Remimeo
ED/CO's Hat
Exec Sec Hat
Tech & Qual

MONITORING TECH QUALITY IN ORGS

Without the highest standards of Technical application
being achieved, an org will not be delivering full results
and so will not fully prosper and the staff will not be well
paid. Scientology Tech applied 100% standardly is what an
org is all about and no effort should be spared to ensure this
happens.

If an ED or CO is to ensure that the Technical Quality
of his org is high he must have a foolproof way to verify that
Tech is in. There can be no more direct proof of Tech appli-
cation than the results found in the completed pcs and stu-
dents.

The following is a write-up by a very successful past CO
AOLA on how to monitor tech quality in an org. The procedure
he describes resolved the problem of a CO/ED not being highly
technically trained yet still having to ensure tech quality
remained high.

A CO/ED must be able to recognize when a person has had
real auditing and training gains. Scientology, with correct ap-
plication, produces gains far beyond those of any ever achieved
by man in the past or in the present time. The wins are there
to be had. If a public person is not enthusiastically happy
about his gains, he has not had Scientology. It's been altered
or abused or omitted and it is up to the CO/ED to recognize
this and get it handled.

You as the CO/ED must know this with total certainty and
insist upon full application of Keeping Scientology Working.

The following write-up is to be put into use in your org
to raise tech quality immediately.

"Toward the end of 1969, I was sent from Flag to AOLA to
rescue the org from certain demise. The income stat had
dropped to peanuts.

"Because I had been out of the tech delivery side of things
for several years and had not done the Class VIII Course, LRH
advised me how I would be able to monitor the tech quality, and
ensure that it was raised to a very high level and remained
there. These were his advices and how I put them into practice.

"1)   Every person on the org's service delivery line was
interviewed by me before they could route out of the org. I
was not only put on the routing form, but I checked periodi-
cally to ensure that every person was sent to me before termi-
nating his or her cycles of service with the org and returning
home. This was every case of a person who was not continuing
another service at that time.

"2)   In the interview, I would question them very closely
as to how satisfied they were with the service they received.

I would want more than just a statement that they were satis-
fied. I would want to know their gains to see if they were
also what we expected them to receive. I would go beyond the
social reply of the person. I would also watch closely for
indicators to pick up the slightest reservation in their reply.

"3)   If the person was not 100% satisfied, was not rav-
ing about the service, was not giving me real and concrete
gains, I would see that they received a FREE review immediately.

"4)   The interview was done at a regular social level,
and not in any sense conducted like a third degree. I would
usually want to know what their immediate future plans were
for Scientology. If they did not have definite plans to re-
turn to the org for service, I knew that there was something
wrong. If they did not have concrete plans to disseminate
Scientology in their area, I knew there was something wrong.
I was careful to not invalidate what they had received in my
questioning, but I did want to know specifics in every case.

"5)   At any sign of discontent, no matter how slight, I
would then offer them the free review. This would still hold
true for those in a hurry to catch a plane, or those who defi-
nitely had to leave to handle a pressing business or personal
problem. There were no exceptions.

"6)   I would have them go and wait in reception escorted
by my Communicator, VIP treatment. Then I would call in the
Qual Sec and ensure that she understood the situation and I
would see that it was handled immediately.

"7)   The review was not a long action. It was a run-
through of the current general list to find and handle by-
passed charge. It only took a few minutes, the BPC located
and indicated, and restimulated charge cleaned up on it.

"8)   The person was then sent to the Registrar to sign
up for and take any additional service that was needed. This
was worked out by the Qual Consultant from study of the per-
son's record in the org, study of the review folder and 2WC
with the person himself.

"9)   The person then either made plans to stay on and
complete the service, or made definite plans to return for the
additional service indicated and signed up for.

"10)   I would always interview them again before they
left, and repeat the above drill in full.

"11)   THEN, without any hesitation or reservation, I would
call a full Committee of Evidence on all those staff members
who were responsible for that person's poor handling. They
would all be comm eved from the Secretaries of the Divisions
responsible on down. I would see that the Comm Ev was carried
through and that correct justice was done.

"After the first few Comm Evs, they became very infrequent
because the tech quality went way up, and was maintained at a
very high level.

"Otherwise, I stayed away from the tech experts and let
them get on with their jobs. My main concern was to closely

monitor the lines and see that service delivery was swift and line blocks were handled quickly. I pushed quantity, and handled the quality per the above rundown.

"On my daily rounds of the org, I did question pcs and students about the service delivery and did take action to see that any outnesses were handled quickly, but my main intention here was to see that the delivery flow was swift and effective. I only Comm Eved tech personnel for permitting someone to leave the org with shoddy service delivery.

"There were two neatly made signs posted in Reception and in student and pc areas. One said that if they were not satisfied with the service, they were to notify me. The other said that they would not be permitted to leave the org unless I was satisfied that they had received the gains that they expected. Both were signed by me.

"All complaints about service delivery were fully handled immediately. The second sign served to back up the above drill on those leaving the org.

"The well publicized motto of the org was WE DELIVER, and we did. I made sure of that.

"In a year's time we increased the income 25 TIMES."

As this interview line is essentially an SPO hat, where the CO/ED has an SPO posted and functioning he will turn this line over to the SPO. This will prevent the CO/ED being overloaded with this function in large orgs with lots of public on lines. However this will not relieve the CO/ED from ensuring that this line is kept in and functioning.

SUMMARY

Monitoring technical quality is one of the vital responsibilities of the ED/CO. An org's prosperity depends totally on the proper delivery of Scientology. There is a way to monitor proper delivery and that is described in this policy. Get it in and watch results soar!

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

Assisted by
Kerry Gleeson
Commanding Officer
 Flag Bureaux

As accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY