

**Forest Service Manual
National Headquarters - Washington Office
Washington, DC**

**Forest Service Manual 1400 – Controls
Chapter 1470 - Research Reviews**

Amendment: 1400-2000-1

Effective date: October 31, 2000

Duration: This amendment is effective until superseded or removed.

Superseded Directive: 1400 Zero Code Contents, Amendment 1400-96-1; 1400 Zero Code, Amendment 1400-96-2; 1410 Contents, Amendment 1400-95-1; 1410-1416 Amendment 1400-95-2; 1417-1418, Amendment 1400-92-3; 1420, Amendment 1400-90-1; 1430, Amendment 1400-90-1; 1440, Amendment 1400-90-1; 1450, Amendment 1400-90-1; 1460, Amendment 1400-90-1; 1470 Amendment 1400-90-1

Approved by: Mike Dombeck, Chief

Date approved: October 31, 2000

Responsible Staff:

Posting Instructions: This is a technical amendment that converts the format and style of this FSM title from Applixware to the current corporate word processing application. Since this amendment replaces all text except Interim Directives (ID's), do not check for the last transmittal received for this title; instead place this transmittal sheet at the front of the title. DO NOT remove ID's when posting this amendment. ID's are not being reformatted at this time.

Explanation of changes: Following is an explanation of the changes throughout the directive by section.

Please read the new posting instructions (above) carefully.

1400: The entire amendment text has been reformatted and replaced, so that the amendment text on the Service-wide Directives Home Page in the Forest Service Web/ Intranet (<http://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/directives/index.html>) corresponds with the amendment text on the Forest Service Directives Home Page in the Forest Service World Wide Web/Internet (<http://www.fs.fed.us/im/directives>).

Although some minor typographical and technical errors have been corrected, substantive direction has not been changed.

Table of Contents

1470.2 - Objective.....	3
1470.4 - Responsibility.....	3
1471 - Combined Program Review	3
1472 - Station Supervisory Review	4
1473 - Reviews within Research Work Units.....	5

This chapter sets standards for special reviews used to evaluate the Forest Service Research program.

1470.2 - Objective

To uniformly evaluate the Forest Service Research program to ensure appropriate quality and quantity of results.

1470.4 - Responsibility

1. Deputy Chief for Research. The Deputy Chief for Research is responsible for Combined Program Reviews of Stations.
2. Station Directors. The Station Directors are responsible for Supervisory Reviews of Research Work Units.
3. Project Leaders. Project Leaders are responsible for informal reviews within Research Work Units.

1471 - Combined Program Review

The Combined Program Review evaluates a Station's overall research program. Use the Combined Program Review to improve the Station's program results.

Conduct Combined Program Reviews on a cyclic basis, unless there is a need to adjust the cycle to review particular Stations.

1. Review Topics. Examine:
 - a. Special research program issues--needs, opportunities, priorities, and overall direction.
 - b. Planning, organization, and staffing of research program.
 - c. Research review and scientist accountability (performance appraisals, evaluation panels, reviews, assistance trips).
 - d. Internal research coordination, external research relationships, and technology transfer.
 - e. Human resource management (recruitment, training, advancement, health and safety, civil rights).
 - f. Research information services (publications, public relations) and data management.

g. Special administration, support service, and productivity improvement issues.

2. Planning the Review. Follow FSM 1416 for scheduling the review, assembling a review team, and preparing a review plan. The Deputy Chief for Research or designated Associate Deputy Chief shall serve as team leader.

3. Conducting the Review. Follow FSM 1417 for conducting the onsite review and preparing a review report.

4. Planning and Taking Action. Follow FSM 1418 for developing an action plan, ensuring the completion of planned actions, and maintaining the review file.

1472 - Station Supervisory Review

The Station Supervisory Review evaluates a Research Work Unit's overall research program. Use the Station Supervisory Review to improve the unit's program results.

Conduct Station Supervisory Reviews as frequently as necessary, but at least biennially.

1. Planning the Review. The Assistant Station Director for Research shall prepare a brief review plan for concurrence by the Project Leader.

2. Conducting the Review. The Assistant Station Director shall visit the Research Work Unit (RWU) to examine and record:

- a. Status of documentation (RWU description, charter, problem analyses, study plans, and operating plans).
- b. Research progress.
- c. Dissemination of research results.
- d. Program development and budget.
- e. Staffing and training.
- f. Health, safety, and civil rights.
- g. Research facilities and overall support services. (Support service activities are examined in detail in Functional Assistance Trips by the Research Support Services staff and Activity Reviews by Washington Office staffs.)
- h. Discussions with unit personnel.

3. Planning and Taking Action. The Assistant Station Director for Research shall prepare a review report that identifies the actions needed and a schedule for completing those actions.

Have the report signed by the Project Leader and submit it to the Station Director. Provide copies to the appropriate Washington Office Staff Directors.

The Assistant Station Director monitors all planned actions to ensure they are completed.

1473 - Reviews within Research Work Units

Reviews within Research Work Units evaluate individual scientist programs. Use the reviews to improve each scientist's research results.

Set targets for research accomplishments within the unit as part of the annual program of work and track progress periodically. Review accomplishments with individual scientists whenever appropriate, and always in conjunction with annual performance ratings.

Use information from (1) established research documents, (2) consultations with users, (3) reviews and assistance trips by the Station, Washington Office, and consultants, and (4) feedback from periodic panel reviews of scientists when conducting these work unit reviews.