Data Series 27

SUPPLEMENTARY EVALUATIONS
(Star rate all evaluators)

If one knows how to evaluate an existing scene correctly (which means by the purest and most exacting application of the Data Series) and still does not achieve an improvement toward the Ideal Scene, several things may be the reason.

First amongst these is of course poor evaluation. Second would be a considerable disagreement in the evaluated scene with the WHY, especially if it is interpreted as condemnatory. Third would be a failure to obtain actual compliance with the targets in the evaluation. Fourth would be interference points or areas which, although affecting the scene being evaluated, are not looked at in relationship to it.

In any scene being evaluated, there are two areas which are not likely to get much attention from the evaluator as they may not be remarked on in any of the reports or data being used in his evaluation. These two types of area are (1) LOCAL ENVIRONMENT and (2) RELAY POINTS AND LINES BETWEEN POLICY AND ORDER SOURCE AND THE SCENE ITSELF.

These two areas may be looked at as (1) the plane upon which the scene exists and (2) the upper stages of authority under which the scene reacts.

THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

The surrounding area to the scene being evaluated in the matter or a person would be the general third dynamic or other dynamic in which he or she lives his day to day life and which influences the person and therefore influences his hat or post. The search for the WHY which exactly causes Joe or Joanna to fail to hold post or wear a hat and which when handled will greatly better Joe or Joanna may well be their reactions to environments at their level and which may be or may not be there with them. Family or distant friends, not visible to an evaluator, or the work environment or on the job friends of Joe or Joanna may greatly influence Joe or Joanna.

This might prove too inviting for the evaluator to blame environment for the state of the existing scene and a caution would have to be introduced: that any WHY must lead to a bettered scene and must not just explain it.

EVAL BY RELAY PTS.

Thus, in such a problem it should be understood that one has TWO existing scenes, one the person and two his environment; that they interrelate does not make them just one scene. Thus

two evaluations about Joe or Joanna are possible, each with its program. To go about it otherwise is likely to prove as unsuccessful as the original evaluation of the person. Life and orders are reaching Joe or Joanna through relay points which are not ordinarily taken into consideration. Thus those areas should be separately evaluated. Usually, in the case of a person, something would have to be done to those areas, on the same plane as the person, by the person himself. So the program might include what the person himself could do about them.

The local environment of a material object, such as a machine or an office or a vehicle, may also be evaluated as well as the machine or the office or vehicle itself.

In short, there are relay points of difficulties that produce situations, on the same plane as the person or thing being evaluated. And these make ADDITIONAL evaluations possible and often profitable to the evaluator in terms of bettered ideal scenes. Yet at first glance, or using only the usual reports, it may seem that there is only one situation such as the person himself.

Completely in the interests of justice, it is unfair to put down a target in some greater area situation like "Remove Joe". It may well be that stats did go down when Joe was appointed to a post. Well, that may be perfectly true. But by only then evaluating Joe and not the greater zone of Joe's *personal* scenes, one may very well come up with a very wrong and abrupt and unjust target. WHO in other words, when found, may not solve the scene at all even when one only targets it as "specially train" or "audit" without removal. There may be another scene that is having an effect on Joe which, if not evaluated properly with a proper program of its own, will make nonsense out of any program about Joe himself related only to his post or position. Another scene may be relaying fatality to Joe which if unhandled will unsuit him to any other post of any other kind.

Thus Joe and Joanna would have, each of them, TWO or more full evaluations possible. What the person is failing at or not doing on the job may have a plain enough WHY that can be corrected by programming and moved to an ideal scene or at least toward it. What is hitting the person at an environmental or familial or social level might be an entirely different situation, requiring its own evaluation, with a proper WHY and program for Joe or Joanna to carry out themselves or even with some help from others.

In a broader case, we have, let us say, an organization or division that is in a situation. One, of course, can evaluate it as itself, finding a proper WHY and a nice bright idea and a program. And one can also do a second evaluation of the local environment. This might be the society or an adjacent division or even another organization. And this will require the location of a situation and finding its WHY and working out a program to handle that can be done by the org or the division itself or with help from outside.

The local environment outside the scene being evaluated is then a proper subject for another evaluation.

It is a serious error to only evaluate the local environment as all too often the person or org or division will insist that that is the ONLY situation and also that it is totally beyond any remedy by their own actions. Thus, if the evaluator is going to evaluate the local environment of a

subject that is in a situation, he does it AFTER he has evaluated the subject on its own ground totally.

EVALUATION OF ECHELONS

On any command or communication channel there are always a certain number of points extending from source through relay points down to the final receipt or action point. These may be very numerous. Some may be beyond the authority of any evaluator. But each is capable of having ITS OWN SITUATION that will cause an evaluation of the receipt or action point to fail.

These can be called "echelons" or step-like formations. The receipt or action point that is to comply finally with the program may be the subject of hidden sources of effect in the relay points of any program or order.

Thus, as in the case of a dangerous decline of some activity somewhere, an evaluator has several evaluations possible and probably necessary.

It would be, by experience, a severe error to try to evaluate all these different scenes (such as many echelons each in a different area) in one evaluation and find a WHY for the lot as one is attempting to find a single WHY for several different scenes in different places which violates the strict purity of evaluation procedure.

One may find the exact and correct WHY for the point of action and do a splendid program only to find that somehow it didn't come off or didn't last. Yet it was the right WHY for that scene. Hidden from view is the influence on that scene from one or more upper echelons which have, themselves, an individual situation and need their own WHY and their own program. Only then can the influence on the action point be beneficial in its entirety.

There is a system by which this is done.

1. One recognizes that there is a situation in an area which has not responded well to previous evaluation or has not maintained any benefit received very long.

2. One realizes that there are several echelons above the point being evaluated.

3. One draws these points without omission. This makes a sort of graph or command chart. It includes every command or comm relay point above the level of the point being evaluated.

4. The points, if any, BELOW the point under consideration as in 1 above are then added to the chart below it.

5. One now undertakes a brief study of EACH of these points above and below to see if any have a situation of its own that could influence the success or failure of the original point evaluated as in 1 above.

6. One does a full separate evaluation of each of these echelon points where any situation seems to exist. Each of the evaluations done must have its own local situation, WHY and

program. Care is taken not to evaluate "no situations". Care is also taken to keep this SERIES of evaluations consistent with the main idea of remedying 1 above.

7. The evaluations are released as a series and executed as feasible.

In doing such a series, brand new data may leap out as to the inter-relationship of all these. relay points and this may bring about a recommendation for a change of organization requiring new policy. But this would be another evaluation entirely as it is in effect an evaluation of basic organizational policy and may even require that tech be issued or withdrawn.

Take a case where the area which has not bettered or sustained a betterment has in actual fact two echelons below it and six above. The area, let us say, is a continental management office of an international hotel chain. Below it are its state offices and below that the hotels on that continent. Above it is the International comm relay center, the International headquarters executive at International headquarters for that continent, above that the International management organization, above that the chief executive of the International management organization, above that the advisors to the board and above that the board itself.

By drawing these out as a series. of echelons one sees that there is potentially a series of eight evaluations in addition to the main evaluation of that continental office which is where the situation originally was. By scanning over all these eight other influencing areas, one may find one or more of them which have situations of real influence on the original evaluation subject.

One then evaluates separately and handles separately WHILE STILL GOING ON HANDLING THE ORIGINAL SUBJECT.

One can then also do the local environment evaluation of the original subject if there seems to be a situation there.

No evaluation is done where there is no situation. But one should assert in a covering note to the series that there are no known situations in the remaining points.

Doing a series of evaluations and local environment evaluations can be extremely fruitful only so long as one realizes that they comprise separate situations which only by their influence are preventing an ideal scene from being achieved in the original area where betterment cannot be attained or maintained.

Supplementary evaluations, when necessary and when done, can rescue a long series of apparently fruitless evaluations of a subject and move the evaluator himself toward a more ideal and happier scene of success.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder