy of senior managers in assigning overall merit to the projects was captured through the use of a least squares fit to a general linear model. Ratings on the dimensions made by the attribute raters along with objective information about the project were statistically regressed on the project's average overall merit rating to determine what dimensions were important in estimating merit, and the relative weights associated with each dimension. The solution to this equation made explicit which dimensions senior managers believe make a project successful at NAVPERSRANDCEN. These same procedures were used to capture the policy reflected in attribute raters' estimates of the overall benefit/cost ratio of the projects.

RESULTS

The distribution of projects and raters by department is presented below.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF LAWPAS PROJECTS AND RATERS

Department	Merit Raters	Attribute Raters	Projects Selected
00/01	2	-	-
31	1	-	-
41	1	6	18
51	2	2	6
52	2	4	14
61	1	2	7
62	1	3	15
63	1	1	3
Total	11	18	63

The results will be presented in several sections: (1) project data, (2) attribute rater data, (3) merit rater data, and (4) building the policy equation.

Project Data

The principal investigator (PI) questionnaires (Appendix B) and Form 1498 (Appendix C) provided detailed information about the 63 projects selected. Projects with several different types of funding appeared in the random sample. Table 2 summarizes the projects by funding program element.

FUNDING CATEGORIES FOR SELECTED PROJECTS

Funding Category

Number of Projects

ななれたれたい

1222000000

V = V = V = V = V = V

1222 C 1223

122222234

61152N	In-house Independent Research	2
62744N	Marine Corps Air Ground Technology	2
62757N	Human Factors and Simulation Technology	3
62763N	Personnel and Training Technology	8
63502N	Advanced Surface Mine Countermeasures	1
63701N	Human Factors Engineering	2
63707N	Manpower and Personnel Systems	3
63720N	Education and Training	3
63732N	Advanced Manpower/Training	4
63733N	Simulation and Training Devices]
63739N	Navy Logistics Productivity	1
64722A	Education and Training System Development - Army	1
99000N	Reimbursables	32
		_
		63

Note: Only the primary funding category is reported.

As can be seen, the projects were evenly divided between R&D and reimbursable-funded projects. The mean FY86 funding level for the selected projects was \$210,546; the median was \$120,500, and standard deviation (SD) was \$233,308.

A summary of the sponsors and endorsers of the projects is presented in Table 3.

PROJECT SPONSORS/ENDORSERS AS REPORTED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Sponsoring Command	Number of Projects*
Secretary of the Navy/ Assistant Secretary of the Navy	6
Department of Defense	7
Office of the Chief of Naval Operations	21
Office of Naval Research/Office of Naval Technology/Chief of Naval Research	18
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command/ Naval Sea Systems Command/Naval Air Systems Command/Naval Supply Systems Command/Navy Data Automation Command	18
Navy Military Personnel Command/ Navy Civilian Personnel Command	8
Chief of Naval Education and Training/ Chief of Naval Technical Training	7
Other	22

* Does not sum to 63 because multiple responses were permitted.

Project end-products usually were in the form of briefings, technical reports/notes, software, and conference papers. The mean number of months to deliver end-products was 18.33, with a median of 12.00, and standard deviation of 18.91. The settings in which end-products are/will be used are summarized in Table 4.

Attribute Rater Data

Each of the 18 attribute raters completed the attribute questionnaire (Appendix A) for a random set of 14 projects. The Ward-Jennings (1979) technique was used to estimate attribute raters' ratings for all projects not rated on the 29 items. The multiple regression coefficients from the analyses used to estimate the unobserved data elements indicate the degree of agreement between raters and the accuracy of the estimation of ratings not made. The multiple R ranged from .71 to .99; the mean R was .81. These values indicate a high degree of agreement among raters on the project attributes. The analysis procedure made it possible to correct for rater bias in the ratings given. With a corrected data set, the corrected average across raters for each of the 29 items for all the projects was computed.

THE VARIOUS SETTINGS WHERE PROJECT END-PRODUCTS WILL BE USED

Setting	Number of Projects*
Navy Shore Activities	28
Navy Operational Fleet	26
Navy R&D Centers/Laboratories	25
Other Military Activities	20
Government or DoD Headquarters	19
Universities	12
Private Sector Business	12
Navy Industrial Activities	8
Other Settings	9

* Does not sum to 63 because multiple responses were permitted.

Next, a principal components factor analysis of the 29 average corrected attributes was performed. A varimax rotation resulted in six dimensions, which are described in Table 5. Alpha coefficients were computed to estimate the reliability of the composite scores created by summing the items that clustered together in the factor analysis. The alpha coefficients ranged between .72 and .91. The means, standard deviations, and alpha coefficients are shown in Appendix D, Table D-1.

Merit Rater Data

The merit raters ranked the overall merit of the projects. Ties were permitted. Sixty of the projects received an overall merit rank score based on the merit rater sorting procedure. These scores were then standardized within raters to control for the number of categories into which the projects had been sorted, since this number varied somewhat by rater. The average merit rating for each project was then calculated across all 11 merit raters. Again, the degree of agreement between raters was analyzed. The alpha coefficient for interrater agreement was .86, showing a high degree of agreement between raters.

9

QUESTIONNAIRE DIMENSIONS POTENTIALLY RELATED TO PROJECT MERIT

1. MISCNTRD Centrality to NPRDC's Mission

Questionnaire items¹

- Ala. To what extent are the issues addressed by this project important to NPRDC?
- A2. To what extent do the issues addressed by this project correspond with NPRDC's formal mission?
- B1a. To what extent does this project build upon NPRDC research and development?
- B2a. To what extent does this project integrate with current NPRDC projects?
- C1. To what extent will the end-product(s) from this project be useful to the R&D community?
- C3. To what extent will the end-product(s) from this project reflect positively on NPRDC?
- C5. To what extent will this work facilitate future opportunities for funding and/or applications?
- C6d. To what extent is/will this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, be <u>important</u> and <u>valuable</u> to the Navy by expanding the technical base (developing new technology, procedures, etc)?

2. DODRD Connectivity with DOD R&D

Questionnaire items

- Blc. To what extent does this project build upon other DoD research and development?
- B2c. To what extent does this project integrate with current DoD R&D projects?

3. TRANSITN Likelihood of Transitioning

Questionnaire items

B3c. To what extent does the approach for this project seem to be feasible?

C4. What is the probability that end-products from this project could be implemented?

4. RISK Project Risk

Questionnaire items

- A3. To what extent is NPRDC uniquely qualified to do this work? (reverse scored)
- B1b. To what extent does this project build upon other Navy research and development?
- B2b. To what extent does this project integrate with current R&D projects?
- B4a. To what extent are there administrative risks associated with pursuing this project?
- B4b. To what extent are there technical risks associated with pursuing this project?

5. NAVYOP Usefulness to Operational Navy

Questionnaire items

- Ald. To what extent are the issues addressed by this project important to the operational Navy?
- A2. To what extent do this issues addressed by this project correspond with NPRDC's formal mission?
- C2. To what extent will the end-product(s) from this project be useful for Navy applications?
- C6a. To what extent is/will this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, be <u>important</u> and <u>valuable</u> to the Navy by improving Navy effectiveness (e.g., meeting operational requirements, achieving stated goals, etc.)?
- C6b. To what extent is/will this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, be <u>important</u> and <u>valuable</u> to the Navy by improving Navy efficiency (e.g., improving use of resources, reducing costs, etc.)?

6. SOUND Scientific validity

Questionnaire items

B3a. To what extend does the approach for this project seem to be methodologically sound?B3b. To what extend does the approach for this project seem to be theoretically sound?

¹The three major sections of the questionnaire are designated by capital letters (Appendix A). Section "A" refers to Attributes of the Problem Addressed, "B" to Attributes of the Project, and "C" to Attributes of End-products

1.1.1.1.1.2.C.

7

Upon completing the sorting technique, raters were asked what dimensions they were using during the rating process. These comments were content-analyzed and collapsed into five dimensions; these are presented in Table ϵ Three of the merit raters were asked to rate the projects again to get a measure of the intra-rater reliability. The average correlation between the original and second rating was .77, ranging from .71 to .85.

Table 6

MERIT RATERS' SELF-REPORT OF CRITICAL DIMENSIONS FOR EVALUATING POTENTIAL PROJECTS

Is it R&D?

Is there a well-articulated research goal? Will this contribute to the technology base? Is this project innovative, testing new ideas? Does this build on prior work in the area?

Priority for the operational forces?

Does this address an identified Navy priority (i.e., ASW)?

What will the impact be?

Will this effort result in products with generalized application to the Navy? Does this project have milestones with deliverable and usable products? Are the end-products transitionable to other R&D or the fleet? Will the end-products impact a broad range and number of people? Is there an identifiable user?

Top-level support?

Does this effort have adequate funding? Will this project have continued funding over time? Is this project Congressionally-mandated?

Do we have the resources?

Is there a better agency to do the work? What is the reputation of the principal investigator? Is this "body shopping" that could easily be done by a contractor?

Building the Policy Equation

All the variables from both groups of raters and the principal investigator information were correlated to identify significant relationships between variables (Appendix E). A description of all the variables with significant correlations is presented in Table 7. The means, standard deviations, and alpha coefficients are found in Appendix D.

VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE REGRESSION ANALYSES

Merit Rater and Attribute Rater Variables

Variable	Label
MERIT	Average merit rating (CO, TD, and all GM-15's)
B _c C	Overall benefit/cost from the attribute raters
MISCNTRD	Central to mission of the Center
NAVYOP	Usefulness to operational Navy
RISK	Degree of risk
DODRD	Connectivity with DoD R&D
TRANSITN	Likelihood of transitioning
SOUND	Scientific validity

Archival Information Variables

Variable	Label
ACTFUND	Actual funds received in FY86
LFUND	Log transform of the FY86 actual funding
TYPEI	6.1 Funding (binary)
TYPE2	6.2 Funding (binary)
TYPE3	6.3 Funding (binary)
TYPE4	6.4 Funding (binary)
TYPER	Reimbursable funds (binary)

Principal Investigator Questionnaire Variables

Label
Degree of integration with other projects
Percent of overall effort
Years until planned completion
Percent in-house resources available at start-up
Difficulty in getting resources
Percent contracted
Will the end-products change information/knowledge? (binary)
Will the end-products change policy? (binary)
Will the end-products change procedures/techniques? (binary)
Number of sponsors
Number of settings in which products will be used

7

Two stepwise regression analyses were conducted. All the variables in Table 7 were entered into the regression analysis to predict two criteria. The first analysis regressed the variables on the average merit rating calculated from the merit raters. The results are presented in Table D-2, forming the following equation:

PMERIT = (.690 * MISCNTRD) + (.321 * LFUND) + (-.241 * DODRD) + (-.212 * POLICY) + (.172 * TYPE3)

The second analysis regressed the variables on the overall benefit/cost rating produced from the attribute raters. Table D-3 presents the results of this analysis and the following equation:

PB/C = (.773 * MISCNTRD) + (.378 * TRANSITN) + (.145 * TYPE3) + (-.154 * RISK) + (-.143 * INHOUSE)

The weights reported here in the equations are the standardized regression weights (Beta). The correlation between actual merit and actual benefit/cost ratings and predicted merit and predicted benefit/cost ratings is summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MERIT CRITERIA AND PREDICTED CRITERIA

	MERIT	B/C	B /CMRT	PMERIT	PB/C
B/C	.550	1.000			
B/CMRT	.880	.880	1.000		
PMERIT	.830	.702	.870	1.000	
PB/C	.638	.921	.886	.794	1.000
PB/CPMRT	.775	.857	.927	.947	.947

Labels

MERIT	Average merit rating
B/C	Overall benefit/cost rating from attribute raters
B/CMRT	Average of MERIT and B/C
PMERIT	Predicted MERIT
PB/C	Predicted B/C
PB/CPMRT	Average of predicted B/C and predicted MERIT

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and recommendations are concerned with four areas based on the results described above: (1) interpretation of policy equations, (2) benefits of LAWPAS. (3) evaluation of LAWPAS, and (4) future applications.

Interpretation of Policy Equations

Several conclusions can be drawn from a review of the dimensions found in the policy equations. The equation based on the merit raters emphasizes several dimensions. Projects focusing on issues central to NAVPERSRANDCEN'S mission (MISCNTRD) have higher worth and merit. Also 6.3 Advanced Development-funded projects (TYPE3) with significant funding (LFUND) were rated higher in terms of merit. Projects addressing Navy R&D concerns were rated higher than those built upon or integrated with DoD projects (negative weight on variable DODRD). Lastly, projects thought to influence policy (negative weight on variable POLICY) were not valued as much as those addressing information/knowledge (INF/KNOW) and procedures/techniques (PROCEDR).

The equation based on the attribute raters is similar in several respects but somewhat different. Middle managers/researchers agreed with senior managers that projects addressing the center's mission were more highly valued (MISCNTRD). They also valued projects that were likely to transition (TRANSITN) to other R&D projects or into the field. Attribute raters also rated highly those projects with 6.3 (Advanced Development) funding (TYPE3) and projects with lower risk (negative weight on variable RISK). Also rated highly were those projects perceived to be of sufficient value to warrant redirection of in-house resources to make the project possible (negative weight on the variable INHOUSE). Kusse accord manage manage

A few rather unexpected relationships appeared in these equations. Several managers expressed surprise at the fact that DoD R&D was not highly valued, as demonstrated by the negative weight attached to that dimension. At face value this appears to be contradictory to the mission of a Navy R&D center that is part of DoD. But it was found that those projects focusing on Navy issues (NAVYOP) were of very high merit. Thus it seems that projects focusing on issues useful to the operational Navy are seen as having greater merit than those focusing on issues important to other services. The negative relationship with the policy variable also suggests an inverse effect, that those projects impacting information/knowledge and procedure/techniques are seen as more valuable.

The negative relationship between the risk variable and overall merit should not be taken at face value, for comments from attribute raters emphasized that they valued risk when conducting R&D. It is realistic to say that projects with high risk have unknown payoffs, and usually have low expected benefit/cost ratings. Since this equation was calculated in terms of overall benefit/cost, it is not surprising that the risk variable was rated in this fashion.

These examples demonstrate an important point concerning LAWPAS. The policy captured by these equations is the policy being used by managers to evaluate existing or past work. This captured policy may not represent the preferred policy. What has been reported in the results are those dimensions that managers currently value in judging and accepting work. It is possible that the organization would like to shape those values differently, and consciously emphasize dimensions that may not currently be highly valued. Thus the policy equation may in the future be altered to reflect those dimensions the organization would like to emphasize in its work acceptance policy. This equation could be a combination of the dimensions both middle and senior managers value. This would allow for the clear and concise specification of the organization's R&D goals.

Benefits of LAWPAS

LAWPAS is useful in many respects. The process of rating projects and capturing policy provides insight to the organization. It clarifies for managers what dimensions they perceive to be valuable in accomplishing their organization's mission. This process also clarifies the extent to which the policy viewpoints of senior and middle managers are congruent.

The policy equation may also be used by managers in a proactive way to design projects emphasizing those dimensions valued by the organization. Currently, projects lasting longer periods of time with larger amounts of funding and emphasizing Navy R&D concerns are more highly valued than quick turnaround projects with low levels of funding and focusing on services or groups other than Navy. Revising a project to fit this profile should increase its merit score and also better reflect the mission of the organization.

Managers expressed concern that implementing the policy equation would infringe on their decision-making authority in terms of work acceptance. It needs to be clearly understood that the policy equation is based upon data generated by the managers. The essence of their policy viewpoints is captured with the equation. The predicted merit scores are just another source of information when deciding whether to accept or reject a project. This information may be particularly useful for projects that are difficult to decide upon in terms of acceptance. Managers will need to continue to give consideration to a variety of information in the decision-making process, such as the priority of the requirement or whether the request comes from a long-term sponsor. The results of the policy equation will not replace the manager in the work acceptance decision but will serve as a tool to assist the manager in making the decisions required.

In the past, simple work acceptance algorithms have proven much more effective than complex, sophisticated algorithms (Liberatore & Titus, 1983). Thus, in developing a decision aid, a simple algorithm that satisfactorily deals with the work acceptance problem should be used to estimate the merit of proposed R&D projects. The LAWPAS equation seems to meet that criterion. By using the LAWPAS equation to predict the merit of potential projects, the manager has an aid to assist in the project selection and evaluation process. If the decision is not to accept the project at this time because its predicted merit is low, the manager's choices are to (a) defer the decision and postpone the effort, (b) renegotiate the terms of the project so that it is of higher merit, or (c) reject it outright.

Evaluation of LAWPAS

There are three areas where LAWPAS needs to be evaluated as it is implemented within an organization. The high reliability achieved from 18 attribute raters and 11 merit raters may not be achieved when using a somewhat smaller number of raters.¹

¹In the process of collecting the ratings from both attribute and merit raters, many people expressed skepticism that agreement of ratings would be found. Several attibute raters felt that they could not rate the projects on the dimensions, and that the data resulting from this would be random and incomprehensible. Interestingly enough, much more agreement was found between the raters than even the authors expected. Attribute raters agreed on ratings of project dimensions and on the overall project benefit/cost to a high degree. Merit raters also agreed highly on the overall merit ratings of projects, and these two groups valued many similar dimensions associated with the projects. Due to this high level of agreement among the raters, confidence in the results is high.

The reliability of a smaller group of raters can be estimated, but the reliability achieved with a smaller set needs to tracked.

Second, the ratings were gathered on projects already active in FY86. Due to intense review of all projects active during that particular fiscal year because of many external review committees visiting NAVPERSRANDCEN, many raters may have had more information available to them than would be typical. In addition, ratings of historical data may be much more reliable than ratings of data gathered for proposed projects. Certainly there is more information available on an active project and greater familiarity among the raters with it than with one that is proposed. Again, the reliability of the process must be tested using projects that have not yet been initiated.

Third, the process at NAVPERSRANDCEN included only those projects that were already accepted and initiated; it did not include those projects that were proposed at the start of the fiscal year but not accepted or funded. The process needs to be tested at the beginning of a fiscal year and include all proposed projects. Then the ability of the equation to accurately predict merit under these circumstances can be assessed.

Future Applications

This procedure has many potential applications both within NAVPERS-RANDCEN and within other R&D organizations. The data collection forms were revised to include only that information found to be significant or thought to be important in the future for NAVPERSRANDCEN (Appendices F and G). The proposed rating form would need to be revised for each organization to include dimensions senior managers believe to be relevant and important for their specific situation. Instructions have been included on how to calculate predicted merit for proposed projects (Appendix H).

There are several issues to consider when implementing LAWPAS. First, managers need to determine which projects should be assessed using the policy equation. Should all projects be evaluated or just reimbursable projects so that program element tasks that have been planned in the funding cycle are exempt from the procedure?

Second, there is the issue of when to apply the equation to projects. If the equation will be used to assess the merit of possible program element tasks, should these be evaluated prior to submitting requests for funds? What about applying the equation to ongoing projects to help determine if resources are being used in an optimal manner?

A third issue in implementing LAWPAS concerns gaining an understanding of the meaning of the merit scores. When used over time, a distribution of the predicted merit scores can be constructed. It is then possible to gain a clearer understanding of the meaning of the predicted scores. It would be possible then to define ranges or cut scores based on resources available. These could be regularly revised to allow for changes in the distribution of the predicted scores along with changes in the operating environment of the organization.

It is important to note that the results from LAWPAS capture policy viewpoints at a particular point in time. For it to be an effective management tool, the process should be repeated, possibly every year, so as to accurately reflect changes in priorities and policy viewpoints. There are several considerations when transitioning LAWPAS to new organizations. It would be desirable to be able to make a quick assessment of an organization to determine if acceptable agreement can be found among managers in their ratings of projects. If a high enough level of reliability in ratings is not achieved, there are several possible explanations. The instruments used to gather the ratings may not be effective for this particular organization. Or it may be that there is little, if any, agreement on the values assigned to the dimensions of the rated projects. If such a situation exists, it may not be worthwhile to continue with the LAWPAS process unless the organization wishes to do so for self-assessment purposes, with no expectation of a reliable policy equation resulting as an end-product.

Second Managements

The second second second

ALCOLOGY AND SAME SUBJECT NUMBER

وكمناكبة

Courses of the second s

Describing LAWPAS to managers who lack an extensive understanding of statistics and reliability measures may also be a problem when transitioning LAWPAS to other R&D organizations. What is a meaningful method for describing the results of this process to managers and engineers? How else may these data be conveyed so as to make sense?

LAWPAS proved to be successful at NAVPERSRANDCEN. Managers felt that the results were useful in clarifying important dimensions for reviewing potential R&D projects. The level of agreement achieved and defined through the process may lead to a much more systematic evaluation and acceptance of work. It was useful for senior managers to realize that they agree with each other in their policy viewpoints more than they disagree. LAWPAS also served as a communication tool between senior and middle managers, highlighting similarities and differences in their viewpoints. It remains to be seen whether NAVPERSRANDCEN will fully implement LAWPAS over time, but as an organizational assessment tool, it has served its purpose well.

REFERENCES

- Chief of Naval Material. (May 1980). <u>CNM-commanded research and development</u> <u>centers:</u> missions and functions of (NAVMATINST 5450.27B). Washington, DC: Author.
- Costello, D.A. (1983). A practial approach to R&D project selection. <u>Technological</u> Forecasting and Social Change, 23, 353-368.
- Department of Defense, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering. (November 1981). <u>Report of the Defense Science Board 1981 Summer</u> <u>Study Panel on Technology Base</u>. Washington, DC: Author.
- Department of the Navy. (January 1985). <u>RDT&E management guide</u> (NAVSO P-2457). Washington, DC: Author.
- Doherty, L.M., & Seymour, H.R. (January 1983). <u>Planning and prioritizing people-</u> related research and development in the Navy (NPRDC SR 83-12). San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- European Industrial Research Management Association. (March, 1978). Top-down and bottom-up approaches to project selection. <u>Research Management, 21</u>(2), 22-24.
- Liberatore, M.J., & Titus, G.J. (1983). The practice of management science in R&D project management. <u>Management Science</u>, 29, 962-974.
- Sounder, W.E. (1975). Achieving organizational consensus with respect to R&D project selection criteria. <u>Management Science</u>, 21(6), 669-681.
- Ward, J.H., & Jennings, E. (1979). <u>Introduction to linear models</u> (pp. 230-242). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Williams, D.J. (1969). A study of a decision model for R&D project selection. Operational Research Quarterly, 20(3), 361-373.

APPENDIX A

ATTRIBUTE RATER QUESTIONNAIRE

Projec	t Num	ber									4/20/
Rater_					_		<u> </u>				
Please projec Corps.	compl t is att If yo	ete the ached ou are o	follow for you unable p	ing iten r refere give an	ns foi ence. exact	the above Reference response, t	identi to the hen g	fied pro Navy i ive you	oject. I includes r best e	nform both stimat	nation deta Navy and te.
<u>A. At</u>	tribute	s of th	ne Prob	lem Ado	tresse	<u>ed</u>					
1. To	what	extent	are the	issues a	addre	ssed by this	proje	ect <u>impo</u>	ortant to) :	
	a) NF	RDC?									
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a grea extent
	b) the	e Navy	R&D	commur	nity?						
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a gree extent
	c) Go	vernm	ent fun	ding or	ganiz	ations (e.g.,	SYSC	oms, c	Congress	s)?	
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a gre extent
	d) Th	ne oper	ational	Navy?							
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a gre extent
	e) Th	e priv	ate sect	or?							
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a gre extent
2. To missio	what n?	extent	do the	issues a	ddre	ssed by this	proje	ct corre	spond v	with N	NPRDC's f
Not	0 at all	l	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a gre exten
3. To	what	extent	is NPR	DC uni	quely	qualified to	o do t	his wor	k?		
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a gre

ú

a the second base of the second provided the second the second second second second second second second second

and a second and

<u> 1988 - Eresteren Drazanan Sananan (Eresteren Drazanan)</u>

4 To	what a	vtont o	ra otha	r Nouv	D&F) conters/lal	oorato	rias hat	ter able	to ba	ndle this project?
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
<u>B.</u> A	ttributes	of the	Proje	<u>ct</u>							
1. To	what e	xtent d	loes thi	s projec	et bu	ild upon:					
	a) NP	RDC re	search	and de	velop	oment?					
No	0 tatall	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	b) oth	er Nav	y resea	rch and	deve	elopment?					
Not	0 tatall	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	c) oth	er DoD	resear	ch and	devel	lopment?					
Not	0 tatall	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
2 . To	what e	xtent d	oes thi	s projec	et int	egrate with	curre	nt:			
	a) NP	RDC p	rojects	?							
No	0 tatall	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	b) oth	er Nav	y R&D	project	ts?						
No	0 tatall	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	c) oth	er DoD	R&D	project	s?						
No	0 tatall	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
3. To	o what e	extent c	loes th	e approa	ach f	or this proj	ect se	em to b	e:		
	a) me	thodolo	gically	sound?							
No	0 tatall	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent

0.0.0

1

5

STATES STATES STATES

		b) the	oreticall	ly sound	1?							
		_,					-		_	0	0	10
	No	0 totall	1	2	3	4	5 Newhat	6	1	8	9	To a great
	1901	atan				3011	ie wildt					extent
		c) feas	sible?									
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	No	t at all	•	-	5	Son	newhat	U U				To a great
•												extent
	4 T	what	vtont o	ra thara								
	4.10) what e	extent a	le there								
		a) adr	ninistra	tive risł	ks (delay	ys, cuts	in fund	ing, etc	.) assoc	iated w	ith p	oursuing this
		pro	ject?									
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	No	t at all	-	_	_	Sor	newhat					To a great
												extent
		b) tec	hnical r	risks ass	ociated	with n	irsuing	this pro	iect?			
		0) (00	inneur i	151(5 455	ociated	with p						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	No	t at all				Sor	newhat					lo a great
												extent
	<u>C. A</u>	ttribute	s of En	<u>d-produ</u>	ict(s)							
	· •	. 1		11 41 4			from th	in munit	at ha s	a of ul to		P&D community
	1. 10	o what e	extent v	viii the	ena-pro	bauct(s)	from tr	ns proje	eet be t) the	Rad community
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	No	t at all				Sor	newhat					To a great
												extent
	2 . T	o what e	extent v	vill the	end-pro	oduct(s)	from th	nis proje	ect be u	iseful fo	or Na	avy applications?
		_					_		_		•	10
	No	0	1	2	3	4 507) newhat	6	/	8	9	To a great
	190	t at an				501	ne what					extent
							_					
	3. T	o what o	extent v	vill the	end-pro	oduct(s)	from th	nis proje	ect refle	ect posi	tivel	y on NPRDC?
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	No	t at all	-	_	-	Sor	newhat					To a great
												extent
	A W	bat is t	he prob	ability	that end	-produc	rts from	this nr	niect c	ould be	imp	lemented?
		nat is ti		aonny	inat end	produc		i this pi			p	
		0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80 %	9 0	% 100%
	<i>е</i> т	1					future	onnorti	nitian (for fund	lina	and (or application
	5. 1	o what o	extent v	vin this	WORK I	acintate	ruture	opporte	innies i	or runc	ing	and of application
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	No	ot at all				So	newhat					To a great
												extent
							A-3					

6. Please indicate to what extent this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, is or will be <u>important</u> and <u>valuable</u> to the Navy by:

a) improving Navy effectiveness (e.g., meeting operational requirements, achieving stated goals)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Value less				Va	lue equ	al				Value greate	r
than 90%					than 90%						
of projects				of	proje	cts				of projects	

b) improving Navy efficiency (e.g., improving use of resources, reducing costs)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Value less				Va	lue equ	al				Value greater
than 90%					than 90%					
of projects				of	proje	cts				of projects

c) improving Navy personnel quality of life (e.g., improve morale, increase job satisfaction)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Value less				Va	ilue equ	al				Value greater
than 90%				to	middle	20%				than 90%
of projects				0	f proje	cts				of projects

d) expanding the technical base (e.g., developing new technology, procedures)?

0	ł	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Value less				Va	lue equ	al			V	alue greater
than 90%		to middle 20% than								
of projects				of	f proje	cts				of p
rojects					-					•

7. Overall, to what extent do you perceive the benefits of undertaking this project outweighing the costs?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all				S	omewha	it				To a great
										extent

APPENDIX B

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

The information you provide here is part of the information that will used by a set of judges to rate the attributes of selected projects. Please complete the following items as accurately and completely as possible.

Project/Work Unit	 	
	 	(see attached 1498)

ΡI

1. Please check the <u>organizations</u> funding and/or endorsing this project. For each organization checked, indicate the <u>specific code</u> providing funding and/or endorsing the project.

TEADERS TRANSMERS TRANSMERS

PARTIN NAMANA BERERA RADARA PARAKA

SECNAV	ONT	
ASN	ONR	
DoD	NAVSEA	
OPNAV	NAVAIR	
SPAWAR	NAVSUP	
NMPC	NAVDAC	
NCPC	NAVFAC	
NRC	Other (specify)	
CNR	Other (specify)	
CNET	Other (specify)	
CNTT		

2. Please indicate the rank or grade of the highest official endorsing this project.

	Political AppointeeElected Official											
	O-10	C)-9	(D-8	(D -7	0)-6	(D-5	
	SES	(GM/GS	-15		GM/GS	-14	0	GM/GS	-13		
3.	What fundi	ng lev	el (\$K)	was ori	iginally	planned	d for th	is proje	et over	its <u>enti</u>	re duration	n •
4.	Was'is this If so, what	projec percer	t part of th	of an in e total (tegrated	d set of loes it r	project epresent	s? t?				
	0%	10 ⁰ 0	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80 %	90 %	100%	
5.	To what ex	ctent d	oes this	work s	upport	element	ts of yo	ur depai	tment's	Work	Breakdown	Structure?
	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4 Sor	5 newhat	6	7	8	9 To	10 a great extent	
6.	a) What wa	is∕is th	e plann	ed start	t date o	f this p	roject?_		·			
	b) What wa	is the a	actual s	tart dat	e?							
	c) What wa	s∕is th	e plann	ed end	date of	this pr	oject?	=				

d) If completed, what was the actual end date?

7. What percent of the in-house resources (e.g., personnel, equipment, facilities) required to perform this project were available when the project was <u>initiated</u>?

AND INCOME TRANSING

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

8. If less than 100%, how difficult was it to obtain the remaining resources?

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at a	all				Se	omewha	it			E	xtremely
difficul	t				d	ifficult				d	ifficult

9. What percent of the total funding for this project was contracted?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

10. Please indicate the <u>number</u> of end-products this project has or is planned to produce over its entire duration for each category:

Software	
Hardware	
Operating/administrative procedures	
System/equipment design specifications	
NPRDC technical note/report	
Journal article	
Briefing	
Convention paper	
Other (specify)	

11. Please indicate what did/will change as a result of this project's end-products.

Information/knowledge

____Policy

Procedures/Techniques

12. Please check the setting(s) in which end-products of this project are/will be used.

The operational fleet

Navy shore activities

Navy industrial activities

Navy R&D centers and laboratories

Other military activities

Government or DoD headquarters (policy makers)

Universities

Private sector businesses

Other (specify)_____

13. To what extent did/will each of the following groups be directly affected by this project's end-products:

	a) Mili	tary rec	ruits								
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	b) Mili	itary off	ficers								
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	c) Enli	sted per	rsonnel								
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	d) Mil	itary de	pendent	s							
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	e) Gov	ernmen	t civilia	in empl	oye	es					
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	f) Gov	ernmen	t contra	ictors							
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	g) Other private sector personnel										
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent

14. How many months did/will elapse from the initiation of this project until end-products were will be delivered to a customer? _____months

15. To what extent did/will existing conditions have to be altered to implement end-products from this project?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all				S	omewha	it			•	To a great
										extent

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE OF FORM 1498

REJEARCH AND	TECHNOLOG	Y WORK UNI	T SUMMARY	DN297508	15 0N 2 DATE	OF SUMMARY	REPORT CONTROL SYMI
3 DATE PREV SUM RY	4 KIND OF SUMMARY	5 SUMMARY SCTY	6 WORK SECURITY	7 REGRADING	8 DIS8	NINSTRIN	9 LEVEL OF SUM A WORK UN T
15 FEB 86	D CHANGE	U	UU			<u> </u>	
O NO CODES	PROGRAM ELE	MENT PROJ	ECT NUMBER	TASK AREA NUM	869	WCPK U	NIT NUMBER
PRIMARY	62763N	F6	3521	RF635218	04 52	1804-031-0	03.CE
CONTRIBUTING							
CONTRIBUTING	83	PE	REONNEL	AND TRAININ	G		
11. TITLE (Precede u	with Security Class	ilication Coaei	(U) PER	SONNEL ASSI	GNMENT (OPTIMIZAT:	ICK
2 SUBJECT AREAS	S		0501				
13 START DATE	14 ES	TIMATED CON	APLETION DATE	15 FUNDING ORG	ANIZATION	16 PERFORMA	NCE METHOD
17 CONTRACT.GR	<u> 1</u>			18 RESOURCES ES	TIMATE	•	
DATE EFFECTIVE	E EXPIR	PATION		FISCAL YEARS	a. PROFESSIC	NAL WORKYEA	PS D FUNDS In thousa
5 CONTRACT GRA	NT NUMBER			86		1.5	405.0
TYPE		OUNT		1			
				7 97		1.5	321-0
RIND OF AWARC	1.00		21.06.10				
9 RESPONSIBLE D	DOD ORGANIZAT	<u>en 59077</u>	2 0640	20. PERFORMING	DECENIZATIO		1330772 004
NAME NAVY	PERSONNE	L RESEAR	CH AND	NAME NAVY	LEKOONI	NEL REDEAR OFNITER	NUT AND
DEVEL	LOPMENT CI	ENTER		DEVE	LUPBENI	VENIER	
SAN I	DIEGO, CA	92152-6	800	SAN	DIEGO, (CA 92152-6	5600
NAME OF RESPO	NS-BLE IND. VID	UAL		C NAME OF PRINC	IPAL INVEST	GATOR	
BLANCO, T.	.Α.		61	LIAN	Б, Т.		
3. TELEPHONE NUN	MBER Include are	a cudf		d. TELEPHONE NU	MBER (include	area cuai	
619-225-76	542			619-	225-2373		
DI GENERAL HEE							
21 DEVENAL USE				I NAME OF ASSOC	CIATE INVEST	IGATOR II' acana	50
ZI GEVERAL USE				* NAME OF ASSOC	CIATE INVEST	IGATOR of acana	5., c.,
H MIL TARY C	W LIAN APPLICA	17:0N		' NAME OF ASSOC	STE INVEST	IGATOR of acaila	50 ci.
H MIL TARY C	COLLAN APPLICA	TION Nicuriti Classific	cation Code	VAME OF ASSOC	CIATE INVEST	IGATOR (Carana IGATOR (Carana MENT; (U)	PE 62763N;
H MIL TARY C	COLIAN APPLICA	TION Nicural Classific TI (U) D	cation Code: (VAME OF ASSOC KRAS NAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE	CIATE INVEST	IGATOR (Calana IGATOR (Calana MENT; (U)	5 FE 62763N;
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JIII (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OB	COLEAN APPLICA	ation Sicurit: Classific 3: (U) D PEROACH 25	ation Code. ISTRIBUTI PROGRESS .Pr	I NAME OF ASSOC RRAS	TATE INVEST	IGATOR (l'acalia IGATOR (l'acalia IMENT; (Ù)	PE 62763N;
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JIN (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OB	IV LIAN APPLICA	TION Necurity Classific 3: (U) D DEROACH 25	ation Code.	I NAME OF ASSOC RRAS I NAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE ION POLICY ASSICNMENT	CLATE INVEST	IGATOR of a ana IGATOR of a ana IMENT; (U) Issification Coar	PE 62763N;
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JIN (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OB 23. OBJECT	V LIAN APPLICA cedi F ACH usine S <u>PLANNTN</u> DECTIVE 24 AF TIVE: (U)	ATION Nicurit Classific 3: (U) D PERCIACH 25 NAVY PE	ISTRIBUTI PROGRESS (Pr RSONNEL /	I NAME OF ASSOC KRAS 9 NAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE ION POLICY Cone feet of each with ASSIGNMENT	CLATE INVEST	IGATOR of a dia IGATOR of a dia IMENT; (U) Institution Coar IGE, COMPL	PE 62763N;
H MIL TARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JIN (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION.	COLIAN APPLICA CODE FACHUSES SECTIVE 24 AP FIVE: (U) OVER 500	TION SECURIT Classific SECURIT Classific SECURIT Classific DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC	TIVE ENLI	I NAME OF ASSOC RRAS I NAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U)	CLATE INVEST	IGATOR of a dia IGATOR of a dia IMENT; (U) Institution Coar IGE, COMPL INSTIGNET	PE 62763N; EX TO SOME
H MIL TARY CI ZZ KEYWORDS JIH (U) CAREEN Z3 TECHNICAL OB 23. OBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFF	COLIAN APPLICA COLIENCHUIES SELANNIN SUECTIVE 24 AP LIVE: (U) OVER 500 FERENT AC	TION MIGENTI Classific 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES	TIVE ENLI CR UNITS	INAME OF ASSOC RRAS INAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE ION POLICY Construction for the Construction of the Construc	INTE INVEST	IGATOR (faidina IGATOR (faidina IMENT; (U) Institution Coar IGE, COMPL INGT DCGU	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME PATIONAL
H MILTARY CI ZZ KEYWORDS JIN (U) CAREEN 23 TECHNICAL OB 23. OBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE	CONTRACTOR AND	TION MIGHT Classific 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI	TIVE ENLI FREGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S	INAME OF ASSOC RRAS INAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE ION POLICY CON	INTE INVEST	IGATOR (faidina IGATOR (faidina IMENT; (U) INGE, COMPL INGE OCCU INGE OCCU INGE OCCU	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JAA (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS	COLIAN APPLICA COLIFICHUINES E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANAPPLICA E PLANNING E PLANG E PLANNING E PLANG E PLANG	TION SECONCE Classific SECONCE 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A	ISTRIBUTI PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO	INAME OF ASSOC RAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE	INTE INVEST	IGATOR (faiding IGATOR (faiding IMENT; (U) INST COMPL INST COMPL INST COMPL INST COMPL INST COMPL DJECTIVE SOLVE CO	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX,
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JUN 23 TECHNICAL GE 23 DBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFF SFECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL	CONTRACTOR OF THE TANK THE TAN	TION SECONCERSING S: (U) D SEEOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT	TIVE ENLI FROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (ON POLICY ASSIGNMENT (STED PERSO 5 IN ABOUT 5KILL LEVEL OF METHODOL (MIZATION P	TATE INVEST	IGATOR (faidina IGATOR (faidina IMENT; (U) ISSUMENT; (U) ISSUMENT; (U) ISSUMENT; INCT OCCU INCT OCCU ISJECTIVE ISSUME CO ASSOCIATE	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; LEX CTC SOME UPATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JUN 23 TECHNICAL GE 23 DBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO	CONTRACTOR OF THE TANK THE TAN	NCLAR Classific 3: (U) D PEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT.	TIVE ENLI FROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER	I NAME OF ASSOC REAS I NAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE ION POLICY ASSIGNMENT (STED PERSO STED PERSO STED PERSO STEL LEVEL OF METHODOL MIZATION P NORK UNIT N	INTE INVEST	IGATOR (faidina IGATOR (faidina IMENT; (U) ISSURIE INCT OCCU DBJECTIVE DSJECTIVE SOLVE CO ASSOCIATE 21-804-031	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME UPATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH FORMER
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JUE 23 TECHNICAL GE 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFE SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TILE CARE	CONTRACTOR OF A CHARTER OF A CH	NCLAR Classific 3: (U) D PEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. FMENT PL	TIVE ENLI FROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER A ANNING (O	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (ON POLICY (C) POLICY (S) POLI	INTE INVEST	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IMENT; (U) ISSUITATION IGE, COMPLE ISSUITATION ISSUITATION ASSOCIATE ISSUITATION ISSUITATION ISSUITATION	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH FORMER (-22025.
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JUE 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE	CONTRACTOR OF A CHARACTER OF A CHARA	NCLAR Classific 3: (U) D PEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL	TIVE ENLI FROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER A ANNING (O	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (ON POLICY (CON POLICY (SSIGNMENT (STED PERSO (STED PERSO) (STED PERSO) (ST	TATE INVEST	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IMENT; (U) ISSECTIVE INCT OCCU DBJECTIVE DSOLVE CC ASSOCIATE 21-804-C31 IK UNIT WF	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, E WITH FORMER -22025.
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JUE 23 KEYWORDS JUE 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 OBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE	COLIAN APPLICA COLETIVE 24 APPLICA E PLANNING E PLA	NCLAR Classific 3: (U) D PEROACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL	TIVE CODE TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C	(U) MANPOWE (U) M	TATE INVEST	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IMENT; (U) ISSECTIVE INCT OCCU INCT OCCU	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, E WITH FORMER -22025. CF NEW
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JUN 23 KEYWORDS JUN 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 DBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFH SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA	CONTRACTOR OF THE TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF TO TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF THE TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF THE TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF THE TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF THE TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF T	NCLAR Classific 3: (U) D PEROACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRI	TIVE Code: ISTRIBUTI PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI CR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (CO OACH IS T	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) POLICY (U) MANPOWE (U) MA	TATE INVEST	IGATOR (faidual IGATOR (faidual IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) I	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS CMFLEX, ID WITH . FORMER A-22025. CP NEW TY OF
H MILTARY CI (U) CAREEF (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATIO	COLIAN APPLICA COLIFICHTURE STELENTING DECTIVE 24 APPLICA DECTIVE 24 APPLICA DECTIVE 24 APPLICA DECTIVE 24 APPLICA TO EXAMPLICA EXAMPLICA EXAMPLICA TO INVEST LE, MULTIN DNEL ASSE EXAMPLICA COLL (U) TO DNAL NETWO	NCLAR Classific 3: (U) D PEROACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRE DRK CODE	TIVE CODE ISTRIBUTI PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) POLICY (U) POLICY (U) POLICY (U) MANPOWE (U) POLICY (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPO	TATE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IS A LAF IS A LAF NNEL ARE 300 DIST S. THE C OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE NG A LAF	IGATOR (faiding IGATOR (faiding IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) I	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; EX TC SOME UPATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, IC WITH . FORMER -22025. CP NEW Y OF
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JHE (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROF COMPUTATIO OBJECTIVES	CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR CONT	ATION MELLE Classifie 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRO DRK CODE STRAINTS	TIVE ENLI FFERENT S ND DEVELO FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (ON POLICY (C) POL	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IS A LAF NNEL ARE 300 DIST S. THE CO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE NG A LAF IGNMENT	IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U)	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 52763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH FORMER -22025. CF NEW Y CF (1)
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JHE (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATIO OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST	CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR OF	A CON A CONTENT Classifie 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRI DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELING	TIVE ENLI FFERENT S ND DEVELO FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (ON POLICY (C) POL	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IS A LAF NNEL ARE 300 DIST S. THE CO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE NG A LAF IGNMENT HEORY FO	IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U)	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 52763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH FORMER -22025. CF NEW Y CF (1) SCING THE
H MILTARY CI (U) CAREEN (U) CAREEN 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFN SPECIALTIN EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPRON COMPUTATIO OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST LINKS IN F	CONTRACTOR OF CONTACTOR OF CONTACTOR OF CONTACTOR OF CONTACTOR OF CONTACTOR OF CONTACT	TION MELANT Classifie 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRI DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELING TTING AT	TIVE ENLI CR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) POLICY (U) POLICY (U) POLICY (U) POLICY (U) MANPOWE (U) POLICY (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOW	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IN SECURITY CLA IN SECURITY CLA IN SECURITY CLA IS A LAF IGNENT HEORY FOL AND IM	IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT INCT OCCU INCT OCCU	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 52763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH FORMER -22025. CF NEW Y OF (2) CING THE ICN AT THE
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JAC 23 KEYWORDS JAC 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 OBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFH SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATIO OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST LINKS IN F OPERATIONA	CONTRACTOR OF THE TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF THE TAXABLE CONTRACTOR OF TAXABLE CONTACTOR OF TAXABLA CONTACTOR OF	TION MELANT Classifie 3: (U) D PEROACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRI DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELIN TTING AT AND (3)	TIVE ENLI PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER A ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE	(U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (ON POLICY (C) POL	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY Cla IS A LAF IS A LAF IS THE C OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE NG A LAF IGNMENT HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE	IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana INCT OCO ISSOCIATE INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT OCCU INCT INTER INTERFA INTERFA INTERFA	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH FORMER C2025. CF NEW Y OF (1) CING THE ICN AT THE CIAL
H MILTARY CI CONTRACTORY CI CONTRACTORY C	CONTRACTOR OF A CHARTER OF A CH	TION MELANT Classifie 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRID DRK CODE ETRAINTS MODELIN TTING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM	TIVE ENLI PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER A ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL	(V) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) POLICY (SSIGNMENT	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IN	IGATOR (fordina IGATOR (fordina IGATOR (fordina IMENT; (U) INFIGATION COAC RGE, COMPLE ASSIGNET INCT OCCU DIJECTIVE DIJECTIVE OBJECTIVE ASSOCIATE ASSOCIATE IND DEVEL RE UNIT WE AND DEVEL RE VARIET PROBLEM, DR INTERFA IPLEMENTAT OF ARTIFI SYSTEMS.	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 52763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, IC WITH FORMER FORMER FORMER FORMER CONG THE ICN AT THE CIAL
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JAR (U) CAREEF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFF SPECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATIO OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST LINKS IN F OPERATIONA INTELLIGEN	COLIAN APPLICA COLIAN APPLICA COLIAN APPLICA E PLANNING E PLAN	TION Control Classifie Control	TIVE CODE PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER A ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL	(V) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (ON POLICY (SSIGNMENT (STED PERSO (STED PE	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN A LAF IN A LAF IS A LAF IS A LAF 300 DIST S. THE C OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE NG A LAF IGNMENT HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE IGNMENT	IGATOR (fordina IGATOR (fordina IGATOR (fordina IMENT; (U) INITIAL COMPLE ASSIGNE INCT OCCU DEJECTIVE DEJECTIVE DEJECTIVE SOLVE CO ASSOCIATE INCT OCCU ASSOCIATE AND DEVEL RE VARIET PROBLEM, DR INTERFA IPLEMENTAT OF ARTIFI SYSTEMS.	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, D WITH FORMER C2025. CP NEW Y OF (1) CING THE ICN AT THE CIAL
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JUN 23 KEYWORDS JUN 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 OBJECT OPERATION 5,000 DIFH SFECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATIO OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST LINKS IN F OPERATIONA INTELLIGEN	CEAN APPLICA CEAN FICHALLES E PLANNING E PLANNE E PLANNING E PLANNE E PLANE E	TION MELANT Classifie 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRID DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELING TTING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM: (OCT 85	TIVE CODE PROGRESS P PROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL	(WAME OF ASSOC (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) POLICY (SSIGNMENT (SSIGNMENT (STED PERSO STED PERSO (STED	INTE INVEST STITUTE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITS CIA IS A LAF NNEL ARE 300 DIST S. THE C OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 IGNMENT HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE IGNMENT MPUTATIO	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IMENT; (U) ISACAL COMPL ISACAL COMPL ISACAL COMPL ISAC COMPL ISAC COMPL ISAC COMPL ISAC COMPLE ISAC COMPLICAC COMPLE ISAC COMPLICAC COMPLE ISAC COMPLICAC COMPLE ISAC	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; LEX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, TO WITH FORMER C2025. CF NEW Y OF (2) CING THE ION AT THE GIAL DEK CODE
H MILTARY CI H MILTARY CI CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR H MILTARY CI CONTRACTOR H MILTARY CI H MILTARY CI CONTRACTOR H MILTARY CI H	CEAN APPLICA CEAN FICH WINE E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNE E PLANE E PLANE	TON MELLE Classifie 3: (U) D PEROACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRID DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELING AND (3) T SYSTEM (OCT 85	ISTRIBUT PROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL	(V) MANE OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) POLICY (SSIGNMENT (SS	CLATE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURICS CLA IS A LAF IS A LAF NNEL ARE 300 DIST S. THE C 0GIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 IGNMENT HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE IGNMENT MPUTATIO	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; LEX TO SOME PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, DE WITH FORMER G-22025. CF NEW Y OF (1) CING THE TON AT THE CIAL PRK CODE CUTE
H MILTARY CI H MILTARY CI CONTRACTOR H MILTARY CI H MI	CEAN APPLICA CEAN FACTURES E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING E PLANNING I VE: (U) OVER 500 FERENT AC ES AND AT TO INVES LE, MULTIN ONAL ASS E R MANAGE ACH: (U) ONAL NETWO S AND CONS FRUCTURED POLICY SE AL LEVEL, NCE/EXPERT ESS: (U) OPED THAT	TON Control Classifie Control Classifie Clas	ISTRIBUT PROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL - MAR 86) VE AN ASS	(WAME OF ASSOC (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) POLICY (W) POLICY	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CIA IS A LAF IS A LAF IS A LAF IS A LAF S. THE C OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBER 52 IGNMENT HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE IGNMENT MPUTATIC OBLEM WI	IGATOR (Salana IGATOR (Salana IGATOR (Salana IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT INCT OCCU IMENT INCT OCCU IMENT INCT OCCU IMENT INCT OCCU IMENT INCT OCCU IMENT INCT OCCU IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IM	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, DE WITH FORMER A-22025. CP NEW Y OF (1) CING THE TON AT THE CIAL PRK CODE OUTE
H MILTARY CI H MILTARY CI (U) CAREEN 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION, 5,000 DIFH SFECIALTIE EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATION OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST LINKS IN F OPERATIONA INTELLIGEN 25. PROGRE WAS DEVELO TRAINING C	CLAN APPLICA CERE FICH WHEN S PLANNING DECIVE 24 AF TIVE: (U) OVER 500 FERENT AC ES AND AT TO INVES LE, MULTIN DNNEL ASSI EER MANAGE ACH: (U) DNAL NETWO 5 AND CONS TRUCTURED POLICY SE AL LEVEL, NCE/EXPERT ESS: (U) DPED THAT CAPACITY (TION Control Classifie Control Classifie Control 25 NAVY PE CONTROL TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL TIGATE APPRI DRK CODEL STRAINTS MODELINI TTING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM COCT 05 CAN SOLY CONSTRAIN	TIVE CODE ISTRIBUT PROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI CR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL - MAR 86) VE AN ASS NTS THAT	(WAME OF ASSOC (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) POLICY (C)	INTE INVEST SITE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITS CION IN SECURITS CION IS A LAF IS A LAF IS A LAF SO DIST S. THE CON OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UMBER 52 UMBE	IGATOR (faiding IGATOR (faiding IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT INCT OCCU IMENT INCT INCT INCT INCT OCCU IMENT INCT	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH . FORMER A-22025. CP NEW Y OF (I) CING THE ICN AT THE CIAL PRK CODE OUTE AS ARE ALL
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWCROSJUN (U) CAREEN 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFN SPECIALTIN EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATIO OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST LINKS IN F OPERATIONA INTELLIGEN 25. PROGRE WAS DEVELO TRAINING C THE SAME).	CLAN APPLICA CELE FICH WHEN S ELANNING SECTIVE 24 AF TIVE: (U) OVER 500 FERENT AC ES AND AT TO INVES LE, MULTIN DNNEL ASSI EER MANAGE ACH: (U) DNAL NETWO S AND CONS TRUCTURED POLICY SE AL LEVEL, NCE/EXPER ESS: (U) DPED THAT CAPACITY (C THIS DEN	ATION MELANT Classifie 3: (U) D DEFEARCH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL ORK CODE STRAINTS MODELING TTING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM (OCT 85 CAN SOL CONSTRAIN VELOFMEN	TIVE CODE TIVE ENLI PROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI CR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL - MAR 86) VE AN ASS NTS THAT T IS AN E	(WAME OF ASSOC (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) MANPOWE (W) POLICY (C)	INTE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITS CHA IS A LAF IS A LAF IS A LAF IS A LAF 300 DIST S. THE C OGIES TO ROBLEMS UDES WOF STIGATE HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE IGNMENT MPUTATIO DBLEM WI M (I.E., STEF TO	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) IMENT INCT OCCU IMENTIVE IMENTIVE INCT OCCU IMENTIVE IMENTIVE IMENTIVE IMAL NETWO IMAL NETWO IMAL DEVE	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH . FORMER -22025. CP NEW Y OF (2) CING THE ION AT THE GIAL PRK CODE OUTE AS ARE ALL LOFING
H MILTARY CI 22 KEYWORDS JAR (U) CAREEN 23 TECHNICAL OF 23 TECHNICAL OF 23. OBJECT OPERATION. 5,000 DIFN SPECIALTIN EFFORT IS LARGE-SCAL NAVY PERSO TITLE CARE 24. APPROA COMPUTATION OBJECTIVES EXPLORE ST LINKS IN F OPERATIONA INTELLIGEN 25. PROGRE WAS DEVELO TRAINING C THE SAME). ALGORITHMS	CLAN APPLICA CELE FICH WHE SECTIVE 24 AF TIVE: (U) OVER 500 FERENT AC ES AND AT TO INVEST LE, MULTIN DNNEL ASS EER MANAGE ACH: (U) DNAL NETWO S AND CONS TRUCTURED POLICY SE AL LEVEL, NCE/EXPERT ESS: (U) DPED THAT CAPACITY (C) THIS DEV 5 TO SOLVE	TION MELANIC Classifie 3: (U) D DEFOACH 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRID DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELING TTING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM: (OCT 85 CAN SOL CONSTRAIN VELOFMEN E ASSIGN	TIVE CODE TIVE ENLI PROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI CR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELC ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGC THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL - MAR 86) VE AN ASS NTS THAT T IS AN E MENT PROE	INAME OF ASSOC INAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) FASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) FOR (U) MANPOWE (U) FOR (U) MANPOWE (U) MANOVE (U) MANOVE (CLATE INVEST STATE INVEST INTEL ARE SOO DIST S. THE CO OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE HEORY FO LAND IM IAL USE IGNMENT HEORY FO LAND IM IAL USE IGNMENT MPUTATIO OBLEM WI M (I.E., STEF TO NLISTED	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) INCT OCCU DBJECTIVE DSCLVE CO ASSOCIATE 21-804-C31 INTERFA I	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, TO WITH PORMER - 22025. CP NEW Y OF (2) CING THE ICN AT THE GIAL PRK CODE POUTE AS ARE ALL COFING TTH
H MILTARY CI CONTRACTORY CI CONTRACTORY C	CLAN APPLICA CCAL FICHADIES S ELANNING S ELANNING S ELANNING S ELANNING S ERENT AC ES AND AT TO INVES LE, MULTIN DNNEL ASS EER MANAGE ACH: (U) DNAL NETWO S AND CONS TRUCTURED POLICY SE AL LEVEL, NCE/EXPER ESS: (U) DPED THAT CAPACITY (C THIS DEV S TO SOLVE NAVY ENLIS	TION TELESCONTECTION TELESCONTECTION TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPREDICT TING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM COCT 85 CAN SOL CONSTRAIN VELOFMEN E ASSIGN 5TED CLAS	TIVE CODE TIVE ENLI PROGRESS P RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI CR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELC ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (C OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGC THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL - MAR 86) VE AN ASS NTS THAT T IS AN E MENT PROE SSIFICATI	INAME OF ASSOC INAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) FASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) FOR (U) FOR	CLATE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IN SECURITY CLA IN SECURITY CLA IS A LAF 300 DIST 300 DIS	IGATOR (faiduate IGATOR (faiduate IMENT; (U) IMENT; (U) INCT OCCU DEJECTIVE DEJECTIVE DEJECTIVE DEJECTIVE ASSOCIATE INCT OCCU DEJECTIVE ASSOCIATE INCT OCCU ASSOCIATE INCT OCCU INCT OCU INCT OCU IN	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MPLEX, IC WITH PORMER -22025. CF NEW Y CF (1) ACING THE ICN AT THE CIAL PRK CODE HOUTE AS ARE ALL CLOFING TTH HAT MUST
H MILTARY CI CONTRACTORY CI CONTRACTORY C	CLAN APPLICA COLOR ADDICA COLOR ADDICA SECTIVE 24 APPLICA DECTIVE 24 APPLICA DECTIVE 24 APPLICA DECTIVE 24 APPLICA COVER 500 FERENT AC ES AND AT TO INVES LE, MULTIN DNNEL ASSI EER MANAGE ACH: (U) DNAL NETWO S AND CONS TRUCTURED POLICY SE AL LEVEL, NCE/EXPERT ESS: (U) DPED THAT CAPACITY (C THIS DEV S TO SOLVE NAVY ENLIS CTENSIVE 50	TION TEACHT Classifie TEACHT Classifie TEACHT 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRID DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELING TTING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM COCT 85 CAN SOL CONSTRAIN VELOFMEN TEACTOR	ISTRIBUTI PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL - MAR 86) VE AN ASS NTS THAT T IS AN E MENT PROE SSIFICATI	I NAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) MANPOWE (U) FASSOC (U) MANPOWE (U) FORMENT (U) FORMENT (U	CLATE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IN SECURITY CLA IS A LAF 300 DIST S. THE CO OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE NG A LAF IGNMENT HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE IGNMENT MPUTATICO OBLEM WI M (I.E., STEF TO NLISTED ASS C	IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR (faidua IGATOR Court INCT OCO INCT OCO INCT OCCU INCT	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MPLEX, TO WITH FORMER -22025. CF NEW Y CF (1) NCING THE ICN AT THE CIAL PRK CODE NOUTE AS ARE ALL COPING TTH PHAT MUST
H MILTARY CI CONTRACTORY CI CONTRACTORY C	CEAN APPLICA COLOR FACHAGES SECONE 24 APPLICA SECONE 24 APPLICA SE	TION TEACHT Classifie TEACHT Classifie TEACHT 25 NAVY PE 0,000 AC TIVITIES NINE DI TIGATE A FLE-CRIT IGNMENT. EMENT PL THE APPRID DRK CODE STRAINTS MODELING TING AT AND (3) T SYSTEM COCT 05 CAN SOLV CONSTRAIN VELOFMEN TEASTIGNI STED CLAS ENROUTE	ISTRIBUTI PROGRESS PR RSONNEL A TIVE ENLI OR UNITS FFERENT S ND DEVELO ERIA OPTI FORMER W ANNING (O OACH IS T S CAPABLE FOR THE G AND AGO THE STRA EXAMINE S TECHNOL MAR 86) VE AN ASS NTS THAT T IS AN E MENT PROE SSIFICATI TRAINING.	INAME OF ASSOC INAME OF ASSOC INAME OF ASSOC (U) MANPOWE ION POLICY ASSIGNMENT ISTED PERSO INABOUT SKILL LEVEL OF METHODOL INIZATION P NORK UNIT N CAMP). INCL IN	CLATE INVEST STATE INVEST R MANAGE IN SECURITY CLA IN SECURITY CLA IS A LAF IS A LAF 300 DIST S. THE CO OGIES TO ROBLEMS UMBER 52 UDES WOF STIGATE NG A LAF IGNMENT HEORY FO L AND IM IAL USE IGNMENT MPUTATICO OBLEM WI M (I.E., STEF TO NLISTED ASS C'	IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR (farana IGATOR Court INCT OCO INCT OCO INCT OCCU INCT INTERFA INTERFA INTERFA INTERFA INTERFA INTERFA INAL NETWO INAL NETWO INAL NETWO INAL NETWO INAL NETWO INAL NETWO INAL DEVE INAL DEVE INAL DEVE INAL DEVE	PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PE 62763N; PATIONAL OF THIS MFLEX, ID WITH FORMER -22025. CF NEW Y OF (1) ACING THE ION AT THE CIAL PRK CODE NOUTE AS ARE ALL IDFING ITH HAT MUST AN OF CASS

PARTIC STREET STREET STREET STREET

A SAMPLE RESIDENCES

A.M.M.

121222222

الحديدي

C-1

APPENDIX D

Ν

VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE REGRESSION ANALYSES

Table D-1

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RELIABILITY FOR VARIABLES

(Cases = 60)

VARIABLE	MEAN	STD DEV	RELIABILITY
MERIT	6.000	1.297	.86
B, C	6.226	1.445	.92
MISCNTRD	5.682	1.421	.91
NAVYOP	6.005	1.482	.89
RISK	3.929	1.944	.84
DODRD	3.634	1.597	.88
TRANSITN	6.898	1.210	.77
SOUND	6.787	1.294	.72
ACTFUND	202445.000	522.554	
LFUND	5.086	.476	
TYPE1	.033	.181	
TYPE2	.200	.403	
ТУРЕЗ	.233	.427	
TYPE4	.017	.129	
TYPER	.483	.504	
INTEGRTN	.533	.503	
PERCENT	64.600	36.392	
YRS	2.817	1.935	
INHOUSE	74.500	28.711	
DIFFCLTY	2.867	3.100	
CONTRCT%	23.383	21.381	
INF/KNOW	.833	.376	
POLICY	.383	.490	
PROCEDR	.850	.360	
SPONSORS	1.800	1.162	
SETTINGS	2.433	1.671	

Table D-2

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ON MERIT RATERS' AVERAGE OVERALL MERIT RATINGS (MERIT)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE MERIT

MULTIPLE R	.83005
R SQUARE	.68898
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.66018
STANDARD ERROR	.75598

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	DF	SUM OF SQUA	ARES	MEAN	SQUARE
REGRESSION	5	68.36427	13.6	7285	
RESIDUAL	54	30.86113	.57	150	

F = 23.92441 SIGNIF F = .0000

------ VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------

VARIABLE	В	SE B	BETA	Т	SIG T
MISCNTRD	.630101	.080469	.690408	7.830	.0000
LFUND	.872882	.247518	.320504	3.527	.0009
DODRD	196120	.070371	241561	-2.787	.0073
POLICY	559802	.211184	211647	-2.651	.0105
ΤΥΡΕ3	.524012	.250030	.172344	2.096	.0408
(CONSTANT)	-1.214168	1,122480		-1.082	.2842

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ON ATTRIBUTE RATERS' AVERAGE OVERALL BENEFIT/COST RATINGS (B/C)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE B/C

MULTIPLE R	.92119
R SQUARE	.84858
ADJUSTED R SQUARE	.83456
STANDARD ERROR	.58776

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

	DF	SUM OF SQUA	ARES	MEAN	SQUARE
REGRESSION	5	104.52705	20.90	541	
RESIDUAL	54	18.65119	.34	539	

F = 60.52654 SIGNIF F = .0000

----- VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION ------

VARIABLE	В	SE B	BETA	Т	SIG T
MISCNTRD	.785814	.055213	.772787	14.232	.0000
TRANSITN	.451882	.066938	.378442	6.751	.0000
TYPE3	.500490	.185194	.147739	2.703	.0092
RISK	114400	.042347	153950	-2.702	.0092
INHOUSE	007193	.002768	142938	-2.598	.0120
(CONSTANT)	487197	.662315		736	.4652

APPENDIX E

DSSESSAR DV/V/VAT XXXXXX DXXXXXX DXXXXXXX

1.1.1

22222

1. 2. 2. L

and the second second

CORRELATION MATRIX

CORRELATION MATRIX

	MERIT	B/C	MISCNTRD	NAVYOP	RISK	DODRD	TRANSITN
MERIT	1.000	.550	.718	.553	.218	.165	.001
BC	.550	1.000	.758	.721	133	.259	.444
MISCNTRD	.718	.758	1.000	.626	.166	.433	.004
NAVYOP	.553	.721	.626	1.000	096	.308	.345
RISK	.218	133	.166	096	1.000	.152	321
DODRD	.165	.259	.433	.308	.152	1.000	177
TRANSITN	.001	.444	.004	.345	321	177	1.000
SOUND	.242	.591	.399	.433	335	.106	.406
TYPEI	.068	.244	.203	.070	152	.081	.022
TYPE2	.212	.048	.245	.090	.073	.249	179
TYPE3	.300	.235	.067	.220	.070	044	.045
TYPE4	.098	006	.078	009	.030	.092	034
TYPER	474	323	346	283	073	216	.108
ACTFUND	.464	.176	.327	.290	.223	.241	.003
LFUND	.528	.231	.396	.329	.213	.305	027
INTEGRTN	.091	.014	.258	115	.298	.334	320
PERCENT	062	.008	284	.069	301	350	.374
YRS	.477	.173	.307	.291	.228	.130	161
INHOUSE	156	304	164	054	018	.076	107
DIFFCLTY	.280	.291	.195	.024	.074	.021	.047
CONTRCT%	.170	.070	.169	.170	.041	.218	.094
INF/KNOW	.319	.201	.242	026	.137	047	049
POLICY	057	003	.051	.108	064	048	009
PROCEDR	.048	.089	.152	.106	.069	.092	066
SPONSORS	.291	.064	.213	.024	.149	.094	083
SETTINGS	.033	.124	.243	.107	065	.317	130

CORRELATION MATRIX (CON'T)

h

والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع

	SOUND	TYPE1	TYPE2	TYPE3	TYPE4	TYPER	ACTFUND
MERIT	.242	.068	.212	.300	.098	474	.464
B/C	.591	.244	.048	.235	006	323	.176
MISCNTRD	.399	.203	.245	.067	.078	346	.327
NAVYOP	.433	.070	.090	.220	009	283	.290
RISK	335	152	.073	.070	.030	073	.223
DODRD	.106	.081	.249	044	.092	216	.241
TRANSITN	.406	.022	179	.045	034	.108	.003
SOUND	1.000	.302	053	.141	.074	201	.197
TYPEI	.302	1.000	092	101	023	184	119
TYPE2	053	092	1.000	285	065	518	077
TYPE3	.141	101	285	1.000	071	568	.222
TYPE4	.074	023	065	071	1.000	129	.105
TYPER	201	184	518	568	129	1.000	108
ACTFUND	.197	119	077	.222	.105	108	1.000
LFUND	.194	126	.056	.349	.134	327	.778
INTEGRTN	.056	014	.235	007	.117	208	.210
PERCENT	.018	.053	272	.168	157	.098	104
YRS	.147	.020	.241	.335	.080	516	.357
INHOUSE	258	085	.157	175	017	.061	052
DIFFCLTY	.271	.124	175	.253	036	113	.207
CONTRCT%	.054	078	.032	.092	.235	138	.258
INF/KNOW	.100	.079	.114	.141	.055	254	.196
POLICY	.093	147	093	.156	103	.020	.240
PROCEDR	.084	.074	.208	.015	.052	220	.096
SPONSORS	032	129	087	.061	.244	.003	.564
SETTINGS	.165	.210	.142	084	.035	- 126	115

~~

CORRELATION MATRIX (CON'T)

	LFUND	INTEGRTN	PERCENT	YRS	INHOUSE	DIFFCLTY	
MERIT	.528	.091	062	.477	156	.280	.170
B/C	.231	.014	.008	.173	304	.291	.070
MISCNTRD	.396	.258	284	.307	164	.195	.169
NAVYOP	.329	115	.069	.291	054	.024	.170
RISK	.213	.298	301	.228	018	.074	.041
DODRD	.305	.334	350	.130	.076	.021	.218
TRANSITN	027	320	.374	161	107	.047	.094
SOUND	.194	.056	.018	.147	258	.271	.054
TYPEI	126	014	.053	.020	085	.124	078
TYPE2	.056	.235	272	.241	.157	175	.032
TYPE3	.349	007	.168	.335	175	.253	.092
TYPE4	.134	.117	157	.080	017	036	.235
TYPER	327	208	.098	516	.061	113	138
ACTFUND	.778	.210	104	.357	052	.207	.258
LFUND	1.000	.239	120	.420	056	.148	.267
INTEGRTN	.239	1.000	911	.290	.003	.087	.151
PERCENT	120	911	1.000	- 194	007	049	130
YRS	.420	.290	194	1.000	088	.173	102
INHOUSE	056	.003	007	088	1.000	857	086
DIFFCLTY	.148	.087	049	.173	857	1.000	.044
CONTRCT%	.267	.151	130	102	086	.044	1.000
INF/KNOW	.449	.209	138	.278	357	.374	.080
POLICY	.236	.033	089	.138	.069	032	118
PROCEDR	.047	.260	226	.155	.208	178	.149
SPONSORS	.392	.181	144	.046	127	.113	.322
SETTINGS	.183	.302	308	.110	070	.110	.094

CORRELATION MATRIX (CON'T)

	INF/KNOW	POLICY	PROCEDR	SPONSORS	SETTINGS
MERIT	.319	057	.048	.291	.033
B/C	.201	003	.089	.064	.124
MISCNTRD	.242	.051	.152	.213	.243
NAVYOP	026	.108	.106	.024	.107
RISK	.137	064	.069	.149	065
DODRD	047	048	.092	.094	.317
TRANSITN	049	009	066	083	130
SOUND	.100	.093	.084	032	.165
TYPE1	.079	147	.074	129	.210
TYPE2	.114	093	.208	087	.142
TYPE3	.141	.156	.015	.061	084
TYPE4	.055	103	.052	.244	.035
TYPER	254	.020	220	.003	126
ACTFUND	.196	.240	.096	.564	.115
LFUND	.449	.236	.047	.392	.183
INTEGRTN	.209	.033	.260	.181	.302
PERCENT	138	089	226	144	308
YRS	.278	.138	.155	.046	.110
INHOUSE	357	.069	.208	127	070
DIFFCLTY	.374	032	178	.113	.110
CONTRCT%	.080	118	.149	.322	.094
INF/KNOW	1.000	.086	053	.232	.210
POLICY	.086	1.000	.053	.022	.188
PROCEDR	053	.053	1.000	068	.099
SPONSORS	.232	.022	068	1.000	.125
SETTINGS	.210	.188	.099	.125	1.000

VOURIE PRESERVE ZURANN PRIMINE PRIMINE DEPENDEN DEPENDEN TITAL TANK REPART

APPENDIX F

TREESE DESCENCE PARAMER (BUDDED)

Later Brite

LANNAN DAMAN

12222

PROPOSED PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET

PROJECT INFORMATION SHEET

The information you provide here is part of the information that will used by a set of judges to rate your project. Please complete the following items as accurately and completely as possible.

Project Title

PI

______code_____phone_____

1. Please check the <u>organizations</u> funding and/or endorsing this project. For each organization checked, indicate the <u>specific code</u> providing funding and/or endorsing the project.

	SECNA	V				(ONT					
	ASN				_	(DNR				_	
	_DoD					l	NAVSE	Α			-	
	_OPNAV					l	NAVAI	R				
	SPAWA	R				ľ	NAVSU	P				
	NMPC					Ì	NAVDA	\C			-	
	NCPC				_	!	NAVFA	.C			-	
	NRC					9	Other (s	pecify)				
	_CNR						Other (s	pecify)			<u>-</u>	
	CNET					(Other (s	pecify)	<u> </u>			
	CNII											
2. ((3.	a) What is b) What is Is this pro	the ex the ex ject pa	pected f pected f rt of an	unding `unding integra	level (\$ level or ited set	SK) for ver the of proj	this pro life of ects?	oject th the proj	is year? ject?			
	If so, who	it perce	nt of th	e total (effort d	oes it r	epresen	t?				
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90 %	100%	
4.	To what e	extent d	loes this	work s	upport	element	s of yo	ur depa	rtment's	s Work	Breakdown St	ructure?
1	0 Not at all	1	2	3	4 Son	5 newhat	6	7	8	9 Te	10 D a great extent	
5.	Which ele	ment of	f the We	ork Brea	akdown	Structu	re does	this pr	oject m	ost clos	ely fit?	
6.	a) What is	s the <i>pl</i>	anned s	tart date	e of this	s projec	t?					
	b) What is	s the pl	anned e	nd date	of this	project	?					
7. thi	What perc s project v	cent of vill be a	the in-l available	nouse re when	sources	(e.g., p ject is <i>i</i>	ersonne nitiated	el, equip ?	oment, f	acilitie	s) required to	perform
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80 %	90 %	100%	
8.	What perc	ent of	the <u>tota</u>	<u>l</u> fundir	ng for t	his proj	ect is to	o be cor	ntracted	?		
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	
9.	Please ind	licate w	hat will	change	e as a re	sult of	this pro	oject's e	nd-proc	ducts.		
			tion /kn	owlada								

Policy

Procedures/Techniques

وتعريق وترجي تعريق

APPENDIX G

PROPOSED PROJECT RATING FORM

code	

LALEAN DEPUTT APPEARS DEPUTTS DEPUTTS DEPUTTS DEPUTTS

لدينين بالكر

Please complete the following items for the above identified project. Information detailing the project is attached for your reference. Reference to the Navy includes both Navy and Marine Corps. If you are unable give an exact response, then give your best estimate.

1. To what extent are the issues addressed by this project important to:

ししししたこと

	a) NPI	RDC?									
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4 Sc	5 omewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	b) The	operat	ional Na	avy?							
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4 Sc	5 omewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent
	c) The	private	e sector?	?							
Not	0 at all	1	2	3	4 So	5 omewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent

2. To what extent do the issues addressed by this project correspond with NPRDC's formal mission?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all				S	omewha	it				To a great
										extent

3. To what extent is NPRDC uniquely qualified to do this work?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all				S	omewha	ıt			-	To a great extent

4.	То	o what extent does this project build upon:												
		a)	NPR	DC rese	earch an	d deve	lop	oment?						
	Not	0 at a	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
		b)	other	r Navy	research	n and d	lev	elopment?						
	Not	0 ata	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
		c)	other	r DoD i	research	and de	eve	lopment?						
	Not	0 at a	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
5.	To what extent does this project integrate with current:													
		a) NPRDC projects?												
	Not	0 at a	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
		b)	othe	r Navy	R&D p	rojects	?							
	Not	0 at:	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
		c)	other	r DoD I	R&D pr	ojects?								
	Not	0 at :	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
6.	То	wh	at ex	tent do	es the a	рргоас	h f	or this proje	ct seem	to be:				
		a)	meth	odolog	ically so	und?								
	Not	0 at	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
		b)	theo	reticall	y sound	?								
	Not	0 at	all	1	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
		c)	feasi	ible?										
	Not	0 tat	all	j	2	3	4	5 Somewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	

G-2

0-2

a) administrative risks	(delays,	cuts in	funding,	etc.)	associated	with	pursuing	this
project?								

Survey In

TEETERS SANDAR DUNNER DEPOSIT DESERTER

122222

11.11

N	0 ot at all	1	2	3	4 So	5 mewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
	b) tec	hnical	risks ass	ociated	with p	ursuing	this pr	oject?				
N	0 lot at all	1	2	3	4 So	5 mewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
8	To what	extent	will the	end-pro	oduct(s) from th	nis proj	ject be ı	iseful to) the	R&D community	?
N	0 lot at all	1	2	3	4 So	5 mewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
9. ⁻	To what	extent	will the	end-pro	oduct(s) from th	nis pro	ject be ı	useful fo	or N	avy applications?	
N	0 Iot at all	1	2	3	4 So	5 mewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
10.	To what	extent	will the	e end-p	roduct(s) from	this pro	oject ref	lect pos	itive	ely on NPRDC?	
N	0 lot at all	1	2	3	4 So	5 mewhat	6	7	8	9	10 To a great extent	
11.	What is	the pro	bability	that en	id-prod	lucts from	m this	project	could be	e im	plemented?	
	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90	% 100%	
12 . appl	To what ications?	extent	will thi	s work	facilita	te future	e oppor	tunities	for fun	ding	; and/or	
	0		2	2		F		-	0	0	10	

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all					To a great					
										extent

13. Please indicate to what extent this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, is or will be important and valuable to the Navy by:

a) improving Navy effectiveness (e.g., meeting operational requirements, achieving stated goals)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10				
Value less Value equal										Value greater				
than 90%	than 90% to middle 20%									than 90%				
of project	S			of	proje	cts				of projects				

b) improving Navy efficiency (e.g., improving use of resources, reducing costs)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
Value less Value equal									Value greater			
than 90%				than 90%								
of projects	5			of	` proje	cts			C	of projects		

c) expanding the technical base (e.g., developing new technology, procedures)?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
Value less Value equal									Value greater				
than 90%	an 90% to middle 20%								than 90%				
of projects				of	f proje	cts			C	of projects			

14. Overall, to what extent do you perceive the benefits of undertaking this project outweighing the costs?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at all			-	To a great						
										extent

APPENDIX H

ľ

Land a second

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CALCULATING PREDICTED MERIT

FOR PROPOSED PROJECTS

LABORATORY WORKLOAD PRIORITIZATION AND ACCEPTANCE SYSTEM (LAWPAS)

The following instructions describe how to use LAWPAS to predict the merit of potential projects.

1. Ask the principal investigator (PI) of the proposed project to complete the *Proposed Project Information Sheet* (Appendix F) and to provide any additional documentation describing the project, such as a project plan or technical development plan.

2. Identify three attribute raters. Provide the raters with the *Proposed Project Information* Sheet and documentation for the project. Ask the raters to review these items and to complete the *Proposed Project Rating Form* (Appendix G). PERSONAL PROPERTY PROPERTY PERSONAL PROPERTY

لألالا لالالالالالالالال

3. Combine the three attribute rater scores for each question and calculate the mean for each item in the questionnaire. This is the rating value that will be used in the next step.

4. Combine the rating values from step 3 to create the variables in the predicted merit equation. After totaling the appropriate items, calculate the mean. This is the value you will enter into the equation to calculate the project's predicted merit. The questionnaire items are combined from the *Proposed Project Rating Form* (Appendix G) as follows:

MISCNTRD Centrality to NPRDC Mission

Questionnaire items

1a. To what extent are the issues addressed by this project important to NPRDC?

2. To what extent do the issues addressed by this project correspond with NPRDC's formal mission?

4a. To what extent does this project build upon NPRDC research and development?

5a. To what extent does this project integrate with current NPRDC projects?

8. To what extent will the end-product(s) from this project be useful to the R&D community?

10. To what extent will the end-product(s) from this project reflect positively on NPRDC?

12. To what extent will this work facilitate future opportunities for funding and/or applications?

13c. To what extent is/will this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, be <u>important</u> and <u>valuable</u> to the Navy by expanding the technical base (developing new technology, procedures, etc)?

RISK Project Risk

Questionnaire items

3. To what extent is NPRDC uniquely qualified to do this work? (This item is reverse scored.)

4b. To what extent does this project build upon other Navy research and development?

5b. To what extent does this project integrate with current Navy R&D projects?

H-1

7a. To what extent are there administrative risks associated with pursuing this project?

7b. To what extent are there technical risks associated with pursuing this project?

DODRD Connectivity with DOD R&D

Questionnaire items

ومناوعة والمناركة والمرارك وال

4c. To what extent does this project build upon other DoD research and development?

5c. To what extent does this project integrate with current Dod R&D projects?

TRANSITN Likelihood of Transitioning

Questionnaire items

6c. To what extent does the approach for this project seem to be feasible?

11. What is the probability that end-products from this project could be implemented?

Note: The following two variables did not enter into the current merit equation, but may be of interest to calculate and track.

NAVYOP Usefulness to Operational Navy

Questionnaire items

1b. To what extent are the issues addressed by this project important to the operational Navy?

T STATES CONTRACTOR

T. 2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.5.5.5.

.

9. To what extent will the end-product(s) from this project be useful for Navy applications?

13a. To what extent is/will this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, be <u>important</u> and <u>valuable</u> to the Navy by improving Navy effectiveness (e.g., meeting operational requirements, achieving stated goals, etc.)?

13b. To what extent is/will this project, compared to other NPRDC projects, be <u>important</u> and <u>valuable</u> to the Navy by improving Navy efficiency (e.g., improving use of resources, reducing costs, etc.)?

SOUND Scientific validity

Questionnaire items 6a. To what extend does the approach for this project seem to be methodologically sound? 6b. To what extend does the approach for this project seem to be theoretically sound?

5. Gather the funding information from Form 1498 for the following variables:

- LFUND Log transform of the best estimate of actual funding for FY88 (item 17d on Form 1498 or item 2a on Proposed Project Information Sheet).
- TYPE3 If program element funding type is 6.3, value is 1, otherwise 0 (item 10a).

6. Gather the PI information from the Proposed Project Information Sheet for the following variables:

INHOUSE What percent of in-house resources required are available at startup (question 7)?

POLICY Will the end-products change policy (question 9)? If true, value is 1, otherwise 0.

7. Put the data from steps four and five into the following equation to calculate the project's predicted merit:

PMERIT = (.630 * MISCNTRD) + (.830 * LFUND) + (-.196 * DODRD)+ (-.560 * POLICY) + (.524 * Type3) - 1.214*

*Note: The weights reported here in the equation differ from those found in the text because they are the unstandardized regression weights.

8. If you are interested in calculating the predicted overall benefit/cost score of the project (determined from attribute raters' data), use the following equation:

PB/C = (.786 * MISCNTRD) + (.452 * TRANSITN) + (.500 * TYPE3) + (.007 * INHOUSE) + (-.108 * RISK) - .487*

*Note: The weights reported here in the equation differ from those found in the text because they are the unstandardized regression weights.

9. Compare the predicted score with scores of existing projects and other proposed projects to get an indication of where this project stands in terms of predicted merit.

きんしんしんしん いんてんんようかい

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Director of Navy Laboratories Office (SPAWAR-005) Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) (2)

7

END DATE FILMED 6- 1988 DTIC