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Executive Summary. This regulation prescribes policies and guidance and assigns responsibilities for improving and maintaining the quality of United States Military Entrance Processing Command (USMEPCOM) studies, analyses, and evaluations, and using the resources for these efforts efficiently and effectively.

Applicability. This regulation applies to all elements of USMEPCOM.

Supplementation. Supplementation of this regulation is prohibited without prior approval from Headquarters, United States Military Entrance Processing Command (HQ USMEPCOM), ATTN: J-5/MEPT, 2834 Green Bay Road, North Chicago, IL 60064-3091.

Suggested improvements. The proponent agency of this regulation is HQ USMEPCOM, J-5/Strategic Planning and Transformation Directorate. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on Department of Army (DA) Form 2028, Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms, or by memorandum to the Commander, USMEPCOM, ATTN: J-5/MEPT, 2834 Green Bay Road, North Chicago, IL 60064-3091.

Internal control process. This regulation is subject to the requirements of Army Regulation (AR) 11-2, Managers' Internal Control Program, and contains control provisions and identified key internal controls that must be evaluated. An internal control checklist is in Appendix D.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

1-1. Purpose
This regulation establishes procedures governing the conduct of studies, analyses, and evaluations within
the United States Military Entrance Processing Command (USMEPCOM) in an efficient manner. It
explains the relationship between research and studies, analyses, and evaluations. It establishes the
infrastructure requirements to support research along with the responsibilities to maintain USMEPCOM’s
research infrastructure. This regulation also governs the conduct of research, use of research instruments,
use of data within USMEPCOM, and procedures for disseminating data outside of USMEPCOM.

1-2. References
Required and related publications and prescribed and referenced forms are listed in Appendix A.

1-3. Explanation of Abbreviations and Terms
The Glossary contains explanations of abbreviations and terms used in this regulation.

1-4. Responsibilities

a. The Commander, USMEPCOM, as the sponsor for all USMEPCOM studies, analyses, and
evaluations, will:

(1) Ensure policies and priorities for studies, analyses, and evaluation support Department of
Defense (DoD) and USMEPCOM initiatives.

(2) Establish policy to guide conducting and using studies, analyses, and evaluations to support
USMEPCOM’s strategic vision, goals, and objectives.

(3) Provide necessary guidance to the Scientific Review Committee (SRCOM). This committee
includes representatives from USMEPCOM Directorates and Special Staff. It is chaired by the J-
5/Strategic Planning and Transformation Directorate (J-5/MEPT). This committee prioritizes, approves,
and monitors studies to ensure compliance with Command policy.

(4) Provide program direction for operations research and systems analysis activities.

(5) Provide manpower and funds for the performance of the studies, analyses, and evaluations
program.

(6) Serve as the Institutional Official (IO) for USMEPCOM and support and enforce the terms of
the Assurance of Compliance for the Protection of Human Research Subjects (DoD A20210),
USMEPCOM Human Research Protection Program (HRPP), an Institutional Review Board (IRB) of
record, and an Institutional Agreement for IRB Review (IAIR) between USMEPCOM and Headquarters,
U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command.

(7) Provide USMEPCOM manpower and funds for the performance of the USMEPCOM HRPP.

(8) Designate a Human Protections Administrator/Exempt Determination Official (HPA/EDO)
with the authority and stature to review scientifically rigorous protocols.

b. The HPA/EDO will:
(1) Administer the USMEPCOM HRPP on behalf of the USMEPCOM IO.

(2) Have sole determination authority for reviewing USMEPCOM studies, analyses, and evaluations and associated instruments for applicability of human subject protections.

(3) Report directly to the USMEPCOM IO on matters pertaining to Human Subjects Research on both periodic and as needed basis.

(4) Routinely liaison with the U.S. Army Human Research Protection Office (AHRPO), U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (USAMRMC) Institutional Review Board, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Military Personnel Policy (Accession Policy) (DASD, MPP (AP)), and other research oriented institutions to support human protections administration and scientific review of research impacting USMEPCOM.

(5) Co-chair the Scientific Review Committee.

(6) Develop, monitor, and coordinate training of USMEPCOM personnel as required under the USMEPCOM HRPP.

c. The Director, J-5/MEPT will:

(1) Serve as the USMEPCOM Study Program Coordinator and is designated as the principal advisor for conducting studies, analyses, and evaluations in USMEPCOM. J-5/MEPT provides plans, analysis, evaluation, and recommendations for executing approved programs and policies throughout the Command ensuring an accurate and complete presentation of costs, effectiveness, and capabilities.

(2) Establish guidelines and procedures to plan, conduct, document, and use USMEPCOM studies.

(3) Provide program management for operations research and systems analysis activities of USMEPCOM.

(4) Establish and maintain a USMEPCOM Technical Library to serve as a repository of USMEPCOM research and sponsored research with a staff member designated as the Technical Research Librarian.

(5) Serve on working groups, committees, and other boards relevant to USMEPCOM studies and analyses inside and outside the Command.

(6) Provide training to proponents in developing and conducting studies; encourage sound analytical expertise, tools, and methods; and advise and assist proponents with studies and analyses.

(7) Support connection with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Accessions community, and other outside organizations for subjects involving USMPECOM study programs and activities.

(8) Serve as the proponent for the USMEPCOM Business Intelligence System (UBIS). Support and maintain a web interface and repository to the Command’s business analytics for USMPECOM wide decision-making and efficacious processing through a unified, centralized, and uniform interface.
(9) Serve as the proponent for the stewardship of data used for studies, analyses, and evaluations to include data generated directly from USMEPCOM operations and data collection from external sources.

(10) Serve as the proponent for a Survey Management Control Program (SMCP) to include a review of all survey instruments for quality, regulatory compliance, and assessed impact on USMEPCOM.

(11) Support coordination of USMEPCOM HRPP issues and compliance.

(12) Provide administrative support for the USMEPCOM HRPP budgetary requirements.

(13) Serve as the principal advisor for the USMEPCOM Survey Program.

(14) Develop and implement policies and procedures for Command surveys.

(15) Conduct and/or monitor surveys of, for, or with external agencies.

(16) Provide consultative assistance to HQ USMEPCOM staff, sectors, and Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) in preparing, developing, evaluating, and reporting surveys.

(17) Manage, coordinate, and analyze data from surveys.

(18) Maintain repository of surveys and results and ensure proper access to and use of data.

(19) Assign USMEPCOM survey control numbers.

(20) Facilitate the USMEPCOM Survey Review Board.

(21) Monitor and manage survey software licenses.

(22) Ensure that surveys are administered legally, to include coordination with governmental and nongovernmental IRBs and legal authorities when required.

d. The Director, J-6/Information Technology Directorate (J-6/MEIT) will:

(1) Establish and maintain a Management Information Control System in accordance with Army Regulation (AR) 25-1, Army Knowledge Management and Information Technology; Army Regulation 355-15, Management Information Control System; and USMEPCOM Pamphlet (UMP) 25-2, Management Information Control System.

   (a) Support management of information collections through documentation, collection, handling, transmission, and disposal procedures when an information collection is part of, or involves, an automated data processing product.

   (b) Verify the completion of reviews in accordance with requirements under the USMEPCOM HRPP and Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 3216.02, Protection of Human Subjects and Adherence to Ethical Standards in DoD-Supported Research, before deploying information collections in USMEPCOM computer systems.
(c) Maintain documentation for provided support of information collections that includes the justification for, and intended use of, information collections and released data.

    (2) Provide programming and system analysis in support of survey software.

    (3) Ensure the acquisition, deployment, implementation, and upgrades of survey software.

    (4) Coordinate required hardware support and acquire the hardware as approved by the Commander, USMEPCOM.

e. The Deputy Director, J-5/MEPT or other delegated official will:

    (1) Serve as the USMEPCOM Scientific Review Coordinator (SRCOR).

    (2) Serve as the Chair of the SRCOM.

    (3) Convene the SRCOM periodically to monitor and validate continuous surveys (e.g., Customer Satisfaction Survey) within the Command.

f. Survey Management Control Officer (SMCO) will:

    (1) Manage the USMEPCOM Survey Management Control Program (SMCP).

    (2) Review, recommend action, and coordinate the staff action on all survey instruments generated within USMEPCOM.

    (3) Review and recommend action on all survey instruments affecting USMEPCOM.

    (4) Serve as the Point of Contact (POC) for processing information collection packages through OSD.

    (5) Review information collection packages for public, interagency, and DoD internal surveys.

    (6) Assist the Action Officer with documentation and format requirements for information collection packages for public, interagency, and DoD internal surveys.

    (7) Issue Survey Control Numbers in coordination with the IMCP and after survey instruments are approved by USMEPCOM Commander or delegated approval authority.

g. HQ USMEPCOM Staff Judge Advocate (MEJA) will:

    (1) Review proposed surveys involving target populations other than USMEPCOM personnel.

    (2) Review collection packages for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

h. HQ USMEPCOM Civilian Personnel Division (J-1/MEHR-CP) will:

    (1) Review USMEPCOM-wide surveys to determine impact on unionized MEPS with civilians and provide guidance to the survey proponent.
(2) Assist the survey proponent in preparing an appropriate union-related notification remark for inclusion in the announcement message.

i. Study project leaders will:

(1) Comply with the provisions of this regulation in developing study proposals, plans, and reports for approval by directors, Chief of Staff, and Commander.

(2) Coordinate study funding requirements with the HQ USMEPCOM Resource Management Directorate, J-8/ MERM and affected Directorates and Special Staff.

j. USMEPCOM personnel will:

(1) Comply with the provisions of this regulation in the conduct of analyses and the use and dissemination of data.

(2) Notify USMEPCOM J-5/MEPT and HPA/EDO of all research proposals involving USMEPCOM personnel, data, information, or systems and forward them to J-5/MEPT for scientific review.

(3) Complete training consistent with their level of involvement in human subject research activities as prescribed by USMEPCOM HRPP.

(4) Adhere to ethical and professional standards for the treatment of human beings in the course of all studies, analyses, and evaluations whether or not 32 CFR 219 specifically regulates these activities.

(5) Follow survey request actions in Chapter 5.

(6) Submit survey requests to J-5/MEPT in a timely manner.

(7) Only be assigned by Directors and Commanders as Action Officers when they have subject matter expertise sufficient to lead the project, coordinate all activities, provide expertise in the field of application, and obtain necessary approvals throughout the life cycle of a survey.

(8) Notify, as appropriate, the Civilian Personnel Office for labor union coordination and approval before releasing a survey.

(9) Staff survey packages using current USMEPCOM procedures through appropriate levels of coordination based on the target population. (See Table 4-2.)
1-5. Overview
The purpose of the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations (SAE) Program is to provide decision makers with relevant, credible, and timely information as input to decisions. The USMEPCOM SAE Program provides an important mechanism through which problems pertaining to critical issues are identified and explored to meet USMEPCOM and DoD needs. This regulation encompasses program management of research that provides organized analytic assessments and evaluations in support of policy development, decision making, management, and administration. These activities may be characterized by the application to USMEPCOM business needs of the tools of operations research or systems analyses. Studies, analyses, and evaluations will hereafter be collectively referred to as “studies” in this regulation. Studies produce formal structured documents containing or leading to conclusions, findings, or recommendations. Studies within the scope of this regulation should include, but are not limited to, the examples listed in Appendix B. In addition, studies may include models, methodologies, and related software supporting analyses or evaluations.
Chapter 2  
Concept of Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program Management  

This chapter provides factors and practices that influence the success of USMEPCOM studies. These lessons have been derived from principles of good management practices in the conduct of studies. Management personnel should consider these factors, together with others, which might influence the quality and success of studies they are planning and managing.

2-1. General  
USMEPCOM studies are data-driven analytic assessments undertaken to gain insight and/or evaluate complex issues in support of policy development, assessments of operations, decision-making, Research and Development (R&D) activities, and management. Results include conclusions, findings, and/or recommendations that will inform decision makers. Studies will be documented with required security classifications and restrictions and appropriately archived. Studies may include development and documentation of models, methodologies, and related software programs required to support complex analyses. The day-to-day management of a study is the responsibility of the study manager, who may be assigned to manage the study effort for the study sponsor and act as the contracting officer’s representative (COTR). The success and utility of studies depends on how well persons responsible for the studies perform their management, surveillance, and administrative tasks. When necessary, a study advisory board may also be established.

2-2. Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Objectives  

a. In practice, research encompasses a wide range activities such as studies, analyses, evaluations, and supporting or complementary activities. Study leads and principal investigators are responsible for defining the problem, purpose, and scope of a study. Proper definition also reduces the risk of developing good answers to the wrong questions or providing study results that cannot be made actionable. For studies that are more complex or resource intensive, this will include writing a study plan with purpose, scope, objectives, methods, resources, timeline, and other elements required to enable effective study management and produce actionable results. Improperly defined studies invariably result in scheduling delays and wasted resources.

- (1) Research is formally defined as a systematic investigation, including research, development, testing and evaluation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.

- (2) Operational research represents a subset of the broader spectrum of research. Operational research is the study of polices, programs, procedures, quality indicators, attainment of goals and supporting objectives, costs, efficiency, effectiveness, status of projects, projections, or estimates and forecasts pertaining to USMEPCOM. It also includes evaluating the impact of external decisions, regulations, instructions, or legislation upon USMEPCOM.

- (a) The principal goal of operational research is to support decision-making by the chain of command and in direct support of the USMEPCOM mission. A defining characteristic of operational research is that the objects under study, or analyzed, must currently exist as integral components of USMEPCOM.

- (b) The USMEPCOM Commander is the final arbiter of what is defined as operational research. Given this constraint, operational research does not contribute to generalizable knowledge and therefore USMEPCOM does not define it as research.

- (3) The classification of an activity as research or operational research determines the approval process and nature of oversight.
b. Studies are organized analytic assessments used to understand complex issues. They are also used to improve policy development, decision making, management, and administration. Efforts may involve the study of policy, strategy, tactics, concepts, operations, organizations, resource allocation, training forces, support of forces, and programs. The acquisition, test, and evaluation of systems may additionally be study topics. Studies constitute research when the intent of the study is to generalize to other applications. Figure 2-1 depicts the program system structure. Units of analysis for studies at USMEPCOM are typically defined within three dimensions: domains, functions, and constructs. A unit of analysis is the what or whom being studied (e.g., the people, objects, or business activities). Domains represent the study scope or boundaries. Functions involve some action, intervention, or process that affects the unit of analysis. Constructs represent influencing factors or the organizational and customer context for units of analysis and functions.

![Figure 2-1. Study Program System Structure](image)

Figure 2-1. Study Program System Structure

c. Analyses are those discrete activities carried out as part of a larger study or independently when a full treatment of a topic is unnecessary. Activities such as data extraction, reporting, and dissemination fall under the umbrella of analyses. The guiding principal for these activities is a well stated and documented purpose and scope directly supporting operational research.

d. Evaluations determine the merit, worth, or value of things. The evaluation process identifies relevant values or standards that apply to what is being evaluated, performs empirical investigation using techniques from the social sciences, and then integrates conclusions with the standards into an overall evaluation or set of evaluations. Evaluations do not constitute research, but are instead classified as operational research when the intent is to provide for quality assurance and quality improvement.
2-3. Program Objectives
The objectives of the USMEPCOM SAE Program are to provide:

a. A way to identify long-term and short-term studies required for decision making by senior management.

b. Proper allocation of resources among study requirements.

c. A review and analysis of the performance of the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations considering balance, impact, and quality.

d. Sufficient program documentation and supporting budget data to meet information requirements of USMEPCOM decision makers, OSD, Office of Management and Budget, and Congress.

e. Minimum essential administrative procedures and controls for good business practices consistent with the above objectives and USMEPCOM and DoD regulations.

2-4. Policies
The USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program policies are:

a. Studies will be managed under a system of integrated control with centralized guidance, review, monitoring, and reporting.

(1) The USMEPCOM SRCOM provides governance for integrating studies, analyses, and evaluations with the strategic goals and objectives of USMEPCOM and DoD Accession Enterprise.

(2) The USMEPCOM HRPP provides governance of all studies, analyses, and evaluations involving human subjects.

b. Individual study efforts will be managed to ensure efficient and effective results or outcomes, cost control, implementation of results, and reporting in USMEPCOM and DoD study information systems.

c. Studies will be conducted to provide useful and important input in the development of plans, programs, and budgets. Studies will be conducted only when there is a reasonable expectation of a significant contribution to decision making policy, development, or cost savings.

d. Contract studies will be conducted according to the provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), Defense Acquisition Regulations Systems (DFARS), Army Federal Regulation Supplement (AFARS), and AR 5-14, Management of Contracted Advisory and Assistance Services.

e. Studies should not unnecessarily duplicate other analytical work but they may, in some cases, build on other work done in the same subject area. A literature search before beginning a study is required to provide assurance that the study will not be a duplication of a previous effort as well as providing the researcher with valuable background information. (See Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) or the Libraries of DoD and joint staff service schools for literature search sources.)

f. Studies should be performed with appropriate state of the-art technologies. Analysts will remain current in training. Modern analytical tools and methodologies should be available for their use.
g. Studies, analyses, and evaluations will adhere to the principles set forth by DoDI 3210.1, Administration and Support of Basic Research by the Department of Defense, and comply with the standards established under DoDI 3210.7, Research Integrity and Misconduct with special emphasis on attribution of intellectual work and documentation generated during the course of the research activity.

h. All studies, analyses, and evaluations will comply with the USMEPCOM HRPP. Additional conditions apply to aptitudinal and medical qualification programs.

   (1) Enlistment Testing and Student Testing research projects will comply with the USMEPCOM HRPP and the Scientific Review Process to provide situational awareness for USMEPCOM HRPP determination prior to committing USMEPCOM to implementation.

      (a) Interservice and interagency projects including those originating from the Manpower Accession Policy Working Group (MAPWG).

      (b) Oversight for projects originating from the field to include “research” briefs.

   (2) Medical research projects will comply with the USMEPCOM HRPP and the Scientific Review Process to provide situational awareness for USMEPCOM HRPP determination prior to committing USMEPCOM to implementation.

      (a) Interservice and interagency projects including those originating from the Accession Medical Standards Working Group (AMSWG).

      (b) Oversight for projects originating from the field to include “research” briefs.

   (3) All software applications developed or deployed within USMEPCOM that have a research application will:

      (a) Be registered through the USMEPCOM Enterprise Architecture Program Office.

      (b) Be registered with J-6 Asset Management.

      (c) Have an Army Certificate of Networthiness.

i. All survey, interview, and focus group instruments require a technical review and approval by J-5/MEPT prior to deployment. The review process will include a human subject research determination and ensure compliance with DoD requirements for survey and information collections.

j. Study information and data will be collected, evaluated, and provided to government agencies and the public where appropriate. The following considerations govern data use and release:

   (1) Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) is the DoD authorized source for accession data both inside and outside DoD.

   (2) USMEPCOM Regulation (UMR) 25-52, Management and Disclosure of Command Information governs information requests under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and Privacy Act (PA) Programs.
(3) UMR 360-1, Command Information (CI), Public Information (PI), and Community Relations (CR), governs information requests managed by USMEPCOM Public Affairs Office.

(4) UMR 1-5, White House, Congressional, and Special Inquiry Program, governs relations with the White House, Members of Congress, and special applicant inquiries.

(5) Operational data pertains to the mission of USMEPCOM to effectively and efficiently process applicants during peacetime and mobilization.

(a) USMEPCOM responsibility for the creation of the initial accession record involves the automated exchange of data to the Services and other Accession Enterprise stakeholders. Proponency for this function rests with J-6/MEIT. All other data exchanges supporting operational research will be coordinated with J-6/MEIT and automated to the maximum extent possible.

(b) The UBIS supports official operational requirements. The release or use of business intelligence data and other aggregated data outside of USMEPCOM, including academic research, requires review and approval by J-5/MEPT.

(c) Requests for analysis, and data unavailable through other established channels, will be submitted through an analysis request system maintained by J-5/MEPT.

(d) Requests for Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) scores and data will comply with restrictions established under DoDI 1304.12E, DoD Military Personnel Accession Testing Programs.

(6) When not part of an established release procedure or operational need, data release requires approval of the USMEPCOM Commander or other designated approval authority.

(a) Coordination is required, as appropriate, with the USMEPCOM proponent and for scientific review and human subjects determination.

(b) Action Officers will provide documented staff actions of data use and release to J-5/MEPT as part of the permanent record.

2-5. Resources
Studies performed under this regulation may use resources budgeted from USMEPCOM and DoD appropriation sources as explained in Chapter 3. Resources encompass funds, equipment, personnel, and labor required to execute. Resource requirements will specifically consider the labor costs associated with USMEPCOM and other personnel participation in a study.

2-6. Performing Organizations
Studies are performed by, or with assistance from:

a. Specially formed ad hoc task forces.

b. Organizational staff personnel.

c. In-house DoD R&D or study and analysis organizations.

d. Appointed or contracted consultants or experts.
e. Commercial research organizations.

f. Federally Funded Research and Development Centers.

g. Non-profit organizations.

2-7. Scientific Review
Oversight of USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program at the top level will be provided by the SRCOM. Figure 2-2, Integration of Scientific Review into USMEPCOM Proponent Functions provides a visual concept of operations. It shall:

a. Be chaired by Deputy Director, J-5/MEPT or other designated official.

b. Be co-chaired by the USMEPCOM HPA.

c. Have as an ex officio member, the USMEPCOM Command Surgeon (MECS).

d. Consist of Directors or representatives as needed from:

   (1) Sectors and Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS)
   (2) J-1/Human Resources Directorate (J-1/MEHR)
   (3) J-3/Operations Directorate (J-3/MEOP)
   (4) J-4/Facilities and Acquisition Directorate (J-4/MEFA)
   (5) J-6/Information Technology Directorate (J-6/MEIT)
   (6) J-7/Medical Plans and Policy Directorate (J-7/MEMD)
   (7) J-8/Resource Management Directorate (J-8/MERM)
   (8) Staff Judge Advocate (MEJA)
   (9) Public Affairs Office (MEDC-PA)

e. Coordinate agenda items, representatives, and obtain resources through the USMEPCOM Commander and staff as appropriate.

f. Review, coordinate, and assess the objectives, priorities, focus, balances, and resources for organizations and activities with the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program.

g. Review and coordinate requests to fund high-priority and unprogrammed studies, analyses, and evaluations. Recommend adjustments in the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program.

h. Meet annually during the last quarter of the fiscal year (FY), to review and approve the proposed USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program Plan for the upcoming fiscal year or at the call of the chair to resolve any major issues (see Figure 3-1).
i. Convene the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Planning Sub Committee to:

(1) Develop the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Annual Program Plan.

(2) Ensure that studies, analyses, and evaluations reflect USMEPCOM Commander’s priorities by integrating the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Annual Program Plan into the USMEPCOM Command Campaign Plan.

(3) Assess specific studies, analyses, and evaluations of interest to USMEPCOM Commander.

j. Convene any study advisory committees or work groups required for long-term oversight and support of specific activities and projects as appropriate.

k. Approve all studies, analyses, and evaluations in accordance with USMEPCOM HRPP.
Figure 2-2. Integration of Scientific Review into USMEPCOM Proponent Functions
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2-8. Human Research Protection

Human research protection is governed by a separately maintained DoD A20210 (Assurance) and USMEPCOM HRPP Management Plan. USMEPCOM Commander is the IO and is personally responsible for the terms of the Assurance. Both documents are approved by the Surgeon General of the Army with administrative oversight by the U.S. Army Human Research Protections Office (AHRPO). Human research projections require acknowledgement and acceptance of the responsibilities for protecting the rights and welfare of human subjects. This regulation supplements the governing documents by integrating the USMEPCOM HRPP into USMEPCOM operations.

a. Legal basis and governance adopted by USMEPCOM:

   (1) 10 United States Code (USC) 980, Limitations on Use of Humans as Experimental Subjects

   (2) 32 CFR 219

   (3) DoDI 3216.02

   (4) DoD A20210

   (5) AR 70-25, Use of Volunteers as Subjects of Research

   (6) AR 40-38, Clinical Investigation Program

   (7) USMEPCOM HRPP

   (8) DoD Institutional Agreement for IRB Review (IAIR)

b. Goals of the USMEPCOM HRPP are to ensure that all research:

   (1) Recognizes the rights and welfare of human research participants and ensures these are adequately protected.

   (2) Is guided by the ethical principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice as set forth in the Belmont Report, and is conducted with the highest level of expertise and integrity.

   (3) Complies with applicable federal, DoD, and Department of the Army (DA) laws and regulations.

c. The objectives of the USMEPCOM HRPP are to:

   (1) Outline specific policies and procedures that implement the Institution’s Assurance and ensure ongoing compliance with DoD, Army, and federal regulations, laws, and policies for human subject protection.

   (2) Outline specific policies and procedures for the required scientific, regulatory, and ethical review and approval of human subjects research.

   (3) Establish and direct continuing education requirements for personnel involved in human subjects research.

   (4) Assign roles and responsibilities for the USMEPCOM HRPP.
(5) Ensure accurate and comprehensive transition of USMEPCOM HRPP responsibilities and duties when there is a change in the IO or HPA.

d. All studies, analyses, and evaluations will receive a human subject research determination prior to initiation.

(1) Determination authority rests solely with HPA/EDO in conjunction with the AHRPO as the institution providing DoD HQ oversight. The distinction between Study Efforts and Non-Study Efforts and examples of Not Research Involving Human Subjects is provided in Appendix B.

(2) Human subject research encompasses:

   (a) All human subject research sponsored by USMEPCOM.

   (b) All human subject research conducted by or under the direction of any employee or agent of USMEPCOM in connection with organizational responsibilities.

   (c) All human subject research conducted by or under the direction of any employee or agent of USMEPCOM using a property, facility, or applicant processing site of USMEPCOM.

   (d) All human subject research involving the use of USMEPCOM’s nonpublic information to identify or contact human research subjects or prospective subjects.

(3) An activity is human subjects research when it meets both criteria:

   (a) Research means a systemic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities which meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this regulation, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes.

   (b) Human subject means a living individual about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or identifiable private information.

(4) An activity defined as either a Non-Study Effort or operational research does not require a human subject research determination.

   (a) Appendix B contains examples of Study Efforts and Non-Study Efforts.

   (b) The USMEPCOM HPA will promulgate supplements to Appendix B.

(5) Figure 2-3 depicts a simplified view of classes of research activities and the regulatory criteria governing them. The regulatory environment is increasingly complex as an activity shifts from not-research to human subject research. Study leads and principal investigators are advised to plan accordingly.

e. Human subjects research conducted or sponsored by USMEPCOM may not commence unless the research complies with USMEPCOM Assurance and USMEPCOM HRPP. Human subjects research conducted or sponsored by a proponent other than USMEPCOM must have:
(1) A DoD proponent covered by a DoD Assurance.

(2) Approval by the assured institution’s IRB of Record.

(3) An Institutional Agreement for IRB Review between USMEPCOM and the IRB of Record.

(4) A research protocol that explicitly and specifically details USMEPCOM’s involvement in the implementation of the research.

(5) An Operations Plan (OPLAN) for the research activity approved by the USMEPCOM component responsible for the functional area involving the research activity. The OPLAN will conform to practices detailed under Army Field Manual FM 5-0, The Operations Process, and/or Joint Publication 5-0, Joint Operation Planning.

(6) A data sharing agreement and other appropriate memorandums between USMEPCOM and the proponent.

Figure 2-3. Classification of Activities with Respect to Complexity of Review

2-9. Coordination
The Commander, USMEPCOM will ensure that USMEPCOM personnel have access to a broad array of in-house and contract analytical resources. J-5/MEPT will coordinate the USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program Plan. As part of the coordination process, J-5/MEPT will ensure that human protections determinations and survey, interview, and focus group instrument reviews are completed prior to recommending approval of studies, analyses, and evaluations. Additionally, J-5/MEPT will promote coordination of studies with other DoD organizations to make maximum use of resources already available, as well as to leverage ongoing efforts, within the DoD.
Chapter 3
Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Planning, Programming, and Budgeting

3-1. Processes
This chapter prescribes planning, programming, and budgeting guidance for the USMEPCOM SAE Program. The USMEPCOM SAE Program is developed and executed in a series of processes designed to ensure that USMEPCOM and DoD’s needs are met and resources are used effectively. The major annual program development events are keyed by letters on Figure 3-1.

3-2. Planning

a. Planning for the program begins when the SAE Program Office (SPO) publishes the SAE Program Guidance (Figure 3-1, A). This guidance establishes a base from which commanders, directorate heads, and study sponsors allocate analysis resources and prepare a coordinated, responsive, and executable program. The USMEPCOM Study Program Guidance is based on OSD and USMEPCOM guidance, goals and objectives, problems identified in Commanders’ conferences and mission area analyses, and on results of previous studies. It describes in detail the USMEPCOM Study Program’s critical study issues for the upcoming FY.

b. As a planning baseline the SAE Program Office also provides an electronic list of ongoing projects from previous years.

c. The USMEPCOM Study Program Coordinator uses the USMEPCOM SAE Study Program Guidance together with specific internal organization guidance and requirements initiated by subordinate commands and directorates to begin planning the upcoming USMEPCOM Study Program and to establish priorities among individual study proposals (Figure 3-1, C).

d. The Study Program Coordinator with study sponsors should coordinate with other agencies and determine what studies have already been completed, are underway, or are planned, and what substantive gaps remain to be addressed by studies.

e. Study managers will conduct a literature review of other DoD agencies’ efforts to determine the extent the proposed study issue has already been investigated, underway, or planned and what substantive gaps remain to be addressed by studies.

3-3. Programming

a. Each subordinate commands and Directorate will develop their organization’s prioritized portion of the draft USMEPCOM SAE Program. This information will be forwarded electronically to the SPO in the format detailed in Figure 5-1 and in accordance with the timeline outlined in Figure 3-1.

b. Personnel in the SPO will review all study submissions to DoD and other external study programs as well as USMEPCOM’s Study Program to:

(1) Verify proper integration of the program.

(2) Confirm responsiveness to program guidance.

(3) Ensure the validity of proposed studies.

(4) Prevent unnecessary duplication.
(5) Evaluate the planned performance methods.

(6) Establish a coordinated and executable program.

(7) Ensure the right analytic agency conducts the study.

(8) Verify all USMEPCOM studies have a documented USMEPCOM human subjects determination/IRB review and a USMEPCOM Scientific Review prior to approval for inclusion in USMEPCOM Study Program.

c. Where appropriate, the SPO will forward proposals to DoD and Army analysis R&D agencies to determine whether in-house capabilities exist to perform the proposed studies. These agencies may include, but are not limited to: RAND, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Analysis Center, Army Research Institute (ARI) for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Institute of Defense Analysis, Pacific Northwest Research Lab, Naval Postgraduate School (NPS), Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), and the United States Military Academy (USMA).

d. Study managers from subordinate commands and directorates may be required to modify their portions of the draft USMEPCOM Study Program Plan based on guidance from the SPO prior to a USMEPCOM governance meeting.

e. After review and approval by a USMEPCOM governance meeting, studies will be resourced as funds and personnel become available. The SPO will coordinate a quarterly review of the current year Study Program Plan (Figure 3-1 H, I, J, and K). If necessary, the Study Program Coordinator will recommend to the study sponsor adjustments to accommodate changes in funding levels or initiation of out-of-cycle requests. The program will be executed according to the revised plan until the financial closeout in September (Figure 3-1, K).

f. USMEPCOM’s Study Program Plan is published by the SPO and is posted on USMEPCOM’s website (Figure 3-1, G). The plan lists all programmed studies covered in this regulation which are to be conducted under the control of USMEPCOM for the ensuing year as well as those studies approved by the senior governance board to be forwarded to other outside research agencies’ study programs. Studies contained in USMEPCOM’s Study Plan must have the approval of the study sponsor.

g. For studies initiated after approval of USMEPCOM’s Study Program Plan, subordinate commands and directorates wishing to initiate an out-of-cycle funding request will submit their request through their study program manager to the SPO for coordination and review. Each request will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. When appropriate, the SPO will forward the request for a change to the approved USMEPCOM Studies Program and the study sponsor.

3-4. Budgeting

a. USMEPCOM develops budgets for study activities and reports within the Command Operating Budget and Program Objective Memorandum (POM). Instructions are provided through regular budget channels. The budget requests for contract study funds are reviewed by the SPO for conformity with budget guidance.

b. Studies will be funded using appropriate sources. The study must directly relate to a specific purpose for which fund use is designated. Approved study plans must specify and justify the use of funding sources.
c. USMEPCOM will work to secure appropriated internal and external funds to meet the anticipated study needs of the Command. The use of USMEPCOM analysts will be a consideration for those analytic projects with a short suspense that will preclude the use of outside analytic agencies or when funds are not available to conduct a required study.

d. Funding requirements for Automated Data Processing (ADP) services, except those that directly support and are a minor component of studies, are included in the subordinate command’s or Directorate’s ADP budget submissions and are not included in USMEPCOM’s Studies Program.

3-5. Success Factors
This section describes some important factors and practices that influence the success of USMEPCOM studies. The following is not an exhaustive list, but provides guidance for planning and managing study efforts.

a. Problem definition. Studies are conducted to solve problems and support decision making. Clear definition of the problem, from the perspective of the problem owner, is the essential first step and foundation of a successful study. In some cases, an ad hoc staff study or mission analysis may be necessary to define the problem adequately for formal study. Defining the problem may include such steps as determining what will be done with the answer, how accurate that answer must be, who cares, when the decision must be made, and what is already known (Guidelines for Army Analysts, ALMC, 1989). This leads to a clear, concise statement of what decision-maker needs, shortages, and deficiencies give rise to the study (TRADOC Regulation 11-8, TRADOC Studies and Analysis). Further information on defining clear, actionable problem statements is in Army FM 5-0, The Operations Process.

b. Measures of Effectiveness (MOE). MOE should directly relate to essential elements of analysis. An MOE is described as a quantitative description of the level of success achieved. Selection of the MOE is perhaps the most crucial part of any analysis. Poor problem definition will almost certainly lead to inadequate MOE. This will result in misleading or incorrect conclusions. Even good problem definition does not guarantee good MOE. Too often the measures used are those most easily generated by a model, but not necessarily those most directly related to the real world variables being assessed.

c. Study management.

(1) The study manager, along with the SAE Advisory Sub-Committee (SASC), should be formally designated in study initiation documents. The study manager should be an individual with appropriate experience, knowledge, skills, abilities, assigned authority, and communications access to study team members. These qualifications are regardless of grade, duty assignment within the Command, or geographic location. The study manager should be prepared to expend considerable time in providing overall guidance to the study.

(2) The SASC should have active, knowledgeable, and responsible representatives who can speak with authority for the office that they represent and assist in review of the study initiation document. The SASC ensures the project remains focused on the study objectives, scope, expected results, and projected plan for implementation.

(3) There is no substitute for experienced, knowledgeable study team leaders and study analysts. A multidisciplinary team should be selected to meet the skill and experience requirements of the study. Communication technology, telework strategies, flexible work schedules, and other management tools may be used as appropriate to bring together study teams from geographically diverse locations.
(4) Because problem solving is a learning process and one that frequently extends over a period of years, continuity of study personnel is essential.

d. Timeliness. The time provided to conduct a study should match the problem being addressed. Timely and useful interim results received on time are better than complete results received late. However, solid quality is usually more important than an exact schedule. Given the uncertainties of problem solving, planning should allow for schedule flexibility rather than prescribing the time and accepting whatever results are available at that time. An exception is a level of effort or “term” study contract where the contractor agrees to dedicate specific personnel resources to a study problem for a set period of time.

e. Objectivity. Even the appearance of advocacy is to be avoided. Lack of objectivity lowers the credibility of all studies and deprives USMEPCOM of useful information that an objective study might produce. Decision makers may use other bases than a study to arrive at a decision or a recommendation to higher authority, but they should be supported by unbiased decision information.

f. Uncertainty analyses. A study can produce erroneous results through failure to consider the uncertainty of inputs. A study should define the range of conditions within which results remain valid. This is determined through systematic variation of inputs and assumptions.

g. Long-range planning. Many USMEPCOM problems are of such complexity or novelty that successful resolution requires a series of studies over several years. These may start with data collection and model developments as major efforts in their own right and continue with separate but related studies about different parts of the overall problem. To be avoided is a process of random, inadequately prepared attempts with no plan to get to an eventual resolution. The result is the need to start over again the next year. The essential difference between a successful and an unsuccessful long-range plan is the determination to reach a resolution of the problem rather than a determination just to study the problem. When an individual contract study effort is defined, historical and ongoing contract or in-house efforts related to the problem should be identified and analyzed to avoid duplication. This data should be synopsized in the background narrative of the Performance Work Statement (PWS).

h. Interaction with decision makers. If the problem is significant enough to be addressed by a formal USMEPCOM study, it is significant enough to command the attention of the responsible decision maker. This is important for a full understanding of the problem and for credibility and acceptance of results by the person or persons who will use them. In general, study results cannot be reduced to a few numbers or to a “yes” or “no.” Rather, the results form a better understanding of complex operations or relations, which are best communicated through progressive direct interactions with the decision maker.

i. The whole context. The context defines how the study is related to other problems and situations. Results of a study frequently affect more than the immediate problem being addressed. Audiences other than the study sponsor may have vital interests in the outcome of the study.

j. Appropriate In-Progress Reviews (IPRs) should be planned at appropriate phase points when it is necessary to report on progress or obtain management guidance. A general schedule of IPRs should be scheduled at the beginning of the study effort to permit coordinated advanced planning for each IPR.

k. Presentation of results. Study reports are often too lengthy. Clear, concise presentation of results should be the goal of every analyst. Writing the report is an integral part of the study and is a real test of the study team’s understanding of what has been learned. The report serves as permanent physical evidence of what the study achieved. Studies will be stored in USMEPCOM’s knowledge management
system (pending development). When appropriate, studies may be further documented in the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) and USMEPCOM Technical Research Library.

l. Liaison and exchange of information. A continuing exchange of information is required between the study-performing team, directorates, and subordinate commands as well as other organizations affected by the study. This will ensure up-to-date information is used. It will ensure the study will be relevant to interests of the agencies and will help facilitate adoption of final study recommendations.

m. Analysis of alternatives. Alternatives are frequently identified and analyzed. It is tempting to select a favorite alternative, present a comprehensive analysis of it, and provide less than a complete analysis of the other alternatives. Analysis of alternatives is meaningful only when each is given balanced treatment. It is also beneficial to develop criteria for the judgment of the alternatives; thereby permitting managers or other analysts to apply the same criteria to the various alternatives.

n. The final study report. Preparation and coordination of final study reports require more time and effort than usually envisioned. This frequently results in a heavy workload near the end of the study. Care should be taken in developing the study calendar to allow sufficient time for careful deliberate preparation and coordination of a final report.

o. Implementation planning. Implementation planning should proceed concurrently with conduct of the study. Emerging study results approved by the sponsor may be implemented while the study is in progress. A final product of the study team, in addition to the usual study documents, should be an implementation plan with defined time-phased actions and assigned responsibilities. Responsibility for overseeing the implementation actions should be assigned to an official at a level of the organization that can effectively coordinate the implementation actions.

p. Evaluation. Sometimes it is only after a study has been completed that the problem is understood well enough to design a good study to solve it. This “Monday morning quarterbacking” is valuable for deciding whether or how to implement study results or the initiation of a follow-up study in the same area. Evaluation of a completed study should review the basic ingredients:

1. Was the problem clearly defined?
2. Was it too narrow in scope to cover the important determinants or was it so broad that little depth of analysis was possible?
3. Were the objectives and essential elements of analysis appropriate to the problem? Were all of them completed? If not, why not?
4. Were the models or methods used adequate for the purpose? What else would have helped?
5. Was the available data adequate to get good results? Would it have been better to spend more time collecting data before doing the analysis? Exactly what better data should have been collected?
6. Within what range of variation of major inputs and assumptions are the results valid?
7. Are the results good enough to take action on? If not, why not?
8. Was the study group adequate for the job? What other skills would have been helpful?
(9) If the study could be redone with unlimited resources, how should it be done?

q. Cost savings. One purpose of studies is to find ways of accomplishing USMEPCOM’s missions more efficiently. For example, improved organizations may require fewer people or improved equipment may reduce the number of items needed initially or as replacements. In some cases, cost saving is in the form of future costs avoided rather than actual costs reduced. In such cases, estimate the consequences if a study was not done. For example, a study may cost $45,000 with configuration options that depend on study findings varying by $1,000,000. Therefore, the potential savings are on the order of $1,000,000. Sometimes cost savings can be described only qualitatively. This is particularly true of policy and strategy studies and methodology or data studies in which particular applications or consequences are not yet defined.
### Figure 3-1. USMEPCOM Fiscal Year Studies Program Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upcoming Year Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Year Program</td>
<td>Publish Program Plan (G)</td>
<td>Review Study Program Plan Progress (H)</td>
<td>Prepare Study Program Guidance (A)</td>
<td>Publish Study Program Guidance (B)</td>
<td>Proposal Submissions for Study Program (C)</td>
<td>Review Proposals Against Program Guidance (D)</td>
<td>Prepare Study Program Plan (E)</td>
<td>Approve Program Plan (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Program</td>
<td>Annual Evaluation of Results, Studies, and Program (L)</td>
<td>Publish Study Program Highlights (M)</td>
<td>Review Study Program Plan Progress (I)</td>
<td>Review Study Program Plan Progress (J)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-1. USMEPCOM Fiscal Year Studies Program Events
Chapter 4
Survey, Interview, and Focus Group Instruments Control

4-1. General
This chapter establishes the Survey Management Control Program (SMCP) for HQ USMEPCOM, Sector HQ, and MEPS and prescribes guidance for surveys and other information collections.

4-2. Scope

a. Surveys and other forms of information collections are governed by DoDI 1100.13, Surveys of DoD Personnel; DoDI 8910.01, Information Collection and Reporting; and DoD 8910.1-M, Department of Defense Procedures for Management of Information Requirements.

b. Information collections within USMEPCOM will additionally comply with DoDI 3216.02 and the USMEPCOM HRPP.

c. The term “survey” includes critiques, assessments, questionnaires, comment cards, and other methods, to include interviews and focus groups, which collect information about USMEPCOM business processes and activities from personnel. Surveys may assess the attitudes, opinions, ideas, and intentions of USMEPCOM personnel (military and civilian), MEPS applicants, and other personnel related to USMEPCOM’s core processes. Survey data will be used for gauging performance, policy changes, program management, program evaluation, and process improvement.

4-3. Use of Surveys

a. The SMCP supports DoD survey management objectives:

   (1) Avoid duplicative and unnecessary information collection.

   (2) Conserve the use of USMEPCOM manpower and resources in response to proposed and approved information collections.

   (3) Protect data covered by the Privacy Act and other directives; i.e., HIPPA.

   (4) Protect participants in Human Subjects Research.

   (5) Ensure information collections employ valid and reliable designs so as to generate useful and useable data.

   (6) Use the collected data and conduct credible analyses.

b. The guiding policies of the SMCP are:

   (1) Surveys should not be used as an automatic response to an information need.

   (2) Surveys are a highly effective means to gather information not normally available or collected through existing mechanisms.

   (3) Surveys are valid, accurate, and essential to the mission of USMEPCOM.

   (4) The high level of burden associated with surveys require.
(a) Justification of a survey before use within the Command.

(b) An evaluation of a survey after use within the Command to determine the effectiveness of the instrument and the proponent’s use of the survey results.

4-4. Survey Request Procedure

a. Figure 4-1 presents a flow chart for the request and approval process that all requests must follow. Surveys conducted external to USMEPCOM require approval by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness USD(P&R). USMEPCOM Liaison Officer provides guidance for external survey proposals and is the POC to initiate the review and approval process used by DoD after authorization to conduct an external survey is granted by USMEPCOM.

b. Contact the USMEPCOM SMCO to initiate a request for help with survey design, administration, analysis, and reporting. Specifically state the type of assistance required (e.g., development, administration, analysis, etc.) with a signed, or digitally signed, memorandum.

   (1) Electronic requests can be submitted to the SMCO at: OSD.North-Chicago.USMEPCOM.List.HQ-J5-MEPT-Survey-Program@mail.mil.

   (2) Hard copy request should be sent to HQ USMEPCOM, J-5/MEPT, 2834 Green Bay Road, North Chicago, IL 60064-3091.

   (3) Please note that the target population drives the time required to design, coordinate, and administer a survey. The SMCO can provide an estimated timeline, but anticipate 8 weeks from the date of request to the date of deployment.

c. Survey requests must include the following information:

   (1) Action Officer Information: Name, organization address, duty phone, and email address.

   (2) Title: Survey title should be brief and significant to the respondent.

   (3) Statement of Opportunity or Purpose: State the need for the type of information a survey will provide.

   (4) Objective: State the rationale of the proposed survey. Clearly describe expected results. Identify applicable regulations, policies, stakeholders, etc., driving the proposed survey.

   (5) Target Population: Identify the group of individuals of interest for the survey and sample size (e.g., applicants, recruits, employees, external customers, etc.). Add other defining characteristics (i.e., method used to select participants).

   (6) Timetable: Annotate approximate start and stop dates.

   (7) Frequency: State when and how often the survey is administered.

   (8) Length of Survey: State the estimated time (in minutes) a participant will need to take the survey.
(9) Data Collection Method: State the technique used for data collection (e.g., computer administered, personal interview, focus group, etc.).

(10) Data Usage: State use of data and presentation style (i.e., internal use, research).

(11) Subject areas: List survey topics (potential questions). Ensure each is tied to the objective.

(12) Protection of Data: Describe method(s) for securing data (i.e., locked cabinet, secure computer). Address Privacy Act or Human Research Protections concerns.

(13) Applicable documents: List documents relevant to the request and cite passages pertaining to the request, providing copies of any documents to expedite the review.

(14) Estimated cost of requirement: Provide a cost of each report and survey, to include personnel cost (number of work-hours multiplied by the average cost per work-hour), machine time/cost, supplies used, etc. Multiply the cost by the frequency of the activity.

(15) Coordination: Indicate with whom the request was coordinated.

(16) Justification of the specific need for this requirement: Provide a concise but complete justification for the requirement. Include an explanation of:

(a) Specific need for requirement and resulting benefits in light of projected costs.

(b) Risks or penalties associated with not having the information.

(c) The results of examining other sources of information currently available and why such information cannot satisfy the requirements.

(d) Less costly alternatives considered for satisfying the requirement and why each was not chosen. Specifically address why a survey is the best means to produce the most valid information with the least burden to the individual(s) and organization(s).

(e) How it is to be used by recipients.

(f) How need and use warrant frequency requested.
Figure 4-1. Typical Survey Request and Approval Process Flow Chart.
4-5. Development and Consultative Process

a. J-5/MEPT will partner with Action Officers to assist with preparation, development, administration, analysis, and presentation of surveys. The Action Officer will schedule a pre-administration meeting with J-5/MEPT to discuss survey approach, target audience requirements, and timeline. J-5/MEPT will facilitate the process using their expertise in survey research, methodologies, and data analysis to guide the Action Officer to stated objectives. Appendix D outlines considerations when developing a survey.

b. The amount of time to complete a survey is a function of the types of questions asked. The types of questions are weighted by complexity using Question Points as shown in Table 4-1. Three Question Points will typically take a survey respondent one minute to answer. Additionally, the calculation of total time must take into account any skips or other logical redirection to the flow built into the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Question</th>
<th>Question points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Open-ended question</td>
<td>3 Question Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Question stem (fill in the blank)</td>
<td>1 Question Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Mark all that apply</td>
<td>1 Question Point for every 6 items in the list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Scale (includes yes/no)</td>
<td>1 Question Point for every 3 items in the list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unpublished methodology adopted from Joint Advertising Market Research & Studies (JAMRS)

4-6. Coordination

The Action Officer must follow current USMEPCOM coordination procedures when preparing the survey package. All USMEPCOM surveys need proper coordination based on the target population. Refer to Table 4-2 for appropriate coordination and possible approval requirements. Additionally, the distinction between internal and external surveys is crucial.

a. A survey addressed to USMEPCOM employees in their capacity as employees is an internal survey. Surveys of USMEPCOM personnel at unionized MEPS require coordination from J-1/MEHR

b. A survey of USMEPCOM employees addressed to them in their capacity as a private citizen is an external survey. Similarly, surveys of the public, other DoD agencies, federal agencies, and institutions or agencies other than USMEPCOM, are external surveys requiring coordination through the USD(P&R). The USMEPCOM Liaison Officer will provide initial guidance on the likely steps and administrative requirements.

c. Additional specific requirements may apply for a target population. The existence of additional requirements is a factor considered by USMEPCOM approving authorities when recommending a survey. Refer to DoDI 8910.01 to determine the regulatory requirements to follow when surveying the public and
collecting personal data. The Action Officer must allocate increased coordination time for target populations outside of USMEPCOM. Contact J-5/MEPT promptly for detailed information and timelines.

Table 4-2. Survey Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET POPULATION</th>
<th>COORDINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USMEPCOM Personnel (military &amp; civilian)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruits</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel in any DoD component outside USMEPCOM</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members of active duty recruits</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other civilian personnel (i.e., family members of applicants, contractors, general public)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2. Survey Coordination

4-7. Surveying Unionized Employees
Prior to conducting a USMEPCOM-wide survey of all civilian employees located at MEPS, the Action Officer must contact J-1/MEHR-CP for assistance in preparing an appropriate written notice to inform the unions representing MEPS employees of the proposed survey. The MEPS should also seek guidance from their servicing Civilian Personnel Administration Center (CPAC) concerning the union notification process. For planning purposes, unionized MEPS should receive 60–90 days advance notice of the survey. This allows time to provide proper preliminary notification of the survey to the servicing unions and to complete appropriate bargaining (if necessary) prior to the issuance of the survey. If a union objects to the survey, the employees represented by the union may not participate in the survey until the objection is resolved. J-1/MEHR-CP must be informed and kept apprised of these situations/cases and is available to offer advice and assistance to the MEPS and Action Officers concerning union issues.

4-8. External Surveys
USD(P&R) exercises approval authority over, and direct coordination of, external surveys. DoD 8910.1-M provides specific procedures for approving information collection requirements. The SMCO will engage the USMEPCOM Liaison Officer on behalf of the Action Officer for specific requirements as necessary. The Action Officer is ultimately responsible for ensuring all submission requirements are met.
a. Review and approval by DoD: USMEPCOM will submit the request and application packages to USD(P&R). Submissions are effectively transferred to USD(P&R) for routing through the proper channels. The USMEPCOM Action Officer will complete materials required in advance of the submission and with the guidance provided by the USMEPCOM Liaison Officer.

b. DoD Internal Surveys: When surveying DoD personnel outside USMEPCOM, the Action Officer must prepare a memorandum to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) to request approval in accordance with DoDI 1100.13. The Action Officer must also obtain a Report Control Symbol (RCS) from Washington Headquarter Services (WHS). J-5/MEPT will assist with this process.

c. Public Surveys. When surveying civilians or other members of the public, the Action Officer must meet DoD regulatory requirements under DoDI 1100.13, DoDI 8910.01, and DoD 8910.1-M. Additionally, the Action Officer must protect human subjects in research conducted by DoD components in accordance with DoDI 1100.13 and DoDI 3216.02. These guidelines ensure the research explains rationale of the survey and balances this against the effort imposed on the public. Due to regulatory obligations and added coordination with DoD agencies, expect an increase in administration lead time (about 6months).

(1) Federal Register Notification: The Action Officer must complete a 60-day Federal Register Notification memo and gain approval from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness). This notification lets the public know the proposed survey is being considered and will allow for public comments.

(2) OMB Collection Package: The Action Officer must prepare an OMB information collection package describing the requirement for information. This package is reviewed by J-5/MEPT and USMEPCOM’s Survey Management Control Officer (SMCO). After proper coordination, the package is forwarded to OMB through USD(P&R) for approval and a control number for the proposed survey. The collection package is also published in the Federal Register for 30 days to allow for public comments. OMB receives these comments for evaluation during the approval process.

d. Interagency Surveys. The Action Officer must follow the licensing process for information requirements. This process is initiated through USD(P&R) and involves preliminary discussions with General Services Administration (GSA), preparation of a justification statement, and collection of cost estimates for responding agencies. The submission requires a Standard Form (SF) 360, Request to Approve an Interagency Reporting Requirement. The justification statement accompanying the SF 360 must include the following elements:

(1) State why the report is needed and how it will be used.

(2) Describe the benefits (in dollar value if possible) expected from the information and assess the probability that the benefits will be achieved.

(3) Describe how the program will be affected if the information is not obtained.

(4) Identify any responding agencies that took part in designing, testing, and estimating the cost of the proposed report.

(5) Identify the agencies that agree or do not agree with the proposed report and summarize the reasons.
(6) Explain how the reporting costs shown on the **SF 360** were derived.

(7) Describe other reporting plans considered including:

   a. Frequency of reporting.
   b. Use of exception reporting.
   c. Use of sampling techniques.
   d. Selection of respondents.
   e. Obligation of respondents to comply.
   f. Amount of detail.
   g. Format of report.
   h. Method of transmission.

### 4-9. Approval Process

All USMEPCOM surveys must receive formal approval from the USMEPCOM Commander or Chief of Staff/Deputy Commander (MEDC) prior to administration. The Commander may delegate approval authority for certain kinds of surveys to Directors, Sector Commanders, or Special Staff Officers. As the principal advisor, J-5/MEPT will review the survey request package and make recommendations as required. The Director of J-5/MEPT will recommend approval or disapproval to the MEDC or other delegated officials.

a. If the survey is approved, USMEPCOM, J-5/MEPT SMCO will assign a USMEPCOM survey control number (SCN) and expiration date. The USMEPCOM SCN will appear on the first page in the following format: **USMEPCOM SCN: YYYY NNN.VVV** where:

   1. **YYYY** = a four digit calendar year
   2. **NNN** = a project number
   3. **VVV** = a numerical version and instrument number

b. If the survey is disapproved, J-5/MEPT will submit a memorandum to the requesting official stating rationale for disapproval.

c. The USMEPCOM SMCO will record external SCNs for display on all approved instruments.

### 4-10. Public Release of Survey Results

Survey results can be released to the public if the format does not individually identify respondents and is not harmful to the individual’s privacy or governmental interest, or if the data is not exempted from disclosure by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) as stated in **DoD 5400.11, Department of Defense Privacy Program**. To publish results to the media, contact MEDC-PA. Do not respond directly to requests for survey results from non-DoD agencies, but forward the request to the USMEPCOM FOIA and Privacy Act Release Officer in J-1/MEHR-PR.
4-11. After Action Requirements

While surveys are a highly effective means to collect otherwise unavailable information, there are costs associated with their use. In order to ensure the utility of surveys, After Action Reports (AARs) and/or progress reports in memorandum for record format are required for all survey instruments. These reports constitute an evaluation of the effectiveness of the instrument, the quality of the data collection, and the usage of data by the survey proponent.

a. The Action Officer will submit an AAR to the SMCO within 30 days after the expiration of an information collection.

b. For reports 1.5 years or greater in duration, the Action Officer will submit a progress report to the SMCO within 30 days of the annual anniversary of the USMEPCOM approval for the information collection.

c. AARs and Progress Reports will minimally contain the following elements:

   (1) Progress made in capturing the target responses to include:

      (a) Original number of responses expected.

      (b) Number of responses obtained to date.

      (c) Number of potential respondents.

      (d) Time elapsed since initiation of the survey.

      (e) Time remaining for the survey.

   (2) Frequency the survey is administered.

   (3) Assessment and reliability of the data collected.

   (4) Specification of the methodologies employed when using the data.

   (5) Specification of what decisions, if any, were made using the data.

   (6) Description of how the proponent incorporated the survey into business processes.

   (7) Possible improvements to the instrument.

   (8) Estimate of the benefits of the data or the cost of not having the data.

   (9) Specification of any lessons learned from the employment of the instrument.
Chapter 5
Research Integration and Operational Research Activities

5-1. General
This chapter provides guidance for integrating studies with USMEPCOM operations when studies rely upon USMEPCOM information systems and business processes. Under normal circumstances, the development and deployment of information systems, applications, and business processes follows a linear path. Studies impose additional constraints upon USMEPCOM with respect to data collection and data use. Further constraints are imposed when an activity is human subjects research because a subjective interpretation of permissible interactions or interventions is vested with the HPA. Data for decision making and research purposes requires high levels of reliability and validity, or at least a clear understanding of the administrative context in which the data is generated. Human subject research typically requires a partitioning of the research and operational environments. These constraints complicate a development process already encumbered by requirements from the Privacy Act and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

5-2. Research Forum Coordination
USMEPCOM participates in a number of forums where research is a potential agenda item. Forums may be informal or formal and convened by any level of sponsor (e.g., DoD, academic, USMEPCOM employees acting in a non-official capacity, private parties). Formally convened forums under a DoD Charter, such as the MAPWG and the AMSWG, are expected to generate the bulk of research activities. Regardless of the forum characteristics, functional proponents have a responsibility to provide for coordination internal to USMEPCOM prior to engaging in, or committing USMEPCOM to the support of research. Figure 5-1 presents a holistic view of the process to coordinate research originating from research forums. The process is modified somewhat when the research is internally generated. The requirements for coordination by USMEPCOM functional proponents apply to DoD working groups and entail:

a. Providing HPA and SRCOR with sufficient situational awareness for engagement when research constitutes a forum agenda item.

b. Ensuring research projects will comply with the USMEPCOM HRPP and the Scientific Review Processes.

c. Providing USMEPCOM HPA and SRCOR with technical documents, applicable research protocols, and IRB documents.

d. Submitting internally driven medical research to AMSWG for review and approval.

e. Coordinating the review of USMEPCOM research briefs and data provided outside USMEPCOM with SRCOR and MEDC-PA.

5-3. Enterprise Architecture Program Requirements
The USMEPCOM Enterprise Architecture (EA) Program provides a means to disseminate study constraints to USMEPCOM personnel supporting the deployment of the study and to subsequently facilitate compliance with USMEPCOM Scientific Review and USMEPCOM HRPP requirements. Figure 5-1 also depicts the typical process for ensuring research projects beginning with the development of a project charter comply with the EA Program.

a. All software applications or information systems developed or deployed within USMEPCOM that have a research function will be registered through the USMEPCOM EA Program Office.
Figure 5-1. Integration of Studies and Human Subjects Research with USMEPCOM Approval Processes
(1) Functional proponents will ensure:

(a) USMEPCOM project charters and system change proposals reference any research and human subjects research constraints.

(b) An operations plan is prepared and approved by USMEPCOM and external governing bodies prior to deployment of a research activity.

(c) Research data is identified; specifications for research data are maintained through data sharing agreements governing collection, preservation, and transmission; and specification are filed with the HPA.

1. Data sharing agreements will minimally specify USMEPCOM personnel authorized to access and analyze the data.

2. Data sharing agreements will specify the extent of data that may be included in USMEPCOM enterprise databases, such as the UBIS, in order to operationally support the planning and implementation of the research activity.

3. Barring expressed permission, no research data may be maintained in USMEPCOM enterprise data systems used for workload analysis and reporting. Nor will research data in specifically designated research data systems be accessed by USMEPCOM personnel except those personnel detailed to directly support the research activity by J-6/MEIT; and personnel specifically responsible for the development and implementation of the research activity.

b. The EA Program will have a provision for documenting the presence or absence of research and human subjects research constraints and preserve documentation to this effect for use during development, implementation, and future system change proposals.

c. J-6/MEIT will coordinate compliance reviews through J-5/MEPT for research and human subjects research requirements during the course of developing projects. Deployment of projects entailing human subjects research may not commence until human subjects determinations are made. Project managers are advised to consult with the HPA early in the development process to avoid unanticipated complications.

d. Periodic compliance reviews for human subjects research for multiyear projects, a final quality review, and the conclusion of projects are requirements.

5-4. Business Process Management Program Requirements
The USMEPCOM Business Process Management (BPM) Program defines, improves, and manages USMEPCOM processes from an enterprise perspective. The BPM Program facilitates awareness of, and ensures compliance with, requirements of studies and human subjects research activities. Similarly, the infrastructure established under this regulation supports BPM Program activities.

a. Study Program and USMEPCOM BPM Program will rely upon a common repository and venue in order to minimize redundancies in the administration of activities under either program.

b. The USMEPCOM BPM Program will coordinate the review of projects through the USMEPCOM HRPP to identify any constraints in data use or action. The BPM Program will ensure projects comply with the USMEPCOM HRPP and subsequent recommendations by the Scientific Review Committee.
c. The USMEPCOM Business Intelligence (BI) Program will support ad hoc and on-going data requirements of the USMEPCOM BPM Program for studies, analyses, evaluations, surveys, measures, and business intelligence during project initiation through project management.

d. The USMEPCOM BPM Program will comply with policies and procedures established by this regulation.

5-5. Requesting Analytical Support
J-5/MEPT supports USMEPCOM and the Accessions Enterprise by providing relevant and timely analytical support. Requests for analytical support are sent to the J-5/MEPT through various sources and methods. The Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) below will assist J-5/MEPT leadership in effectively managing, routing, and completing requests.

a. Submission of requests for analytical support.

(1) All requests must be submitted to: USMEPCOM distribution group HQ-J5-MEPT-Analysis Request or emailed to: OSD.North-Chicago.USMEPCOM.List.HQ-J5-MEPT-Analysis-Request@mail.mil.

(2) HQ-J5-MEPT-Analysis Request distribution group and OSD.North-Chicago.USMEPCOM.List.HQ-J5-MEPT-Analysis-Request@mail.mil will forward all emails to:

   (a) Director, J-5/MEPT
   (b) Deputy Director, J-5/MEPT
   (c) J-5/MEPT Program Analysis & Evaluation Division Chief
   (d) J-5/MEPT Human Protections Administrator
   (e) J-5/MEPT Administrative Assistant

(3) J-5/MEPT personnel who directly receive requests will forward the request to: OSD.North-Chicago.USMEPCOM.List.HQ-J5-MEPT-Analysis-Request@mail.mil.

(4) Creation of Unicenter, or HelpDesk, tickets by personnel outside of J-5/MEPT for the purpose of tasking J-5/MEPT personnel to support requests is prohibited.

(5) The Program Analysis & Evaluation Division Chief is the primary POC who will ensure that all requests are properly routed and assigned to J-5/MEPT staff members.

b. Requests will contain the following information:

   (1) Person requesting analytical support.
   (2) Organization requesting analytical support.
   (3) Date Requested.
   (4) Date Required.
(5) Purpose of Request.

(6) End user of analytical support (USMEPCOM, MEPS, OSD, US Government Accountability Office (GAO), etc.).

(7) Type of Request (e.g., data extract, new or modification to BI report, geo-coding, modeling, and/or simulation).

(8) Timeframe of data required (e.g., all of FY08, FY06-08, April 1, 2008-July 31, 2008).

(9) Requested output format (e.g., briefing slides, map, graphs/bar chart, spreadsheet, etc.).

(10) Requestor contact information.

c. J-5/MEPT will maintain an analytical support request repository.

(1) All requests for analytical support will be logged by J-5/MEPT with relevant data elements recorded in a consistent fashion to facilitate tabulation and statistical analysis of requests.

(2) The disposition of requests will be recorded in a timely manner and in accordance with the established data elements to monitor the level of effort.

(3) All work and correspondence generated on behalf of the request will be preserved in a repository for review and future use.

(4) J-5/MEPT will incorporate a Report on Requests for Analytical Support in the Annual Evaluation of Results, Studies, and Programs. The report will:

(a) Analyze the trends in requests especially to identify gaps in analytical products.

(b) Report on level of effort required to support requests.

(c) Assess the efficiency, effectiveness, and timeliness of responses to requests.

(d) Provide, as appropriate, recommendations for new, or suspension of, studies and research products.

5-6. USMEPCOM Business Intelligence

Business Intelligence (BI) is the acquisition, correlation, and transformation of data into insightful and actionable information through analytics. BI enables USMEPCOM and the Accession Community to make better, timelier decisions. BI encompasses a wide range of technologies, data integration approaches, canned and custom applications, and information/analysis delivery methods. USMEPCOM has utilized BI in varying forms and designations. BI employed within USMEPCOM is formally designated as USMEPCOM Business Intelligence (UBI). The environment (infrastructure) supporting UBI is denoted as the USMEPCOM Business Intelligence System (UBIS).

a. UBIS is the Command’s official business intelligence system and the authoritative source for applicant processing information, workload reporting, and Command metrics.
(1) USMEPCOM Integrated Resource System (USMIRS) remains the official accession reporting system for DoD IAW UMR 680-3, USMEPCOM Integrated Resource System and DoDI 1336.08, Military Human Resource Records Life Cycle Management, where USMEPCOM is designated as the authoritative source for accession records information and data.

(2) In keeping with the principals of UBIS as a single, central, and consistent source of data and analyses, management analyses and reports will rely upon UBIS to the maximum extent practical. USMEPCOM personnel will utilize the procedures for requesting analytical support as appropriate to engage the UBI functional proponent.

(3) When UBIS does not contain requisite data, the UBI functional proponent will:

   a. Provide alternative analytical support to include data, analyses, and recommendations. Documentation in a professional and parsimonious format will accompany the analytical support and describe the methodologies used and the uses or limitations of provided support.

   b. Evaluate the feasibility of extending UBIS to encompass other systems and data.

b. Proponency for UBI is jointly shared:

   (1) J-5/MEPT is the functional proponent for BI and will:

      a. Prepare an annual UBI Work Plan.

      b. Incorporate the UBI Work Plan into the USMEPCOM FY Studies Program Cycle with quarterly progress reports and an annual evaluation of the UBI Work Plan.

      c. Maintain a data quality assurance program to:

         1. Monitor the accuracy of UBIS content.

         2. Monitor the accuracy of source data feeding UBI.

         3. Respond to field and HQ notice that data is deemed incorrect when submitted using the procedures for requesting analytical support.

         4. Eschew short-term fixes to raw data and instead institute long-term solutions to encompass modifications to Extract, Transform, and Load (ETL) procedures.

         5. Fully document and maintain documentation of UBI content and components in a manner that facilitates use of the documents by analysts at all levels within and outside of USMEPCOM.

      d. Provide Subject Matter Expert (SME) input on UBI training regimens.

      e. Provide Conferences and orientation with status of UBIS.

      f. Develop and maintain content for UBI to include databases, ETL, Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) models, and reports.
(2) J-6/MEIT is the technical proponent and will:

(a) Maintain the UBIS network infrastructure to include production and development environments.

(b) Provide database administration support to J-5/MEPT for maintenance and development.

(c) Provide situation awareness to, and actively engage with, J-5/MEPT with respect to modifications to source data systems.

(3) J-1/MEHR as the proponent for training will:

(a) Provide and facilitate awareness of UBI for new employees and ongoing awareness throughout USMEPCOM at conferences and training sessions.

(b) Develop a Command-wide training program for UBI with J-5/MEPT and other appropriate SME input.

(c) Establish and monitor training to ensure an appropriate number of personnel degree are proficient with command BI systems.

(4) All USMEPCOM organizational units will maintain a cadre of personnel proficient in the use of UBIS that takes into account employee turnover and improvements in content and capabilities to UBI.

5-7. Data Use and Data Release Procedures

USMEPCOM data, including data from the UBIS, constitutes official operational data. Data use and data releases will comply with DoD Directive (DoDD) 5122.05, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs (ASD(PA)); DoDD 5230.09, Clearance of DoD Information for Public Release; and DoDI 5230.29, Security and Policy Review of DoD Information for Public Release. Additionally, the USMEPCOM mission entails generation of data covered by the Privacy Act, HIPAA, and DoDI 3216.02, and UMR 25-3, Managing Information Technology Resources. Data use within, and release from, USMEPCOM is governed as follows:

a. The UBIS supports official operational requirements. The release or use of BI data and other aggregated data including data compiled for USMEPCOM briefs outside of USMEPCOM or for non-official purposes, including academic research, requires review and approval by J-5/MEPT.

(1) When applicable, J-5/MEPT will coordinate data releases with USMEPCOM functional proponents.

(2) Decision authority to fulfill FOIA/Privacy Act requests and Public Affairs requests respectively rest with the FOIA/Privacy Act Officer and MEDC-PA.

b. Release of record level data, including Personally Identifiable Information (PII), not governed by FOIA, Privacy Act, established operational requirements for directly processing or enlisting applicants, or a formal exemption under this regulation requires:

(1) A formal written request to the Commander, USMEPCOM on file with, and approved by, J-5/MEPT.
(2) A human subjects protection determination by USMEPCOM HPA/EDO unless the activity is conducted entirely internal to USMEPCOM and is listed under Appendix B as a Non-Study Effort or Not Human Subjects Research.

(3) Approval by the Commander, USMEPCOM when the research purpose constitutes human subjects research requiring either an expedited or full IRB review.

   (a) USMEPCOM is engaged in the activity, approval of USAMRMC IRB or another IRB for which USMEPCOM has an IAIR.

   (b) When USMEPCOM is supporting the activity, approval of AHRPO as an administrative review.

(4) A current Data sharing Agreement and either an approved Study Protocol with IRB Determination or Project Plan on file with the USMEPCOM HPA/EDO.

c. DoDI 1304.12E requires review and approval by USD(P&R)(MPP) of requests for test score data except:

   (1) Test score data routinely provided to applicants, Military Services, and DMDC.

   (2) Student test score data routinely provided to students, schools, Military Services, and DMDC.

   (3) Student test scores and school summary data which are provided to school officials.

d. While USMEPCOM is designated as the authoritative source for accession records information and data, DMDC is the DoD authorized source for accession data requested for studies both inside and outside DoD. J-5/MEPT will evaluate requests for data and determine if the request should be fulfilled by USMEPCOM or DMDC based on the following considerations:

   (1) USMEPCOM does not possess the complete data set requested.

   (2) Data is requested by a private third party.

   (3) The request is not within the purview of the USMEPCOM mission.

e. Requests for data and information not part of an established release procedure, requires approval of the MEDC-PA and compliance with UMR 25-52.
Chapter 6
USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program Assessment

6-1. Requirements and Procedures
To ensure the objectives of USMEPCOM’s Studies Program as stated in paragraph 2-2 are met, this chapter prescribes evaluation requirements and procedures for USMEPCOM.

6-2. Evaluation Process

   a. The appointed study manager from each Directorate and subordinate command that requires studies to be conducted must prepare and forward to the SPO an annual evaluation (see Figure 6-1) of their studies during the FY. At a minimum, this evaluation will describe the results and impact of the previous FY’s studies and include, where possible, a quantification of benefits to the Army for implementing the study recommendations. This information will be used as the basis for the annual evaluation of USMEPCOM’s Studies Program.

   b. The SPO will request the evaluations from each Directorate and subordinate command. This request will provide a detailed format for submission and identify any specific information required beyond that stated above.

6-3. Study Program Evaluation
An annual evaluation of the results and uses of the studies is prepared by USMEPCOM SPO and reported for all projects completed during the FY. This evaluation uses Directorates’ and subordinate commands’ evaluations to develop a descriptive evaluation of the impact of the preceding FY’s USMEPCOM Studies Program. This is conducted to provide guidance, identify areas for improvement, maintain continuity, and provide USMEPCOM leaders with an assessment of the return on investment in study resources.

6-4. Operational Program Planning and Program Evaluation
Program planning and program evaluation are inherently complementary activities.

   a. The proponent for program evaluation at USMEPCOM is J-5/MEPT.

   b. Programs and evaluations will be designed for the best balance of effectiveness and simplicity.

   c. Programs will be governed by a USMEPCOM or higher level regulation, or a Command policy.

   d. Programs will be aligned with a goal of the USMEPCOM Strategic Plan. Formative evaluation reports for programs may recommend adding or changing a goal of the Strategic Plan.

   e. Essential elements of program plans include at least: purpose, scope, objectives, organizational alignment, roles and responsibilities, procedures and policies that govern the activity, and timeline.

   f. Formative and summative program evaluations will be coordinated with USMEPCOM staff elements and presented to the USMEPCOM Commander.

   g. A qualified program analyst will lead program evaluations in partnership with a team of three to seven program stakeholders. Evaluations will be championed by an HQ Director, Deputy Director, Commander, or Deputy Commander.
h. A formal or informal formative evaluation will be conducted at the inception of any program. The purpose of this evaluation is to validate the business requirement for the program along with its scope, goals, objectives, performance measures, and strategies for staffing, financial resourcing, and management. The formative evaluation report will assess the overall soundness of the program against the above items and other criteria determined appropriate by the evaluation team. The report will provide one of the following recommendations:

1. Approved for staff coordination leading to approval by the USMEPCOM Commander
2. Returned to the proponent for improvement in specified areas
3. Postponed
4. Halted

i. Periodically, during the life of the program, an informal or formal summative evaluation will be conducted. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess how well the program is meeting its goals. The evaluation report will assess program performance in operational outcomes, personnel productivity, and financial management. The report will recommend changes to program scope, goals, objectives, performance measures, and strategies for staffing, financial resourcing, and management.

j. Selection criteria for program evaluation may include funding impacts, human resource impacts, stakeholder impacts, DoD visibility, Commander’s priority, Congressional interest, and business risk management.

k. Evaluation criteria for programs may include return on investment, time saved, cost saved, milestones met, efficiency or effectiveness improved, quality maintained or improved, or customer requirements fulfilled. Triggers or drivers for evaluations may include budget lines over a specified amount, decision briefs for some threshold level of resources, risk, and mission impact.

6-5. Additional Forms of Evaluation
In addition to the written evaluation prepared annually, the SPO sponsors the following initiatives:

a. Independent evaluations of research or study, through a process commonly known as a peer review, are conducted to examine the credibility, quality, and timeliness of the work performed. Information of a general nature from several peer reviews is consolidated and distributed to provide lessons learned in conducting USMEPCOM studies.

b. The USMEPCOM Study Highlights is prepared annually and is designed to give recognition to well-performed studies, acknowledge outstanding efforts of individual analysts, and encourage excellence in USMEPCOM.
### Figure 6-1. Study Evaluation Format

1. **Purpose.** State the purpose of the effort.

2. **Chronology.** Provide the milestone dates and summary of actions accomplished.

3. **Basic information.** Provide the following information:
   a. Requiring activity.
   b. Sponsor’s study director and/or Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) name and organization.
   c. In-house or contract performer organization name and address, POC name, and telephone number.
   d. Contracting officer name and organization (if necessary).
   e. In-house or contract:
      1. Start date.
      2. Date completed or terminated.
      3. Final total Professional Staff Year (PSY) and cost.

4. **Major problems encountered.** List problems encountered.

5. **Major achievements.** List major achievements.

6. **Results.** List the results. Describe the benefits to the Army from having conducted the effort. In general, the value received from the expenditure of resources may be judged by the benefits derived from the effort. Therefore, special care must be taken to describe the present and anticipated benefits. When possible, cost savings or cost avoidance should be addressed. If definitive cost data cannot be used, well-thought out quantitative or qualitative measures should be used to describe the benefits. Such benefits should be expressed in simple language easily understood by nontechnical personnel.

7. **Evaluation.**
   a. In-house or contract performer:
      1. Performance
      2. Product
   b. Overall management of effort by USMEPCOM.

8. **Lessons learned.** List lessons learned.

9. **Implementation of results.** Provide the names of the agencies or commands implementing the results, the implementation dates, principal milestones, and the action accomplished or products to be provided or published.

10. **Information reports.** Date final work unit information system worksheet for studies, analyses, and evaluations was submitted to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC).

11. **Final report.** Date copy of final report with SF 298 Report Documentation.

**Note:** This format may be used for the evaluation the Scientific Review Coordinator writes after study implementation. See Chapter 7.
7-1. Individual Efforts

a. This chapter prescribes the requirements for managing the life cycle of individual efforts included in USMEPCOM’s Studies Program.

b. Steps to conduct a study include the following:

   (1) Initiation

   (2) Validation (gap analysis)

   (3) Development and conduct

   (4) Evaluation and implementation

   (5) Documentation and reporting

7-2. Initiation

The primary objective of the initiation phase is to decide if the study is needed. This must be accomplished during the development process to avoid including studies that are not required and the use of valuable resources unnecessarily. See Figure 7-1 for format of USMEPCOM SAE Program proposal submission. During this phase the following must be accomplished:

a. Establish a need for the study, relating planned results to solutions to USMEPCOM’s problems.

b. Appoint a study manager or a COTR for the study.

c. Organize an SASC, if required, and convene the SASC early enough to assist in review of the study concept paper and other study documentation.

d. Identify the objective of the study.

e. Verify the requirement for the effort. This may involve coordination with other agencies or commands and should involve conducting a preliminary literature search.

f. Define the problem and scope in clear, unambiguous terms.

g. Determine a manageable number of valid objectives.

h. Identify the uses and users of the anticipated results.

i. Determine when the study results are needed, end product desired, and potential uses of the product.

j. Determine if the study should be accomplished in-house or by contract.

k. Arrange an appropriate schedule of meetings with the sponsor to provide information on the study progress as required.
1. Conduct a literature review and create a file of pertinent study reference papers and documentation as described in DA Pamphlet 5-5; Guidance for Army Study Sponsors, Sponsor’s Study Directors, Study Advisory Groups, and Contracting Officer Representatives; Chapter 3.

7-3. Validation

a. This phase corroborates the need for a study before actual work begins. Validation will consist of a gap analysis (an assessment of the strategic vision and objectives of the Command to determine the requirement for the study) and a thorough literature review. All known work related to the topic must be reviewed to eliminate any unnecessary duplication of work. The Command Technical Research Librarian must be consulted during this phase to ensure all known source documents are reviewed before conducting the study. Studies may be conducted either under contract or as an in-house effort.

b. The study sponsor will:

   (1) For studies to be conducted by USMEPCOM or for USMEPCOM by a government agency: approve the initiation of the project through memorandum or another appropriate instrument.

   (2) For contract studies:

       (a) Approve a Management Decision Document (MDD) and Statement of Work (SOW) (see AR 5-14 for examples of both documents).

       (b) Forward the MDD for studies to the SPO.

       (c) Nominate a study manager and/or COTR.

7-4. Development and Conduct

a. This phase begins when the study organization actually initiates the work and ends when the sponsor approves the final study report or terminates the study effort.

b. The following must be accomplished during this phase:

   (1) Monitor study progress through formal progress reviews and informal discussions with the SPO.

   (2) Review and approve all SASC meeting minutes.

   (3) Request termination of the study contract before the scheduled completion date when appropriate.

   (4) If the study is performed using a contract, ensure the deliverables indicate the quantity of products, place of delivery, and schedule of delivery. All dates in the SOW should be stated relative to the date of contract award.

   (5) Develop a viable study plan and monitor the study progress through frequent contact with the performing organization. Any modifications to the study plan must be necessary, related to the study effort, and should be developed jointly by the sponsor and study organization. Only the contracting officer may approve substantial changes to a contract. Substantial changes are those which would change
the focus of the effort. A copy of the approved changes will be submitted to the SPO to ensure the program accurately reflects work being performed by, or for, USMEPCOM.

(6) If necessary, convene a SASC to provide advice, assistance, and direction to the organization performing the study.

(7) Present a study plan to the SPO for review and approval to ensure the objectives are achieved.

7-5. Evaluation

a. This phase follows completion of a study to inform the sponsor of how well desired objectives were met.

b. The study sponsor will:

   (1) Approve findings and recommendations of the study.

   (2) Review and approve the evaluation of the results of the study prepared for inclusion in the DTIC Work Unit Information System (WUIS) Worksheet.

c. The SRCOR will:

   (1) Provide a written evaluation of the results of each study (see Figure 6-1 for format) within 30 days after implementation of the study results or within 6 months after completion, whichever occurs first. (This evaluation may include a technical assessment of the study methods and procedures used to conduct the study. This evaluation forms the basis for the annual USMEPCOM Study Program Evaluation. Copies of the evaluation will be submitted to the study sponsor, the study performer, and the SAE Program Office. Evaluations submitted to the SAE Program Office will also be used to select studies for consideration and inclusion into the USMEPCOM Study Highlights.)

   (2) Evaluate the completed study and include comments on the DTIC WUIS Worksheet.

   (3) Determine the extent to which study objectives have been achieved.

   (4) Follow the procedures in AR 5-14, paragraph 4-5c for additional management evaluation guidance for a contract study.

7-6. Implementation

a. This phase usually begins after the study ends. However, selected emerging results of a study may be implemented while the study is in progress.

b. The study sponsor will:

   (1) Evaluate the results of each study and determine which results should be implemented.

   (2) Develop an implementation plan and monitor study progress through completion.

c. The SRCOR will:
(1) Submit study findings and recommendations to the sponsor for approval.

(2) Validate or revise the implementation plan.

(3) Coordinate execution of the implementation plan and ensure appropriate follow-up actions are taken.

7-7. Documenting and Reporting
The following activities are conducted before, during, and after completion of an individual study under the direct supervision of the SPO.

a. Information Reports. The study manager through the SPO will ensure the final report and any presentation materials are archived in USMEPCOM’s Technical Library as well as prepare the Scientific and Technical Information Network Research Summary Worksheet and provide it to DTIC when appropriate. The documentation is submitted under the following guidelines:

(1) Initiation: Submit an initiation report consisting of the signed MDD and a statement verifying the completion of the gap analysis and the literature review within 15 days following the initiation of the study. Provide annual updates until the study is completed or terminated.

(2) Interim: Submit an interim report after any major changes (such as, funding, principal personnel, or any substantial in text changes).

(3) Termination: Submit a termination report within 15 days following cancellation or suspension of a study if it continued more than 3 months.

(4) Completion: Submit a completion report within 30 days following completion of a study. The completion report will list the major findings and any actionable conclusions resulting from the study. Recommendations for future studies must also be detailed in the completion report.

(5) Evaluation: Submit results within 30 days after implementation or within 6 months after completion date of study, whichever occurs first. The Scientific and Technical Information Network Research Summary Worksheet may be submitted to DTIC.

b. Preparation and management of study documents. The SPO prepares and manages study documents for both contract and in-house studies. For a contract study, the study manager should follow the guidance of AR 5-14, paragraph 4-6b. For studies performed in-house, the SPO ensures the following requirements are addressed:

(1) The agency performing the study oversees the preparation, review, publication, and distribution of documents in accordance with AR 70-31, Standards for Technical Reporting. This function also involves maintaining proper security measures as found in AR 380-5, Department of the Army Information Security Program.

(2) Personal data collected or assessed during the effort must be managed according to the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 USC 552a) as implemented in AR 340-21, The Army Privacy Program.

(3) FOIA requests must be responded to according to the FOIA (5 USC 552). Only the initial denial authority (as prescribed by the FOIA) may deny information requested under the FOIA.
(4) The controlling authority (usually the SPO) approves release of documents produced by an in-house study.

(5) Disseminating information and materials produced by studies to all interested parties is consistent with security classification and proprietary information under the FOIA and the Privacy Act. However, if a FOIA request is made for release of emerging results, but release would significantly impair Army performance of missions or cause confusion or misunderstanding about Army goals or policies, the information should be withheld under the FOIA and AR 25-55, The Department of the Army Freedom of Information Act Program, by the appropriate initial denial authority until the effort has been completed and release has been allowed by the controlling authority.

(6) A cover page is prepared for each document, identifying the sponsoring organization (including office identification and location), the responsible person within the organization, and a disclaimer statement (such as, “The views, opinions, and findings in this document are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other official documentation”).

c. Final reports. The study manager will submit two copies of each final report (one electronic copy and one hard copy) together with completed SF 298 Report Documentation Page to the SPO, ATTN: USMEPCOM Technical Library, 2834 Green Bay Road, North Chicago, IL 60064-3091.
Figure 7-1. Study Program Proposal Format

PROPOSAL FOR FYXX RESEARCH PROJECT
USMEPCOM Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations Program

1. **Title:** Title should be short but descriptive. Spell out acronyms.

2. **Sponsor:** Subordinate command or staff element submitting proposal.

3. **Action Officer:** Name and Title
   Directorate
   Office Symbol
   Telephone (Commercial and DSN)
   Fax (Commercial and DSN)
   Email

4. **Problem Statement:** Give a brief description of the proposed study such as a single paragraph of three to five lines.

5. **Methodology and Scope:** Provide general methodology options for conducting the research with parameters and/or limits describing the extent of research that must be accomplished such as two to three paragraphs of three to five lines each.

6. **Research Review:** A literature review to see if the issue had been studied in the past by the Army or other DoD agencies. State if research had not been done in this area. If similar research had been done, how will this proposal build on past research efforts? List of completed studies, author, year, and applicability to this effort.

7. **Purpose and Expected Results:** Indicate how the results will benefit the Army and how the results will be implemented, specifically, what decision will this affect, in one to three bullet comments.

8. **Expected Milestones and Timeline:** Provide an estimate of timelines and interim products to be provided, such as IPRs, interim reports, or emerging results of survey information such as a list of proposed dates starting with “N” as approval date.

9. **Estimated Cost and Alternatives:** Discuss costs associated with the research options aligned with methodology options and alternative means to gather required information.

10. **Suggested Researcher(s):** If you have a suggested researcher or believe sole-source justification is necessary, please include the name of the organization or individual and contact information. List one to three researchers.

Figure 7-1. Study Program Proposal Format
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Appendix B
Examples of Study Efforts and Non-Study Efforts at USMEPCOM

B-1. Study Efforts

a. Cost, benefit, or effectiveness analyses of concepts, plans, training, tactics, forces, systems, policies, personnel management methods, and policies or programs.

b. Cost and Operational Effectiveness Analyses (COEA) (AR 71-9, Warfighting Capabilities Determination).

c. Technology assessments and management and operations research studies in support of Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) objectives.

d. Evaluations of organizational structure, administrative policies, procedures, methods, systems, and distribution of functions.

e. Research and development of databases, models, and methodologies for accomplishing specific studies and analyses.

f. Analyses of materiel, personnel, logistics, and management systems.

g. Studies to establish materiel requirements.

h. Studies in support of operational testing.

i. Studies performed by in-house (military and civilian) personnel requiring to make a significant contribution to a body of knowledge, advance understanding of a phenomenon or process, serve as a building block for future efforts, or may be adapted to other functional areas, missions, or applications.

j. Survey, Interview, and Focus Group Instruments unless identified as Non-Study Efforts or Not Research Involving Human Subjects Research.

B-2. Non-Study Efforts

a. Advanced engineering development in support of specific RDT&E programs for materiel systems acquisition policy (AR 70-1, Army Acquisition Policy) and analytical efforts integral to these programs.

b. Audits (AR 36-5, Auditing Service in the Department of the Army).

c. Development and modification of automatic data processing systems which support other study and analysis activities in the information resources management program (AR 25-1).

d. Development test, operational test, and user test (AR 73-1, Test and Evaluation Policy).


f. Internal reviews (AR 11-2).

  g. Recurring USMEPCOM attitudinal and opinion surveys (AR 600-46, Attitude and Opinion Survey Program).
h. Recurring economic and cost analyses in support of mission objectives (AR 11-18, The Cost and Economic Analysis Program).

i. Research and exploratory developments funded in 6.1 and 6.2 RDT&E program categories.

j. Routine engineering analyses of manufacturing methods.

k. Security investigations (AR 380-5).

l. Soldier Oriented Research Development Personnel Training Program (AR 70-8, Soldier-Oriented Research and Development in Personnel and Training).

m. The USMEPCOM Safety Program (UMR 385-1, Safety and Occupational Health Program).

n. Transportation and travel (AR 55-80, DoD Transportation Engineering Program).

B-3. Not Research Involving Human Subjects

DoDI 3216.02 specifies classes of activities that when conducted or supported by the DoD are NOT research involving human subjects. While these activities are not regulated as research involving human subjects other requirements established by DoD and USMEPCOM may exist and the responsibility for ensuring compliance with these requirements rests with the functional proponent. The following activities are treated as not research involving human subjects research:

a. Activities carried out solely for purposes of diagnosis, treatment, or prevention of injury and disease in Service members and other mission essential personnel under force health protection programs of the DoD (including health surveillance pursuant to section 1074f of Title 10, United States Code) and the use of medical products consistent with DoDI 6200.02, Application of Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Rules to Department of Defense Force Health Protection Program.

b. Authorized health and medical activities as part of the reasonable practice of medicine or other health professions undertaken for the sole purpose of patient treatment.

c. Activities performed for the sole purpose of medical quality assurance consistent with section 1102 of Title 10 USC and DoDI 6025.13, Medical Quality Assurance (MQA) and Clinical Quality Management in the Military Health System (MHS).

d. Activities performed solely for an Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) project where the activities and project meet the definition of OT&E as defined in section 139(a)(2)(A) of Title 10, USC (Projects do not meet the definition of OT&E when the intent is to analyze the effect of the project on human subjects.)

e. Activities performed solely for assessing compliance of individuals and organizations with requirements applicable to military, civilian, or contractor personnel or to organizational units (including activities such as occupational drug testing, occupational health and safety reviews, network monitoring, and monitoring for compliance with requirements for protection of classified information).

f. Activities (including program evaluation, customer satisfaction surveys, user surveys, outcome reviews, and other methods) designed solely to assess the performance of DoD programs where the results of the evaluation are only for the use of Government officials responsible for the operation or oversight of the program being evaluated and are not intended for generalized use beyond such programs. Specific USMEPCOM examples include:
(1) Interviews and surveys conducted as part of formal hiring and termination processes.

(2) Conference, educational or training course evaluations and session feedback.

(3) Data requests that are part of congressional, higher HQ, stakeholders, or public inquiries.

(4) USMEPCOM Inspector General (MEIG) and MEJA inspections and investigations.

(5) USMEPCOM Safety and Security programs.

(6) MEDC-EO Climate Assessments.
Appendix C
Survey Development Guidelines
When preparing a survey, refer to these guidelines and those publications listed in Appendix A. Contact J-5/MEPT for consultation with development, administration, analysis, and reporting. J-5/MEPT has the survey background and analysis expertise to design a successful approach. The Action Officer must formulate a detailed plan to define the survey’s objective, target population, data collection methods, life cycle, etc. Complete initial request procedures in Chapter 2 to begin survey design. Designing a survey is an art as well as a science; it takes a structured effort to collect useful, actionable information.

C-1. Survey Design
Surveys should enhance studies and improve policies and programs. Consider:

a. Begin each survey with an introduction or a cover letter to include detailed participant instructions. First impressions are lasting, and will increase respondent participation. Participants need to understand the survey’s full intent, time frame for the survey, level of privacy, and if it is voluntary or mandatory. If voluntary, participants must know that refusal to participate will not yield negative consequences. Participants also want to know their responses are confidential and used only for the stated objective. Lastly, include an agency disclosure notice and a Privacy Act Statement. Refer to DoD 8910.1-M for more guidance.

b. Use the fewest questions needed to obtain required quantity and quality of information.

c. Categorize questions to ensure a simple, logical flow.

d. Determine demographics for data analysis. Ask only pertinent demographic information.

e. Put easy-to-answer questions, such as demographics, at the end of the survey. This allows participants to spend more time on content questions.

f. Allow extra space for comments after each question and/or at the end of the survey.

g. Check the spelling and grammar of the entire survey.

h. Pre-test a survey using a representative pool of respondents to verify accuracy and understanding.

i. End with details of how data will be used. Follow with a sincere “thank you” for participating.

j. Deliver results as promised.

C-2. Methods of Data Collection
These techniques include participant contact and response methodology. Consider survey objective, population, and timeline to decide on the best method. Each has specific advantages and disadvantages:
### Table C-1. Methods of Data Collection Advantages and Disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online/web-based: Administer survey through email or website link.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANTAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISADVANTAGES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data automated for easier analysis</td>
<td>Need computer-savvy target population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast administration time</td>
<td>Need hardware and software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High response rates</td>
<td>Participant concern regarding confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed or Hand-Delivered Paper Copy: Mail hard copy of survey to a target population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANTAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISADVANTAGES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Process</td>
<td>Long administration times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete survey anywhere, anytime</td>
<td>May not remain anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar method</td>
<td>Manual data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: Ask questions telephonically with a participant or participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANTAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISADVANTAGES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask follow on questions/collect more data</td>
<td>Need experienced/trained interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear up confusion of question</td>
<td>Potential high cost and work interruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short survey administration times</td>
<td>Not anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal cost</td>
<td>No thought into candidates answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews/Focus Groups: Ask questions in-person with a participant or participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANTAGES</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISADVANTAGES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask follow-on questions/collect more data</td>
<td>Need experienced/trained interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear up confusion of question</td>
<td>Participants may not express full opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit use of visual tools</td>
<td>Potential high cost and work interruptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table C-1. Methods of Data Collection Advantages and Disadvantages

#### C-3. Question Design

A quality survey poses questions in a variety of formats. Examples include: single-choice, multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank, and essay questions. Use question types that generate appropriate information.

a. Develop concise, straight-forward questions and cover one subject per question.

b. Minimize questions with “no opinion” or “neither agree nor disagree” responses as participants tend to select easy responses to complete the survey.

c. Use consistent scales throughout the survey for multiple choice questions.

d. Write in a neutral style; biased or judgmental wording will lead participants to a specific response.

e. Group questions into similar subsets with a heading to orient participants.

f. Consider the survey objective, participant sample, and analysis form when choosing question type:
Table C-2. Methods of Question Types Advantages and Disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Close-ended: Participants select from a list (i.e., single-choice/multiple choice/table).</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient data analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended: Participants respond in their own words (i.e., fill-in-blank or essay).</td>
<td>ADVANTAGES</td>
<td>DISADVANTAGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture participant’s specific ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect demographic information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Misinterpretation of answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect more complete information</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants may forget items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Assortment of close and open-ended questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANTAGES</td>
<td>DISADVANTAGES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks up repetitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May help gather more complete data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complex analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-2. Methods of Question Types Advantages and Disadvantages

C-4. Participant Anonymity
Assure a high level of participant confidentiality. Never expose participant identity during data analysis and reporting unless: planned in the study authorization documents and agreed by study participants; or required by law to protect the safety of participants, property, or security. Include a Privacy Act statement in the survey’s introduction to help participants understand the protection level of their responses. (i.e., “Your responses to this survey will be held in strict confidence and will in no way be released.”)
Appendix D
Internal Control Evaluation Checklist - Information Management and Human Subjects Protections.

D-1. Function
The functions covered by this checklist are information management and human subjects protections.

D-2. Purpose
The purpose of this checklist is to assist commanders, assessable unit managers, and subject matter experts in evaluating the key internal controls listed below. It is not intended to cover all controls.

D-3. Instructions
Answers must be based on actual testing of key management controls (document analysis, direct observation, sampling, simulation, etc.). Explain answers indicating deficiencies and take necessary corrective actions. Formally evaluate these controls at least once every year. Certify that evaluations have been accomplished by completing DA Form 11-2, Internal Control Evaluation Certification.

D-4. Test Questions

a. Are research activities involving human subjects identified within the USMEPCOM organization conducting or funding research?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

b. Is non-exempt research reviewed by an Institutional Review Board (IRB)?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

c. Is the membership of the IRB(s) or record consistent with requirements of 32 CFR 219?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

d. Is a procedure in place to ensure that IRB members are free of conflicts of interest?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

e. If informed consent cannot be waived under 32 CFR 219, is voluntary informed consent obtained from each subject or the subject’s legal representative?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

f. Does the IRB of record determine the risk level of research protocols?

YES  NO  REMARKS:
g. Does the IRB review research to ensure that risks are minimized and are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

h. Are medical monitors appointed (or is such appointment expressly waived by the IRB) for greater-than-minimal-risk research?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

i. Is research approved at the appropriate Command level after IRB approval?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

j. Is research forwarded for second-level review, if appropriate?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

k. Are decisions by the IRB(s) of record to suspend or terminate research honored by the organization conducting or funding the research?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

l. Are investigators qualified to conduct research involving human subjects?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

m. Does the IRB ensure that investigators are free from conflicts of interest?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

n. Is a system in place to ensure appropriate storage and confidentiality of research records?

YES  NO  REMARKS:

o. Does the IRB of record ensure that research is in compliance with 10 USC 980, FDA regulations, and 45 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 46, Protection of Human Subjects, subparts B, C, D, and DoDI 3216.03?

YES  NO  REMARKS:
p. Does the IRB of record conduct continuing review of research in accordance with 32 CFR 219?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>REMARKS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

q. Are data releases logged and have accompanying approvals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>REMARKS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

r. Do all surveys locally employed have a visible DoD or USMEPCOM Survey Control Number prominently displayed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>REMARKS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

s. Do research projects or activities have human subjects determinations; data sharing agreements or protocols, or project plans; and appropriate approvals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>REMARKS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**D-5. Supersession**

No prior version of this checklist has been published.

**D-6. Comments**

Submit comments on this inspection program through your Sector to HQ USMEPCOM, ATTN: J-5/MEPT, 2834 Green Bay Road, North Chicago, IL 60064-3091.

**D-7. DA Form 11-2, Internal Control Evaluation Certification Statement.** Use [DA Form 11-2](#) to document internal control evaluations.
Glossary

Section I
Abbreviations

AAR
After Action Report

ADP
Automated Data Processing

AFARS
Army Federal Regulation Supplement

AFIT
Air Force Institute of Technology

AHRPO
U.S. Army Human Research Protection Office

AMSWG
Accession Medical Standards Working Group

AR
Army Regulation

ARI
Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

Assurance
DoD Assurance for the Protection of Human Research Subjects

ASVAB
Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery

BI
Business Intelligence

BPM
Business Process Management

CFR
Code of Federal Regulations

COTR
Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative

CPAC
Civilian Personnel Administration Center
DA
Department of the Army

DASD, MPP (AP)
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Military Personnel Policy (Accession Policy)

DFARS
Defense Acquisition Regulations Systems

DMDC
Defense Manpower Data Center

DoD
Department of Defense

DoDDD
Department of Defense Directive

DoDI
Department of Defense Instruction

DTIC
Defense Technical Information Center

EA
Enterprise Architecture

EDO
Exempt Determination Official

ETL
Extract, Transform, and Load

FAR
Federal Acquisition Regulation

FOIA
Freedom of Information Act

FY
Fiscal Year

GSA
U.S. General Services Administration

HIPAA
Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act

HPA
Human Protections Administrator
HPA/EDO
Human Protections Administrator/Exempt Determination Official

HQ
Headquarters

HQ USMEPCOM
Headquarters, United States Military Entrance Processing Command

HRPP
Human Research Protection Program

IAIR
Institutional Agreement for IRB Review

IO
Institutional Official

IPR
In-Progress Review

IRB
Institutional Review Board

IT
Information Technology

J-1/MEHR-CP
HQ USMEPCOM, J-1/Human Resources Directorate, Civilian Personnel Division

J-1/MEHR-PR
HQ USMEPCOM, J-1/Human Resources Directorate, Programs Division

J-3/MEOP
HQ USMEPCOM, J-3/Operations Directorate

J-4/MEFA
HQ USMEPCOM, J-4/Facilities and Acquisition Directorate

J-5/MEPT
HQ USMEPCOM, J-5/Strategic Planning and Transformation Directorate

J-6/MEIT
HQ USMEPCOM, J-6/Management Information Technology Directorate

J-7/MEMD
HQ USMEPCOM, J-7/Medical Plans and Policy Directorate

J-8/MERM
HQ USMEPCOM, J-8/Resource Management Directorate
JAMRS
Joint Advertising Market Research & Studies

MAPWG
Manpower Accessions Policy Working Group

MDD
Management Decision Document

MECS
HQ USMEPCOM, Command Surgeon

MEDC
HQ USMEPCOM, Chief of Staff/Deputy Commander

MEDC-PA
HQ USMEPCOM, Public Affairs Office

MEJA
HQ USMEPCOM, Staff Judge Advocate

MEPS
Military Entrance Processing Station

MOE
Measures of Effectiveness

NPS
Naval Postgraduate School

OLAP
Online Analytical Processing

OMB
Office of Management and Budget

OPLAN
Operations Plan

OSD
Office of the Secretary of Defense

OT&E
Operational Test & Evaluation

PA
Privacy Act

POC
Point of Contact
POM
Program Objective Memorandum

PSY
Professional Staff Year

R&D
Research and Development

RDT&E
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

RCS
Report Control Symbol

SASC
SAE Advisory Sub-Committee

SAE
Studies, Analyses, and Evaluations

SASC
SAE Advisory Sub-Committee

SMCO
Survey Management Control Officer

SMCP
Survey Management Control Program

SME
Subject Matter Expert

SOP
Standard Operating Procedure

SOW
Statement of Work

SPO
SAE Program Office

SPSC
SAE Planning Sub-Committee

SRCOM
Scientific Review Committee

SRCOR
Scientific Review Coordinator
Section II
Terms

Analysis
A broad category of study and investigation which includes support to operational, tactical, and strategic decision-making. Used in the context of this regulation, analysis refers to the situation when the researcher knows the information is available, but it requires statistical manipulation or other scientific investigative techniques to extract relevant conclusions from the data.

Business Intelligence
USMEPCOM has utilized Business Intelligence (BI) in varying forms since the early 1990s. BI from that era was internally developed using unconventional programming techniques under the title Quantitative Information Comparison. Modernization took place in the early 2000s using a commercial off the shelf BI software platform, Cognos. Documents and institutional knowledge concerning this BI modernization effort and subsequent enhancements inconsistently use the acronyms QuIC-R and QuICR to denote: Quality Information Center Reporter, Quantitative Information Comparison Replacement, Quantitative Information Comparison Redesign, Qualitative Information Comparison Redesign, and Quality Information Center - Enterprise Reporter.

Operational Analysis
An internal designation by USMEPCOM that an activity does not, by definition, constitute research or human subject research.

Research
All effort directed toward increased knowledge of natural phenomena and environment and toward the solution of problems in all fields of science. This includes basic and applied research.

Statement of Work (SOW)
Work to be performed under a contract. The SOW is:

a. Prepared by the sponsor of a proposed study contract
b. Coordinated through appropriate agency approval channels
c. Provided to the contracting officer representative who, in turn, forwards it to the contracting officer for use in preparing the solicitation and resultant study contract

Studies, analyses, and evaluations
Services that provide organized analytic assessments and evaluations in support of policy development, decision-making, management, or administration. Services include studies in support of R&D activities. Models, methodologies, and related software supporting studies, analyses, and evaluations are included. Examples include, but are not limited to, cost benefit or effectiveness analyses of concepts, plans, tactics, forces, systems, policies, personnel management methods and programs; studies specifying the application of information technology and other information resources to support mission and objectives; technology assessments and management and operations research studies in support of RDT&E objectives; evaluations of foreign force and equipment capabilities, foreign threats, net assessments, and geopolitical subjects; analyses of material, personnel, logistics and management systems; and environmental impact statements.
Study
An organized analytic assessment used to understand or evaluate complex issues. Also used to improve policy development, decision-making, management, and administration. The acquisition, test, and evaluation of systems may be a study topic.

Study Manager
The individual assigned to manage the study effort for the study sponsor. Normally acts as the contracting officer’s representative or COTR.

Study sponsor
The person who is responsible for a study. The study sponsor will validate the need for the study and provide management oversight of the study effort. In USMEPCOM, the study sponsor is the Commander, USMEPCOM.