

**ORDER**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

CE 1800.7L

Sept. 15, 1992

SUBJ: CENTRAL REGION FLIGHT STANDARDS EVALUATION PROGRAM

1. PURPOSE. This Order prescribes regional policies and guidelines governing evaluation and appraisals of Central Region Flight Standards programs and activities. It assigns responsibilities for conducting and monitoring evaluations, reporting on results, and tracking the implementation of adopted recommendations, and analyzing any discernible trends.

2. DISTRIBUTION. This Order is to be distributed at the division level in the Central Region, branch level in the Flight Standards Division, and to all Flight Standards field offices.

3. CANCELLATION. Order CE1800.7K, dated February 1, 1992, is cancelled.

\* 4. BACKGROUND. Order 1800.2F establishes agency policy regarding managers' responsibilities for periodic evaluation of the programs and activities under their direction. It states explicitly that management officials will establish evaluation programs to, at least triennially, evaluate programs and activities for effectiveness and efficiency, ensure that desired outcomes are achieved at the least possible cost, and verify the quality of services or products being provided FAA's customers.

5. SCOPE. This Order applies to the review and evaluation of all Central Region Flight Standards programs and activities.

6. AUTHORITY. The documents which provide the basis for the Regulatory Standards and Compliance evaluation program are:

*1800.2E*  
*current?* a. Order 1800.2F, Evaluation and Appraisal of Agency Programs.

*current?* b. Order 1800.52D, Regulatory Standards and Compliance Evaluation Programs.

*Not fielded* c. Order CE1800.19E, Central Region Evaluation and Appraisal Program.

DEFINITIONS.

\* a. Evaluation is a measurement of performance against established goals, policies, and procedures. It is a formal, line or staff assessment of mission accomplishment, policy effectiveness, and identifies strategic planning needs. It focuses on responsiveness to public need, agency mission, goals and objectives, and inter-program relationships. An evaluation is a comprehensive investigation of an area that has been identified for review by higher level management to specifically:

- (1) Confirm positive program achievements.
- (2) Determine the significance of real or potential problems.
- (3) Identify recommendations for improvement or correction.

8. OBJECTIVES. The Central Region Flight Standards evaluation programs are designed to:

- a. Assess overall program effectiveness;
- b. Ensure that Flight Standards programs and associated activities are administered in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, directives, and guidance material;
- c. Appraise the effectiveness of program guidance provided by all elements of the Central Region Flight Standards organization and identify areas where improvement or revision is needed;
- d. Promote program standardization;
- e. Promote increased efficiency and effectiveness in managing, administering, and operating Flight Standards programs by exchanging information, ideas, methods, and systems, between Washington headquarters, regions, branches, and field offices;
- f. Determine the degree, quality, and timeliness of service provided to the user;
- g. Help ensure that performance is measured against established goals and objectives;
- h. Strengthen open, honest communications between management and employees, between the agency, industry, and the general public;

- i. Help ensure that effective human resource management practices are used by managers, supervisors and employees;
- j. Determine whether resources are adequate to perform priority functions;
- k. Identify sound management practices in programs, and facilitate the transfer of these practices throughout the Central Region.

9. POLICIES.

- a. Evaluation is an integral part of a manager's responsibility to be knowledgeable about the programs and activities for which he or she is accountable. Periodic evaluations are to be conducted by management officials, at all levels, to ascertain the effectiveness and efficiency of programs and activities under their direction and to ensure that desired outcomes are achieved at the least possible cost.
- \* b. Evaluations help to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of agency operations and to confirm:
  - (1) the quality of services and/or products that organizations provide to their customers;
  - (2) whether the achieved results are worth the costs;
  - (3) internal compliance with and the adequacy of existing policies governing the program or activity; and
  - (4) whether the adoption of new policies and ideas, or the phase out/redirection of an existing program or activity, would better serve agency goals and objectives.
- c. Evaluations are an integral part of the agency's safety mission and are to be accorded the requisite priority when resources are requested.
- d. Evaluations are to be conducted so as to ensure their objectivity, accuracy, and thoroughness, and distributed so as to ensure that their findings and recommendations are directed to appropriate management officials.
- e. While the recommendations of an evaluation are to be carefully weighed and thoughtfully responded to by every manager, the determination of what action to be taken as a

result of any recommendation is, in the first instance, the responsibility of the manager accountable for the success of the program or activity being reviewed.

- \* f. Managers shall provide leadership in taking corrective actions including the implementation of evaluation recommendations. Managers shall also ensure that unresolved disagreements with recommendations are elevated to and resolved by appropriate senior management.

#### 10. EVALUATION TYPES AND CONDUCT.

a. Effectiveness evaluations: These evaluations assess how effectively programs achieve specified goals and objectives. The evaluation's purpose is to assure that the programs and activities effectively achieve their intended objectives, and that program management is competent, constructive, and efficient. These types of evaluations are directed towards entire programs or specific program segments.

b. Compliance evaluations: Compliance evaluations assess whether programs are operating as designed, and whether program management is conforming with the pertinent orders, rules, or regulations. They differ from effectiveness evaluations in that they do not necessarily evaluate the extent to which program objectives are actually achieved, or the efficiency of the program's design for achieving them. Rather, they seek to ensure that the program is implemented in accordance with national, regional, or local policy, procedure and regulation.

- \* c. Evaluations can be in the form of regional systems and program evaluations, individual office evaluations, or evaluations of certificated agencies and operators. Any evaluation may be a combination compliance/effectiveness evaluation.

#### 11. RESPONSIBILITIES.

a. The Flight Standards Division Manager is responsible for:

(1) Ensuring that an evaluation system meeting the policies and standards exists and functions effectively within the division.

(2) Determining that the scope and frequency of evaluations of assigned organizations and programs are appropriate given the nature, safety criticality, public sensitivity, cost, and vulnerability of the functions in the division.

\* (3) Conducting evaluations of programs under their direction every three years with flexibility to determine whether all or selected programs are reviewed in any given year.

\* This triennial evaluation requirement may be satisfied on the basis of external evaluations (e.g., those conducted by the General Accounting Office, Office of Inspector General, etc.) if specific action to address findings or to implement recommendations is being accomplished.

(4) Conducting evaluations of Flight Standards mission accomplishment in the region including any areas of strength and/or weakness.

(5) Providing the Regional Administrator with executive-level assessments of the quality and responsiveness of Flight Standards programs in meeting the needs of the region's aviation customers.

(6) Coordinating evaluation plans with Management Systems, Planning and Evaluation Branch, ACE-41, to assure a cohesive evaluation effort.

(7) Providing ACE-41 copies of annual evaluation plans and the results from all evaluations.

(8) Providing ACE-41 full access, as required, to records, memoranda, documents, correspondence, as well as facilities, land, and buildings, to the extent necessary to fulfill the Regional Administrator's responsibilities.

(9) Informing ACE-41 of evaluations to be conducted by Washington headquarters evaluation teams and providing ACE-41 copies of the results of these evaluations.

(10) Responding to the Regional Administrator's requests for program evaluation support.

b. Flight Standards Division evaluation offices/staffs are responsible for:

(1) Preparing an annual evaluation plan and coordinating all evaluation schedules with the concurrence of the Division Manager.

(2) Ensuring that joint evaluations are undertaken where practicable to conserve resources and to minimize impact on organizations being evaluated.

(3) Submitting a final evaluation report to ACE-200. The final report, due within 30 days of the evaluation completion date, is to include both positive findings and negative findings, discussion, substantiating data, and recommendations.

\* (4) Ensuring follow-up actions on the part of the action offices meet time frames.

\* (5) Ensuring additional follow-up actions are taken approximately six months after final close-outs to ensure effectiveness of corrections.

c. Evaluation Team Leaders are responsible for:

(1) Notifying offices or organizations to be evaluated.

(2) Identifying the objectives of the evaluation. In concert with the evaluation team members, identify multiple sub-objectives, addressing each element of the overall objective.

(3) Completing an evaluation plan identifying overall objectives, specific sub-objectives, methodology for completing each objective, and the necessary data collection tasks. In addition, the team leader is responsible for developing data collection questionnaires and program records review guidelines.

(4) Initiating advance data collection to include orders, regulation, policy directives, and other fundamental background information.

(5) Making all logistics arrangements for team members in advance such as, airline, hotel, G-car and rental car reservations; scheduling on-site interviews, obtaining maps and driving instructions as required; preparing itinerary/schedule.

(6) Scheduling an entrance conference with the head of the organization to be evaluated. The entrance conference should explain the overall evaluation objectives, methodology for completing each objective, necessary data collection tasks to be utilized, and a summarization of the subsequent report and follow-up actions.

(7) Providing an exit conference with the same people as the entrance conference. At the exit conference, a brief description of major findings and recommendations for improvements, if available at that time, are provided.

(8) Compiling the final report, due within 30 days of the evaluation, to include both positive findings and negative findings, discussion, substantiating data, recommendations, action offices.

\* (9) Keeping the manager or supervisor of the evaluating office informed on the status of the evaluation being conducted.

d. The Field Office Manager or manager of the program or organization evaluated is responsible for:

(1) Providing leadership in the implementation of evaluation and appraisal recommendations and ensuring that efforts to resolve disagreements concerning implementation of recommendations are elevated to an appropriate senior management level.

(2) Within 30 days of receiving the final evaluation report, reporting to the Division Manager on actions taken or planned in response to the evaluation recommendations. A copy of the response and any subsequent correspondence will be sent to the manager of the evaluation team for review.

## 12. CONDUCTING EVALUATIONS.

a. Notification. Offices or organizations to be evaluated should be notified as much in advance as possible. Exceptions to the notification requirement may be made for special or urgent evaluations, with the Division Manager's approval. Advance notice of compliance evaluations should not exceed 10 days prior notice to the operator or agency to be evaluated.

b. Objectives identified. The overall evaluation objective identifies the problem or the situation cited by the client requesting the evaluation. Subsequently, the team leader, in concert with the evaluation team members, identifies multiple specific sub-objectives, addressing each element of the overall objective.

c. Evaluation planned. Prior to initiating data gathering, the team leader will complete an evaluation plan. This plan identifies the evaluation's overall objectives, specific sub-objectives, methodology for completing each objective, and the necessary data collection tasks. In addition, the team leader is responsible for developing data collection questionnaires and program records review guidelines.

d. Criteria identified. Establish criteria prior to the evaluation that provide the basis for evaluating data obtained. The criteria identify expected or desired program performance, and are used as the basis for evaluating the program's actual performance or condition.

e. Advance data collection. Advance data collection begins immediately following evaluation notification. It includes orders, regulations, policy directives, and other fundamental background information. It is used to provide basic guidance for identifying sub-objectives, necessary tasks, and interview questions. The data is thoroughly analyzed and assembled for easy use by the team.

f. Logistics. All logistics arrangements are made in advance by the office doing the evaluation, including air-line, hotel, G-car, and rental car reservations; scheduling on-site interviews; obtaining maps and driving instructions as required; itinerary/schedule preparation for each team member.

g. Entrance conference. An entrance conference is scheduled for each evaluation. Formality and attendance at the entrance conference will vary with the nature of the evaluation. It includes as many team members as practicable and the manager or head of the organization being evaluated. The team should offer to review, if possible, any specific areas requested.

h. Exit conference. An exit conference is scheduled by the team leader, including the same people as the entrance conference, for the purpose of briefly describing major findings and recommendations for improvement, if available at that time.

### 13. REPORTS.

a. Types of findings. Evaluation reports include both positive and negative findings and recommendations. It is equally as important to inform managers of program aspects that are going well as it is to point out deficiencies. Positive findings provide positive reinforcement and help form the basis for wider implementation of effective management techniques. Likewise, it is critical to identify deficiencies to provide assistance in improving program performance. Negative findings are presented constructively, with possible remedies identified.

b. Executive summary. Evaluation reports include an executive summary. All executive summaries explain the purpose of the evaluation, provide enough background information to describe the subject program, and what was

evaluated. Executive summaries for effectiveness evaluations enumerate the evaluation's significant, basic program effectiveness findings and recommendations, while those for compliance evaluations identify major areas of program compliance and non-compliance.

c. Reporting style. The main body of the report is succinct, and able to quickly provide critical information, findings, conclusions, and recommendations to busy managers without wading through extensive data discussion. When necessary for detailed understanding, data and discussion is presented in attached or detached appendices.

d. Report content. Effectiveness evaluation reports present findings and recommendations regarding the program's effectiveness at achieving its goals and objectives. These findings are based on the evaluation team's collective opinion using advance data, on-site data, their own experience, knowledge, and judgment. Compliance evaluation reports concentrate on identifying areas of compliance and individual discrepancies between actual program practice and FAR or handbook references. Specific discrepancies are enumerated, their significance or impact identified, and recommended remedies indicated.

e. Report format. The specific report format should be tailored to meet the purpose of the evaluation and the needs of the client-requesting the evaluation. As a rule, the report should be concise and provide key findings and information in a format that makes the information readily available, without having to wade through extensive data discussions. The report should include:

(1) Cover. Title of evaluation and dates conducted.

(2) Approval Page. Includes names of team members and signature line for team leader approval.

(3) Executive Summary. Contains the information described above for Executive Summary.

The text for each evaluation topic should include:

(4) Topic. The evaluation topic should be cited, and its significance explained, if possible.

(5) Finding/Conclusion. A one-sentence statement that summarizes the basic finding, followed by a brief description of the rationale supporting it.

(6) Recommendation. Describe the action items necessary to resolve problems or improve the situation, and identify the office responsible for carrying it out.

- \* Note: Regional program or activity evaluation reports, by their nature, are broad in scope and address the Region as a whole. If, as a result of the evaluation, specific discrepancies relative to a particular office are found, those findings may be addressed in an appendix and provided to the affected office.
- \* All evaluation documents shall be marked "For Official Use Only (Public Availability to be Determined Under U.S.C. 552)"

f. Review. Prior to final determination that an item is indeed a finding, the evaluator will coordinate as necessary with the organization being evaluated for full substantiation, explanation, possible mitigating information, and merit. In some cases a draft report may be coordinated or discussed with the organization being evaluated to ensure the accuracy of technical data. The team leader will have final authority as to report content. The responding manager, of course, has the opportunity to respond as desired in the action plan.

Evaluation reports are prepared by the evaluation team and reviewed by the manager/supervisor of the evaluation office. After that manager's approval, the report is prepared in final and presented to the Division Manager. After acceptance by the Division Manager, the report will be forwarded to the manager of the evaluated organization for action.

#### 14. FOLLOW-UP.

Formal follow-up process facilitates prompt, responsive action on the recommendations.

a. Within 30 days of receiving the final evaluation report, the program or office managers of evaluated organizations should respond to the Division Manager on actions taken or planned in response to the evaluation recommendations. They will provide, and coordinate with the evaluation office, an action plan describing: planned actions; milestones for starting and completing recommended changes; decisions made to resolve disputed findings; and identify recommendations that will not be implemented, and the rationale for not implementing them. The frequency of subsequent progress reports will be identified in the action plan, but not to exceed 30 days. Managers will strive to resolve all follow-up actions within six months, or within agreed upon time-frames established in the action plan.

Copies of the action plan and follow-up reports will be coordinated with the manager of the office responsible for performing the evaluation.

b. Resolving disagreements. Any disagreements regarding the evaluation's conclusion, findings or recommendations should have been resolved prior to compiling the final report. The manager of the organization being evaluated and the team leader should try to resolve disagreements between themselves. If agreement cannot be reached, the manager of the office being evaluated may take his concerns to the manager of the evaluating office. In instances where a program or office manager still disagrees with the evaluation's conclusion, findings or recommendations, provisions stated above allow for those areas to be addressed in the action plan. The Division Manager will be the final authority as to resolution of disagreements.

c. Tracking follow-up. Information on completed evaluations will be maintained by the evaluating office in a system that contains information on evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations, responsible program office, schedules of actions and status.

- \* Approximately six months after final close-out action on findings, the evaluating office will perform follow-up actions to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of corrective actions. This will also serve to identify and verify trend items.

*for*   
Benjamin H. Tollison  
Manager, Flight Standards Division