

AD-A195 746

DTIC FILE COPY

2

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

STUDY PROJECT

COMMAND INSPECTIONS--A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

BY

COLONEL JAMES R. HEIL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 20 1988
S D
C/D

30 MARCH 1988



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

88 6 17 00 2

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Command Inspections - A Self-Evaluation Approach		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Individual Study Project
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Colonel James R. Heil		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same		12. REPORT DATE 30 March 1988
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 55
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) With the introduction of the Army's command inspection program in January 1986, commanders above company level are required to establish command inspection programs. The purpose of this study is to provide commanders with an awareness of a unique self-evaluation approach in performing command inspections. The concept focuses on continuous mission accomplishment in lieu of crisis reaction to meeting special inspection events. The study reviews issues leading up to the implementation of <u>Army Regulation 1-201</u> : Inspections, and the intent of (Cont)		

the command inspection requirement. It discusses why a self-evaluation approach should be considered and the substantial benefits which can be gained through its use. It also addresses how the program can increase motivation and the important impact motivation has on mission accomplishment. A review of the successful U.S. Air Force self-inspection program is highlighted. The study describes how a self-inspection program works and provides guidance for developing key program elements. It looks at considerations for implementing the program and discusses management and maintenance ideas. The study concludes by discussing attractive attributes of the concept and reinforces the benefits of a self-evaluation approach. Recommendations are made as to units most suitable for the program and recommends the Office of the Army Inspector General consider the concept for Army-wide application.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

COMMAND INSPECTIONS & A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Colonel James R. Heil

Colonel Richard L. Kail
Project Advisor

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
30 March 1988

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: James R. Heil, COL. VC

TITLE: Command Inspections - A Self-Evaluation Approach

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 30 March 1988

PAGES: 52

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

With the introduction of the Army's command inspection program in January 1986, commanders above company level are required to establish command inspection programs. The purpose of this study is to provide commanders with an awareness of a unique self-evaluation approach in performing command inspections. The concept focuses on continuous mission accomplishment in lieu of crisis reaction to meeting special inspection events. The study reviews issues leading up to the implementation of Army Regulation 1-201, Inspections, and the intent of the command inspection requirement. It discusses why a self-evaluation approach should be considered and the substantial benefits which can be gained through its use. It also addresses how the program can increase motivation and the important impact motivation has on mission accomplishment. A review of the successful U.S. Air Force self-inspection program is highlighted. The study describes how a self-inspection program works and provides guidance for developing key program elements. It looks at considerations for implementing the program and discusses management and maintenance ideas. The study concludes by discussing attractive attributes of the concept and reinforces the benefits of a self-evaluation approach. Recommendations are made as to units most suitable for the program and recommends the Office of the Army Inspector General consider the concept for Army wide application. (SDW)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	11
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	2
Requirement.....	7
II. WHY A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH?.....	10
Motivation.....	10
Air Force Self-Inspections.....	11
Benefits.....	13
III. HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS.....	16
Basic Considerations.....	16
Self-Inspection.....	17
Command Inspection.....	17
Follow-up.....	19
IV. DEVELOPING SELF-EVALUATION ASSISTANCE PLANS.....	20
Essential Functional Areas.....	20
Critical Elements.....	21
Areas of Concern.....	22
SEAP Format.....	23
V. PROGRAM MAINTENANCE.....	24
VI. CONCLUSIONS.....	28
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	31
APPENDIX 1.....	33
APPENDIX 2.....	34
APPENDIX 3.....	35
APPENDIX 4.....	50
APPENDIX 5.....	51



Version For	
NTIS CRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	
A-1	

COMMAND INSPECTIONS - A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Idealistically, commanders would like to have units which are consistently excellent, as opposed to those that periodically peak to meet the needs of some special inspection event. Unfortunately, in many instances, commanders find themselves sprucing up or squaring away their units to just meet these events. This results in an inordinate amount of time that could be used more wisely if directed towards total organizational improvement. A commander who wishes to succeed in increasing unit productivity, performance, and mission accomplishment can do so by implementing a command inspection program which emphasizes self-motivation. A system which focuses on continuous mission accomplishment and doing the job right.

This paper proposes just that kind of concept, a command inspection program with a unique self-evaluation approach. The approach covers all the key elements of a model inspection program. It includes clearly defined standards. It provides training assistance and evaluation. The program promotes command involvement and offers excellent procedures for follow-up.

Futhermore, the program provides the commander an overall assessment of how well unit missions are being accomplished. It will identify internal and external problem areas, draw attention to training needs, and stimulate

motivation to enhance job performance. More importantly the system allows the commander to design, develop, and tailor his own inspection program.

BACKGROUND

In order to understand the development of Army policy on inspections, it is necessary to start by reviewing the evolution of AR 1-200, Inspections and Staff visits, and AR 20-1, Inspector General Activities and Procedures.

Army Regulation 1-200, Inspections and Staff Visits, was first published in 1959 by the Comptroller of the Army. The regulation was initiated as a result of complaints that units were being over inspected and that the Chief of Staff of the Army felt units were not being sufficiently visited by responsible commanders. Even though command inspections were not specifically addressed in AR 1-200, several key points persisted throughout its existence until the regulation was rescinded in 1980:

1. To minimize unit disruption, the number of inspections should be held to the minimum possible.

2. As many inspections as possible should be consolidated under one comprehensive annual inspection.

3. Inspections of technical areas/subjects should be conducted by the lowest headquarters capable of doing the inspection effectively.

4. Inspections that are general in nature and staff visits should be restricted to one echelon below the initiating headquarters unless specifically excepted by competent authority. When exceptions are made, they will be coordinated with echelons by passed.

5. Maximum utilization and credence will be given to reports of inspections conducted by other agencies and lower echelons."²

The question of who should be the proponent for inspection policy, the Comptroller of the Army, who published AR 1-200, or The Inspector General, (TIG), resulted in the elimination of the regulation. With its removal in 1980, no specific publication remained to define inspections or establish Department of the Army inspection policy.³

AR 20-1, Inspector General Activities and Procedures, provides the inspection doctrine applicable to inspector general inspections. This regulation has gone through three significant changes in emphasis during the past three decades: "Before 1980 the AR implied limited TIG control over Army-wide inspection activities. Since then the inference that TIG coordinates all DA level inspections has been stronger in each iteration. At the same time the role of inspectors general in non-IG inspection and investigative activities has been increasingly restricted. Before 1966 there were no regulatory restrictions. From 1966-1974 some limits were implied, and in 1974 specific restrictions were stated in the AR (e.g., 'Officers detailed as Inspectors General will not be appointed as investigating officers...UMCJ...AR 15-6...'). In 1982 the AR placed a complete prohibition on inspectors general participating in any manner in '...non-IG evaluations and assistance functions...' Finally in 1982, AR 20-1 shifted the IG away from conducting strictly compliance oriented inspections to the conduct of compliance/systemic inspections and '...requires that commanders... conduct continuous command and staff inspections of ...their

organizations.' Throughout the evolution of inspection policy and doctrine, one point has remained constant--the ARs consistently stressed that inspection is a command responsibility."⁴

The thrust which influenced the change of Army inspections from compliance oriented efforts to a more systemic approach was the October 30, 1979, Comptroller General's report to the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, House Committee on Government Operations on the Army's inspection system.⁵ The report identified that headquarter's inspections provided valuable information which was useful to the Army's top management. However, inspections below headquarters level often contained nonmission related, insignificant findings, which did not identify the causes of problems uncovered. It further concluded that inspections usually covered many broad subjects and that adequate time was not allocated to perform inspections properly.⁶ The report noted even though TIG recognized that the systemic approach would provide commanders a better evaluation of mission performance, he did not have direct control over lower level inspector general personnel to influence a systemic approach. In other words, a commander could maintain broad compliance inspection techniques if he so desired.⁷ However, TIG could change the inspection approach at lower levels if he was designated the proponent to develop specific guidance and if its implementation was directed by the Secretary of the Army.⁸ It was recommended by the Comptroller General that the Secretary of the Army should: "Issue directives to lower level inspectors general on (1) the systemic approach to inspections, (2) the need to identify causes of problems, (3) the inadvisability of reporting minor

deficiencies, and (4) the need to allow adequate time for a thorough inspection."⁹

The effects of the shift to a compliance/systemic inspection approach started to be applied at the lower IG levels during the middle of 1982. The frequency of inspections were lengthened from 12 to 18 months. The title of annual general inspection was changed to command general inspection.¹⁰ Organizations to be inspected received formal communications at least 60 days in advance of the inspection. Units or activities received command and IG guidance outlining the scope of the inspection and a list of functional areas which would be evaluated. Organizations were given the opportunity to submit problem or special interest areas to the IG inspection team to foster a joint problem solving atmosphere. Inspection philosophy was oriented towards "...teaching and helping leaders fix problems, especially those which are most important to them or beyond their control."¹¹

A command general inspection was to focus on people and systems and its inspection schedule designed to complement unit training and mission accomplishment.¹² The final IG written reports eliminated merely writing up a laundry list of "gigs" or "deficiencies" and concentrated on registering organizational problems. Reports were divided into two parts. Part I findings were written for the exclusive use of the commander and no follow-up action was taken by the IG. Part II findings, because of their severity, level of significance, or impact on readiness required follow up action by the IG to ensure corrective actions were satisfactorily completed.¹³

"In January 1984 The Chief of Staff, Army, wrote a letter urging commanders to conduct command inspections and followed up during talks at the precommand course. He strongly believed in establishing programs directed at company level. To measure the implementation of command inspection programs, he charged The Inspector General to conduct a special inspection of Army inspection activities in early 1985. The inspection evaluated chain of command involvement in inspections, implementation of the 90-day free inspection, and the role of the Inspector General in inspection activities. During that inspection the team visited only active Army units. The Army Inspector General Agency report of the inspection was published in July 1985.

The inspection determined that, throughout the Army, commanders were slow in implementing command inspection programs. There were units where the intent and spirit of the Chief of Staff's letter on command inspection programs were in place. However, this occurred because some units had a history of command inspection or because individual commanders on their own initiative implemented programs based on The Chief of Staff comments at the precommand course. It was also determined that the January 1984 letter on command inspections was not effective in communicating the desires of The Chief of Staff. It was clear that a void existed in the articulation of basic Army inspection philosophy and policy. At the time, there was no Army regulation which defined inspections, stated inspection policy, or established proponentcy for Army inspection activities.

As a result of the 1985 special inspection, The Chief of Staff, Army, tasked The Inspector General to be the proponent for broad inspection policy and to publish an Army regulation that defines inspection, states policy, and established responsibilities for Army inspection activities. As an intermediate measure pending publication of the Army regulation, The Chief of Staff issued a second letter to all commanders in June 1985. It detailed the fundamentals of command inspection programs as he desired them to be implemented.

In January 1986, AR 1-201, Inspections, was published to provide structure to the Army's inspection programs. It filled a void in inspection policy that had existed since 1980 when AR 1-200, Inspections and Staff Visits, was rescinded.¹⁴

REQUIREMENT

Army regulation 1-201, Inspections, outlines the responsibilities, policies, and procedures for planning and conducting inspections of Army organizations.¹⁵ Commanders above company level are required to establish inspection programs. The regulation does not specifically direct how that policy will be established or implemented. It gives the commander a great deal of latitude to develop procedures that will provide him with the most accurate representation of subordinate unit status and readiness while efficiently using the resources available to him.

An effective command inspection program should provide company and detachment level commanders a clear focus of the goals, standards, and priorities of the unit and its missions.

The frequency and composition of the inspection team as well as the functional areas to be evaluated are determined by the inspecting headquarters. However, the requirement exists for a free inspection for all newly assigned commanders within 90 days of assuming command. A free inspection is defined as "Any inspection designed only to inform the inspected organization of its current status, establish goals and standards, or to provide assistance, with the results not used competitively or as the sole basis for evaluation of past performance."¹⁶

Inspections must identify both problem areas and corrective actions required. Problems identified which are beyond the authority or capability of the inspected unit are to be passed to the appropriate level of command for action. The emphasis is to be on reinforcement and maintenance of established goals and standards and by teaching and leading subordinates to meet this challenge.¹⁷

It is understood that there is a need in many instances to ensure compliance with certain regulations, rules, and policy directives. But more importantly, a command inspection program which is to be successful needs to provide additional incentives to make it attractive and worthwhile. Chapter II will discuss the important role motivation plays in assuring a quality program.

highlights the success the U.S. Air Force has experienced with self-inspection, and lists significant benefits which can be gained through the adoption of a self-evaluation approach.

ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Army Inspector General Agency, Special Inspection of Army Inspection Activities, 1985, p.1.

2. IBID., p. 1.

3. IBID., p. 1.

4. IBID., pp. 1-2.

5. U.S. General Accounting Office, Comptroller's Report to the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, House Committee on Government Operations, The Army Inspector General's Inspections - Changing from a Compliance to a Systems Emphasis, 1979, pp. 1-47.

6. IBID., pp. 10-11.

7. IBID., p. 11.

8. IBID., p. 12.

9. IBID., p. iii.

10. Charles R. Weaver and Theodore W. Nell, "The IG Inspection: A New Focus," Military Review, July 1984, p. 38.

11. IBID., p. 38.

12. IBID., p. 39.

13. IBID., p. 40.

14. U.S. Army Inspector General Agency, Follow up to the Special Inspection of Army Inspection Activities, 1987, pp. I-1 and I-2.

15. U.S. Department of the Army, Army Regulation 1-201, pp. 1-3.

16. IBID., p. 1.

17. IBID., p. 2.

COMMAND INSPECTIONS - A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

CHAPTER II

WHY A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

An important factor in promoting a successful and quality command inspection program is motivation. A self-evaluation approach can stimulate motivation among soldiers and foster individual incentive and effort to meet the objectives and goals of the command. The self-inspection aspect of the system in itself becomes the motivational tool to improve soldier and organizational job performance.

MOTIVATION

"The mission of the services - safeguarding the peace and security of the country - is so important that any source of help in motivating people to do their jobs better deserves serious attention."

Communication is considered an important key to the whole process of motivation.¹ The challenge of the work functions to be performed must be proficiently communicated to the workers. This encourages the workers to fully utilize all their talents to perform the jobs required to accomplish the mission.² Under the self-evaluation concept, communication is provided to the workers in the form of written menus. The menus clearly state the standards, objectives, and goals of the commander.

It is important for the leaders of any organization to plan a close and precise path for the motivation of its followers. According to Brewer in his chapter on power motivation,⁴ there are three vital steps necessary to achieve this motivation: the identification of organizational objectives in very specific terms; recognizing the kinds of follower behavior needed to accomplish the objectives; and to select and administer incentives that reward followers for the behavior identified in step two. "The idea, of course, is to bring the follower's behavior as close as possible to the behavior needed to accomplish the task. When followers see the positive results of this behavior for them individually, they will be motivated to achieve organizational goals. It is difficult, however, for some followers to see the immediate rewards of doing a specific task. This is why it is important for the leader to continuously communicate organizational and task goals. In fact, most followers will respond more to the immediate rewards of doing a specific task if they are meaningful..."⁵

The self-evaluation approach supplies menu type assistance plans which satisfies the continuous communication of tasks and objectives. Soldiers will be able to evaluate their work performance to meaningful standards which in turn will enhance their motivation to do the job right.

AIR FORCE SELF-INSPECTION PROGRAMS

The Air Force has recognized the benefits of self-inspections programs for several years. Many of its commands, separate operating agencies (SOA), and direct reporting units (DRU) have self-inspecting systems. The November 1985

version of Air Force Regulation 123-1, required SOAs and DRUs, without formal inspection systems, to establish a self-inspection program. Other organizations and agencies were encouraged to consider self-inspections.⁶ In accordance with change one, 15 August 1986, to the Air Force regulation 123-1, "Major commands and other commands with formal inspection systems shall direct self-inspection programs for units and organizations under their authority. Each SOA and DRU that does not have a formal inspection system must establish a self-inspection program."⁷ All other Air Force organizations or agencies not included in the above categories are encouraged to establish a self-inspection program.⁸

Air Force self-inspection programs are specifically tailored to the missions and structure of the organization. They include checklists or other oversight mechanisms to assure adequate review of organizational missions, resources, training, and people programs. The programs identify problems and categorize them as to mission impact, compliance, or effort needed for correction. They include a feedback mechanism so problems can be tracked until resolved or directed to the proper level for action or resolution. All self-inspection programs are reviewed by an inspection team.⁹

Air Force internal self-inspection programs, regardless of how frequently performed, provide important feedback to the supervisors, organizational headquarters, the commander, and serve as an important management tool.¹⁰ It is specifically recommended that a program be strengthened by: "Placing your self-inspection philosophy and methodology in succinct written format. Ensure all key supervisors and organizational personnel understand how the self-

inspection program is used and what their individual roles are. Emphasize that all applicable references (normally listed on the self-inspection item) are reviewed for accuracy and content. Also, stress the need for program management on a continuing basis and not just before a major inspection or self-inspection."¹¹

Strategic Air Command (SAC) Regulation 123-2, Self-Inspection Program, specifies that SAC units will conduct semi-annual self-inspections.¹² The results of recent SAC Inspector General inspections revealed that success during Unit Effectiveness Inspections was the direct result of active on-going self-inspection programs.¹³

BENEFITS

The most important benefit of self-evaluation is the stimulation of motivation in soldiers to do the job right. Soldiers are basically willing to perform their duties and generally take pride in their work performance. All too frequently however, the objectives, goals, and essential tasks have not been sufficiently explained. This can result in confusion, lack of direction, and a loss of motivation. A self-inspection concept provides clear up front guidance as to the specific desires of the commander. It focuses on the first line, "hands on", supervisors who are the key to motivating our soldiers to properly accomplish their missions.

Other significant benefits to be gained through a self-evaluation approach are:

1. Systematic self-review
2. Early identification of problem areas
3. Immediate corrective actions
4. Identification of training needs
5. Effective levels of standardization
6. Identification of systemic problems

The importance of motivation can not be overemphasized. The U.S. Air Force has realized the substantial benefits of a self-inspection program. A self-evaluation approach is easy to comprehend and straight forward in its application. Chapter III will discuss how the program works.

ENDNOTES

1. Timothy R. Kech and James D. Kellin, "In Search of Excellence: A Military Perspective," Defense Management Journal, Vol. 22, No. 2, Second Quarter 1986, p. 26.
2. Arthur A. Thompson, "Motivating Government Personnel," Armed Forces Comptroller, Vol. 30, No. 4, Fall 1985, p. 39.
3. IBID., p. 131.
4. James H. Brewer, et al., Power Management, pp. 120-136.
5. IBID., p. 131.
6. Interview with Randy Vincent, LTC, U.S. Air Force Inspection and Safety Center, California, 16 December 1987.
7. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Air Force Regulation 123-1 (C1), p. 9.
8. IBID., p. 9.
9. IBID., p. 9.

10. CPT Woof, "Self-Inspection Management from the Top Down," TIG Brief, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 3, March 1986, p. 4.

11. IBID., p. 4.

12. U.S. Department of the Air Force, Strategic Air Command and Regulation 123-2, p. 1.

13. SMSgt Isham, "Self-Inspection: Productive or Burdensome?," TIG Brief, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, March-April 1987, p. 7.

COMMAND INSPECTIONS - A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

CHAPTER III

HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS

The commander is the cornerstone of a command inspection program. By direct and active participation, the commander influences the development of the program which reflects his/her particular desires and areas of concern. This is especially true in the formulation of a self-evaluation approach. Regardless of the number of areas selected for evaluation, to assure success, the commander must determine the scope and content of the program. He/she must play an active role in its implementation.

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

Since the self-evaluation program is prepared by the inspecting headquarters, the following basic considerations must be reflected in its development:

1. The primary focus is directed towards stimulating motivation. This is accomplished by providing help and assistance instead of the "gotcha" concept often dominating inspection techniques.
2. The emphasis of the program is self-evaluation followed by internal inspection by the commander.
3. The program is to promote standardization within the units of the command as well as in like technical and functional areas.
4. The level and quality of job performance is assured and reinforced through command evaluation, training, and assistance visits.

5. The intent of the program is not to create a paperwork exercise, but to establish a realistic mechanism to improve continuous mission accomplishment.

SELF-INSPECTION

The foundation of the program is the Self-Evaluation Assistance Plans (SEAP). These plans serve as a blue print or menu for self-inspection. A SEAP is developed for each functional or technical area of concern established by the commander. The plan must fully reflect the critical tasks and objectives to be accomplished. Once the SEAPs have been prepared they are distributed throughout the chain of command to the responsible unit. These menus are given to the lowest level supervisor and "hands on" workers who use them to conduct a self-evaluation of their mission areas. The self-inspection identifies whether the job is being accomplished in accordance with the commander's desires. If not, it provides a starting point to determine what is necessary to perform the job. Ideally, self-inspections should be conducted at least semi-annually.

COMMAND INSPECTIONS

After subordinate units have had a chance to conduct self-inspections with the aid of the Self-Evaluation Assistance Plans, the higher headquarters may now conduct Command, Assessment, Training, and Advisory Visits (CATAV). The purpose of these visits is to evaluate how well the self-inspections were accomplished and if the jobs are being performed satisfactorily. Furthermore, assistance is provided in resolving internal and external problems, and in direct training of supervisors in areas where improvement is needed.

The commander will determine the composition of the inspection team and the number of functional and technical areas to be evaluated. The team should consist of the commander and technical or functional area experts. The experts need to be thoroughly confident and able to communicate knowledgeably with the inspected unit on-line supervisors. This is absolutely critical to assure adequate evaluation, assistance, and training.

All essential areas should be evaluated at least one time every year. At the scheduled CATAV, the commander and team members receive a formal in-briefing to include the results of the self-inspections and problem areas uncovered. The inspected unit should be prepared to discuss what corrective actions have been initiated and the status of ongoing efforts. The commander and inspection team then conduct evaluations using identical SEAPs as the unit used for self-inspection. The purpose is to verify compliance with the plan, compare findings with unit self-evaluation, and to provide assistance, training, and guidance where differences occur.

Upon completion of the inspection the commander and inspection team conduct an out-briefing reviewing the unit's overall status and level of performance. Recommendations and guidance to improve job performance should be provided on any problem areas and when a difference of opinion exists. This will establish the best possible course of action to resolve existing problems. Prior to departure, the inspection team provides the inspected unit with on site written findings. These are written in the comment/recommendations sections of the SEAP. SEAPs will serve as the written report. Findings should include:

specific recommendations which require action by the inspected unit; address all positive aspects of the inspected unit; and identify problems which require action by higher headquarters.

FOLLOW-UP

Upon return to the command headquarters, the results of the Command, Assessment, Training, and Advisory Visit will receive a thorough review. Each problem area identified requiring resolution at headquarters will have a separate summary sheet prepared. The summary sheet will detail the specifics of the finding. Each summary sheet is routed through the appropriate headquarter staff element for verification and recommendations. Problems identified as requiring more than sixty days to fix can be assigned a separate project for resolution. Actions identified for resolution at higher headquarters or other commands and agencies will be staffed and forwarded. Solutions or recommendations for correction are then shared with the inspected unit.

The inspecting commander then decides, after careful review of the unit's inspection, if any additional inspected unit follow-up evaluation is necessary. The commander may choose to conduct a subsequent evaluation visit or require a reply by endorsement. This will be influenced by the severity of the problem or the commander's particular concern for unit readiness.

COMMAND INSPECTIONS - A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPING SELF-EVALUATION ASSISTANCE PLANS

Probably the most important element in making a self-evaluation program successful is the Self-Evaluation Assistance Plan (SEAP). A separate plan needs to be developed for each functional area which is to be included in the program. The first step in this process requires the identification of the essential functional areas.

ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONAL AREAS

Deciding which functional or technical areas are most important in accomplishing the mission lies with the commander. It needs to be emphasized that the commander can tailor these areas to his individual objectives, goals, and desires. The focus and emphasis of the program is entirely up to what he/she feels needs to be accomplished. For example, a combat arms organization may stress particular functional areas involving weapon systems or tactical maneuvers. A medical unit may lean towards identifying technical areas, such as emergency room medical care, or infectious disease control, as essential functional areas. Regardless of the military organization, common functional areas such as supply, vehicle maintenance, or arm room management, should be included. Some suggested essential function areas can be seen in Appendix 1.

It is recommended that the commander solicit input from his immediate staff, functional area experts, or other assets in determining the essential

areas. An internal survey could serve to assist in determining weak or problem areas requiring improvement. Essential functional areas should be broad in scope, but the commander can select as few or as many as he deems necessary.

Each essential functional area is subcategorized into critical elements and areas of concern. Critical elements tell "what" needs to be accomplished and the areas of concern tell "how" to evaluate. See Figure 1.

Essential Functional Area: Supply

Critical Element: Inventory

Area of Concern:

1. Are all inventories, to include the monthly 10 percent inventory, conducted and adjustment documents initiated to maintain proper supply accountability (Section Z, TM 38-L17-11)?
2. Are monthly sensitive item inventories conducted and filed?
3. Are inventories and files maintained IAW Section XI, AR 340-2?

Figure 1

CRITICAL ELEMENTS

Critical elements constitute what needs to be accomplished to assure the mission requirements are being met. In some instances it may be convenient to further subcategorize critical elements. If all the elements, or a high percentage, are being performed satisfactorily, then the functional area is being maintained to the standards set forth by the organization.

The identification of critical elements should once again be a team effort led by the commander. Functional area or technical experts are usually well

qualified and prepared to identify critical elements. However, appropriate research into regulations, policy directives, field and technical manuals along with other references may be required. An example of the critical elements for the essential function area of supply can be seen in Appendix 2.

The last and most time consuming step is to determine specific areas of concern within each critical element.

AREAS OF CONCERN

Developing areas of concern within each critical element tells the "how" to evaluate and determine if the critical element is being satisfactorily accomplished. The areas of concern can be specific tasks or functions that the soldiers need to perform. They may consist of preparing specific reports or the documentation of record files. They may be the satisfactory completion of certain training events or the calibration of special equipment. The functional or technical area expert is probably best qualified to identify and develop the areas of concern. These serve as the main body of the menu or check list and provide the details for the self-evaluation process. The areas of concern must fully represent the critical element and be in sufficient quantity to achieve the desired end result. As the areas of concern are developed it is necessary to document applicable references which are to be included in the SEAP. An example of the areas of concern for the critical elements of supply can be seen in Appendix 3.

SEAP FORMAT

The format for the SEAP consists of a title page with a table of contents listing each critical element for the essential functional area. Each critical element is to be addressed separately and divided into three sections: references; areas of concern; and comments/recommendations/follow-up actions.

By providing general references for each critical elements, units and soldiers are able to conduct research in a particular area of concern or increase their knowledge of the subject element. Areas of concern, if applicable, should also include specific references as to the requirements. The comment/recommendation/follow-up action section is provided to allow written comments during the self-evaluation process and will be utilized when the commander and inspection team conduct Command, Assessment, Training, and Assistance Visits. Look at Appendix 3 for an example of the SEAP format for supply.

COMMAND INSPECTIONS - A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

CHAPTER V

PROGRAM MAINTENANCE

In order to establish a self-evaluation program, several aspects need to be considered. First, the inspecting headquarters must develop and produce the self-evaluation assistance plans (SEAPs). This process entails the functional or technical area experts to write the SEAPs, which could take several months to complete. The commander must be willing to accept up front preparation time and be personally involved during the development phase. As the SEAPs are reaching the final stages, a draft should be appropriately staffed throughout the command to solicit constructive review and recommendations for improvement. This will enhance organizational acceptance of the program and allow subordinate unit input in the establishment of the standards, objectives, and goals. This is extremely important in promoting the motivational aspects of the system. After drafts have incorporated appropriate recommendations and changes they are ready for the commander's approval.

All SEAP should be maintained on word processing equipment. This capability will allow for easy and continuous plan updating. Updates can include: feedback from units inspected; changes in regulations, policies, and directives; and changes in the commander's emphasis or desires. Updates may be further influenced by high-visibility areas, changes in the critical aspects of unit missions, recurring deficiencies, readiness requirements, or other concerns. The direction and focus may also vary with a change in inspecting commanders.

Irregardless, each SEAP should be republished annually. It is highly suggested that a continuity file be maintained on each SEAP to capture changes and to insure that they will be included when updates are performed.

The frequency of conducting Command, Assessment, Training, and Advisory Visits (CATAV) is determined by the inspecting commander. Consideration should be given not to overload inspected units. All essential functional areas could be evaluated at one time, however, it is recommended that evaluations be spread out in order to prevent a stand down in normal unit mission accomplishment. The advantage of the self-evaluation approach is that the subordinate units have already pre-identified most of their problems and will be well along in their corrective mode. Subordinate unit preparation for CATAVs should not be a major undertaking. The longer the self-evaluation program is practiced throughout the organization, the more prepared subordinate units will become.

The commander must encourage the inspecting team members to always exhibit a helpful approach in conducting CATAV. There can be no allowance for a "gotcha" type attitude. How the CATAVs are received by the subordinate units can make or break the purpose of the program. Emphasis must be placed on assistance and on site training. By insisting on a helpful approach the motivational aspects of the program will be intensified and beneficial results apparent.

SEAPs are designed to include a recommendation/comment/follow-up section for each essential element in the plan. This section serves to document both

unit self-evaluation efforts and the results of the headquarters CATAV. During the self-evaluation phase, the unit records the level of success in meeting the requirements and lists corrective actions to be completed. During the CATAV, evaluators will document observations and findings. Furthermore, emphasis will be placed on specific follow-up actions required of the inspected unit. Problems identified for resolution at the inspecting command headquarters will be noted. All documentations on SEAPs are to be completed on site and prior to out briefing the inspected unit. A copy of the completed SEAPs are to be left with the inspected unit. These procedures will avoid misunderstandings that can arise when inspection reports are written at a later date. Extensive writing of separate inspection reports is not required. This is a strong feature of the SEAP format.

A consolidated evaluation and staffing action list can be prepared for each SEAP by the inspecting headquarters. It can be used by the evaluators to summarize the CATAV for the inspected unit. It identifies critical elements evaluated, if inspection unit follow-up is required, and which elements require further action upon return to headquarters. See Appendix 4 for an example. The list can also serve as an overview of the inspection results for each SEAP at command headquarters. It should be attached to the front of the SEAP.

For each item requiring further resolution at the headquarters, a separate problem summary sheet is prepared. The on site evaluator is the responsible action person. The problem area is fully explained to include a solution or recommendation. Although time may be needed for further discussion and

research, each summary sheet should be completed as rapidly as possible. See Appendix 5 for an example. All summary sheets are attached to the SEAP along with the consolidated evaluation and staffing action list.

The completed SEAP packages are staffed through the commander for review. The commander directs what follow-up actions are required. The commander may direct no further action is necessary. He/she may provide follow-up action guidance, or determine a special project be initiated. Each summary sheet requiring further action is then placed into a suspense system. The evaluator initiating the summary sheet will usually be the action officer. A good suspense framework is critical to insure timely resolutions are completed.

COMMAND INSPECTION - A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

There are many attractive attributes associated with a self-evaluation approach to a command inspection program. Three significant benefits were highlighted in Chapter II: an increase in unit motivation to do the job and do it right; early identification of training needs; and the promotion of standardization. These merits alone provide adequate justification to consider this type of program. However, there are many other positive aspects to the system. Probably the most noteworthy is the solid foundation this approach sets up for continuous mission accomplishment. As the program progresses, the closer the entire organization will come to meeting the standards, objectives, and goals set forth by the commander.

The Self-Evaluation Assistance Plans (SEAPs) are the catalyst to insure essential tasks are performed correctly. They provide information in sufficient detail for excellent self-evaluation and act as the building blocks (foundation) of the program. With the use of a word processing system, SEAPs can be easily updated and improved. By maintaining continuity files, annual updates can readily reflect necessary changes.

The time consuming task of writing after-action inspection reports is drastically reduced. Reports will be timely and allow for immediate initiation of corrective actions at the inspected unit. The use of summary sheets at the

inspecting headquarters coupled with a good suspense system will assure adequate follow-up and resolution of problems identified.

Overall unit productivity, duty performance, and mission accomplishment can definitely be enhanced through the adoption of this type of program. The Air Force has found the self-inspection approach to be an effective means of increasing readiness. As a result of their success, the Air Force has directed that self-inspection programs be established throughout its commands and organizations.

After the program is established, a Command, Assessment, Training, and Advisory Visit (CATAV) can provide newly assigned subordinate commanders an overall assessment of his/her unit. An initial CATAV is an excellent method of meeting the "free" inspection requirement.

The information presented in this study discussed the elements and mechanics of conducting a command and inspection program utilizing a self-evaluation approach. All that is required to get started is that precious motivation factor we all strive to capture. Remember, it will be your program. Tailor it to your needs and go for it!

COMMAND INSPECTIONS - A SELF-EVALUATION APPROACH

CHAPTER VII

RECOMMENDATIONS

The self-evaluation approach to the command inspection program should be considered by the active Army, the Army National Guard, and the U.S. Army Reserve. The system can be adapted for use by all modification table of organization and equipment (MTOE), and table of distribution and allowances (TDA) units and organizations.

The self-evaluation program can be utilized by units regardless of size and organization. However, the system is especially well suited for battalion size units.

Small unit organizations performing unique missions with wide geographical dispersion would also find this system especially beneficial. MTOE, Medical, Finance, and Criminal Investigation Command units are prime examples. Such organizations are usually commanded by senior field grade officers and consist of numerous outlying sections (branches) without subordinate commanders.

Lastly, it is recommended that the Office of the Army Inspector General review the merits of a self-evaluation approach to the command inspection program. Furthermore, they should evaluate the effectiveness of the Department of the Air Force self-inspection system and consider establishing a systemic self-evaluation approach for the Department of the Army.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, CPT. "Maintaining an Effective Self-Inspection Program," TIG Brief, Vol. XXXVII, No. 9, October 1985, p. 5.
2. Ballou, Dennis L. "Productivity Improvement," The Military Engineer, Vol. 77, No. 503, September/October 1985, pp. 484-487.
3. Brewer, James H. et al, Power Management, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1984.
4. Chatelain, MSgt. "Internal Control Review Program," TIG Brief, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 1, January 1986, p. 20.
5. Doye, MAJ. "Improving Public Service and Our Productivity Goals," TIG Brief, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, March-April 1987, p. 21.
6. Hewman, Ronald H. "Army's Mission Is Not Just Happy Inspectors," ARMY, Vol. 36, No. 9, September 1986, pp. 52-55.
7. Isham, SMSgt. "Self-Inspection: Productive or Burdensome?," TIG Brief, Vol. XXXIX, No. 2, March-April 1987, p. 7.
8. Kellim, James D., and Keck, Timothy R. "In Search of Excellence: A Military Perspective," Defense Management Journal, Vol. 22, No. 2, Second Quarter 1986, pp. 26-31.
9. Pytlik, William F. "Motivation a Necessary Personnel Management Tool in the Air Force," Air War College Report No. AV-AWC-85-174, Air University, United States Air Force, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, May 1985, pp. 1-40.
10. U.S. Army Inspector General Agency. Follow-up to the Special Inspection of Army Inspection Activities, January 1987.
11. U.S. Army Inspector General Agency. Special Inspection of Army Inspection Activities, 1985, pp. 1-23.
12. U.S. Department of the Air Force. Air Force Regulation 123-1(G1): Inspections: The Inspection System: Washington: 15 August 1986.
13. U.S. Department of the Air Force. Strategic Air Command Regulation 123-2: Inspections: Self-Inspection Program: Offutt Air Force Base: 20 October 1987.
14. U.S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 1-201: Inspections: Washington: 3 January 1986.
15. U.S. Department of the Army. Second Division Pamphlet No. 1-201: Inspections: Command Inspection Program Checklist: Korea: 12 June 1987.

16. U.S. General Accounting Office. Comptroller's Report to the Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security. House Committee on Government Operations. The Army Inspector General's Inspections - Changing from a Compliance to a Systems Emphasis. FGMSD-80-1, October 30, 1979, pp. 1-47.

17. Thompson, Arthur A. "Motivating Government Personnel," Armed Forces Comptroller, Vol. 30, No. 4, Fall 1985, pp. 39-44.

18. Vincent, Randy, LTC, Headquarters. U.S. Air Force Inspection and Safety Center. Telephonic interview. California: 16 December 1987.

19. Weaver, Charles R., and Nell, Theodore W. "The IG Inspection: A New Focus," Military Review, Vol. LXIV, No. 7, July 1984, pp. 35-41.

20. Woof, CPT. "Self-Inspection Management from the Top Down," TIG Brief, Vol. XXXVIII, No. 3, March 1986, p. 4.

APPENDIX 1

Suggested Essential Functional Areas¹

1. Personnel Services and Administration
2. Safety and Fire Prevention
3. Physical Security and Crime Prevention
4. Information and Personnel Security
5. Operations
6. Training
7. Nuclear, Biological and Chemical (NBC) Proficiency
8. Communications - Electronics Equipment
9. Supply
10. Post/Camp/Station Property
11. Energy Conservation/Environmental Protection
12. Unit Maintenance Management System (UMMS)
13. The Army Maintenance Management System (TAMMS)
14. Prescribed Load List (PLL)
15. Vehicles
16. Engineer Equipment
17. Fire Control Equipment
18. Weapons
19. Ammunition Management/Accountability
20. Radar Equipment
21. Dining Facility Management
22. Aviation
23. Personnel Inspection

ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Department of the Army, Second Division Pamphlet No. 1-201.
- p.2. The preceding list of suggested essential functional areas was adapted from the table of contents.

APPENDIX 2

Critical Elements Associated with the Essential Functional Area of Supply

1. Standard Operating Procedures
2. Standard Property Book System (SPBS)
 - a. Property List (File Copy)
 - b. Inventory File
 - c. Property List (Work Copy)
 - d. Delegation of Authority - DA Form 1687
 - e. Expendable/Durable and Non-Expendable Components Request
 - f. Sub-Hand Receipts
 - g. Change of Responsible Officer
3. Property Accountability
4. Personal Clothing and Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment (OCIE) Procedures
5. Absentee Clothing
6. Basic Load
7. Supply Storage
8. Publications

ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Department of the Army, Second Division Pamphlet No. 1-201, pp. 11-1 - 11-8. The preceding list of critical elements was adapted from Chapter 11, Inspection Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Supply.

APPENDIX 3

SELF-EVALUATION ASSISTANCE PLAN¹

SUPPLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CRITICAL ELEMENTS:	Page
1. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES.....	36
2. STANDARD PROPERTY BOOK SYSTEM (SPBS).....	37
a. Property List (File Copy).....	37
b. Inventory File.....	38
c. Property List (Work Copy).....	39
d. Delegation of Authority - DA Form 1678.....	40
e. Expendable/Durable and Non-Expendable Components Request....	41
f. Sub-Hand Receipts.....	42
g. Change of Responsible Officer.....	43
3. PROPERTY ACCOUNTABILITY.....	44
4. PERSONAL CLOTHING AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLOTHING AND INDIVIDUAL EQUIPMENT (OCIE) PROCEDURES.....	45
5. ABSENTEE CLOTHING.....	46
6. BASIC LOAD.....	47
7. SUPPLY STORAGE/ANNEXES.....	48
8. PUBLICATIONS.....	49

ENDNOTES

1. U.S. Department of the Army, Second Division Pamphlet No. 1-201, pp. 11-1 - 11-8. The Self-Evaluation Assistance Plan presented in this appendix was adapted from Chapter 11, Inspection Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Supply.

1. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES:

a. References:

- (1) FM 10-14-2
- (2) FM 101-5
- (3) AR 710-2-1

b. Areas of concern:

- (1) Have the SOPs been reviewed and kept current in accordance with local procedures and meet with ARs and other guidance from higher headquarters (Chapter 2 & 8, FM 10-14-2; App R, FM 101-5)?
- (2) Are the SOPs informative and did they contain instructions for each task within the scope of unit supply operations (FM 10-14-2; Chapter 8, AR 710-2; Table 1-1 thru 1-3, DA PAM 710-2-1)?
- (3) Are the unit supply personnel familiar with the SOPs and are they on file in the supply room (FM 10-14-2)?
- (4) Are the SOPs being followed and enforced?

c. Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

2. STANDARD PROPERTY BOOK SYSTEM (SPBS):

References:

- (1) TB 38-L17-11
- (2) DA PAM 710-2-1
- (3) AR 340-2
- (4) AR 710-2

a. PROPERTY LIST (FILE COPY):

(1) Areas of Concern:

- (a) Is the commander's signature on the unit file copy of the organizational, TDA, and Installation Hand Receipt Property Listing evidence that he accepted responsibility for all property listed (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (b) Has the original copy of the Hand Receipt Property Listing been certified and signed by the hand receipt holder and returned to the Division Property Book officer (DPBO) within the allotted time frame (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (c) Is any officer, other than the commander, designated as the hand receipt holder (HRH)? If so, was prior approval obtained in writing from the DPBO (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?

(2) Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

SPBS contd.:

b. INVENTORY FILE:

(1) Areas of Concern:

- (a) Are all inventories, to include the monthly 10 percent inventory, conducted and adjustment documents initiated to maintain proper supply accountability (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (b) Are monthly sensitive item inventories conducted and and filed (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11; Chapter 9, DA PAM 710-2-1)?
- (c) Are inventories and files maintained properly (Section XI, AR 340-2)?

(2) Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

SPBS contd.:

c. PROPERTY LIST (WORK COPY):

(1) Areas of Concern:

- (a) Is the unit posting transactions to the working copy of the Hand Receipt Property Listing as they occurred (Chapter 3, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (b) Have supporting documents been posted and retained on file until the transactions appeared on the updated Hand Receipt Property Listing (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (c) Have changes before the "as of" date of the Hand Receipt Property Listing, that did not process through the automatic system, been entered in ink on the work copy of the Hand Receipt Property Listing and initialed by the unit commander (TM-L17-11)?

(2) Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

SPBS contd.:

d. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY - DA FORM 1687:

(1) Area of Concern:

- (a) Has the unit commander prepared a DA Form 1687 for individuals delegated the authority to receipt for non-expendable/durable supplies (Chapter 2, DA PAM 710-2-1; Section 2, TM 38-L17-11: Chapter 2, AR 710-2)?

(2) Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

SPBS contd.:

e. EXPENDABLE/DURABLE AND NON-EXPENDABLE COMPONENTS REQUEST:

(1) Areas of Concern:

- (a) Are expendable/durable items requested through the battalion S-4, and a copy of the DA 2765-1, with request number, on hand in the unit (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (b) Is there proper justification on file with the request for expendable/durable items (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (c) Are requests for issue of non-expendable components and installation property prepared and submitted as required (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (d) Are shortage annexes for durable/expendable components validated by battalion's S-4 on file?
- (e) Are shortage annexes for non-expendable components validated by the Division Property Book officer on file?

(2) Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

SPBS contd:

f. SUB-HAND RECEIPTS:

(1) Areas of Concern:

- (a) Are sub-hand receipts set up and maintained for all Property Book or durable items (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11; Chapters 5 & 6, DA PAM 710-2-1)?
- (b) Are sub-hand receipts directed to the person identified as the user, platoon, or comparable element (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11; Chapter 5 DA PAM 710-2-1)?
- (c) Is a file folder prepared for each sub-hand receipt with all required component listings, and with a locally assigned number identifying the sub-hand receipt holder (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11; Section XI, AR 340-2)?
- (d) Is the serial number/registration number indicated on the sub-hand receipt for those items requiring serial numbers (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11; Chapter 5, DA PAM 710-2-1)?
- (e) Are hand receipts adjusted properly (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11; Chapter 5, DA PAM 710-2-1)?
- (f) Are hand receipts annexes/component hand receipts established for sets/kits/outfits and other equipment as required (Chapter 6, DA PAM 710-2-1; TM 38-L17-11)?
- (g) Do sub-hand receipts reflect all property in the custody of the user (Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?

(2) Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

SPBS contd.:

g. CHANGE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:

(1) Area of concern:

- (a) Are change of responsible officer inventories (change of command) conducted within the normal 30 days or a written extension granted by the next higher command indicating the length of extension (Chapter 9, DA PAM 710-2-1)?

(2) Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

3. PROPERTY ACCOUNTABILITY

a. References

- (1) AR 735-11
- (2) AR 710-2
- (3) TM 38-L17-11

b. Areas of Concern:

- (1) Are DA Forms 4697 (Reports of Survey) prepared when required (Section 2, AR 735-11)?
- (2) Is the initiation and processing time for Reports of Survey accomplished within 5-15 days, as required (Chapter 3, AR 735-11)?
- (3) Are cash sales or statements of charges being used to replace or account for hand tools when pecuniary liability was admitted (Chapter 2, AR 735-11)?
- (4) Is a copy of the supporting adjustment document retained (AR 710-2; Section 2, TM 38-L17-11)?
- (5) Is excess property on-hand without action being initiated (Table 1-3, AR 710-2)?
- (6) Is there a shortage of authorized allowances of property (MTOE and TDA) not covered by a valid requisition (para 2-3, AR 710-2)?

c. Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

4. PERSONAL CLOTHING AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLOTHING AND INDIVIDUAL EQUIPMENT
(OCIE) PROCEDURES:

a. References:

- (1) DA PAM 710-2-1
- (2) AR 700-84
- (3) AR 735-11

b. Areas of Concern:

- (1) Is DA Form 3645 and DA Form 3645-1 reflecting the issue of clothing and equipment on file for each individual assigned (Chapter 10, DA PAM 710-2-1)?
- (2) Are inventories conducted upon arrival, and prior to clearing the installation (Inventory Departure file) (Chapter 10, DA PAM 710-2-1; Chapters 1 and 11, AR 700-84)?
- (3) Is lost, damaged, and destroyed OCIE, other than fair wear and tear, accounted for either by purchasing from the clothing sales store or processing of appropriate adjustment documents (Chapter 2, AR 735-11)?
- (4) Are personal clothing and organizational clothing and individual equipment secured in a unit facility prior to the individual's departure on leave (Chapter 12, AR 700-84)?
- (5) Is unit property that was issued by unit supply recorded on DA Form 2062 (Chapter 5, DA PAM 710-2-1)?

c. Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

5. ABSENTEE CLOTHING:

a. References:

- (1) AR 700-84
- (2) AR 638-1

b. Areas of Concern:

- (1) Have OCIE, personal military clothing and privately owned personal effects of personnel absent without leave (AWOL), dropped from the rolls (DFR), hospitalized for a period more than 120 hours, or who PCS while on emergency leave, been inventoried, safeguarded, and disposed of as required (Chapter 12, AR 700-84)?
- (2) Are the personal effects of deceased or missing personnel shipped or disposed of properly (AR 638-1)?

c. Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

6. BASIC LOAD (MEALS, READY TO EAT):

a. References:

- (1) AR 30-7
- (2) TM 38-L17-11

b. Areas of Concern:

- (1) Is the unit maintaining a Unit Basic Load (UBL) of nine meals per person for each person authorized, assigned, or attached for a period of more than 60 days (AR 30-7)?
- (2) Is any case in the UBL past its expiration date (AR 30-7)?
- (3) Is the UBL sub-hand receipted by date of pack and lot number (AR 30-7)?
- (4) Is the UBL properly stored at least 56 inches from the ceiling, 6 inches from all walls, and 5 inches off the floor with 4 inch dunnage between each layer and not more than two pallets high (AR 30-7)?
- (5) Is the UBL storage temperatures maintained between 40 and 90 degrees F (AR 30-7)?
- (6) Do the quantity of cases sub-hand receipted or on-hand match the quantity on the Hand Receipt Property Listing (Chapter 3, TM 38-L17-11)?

c. Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

7. SUPPLY STORAGE:

a. References:

- (1) FM 10-74
- (2) AR 710-2

b. Areas of Concern:

- (1) Are the supplies and equipment pelletized as required (FM 10-14)?
- (2) Is servicable property turned-in or was it being processed for turn-in (Chapter 2, AR 710-2)?

c. Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

8. PUBLICATIONS:

a. Area of Concern:

All of the following minimum essential publications should be on-hand and posted with all changes or on valid request to include appropriate supplements of the Army Command:

- (1) AR 30-7
- (2) AR 190-11
- (3) AR 340-2
- (4) AR 638-1
- (5) AR 700-84
- (6) AR 710-2
- (7) AR 735-11
- (8) DA PAM 710-2-1
- (9) TM 38-L17-11
- (10) CTA 50-909
- (11) CTA 50-900
- (12) FM 10-14
- (13) FM 10-14-1
- (14) FM 10-14-3
- (15) FM 101-5
- (16) Current MTOE and TDA
- (17) Current Unit Supply Update
- (18) Army Master Data File (AMDF)

b. Comments/Recommendations/Follow-up Actions:

APPENDIX 4

SUPPLY

CONSOLIDATED EVALUATION AND STAFFING ACTIONS LIST

	EVALUATED		REQUIRES UNIT FOLLOW-UP		REQUIRES COMMAND HQ'S FOLLOW-UP	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
1. Standard Operating Procedures	---	---	---	---	---	---
2. Standard Property Book Systems (SPBS)						
a. Property List (File Copy)	---	---	---	---	---	---
b. Inventory File	---	---	---	---	---	---
c. Property File (Work Copy)	---	---	---	---	---	---
d. Delegation of Authority (DA Form 1687)	---	---	---	---	---	---
e. Expendable/Durable and Non-Expendable Components Request	---	---	---	---	---	---
f. Sub-Hand Receipts	---	---	---	---	---	---
g. Change of Responsible Officer	---	---	---	---	---	---
3. Property Accountability	---	---	---	---	---	---
4. Personal Clothing and Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment (OCIE) Procedures	---	---	---	---	---	---
5. Absentee Clothing	---	---	---	---	---	---
6. Basic Load	---	---	---	---	---	---
7. Supply Storage	---	---	---	---	---	---
8. Publications	---	---	---	---	---	---

APPENDIX 5

PROBLEM SUMMARY SHEET

I. BACKGROUND

Date Prepared _____

A. Unit Inspected: _____

B. Locations and Dates Visited: _____

C. CATAV Evaluator: _____

D. SEAP Utilized: _____

II. ESSENTIAL ELEMENT EVALUATED: _____

III. EVALUATOR'S REMARKS:

IV. OTHER STAFF REMARKS:

V. COMMANDER'S REMARKS:

VI. FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS:

A. Identified Staff Actions:

B. Completed Staff Actions:

VII. DATE PROBLEM RESOLVED: _____