

PD-ABW-641
92693

EVALUATION REPORT
ON THE
THIRD PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
PATTAYA, AUGUST 22 - SEPTEMBER 23, 1983

Prepared for:

The Department of Technical and Economic Co-operation
Office of the Prime Minister
Royal Thai Government

by:

Ian Mayo-Smith
Director, IPS International
Institute of Public Service
University of Connecticut

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Introductory Note

The purpose of this evaluation report on the Third Project Management Program, held at Pattaya from August 22 to September 23, 1983, is to provide a basis for future decision making by the agencies involved in sponsoring, organizing, funding, designing and delivering the program and any future similar programs.

The information in the report is derived from information provided by participants and DTEC, written participant evaluations, oral comments, discussions with Thai facilitators, DTEC staff and the University of Connecticut instructional team.

The compiler of the report gratefully acknowledges the help and assistance provided by Khun Kittipan Kanjanapipatkul, Khun Tipsuda Nopmongcol, Khun Malinee Intarangsi and Khun Varee of DTEC and of his colleagues Nancy L. Ruther and Dr. Peter Delp.

Ian Mayo-Smith
Director
IPS International
Institute of Public Service
University of Connecticut

APPENDICES

Appendix A	List of Participants
Appendix B	DTEC English Test Scores
Appendix C	Program Modules and Textbooks
Appendix D	Interim Evaluation
Appendix E	Interim Report by Director, IPS International
Appendix F	Final Evaluation Form
Appendix G	Summary of Final Participant Evaluation
Appendix H	Program Certificates and Grading
Appendix I	Participant's Grades

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A third training program in project management was held at Pattaya City from August 22 through September 23, 1983. Thirty-one participants attended the program. Twenty-nine were officials from eight central departments of the Royal Thai Government. The other two were from the USAID Mission to Thailand. As on the two previous occasions, the program was organized by the USAID Sub-Division of the Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation, Office of the Prime Minister. It was designed and delivered by IPS International, the international wing of the Institute of Public Service, University of Connecticut. The program was largely supported from funds provided by the United States Agency for International Development.

The objectives of the training program were fundamentally similar to those of the two previous programs, held at Hua Hin in 1980 and 1981, i.e. to develop participants' skills in all aspects of project planning, appraisal, implementation and evaluation. Adjustments were made to the design and content of the program to take into account, first, the different responsibilities of this group of participants, as compared with the two previous groups, and secondly, recent advances in information processing technology. A greater emphasis was placed on the monitoring and evaluation of projects.

The duration of the program was five weeks. This shorter duration also called for some changes in program design and scheduling. (The two previous programs were both scheduled for six weeks.) The program was extremely intensive, involving a minimum working day of six classroom hours. In addition, evening tutorial sessions were held by instructors and facilitators. No Saturday classes were held, as many of the participants were married women who had young children and had a high need to be with their families at weekends.

According to the evaluations of the program made by the participants at the end of the course and, also, judging by the test results and the quality of individual projects completed by participants, the program was largely successful in meeting its objectives. All participants demonstrated substantial learning gains. The general overall quality of projects developed by the group was extremely high. In the opinion of the two instructors concerned, the group produced on average the highest quality of any of the many groups whose projects they have previously supervised.

The following general conclusions and recommendations may be drawn.

Selection

-A unique feature of this group was the extremely high proportion of women participants, 26 out of the 31. Another feature was that all the participants were from central agencies in Bangkok, concerned with the appraisal, monitoring and evaluation of projects, but not with the field implementation, since none came from the functional operating ministries. Group members were, without exception, very hardworking and conscientious.

-As regards English language ability, all but one participant had scores of 50 or higher in the DTEC English language test. It was clear that those participants with higher English scores had a considerable advantage over those with lower scores. However, even the participant with the lowest score managed a creditable performance overall, though the effort required was much greater. It is recommended that for future programs the present criterion for selection (a score of 50 or above) should at least be maintained, or, if possible, be raised.

-It is also recommended that in future programs there should be a mix of officials from central planning departments, such as those on this program, and officials from the functional operating ministries, such as the Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education, etc. This would help planners, implementers and evaluators of projects to gain a wider perspective of the whole project planning and project management cycle.

Instruction and Program Activities

-The class working day should be maintained at 6 hours with the evenings being used for facilitator sessions and occasional formal evening classes. Saturday classes should be avoided. The general consensus among instructors and participants was that the program should be of six weeks duration.

-Visits to development projects should be included in the program.

-The development of more Thai case study material should continue for future programs.

Faculty

-The same instructional team, rated very highly by participants, should, if possible, be employed on any future programs. This should help to guarantee the success of future programs and would optimize the experience already gained. If it is not possible for all three instructors to come to Thailand for the next program, not more than one change in the team should be made.

Materials

-The book list should be revised and the number of books provided should be increased to include references on monitoring and evaluation and on information management. For some topics, alternative texts should be introduced.

Assessment of Participant Performance

-The current system for evaluating participant performance is considered satisfactory, but IPS International should consider revising the weighting attached to the five different factors used in determining participants' overall gradings.

Facilitators

-The use of outstanding past participants as facilitators should continue, but choice should be confined to those who are considered to have an aptitude as trainers.

-A team of two or three facilitators should be chosen and should remain for the entire duration of the program. Mid-program changes of facilitator cause problems for participants, instructors and the facilitators themselves and should be avoided.

-A number of excellent potential facilitators are to be found among the participants with A+ or A overall gradings on this program.

Facilities

-The facilities at the Jomtien Palace Hotel are potentially excellent. However, the majority opinion of participants, instructors and facilitators was that until the management of the hotel is significantly improved and the hotel staff becomes more client oriented the Jomtien Palace should not be used for further programs. An alternative site in Pattaya is the Island View Hotel.

-Office space should be provided for instructors and facilitators as well as for the coordinator and secretary. Living accommodation was not satisfactory for classroom preparation.

Location

-If possible, a location should be chosen where visits to the sites of development projects can be arranged without difficulty.

Timing

-If possible, the rainy season should be avoided, since this makes visits to the sites of development projects difficult.

Logistics

-The logistical support provided by DTEC was of a very high standard. The only significant logistical problem concerned transportation from the Jomtien Palace Hotel to downtown Pattaya.

Evaluation

-If possible, a follow-up survey should be conducted in six-months to one year, in order to assess the impact of the program on participant work performance.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

A. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Third Project Management Program was held at the Jomtien Palace Hotel, Pattaya City, from the 22nd August through the 23rd September 1983. It was attended by 31 participants, 29 of whom were government officials in central government departments in Bangkok, while 2 were from the USAID Mission to Thailand. Like the two previous Project Management Programs held at Hua Hin in 1980 and 1981, the program was organized by the USAID Sub-Division, DTEC, in collaboration with IPS International, University of Connecticut, who were contracted to deliver instructional services. The program was once again largely supported through funds provided by the United States Agency for International Development under the Emerging Problems of Development (EPD) project.

The program differed in certain ways from the previous programs. Firstly, it was of five instead of six weeks duration and was of an extremely intensive nature: secondly there were a number of changes in program design and content. Some of these changes were made as a result of participants' feedback from the previous program and others were the result of changing priorities and the different needs of this group of participants. The principal changes were a new modularised design for the program, which consisted of seven modules, (See Appendix C) a heavier emphasis on project monitoring and evaluation, and the inclusion of a more detailed package on communications and information management, including an introduction to micro-computers. The group project, which had formed part of the previous programs was discontinued.

A working day of six classroom hours was maintained throughout the program and additional facilitator tutorials were held in the evenings as and when requested by participants. Small group tutorials on the use of the micro-computer were also held in the evenings. Occasional formal evening classes were also held.

The on-site management of the program was in the hands of the University of Connecticut team leader, Dr. Ian Mayo-Smith, Director of IPS International, with a team of two instructors, Professor Nancy L. Ruther, Associate Director of IPS International, and Dr. Peter Delp, each of whom was present for four out of the five weeks of the program. They were assisted by Thai facilitators (two for the first three weeks and another two for the last two weeks) and one full time and one part time coordinator from DTEC, plus a full time secretary.

B. PARTICIPANT SELECTION

The basic criteria for selection were

- 1) education at least to Bachelor's degree level;
- 2) grade level of PC 3,4,5 or 6;
- 3) currently employed in a department of the Royal Thai public service;
- 4) a minimum score of 50 in the DTEC English Language test.

Exceptions were made in the case of the two USAID officials, who, however, met or exceeded all the criteria except for #3; and also in the case of one official from the Office of the Auditor General whose score on the language test was 48.

Education

Eleven of the twenty-nine participants had masters' degrees. Three had bachelors' degrees plus post-graduate diplomas (one from Cambridge, one from Oxford and one from France.) The remaining seventeen participants all had bachelors' degrees.

Six of the participants had studied for at least some part of their higher education in the United States and two had studied in England.

The disciplines studied by the participants, included 12 who had studied economics or public finance, 8 who had studied public administration or political science, 4 who had studied commerce or accounting and two who had majored in law. Of the remaining five, the disciplines in which they had majored were biology, educational psychology, English, chemistry and social development.

Grade Levels

In terms of civil service rank, there were 7 officials at PC level 6, 10 at level 5, 11 at level 4 and 2 at level 3.

English Ability

In the language tests, eight participants had scores of between 80 and 89; seven scored between 70 and 79; seven between 60 and 69; seven between 50 and 59; and one scored 48. No scores are available for the two USAID participants, but both had studied in the U.S.A. and had excellent English skills.

It will be noted that the English scores for this group included four participants with scores below 55, as compared with the previous group, where only one participant had an English score below 55. It was evident that those with the lower English

scores had more difficulties on the program than those with higher scores. The two participants who gained an overall assessment of A+ had been the second and third highest scorers on the English test. In the learning assessments (tests), of which three were given during the program, the eight participants with English scores of 80 or above, achieved between them, two A+'s, two A's, two A-'s, a B+ and a B-. At the other end of the scale, the eight who scored lowest on the English test (with scores from 61 down to 48) achieved between them two B+'s, three B's, a B-, and two C+'s.

As in the case of the two previous programs, participant selection was carried out by the USAID Sub-Division of DTEC.

A full list of participants, giving their names, organizations, job titles and grade levels is included as Appendix A. Details of language scores are included in Appendix B.

C. INSTRUCTION AND PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The program was designed in seven modules and a schedule was drawn up which allowed for 120 hours of classroom instruction, excluding formal opening and closing sessions, program orientation, review sessions, tests, facilitator sessions and evening tutorials, which between them accounted for approximately another 35 to 40 hours. No Saturday classes were scheduled owing to the fact that a high proportion of the participants were married women with young children, who needed to be able to visit their families at weekends. In any case the workload was extremely heavy.

Participants worked extremely long hours outside class to complete their PIP projects and the assignments on the time value of money, cost benefit analysis etc.

Much of the instruction on this program was team taught, four out of the seven modules being taught by two or more instructors. Emphasis was placed on the inter-connectedness of the different aspects of project management taught by the three instructors. A considerable advantage this time was that the instructors were all accustomed to working with each other.

The Thai facilitators for this program consisted of two teams of two persons. Three of the facilitators had been high performing participants on the second program. One facilitator, Khun Pisamai Chandavimol of the Ministry of Public Health, proved to be outstanding in the view both of the instructors and participants. (This is clearly reflected in the Final Evaluation by participants. See Appendix G.) Facilitators conducted evening tutorial and coaching sessions and gave considerable help to participants.

It became clear that there would be major advantages in having the same team of facilitators throughout an entire program. Those that arrived after the end of the third week were at a definite disadvantage as they were not familiar with what had previously been taught on the program which contained considerable new material which they had not encountered on previous programs. It was also unsettling for participants and instructors to have to adjust to a new team, however hard and conscientiously the new facilitators worked to facilitate learning.

Owing to the lack of suitable projects which could be visited in the Pattaya area no field site visits to development projects were arranged. A valuable visit was however arranged by the participant group leaders to the City Manager's Office in Pattaya City. A social trip was made at the end of the program to Coral Island.

The program commenced with team building exercises and a program overview and preliminary skills assessment. An interim evaluation was carried out at the midpoint of the program. (See Appendices D & E). Three tests were held. Each of these learning assessments included questions from the instructional team rather than from a single instructor. A final written program evaluation was administered on the last Thursday of the program. The program ended with a formal ceremony in which participants received Certificates of Achievement issued jointly by DTEC and the University of Connecticut.

D. MATERIALS

A list of the text books provided to participants is given at Appendix C. These books, fewer in number than on previous programs, were air freighted to Thailand in advance of the program. Additionally a very extensive set of handout material was prepared in advance, specially tailored in many instances to this program, and was sent by air courier in advance. Additional handout material was developed during the course, including a case study on monitoring and evaluation, based to a considerable extent on information provided by Khun Pisamai.

Pre-prepared overhead transparencies and an audio-visual presentation on the time value of money were brought out by the instructional team.

It is proposed to revise the book list for any further programs. Good texts on project monitoring and evaluation and on the political aspects of project management are available but were not brought this time. The UNIDO publication "Guidelines for Project Evaluation" was not found to be valuable and will not be used in future programs. An alternative also needs to be found for Gittinger's "Economic Analysis of Agricultural Projects".

E. FACULTY

The IPS International instructional team consisted of two members of the previous team, Professor Ian Mayo-Smith and Dr. Peter Delp, plus Professor Nancy L. Ruther. Dr. Mayo-Smith and Professor Ruther arrived in Bangkok on the Thursday before the program commenced. Dr. Mayo-Smith remained in Thailand for the entire period of the program and for one further week, in which to complete the evaluation report on the program. Professor Ruther had to leave at the end of the fourth week of the program, owing to the fact that the IPS International diploma program in Public Management Development was due to open on September 23, and it was not possible for both the Director (Mayo-Smith) and Associate Director (Ruther) to be absent at the start of this program. Dr. Delp arrived in time for the beginning of the second week of the program and remained until the end of the program.

Participant satisfaction with the instructional team, as

indicated in both the interim and final evaluations, was extremely high and it is recommended that if possible the same team should be retained in any further programs. If it is not possible for all three of members of the team to return, at least two should be included in the next team.

F. FACILITATORS

As already mentioned, two teams of facilitators, consisting of two persons, helped to facilitate learning on this program. Khun Pisamai Chandavimol was present for the first three weeks and performed outstandingly as a facilitator and colleague. Her presence was of particular help to Professor Nancy Ruther, with whom she shared a bungalow, as it was Professor Ruther's first experience in Asia. Khun Pisamai, as a very experienced and capable trainer, was a major asset to the program.

Khun Rujapong Prabhasanobol was present for the first two weeks of the program only, as unfortunately his employers, the Bank of Thailand, could not release him for a longer period.

Khun Chadchai Tansiriratanakul, of the Ministry of Public Health, and Khun Watana Chirungsarpsook, of the Commercial Bank of Siam, were facilitators for the last two weeks of the program.

As mentioned above, it is again stressed that changing the team of facilitators in mid-program causes problems which affect not only the incoming facilitator team, but also the participants and instructors. It is highly desirable that the same facilitator team of two or, possibly, three persons should remain with the program throughout.

For the next program, if facilitators are to be drawn from participants on this program, Khun Valairat Sriaroon of the Bureau of the Budget and Khun Suthanone Funtammasan of DTEC would be first choices. Both gained overall gradings of A+ on the program and seem equally able to deal with the non-quantitative and the quantitative aspects of the program. Other possible facilitators would be Khun Pornsiri Chatiyononda (for the non-quantitative aspects) and Khun Supanee Artchinda (for the quantitative aspects). Both these ladies are from the USAID mission to Thailand and both earned A overall gradings.

G. FACILITIES

The Jomtien Palace Hotel, where the program was held, has a number of advantages as a training site. It is sufficiently close to Bangkok to enable participants either to go home for weekends or to have their families visit them in Pattaya. It has a good training room and a small, but otherwise satisfactory, office room. The bedrooms in all bungalows and the conference room are air-conditioned.

There were also, however, a number of serious disadvantages from both participants and instructors' viewpoints. Most of these

arose from the management problems of the hotel.

The microphone and public address system in the conference room was constantly going wrong and causing problems. The lighting in bungalows was dim and it was difficult for both instructional staff and participants to read or work in their rooms after dark. There were some complaints about food and many more about the quality of service at the hotel. Transportation between the hotel and the town was provided largely by the co-ordinator, Khun Malinee, with her personal pick-up or by participants making their own arrangements. There was no apparent effort by the hotel management to assist with transportation problems. The fact that there was only one telephone in the hotel was also a source of complaints. All phone calls had to be made in the hotel lobby, often against a background of noise from a television set. There was absolutely no privacy for private phone conversations.

The more serious complaints, however, stem from the very poor service; rooms not being properly cleaned. (In one instructor's room a dead scorpion remained on the floor for several days, not being removed by the cleaners. Eventually he removed it himself. This incident was symptomatic of the general standards of the hotel.) The one exception to the generally poor standards and the indifference to the needs of guests was the restaurant manager who did make efforts to supply service and who could usually be relied on to correct any deficiencies in his power to correct. Also during the last two weeks, the sales manager made efforts to improve the standards.

In response to a questionnaire prepared by the University of Connecticut team leader and completed by the instructors and facilitators, five respondents indicated that they would recommend that DTEC use the Jomtien Palace Hotel for future programs only if changes were made and no better locations were available. The other two respondents both indicated that they would definitely not recommend that the hotel be used again.

H. ASSESSMENT OF PARTICIPANT PERFORMANCE

Participants were assessed in five categories of performance, each category being given a particular weight. (See Appendix H). The categories and the weighting attached to them were:

Active participation in class	15%
Completion of Assignments	20%
Quality of project work	25%
Test scores	20%
Instructors' overall assessment	20%

Letter grades were awarded in each category. These ranged from A+ (excellent) through B (good) and C (satisfactory) to D (unsatisfactory).

In fact the grades awarded at the end of the program ranged from a high of A+ to C-. No D grades were awarded. In the overall grades, 2 participants achieved ratings of A+, a very considerable achievement. 7 more achieved A's and a large group (16 participants) received overall gradings of A-. 4 received B+'s and 2 received B's.

Since a different grading system was used on this program from that used on the two previous programs no direct comparison can be made with previous participants. Additionally the contents of the program were somewhat different. What can be said, however, is that this was an exceedingly hardworking and conscientious group who were prepared to put in long hours of work outside class hours to complete their assignments as well as possible. In the opinion of the two instructors responsible for coaching the group through the development of the PIP projects, the group as a whole produced an outstandingly high quality set of performance improvement projects.

All participants qualified for Certificates of Achievement.

A completed listing of all participants' final grades in all five categories, plus their overall gradings is given in Appendix I. The two participants who achieved A+ overall gradings can be considered outstanding by any standards.

I. LOGISTICS

There were no serious logistical problems on this program other than the transportation difficulties and the inadequate telephone facilities already referred to. On-site duplicating and photocopying equipment was provided; there were adequate supplies of stationery for all needs; a very efficient full time secretary was available throughout the program; and excellent support was provided throughout by Khun Malinee, the DTEC coordinator who received high praise from participants, instructors and facilitators for her dedication.

Provision of larger office space would have been desirable. With the coordinator's and secretary's desks and the microcomputer with peripherals, plus the photocopying and duplicating equipment, there was no room left for instructors or facilitators to work. As a result classroom preparation had to be done in living accommodations which was far from ideal owing to the poor lighting already mentioned.

The group selected two group representatives, one male and one female. These two persons, Khun Prisdang Choopen and Khun Pornsiri Chatiyononda, gave good support throughout to the project team. They arranged the official visit to the City Manager as well as a number of very enjoyable social events.

Support from DTEC staff in Bangkok as well as in Pattaya was, as

usual, of high quality.

J. EVALUATION

Interim and Final written evaluations were completed by participants. These have been summarised and full details are to be found in Appendices D, E, F, and G.

II. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Three criteria will be used in evaluating this program. They were also used in evaluating the previous two programs. They are:

1. The extent to which the program fulfills the mission of DTEC and their purposes in organizing the program;
2. The actual performance of participants in mastering the instructional objectives of the program;
3. The participant's evaluation of the relevance and quality of the program.

A. DTEC'S MISSION AND PURPOSE

The purpose of the program was to develop the project appraisal, management and evaluation skills of mid-level officials concerned with development projects in Thailand. The extent to which this purpose has been achieved can be assessed partly through an examination of participant performance on the program and partly through participants' evaluation of the extent to which they have acquired the needed skills and knowledge. If possible, a follow-up survey should be carried out at a later date (in 6 to 12 months) by DTEC to assess the impact of the training on actual job performance.

A secondary aspect, as in the case of previous programs, is to provide training in a cost-effective manner through in-country, as opposed to overseas, training. This may be certainly be said to have been achieved since the cost of sending a group of 29 government officials to a similar program in Connecticut would be three or more times as much.

B. PARTICIPANT PERFORMANCE

Participant performance on the program has already been summarised above. Although it is difficult to compare the performance of this group of participants to any other group, the opinion of the instructional team and of the facilitators, all of whom were members of previous programs, was that this group performed very well. The increases in learning, as gauged by a comparison of pre-test and test scores, was good, and the quality of individual projects was exceptionally good.

C. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

The interim and final evaluations by participants, summarized in Appendices D and G provide a further basis for judging the relevance of the program and the quality of instruction given.

III. PARTICIPANT PERFORMANCE

A. LEARNING GAIN AND OVERALL PERFORMANCE

In contrast to the previous programs the three tests that were given had to be completed in the classroom in examination conditions. Apart from calculators, discount tables and dictionaries, participants were not allowed to refer to texts or notes in answering the questions. By comparing scores on the preliminary skills assessment (pretest) with the average scores on the learning assessments (tests) it is found that nearly all participants raised their scores by 30 or 40% and some did so by as much as 60%. This represents an excellent learning gain.

All written assignments were conscientiously carried out, though the extent to which reading assignments were done is uncertain.

As had been mentioned above the quality of individual projects was outstanding.

In the overall final assessment of participants there were 2 A+'s, 7 A's, 16 A-'s, 4 B+'s and 2 B's.

B. INFORMAL OBSERVATION AND COMMENTS BY PROGRAM TEAM

Instructors and facilitators commented on the following points:

1. standards of English were generally adequate, but those with lower English scores tended to have much greater difficulty in coping with the work of the program;
2. the group was extremely hardworking and conscientious;
3. there was a high degree of math anxiety among some members of the group;
4. group members had very limited knowledge of the way projects were implemented at grass roots level; they had a headquarters outlook and there were no field officials to balance this, as in previous groups. It would have been advantageous to have had a group with more varied backgrounds.

C. CONCLUSIONS

The high overall gradings, the excellent quality of individual projects and the good learning gains as reflected in test scores give a good indication of the increased skills and knowledge gained by participants on the program and indicate the likelihood of a desirable impact on participant performance.

IV. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

The interim evaluation completed by participants at the midpoint of the program is summarised at Appendix D. The IPS International team leader's comments are at Appendix E. Although direct comparisons between participant evaluations from different groups are not necessarily significant, it is noted that participant evaluations were somewhat higher than for the previous programs.

The final evaluation, summarised at Appendix G, reflects a continued high degree of satisfaction with almost all aspects of the program. Specific highlights are mentioned here.

A. OVERALL REACTION TO THE PROGRAM

In answer to the question that asked whether participants would recommend that others in their organization should attend any future program, all participants responded affirmatively, except for one whose copy of the final evaluation form was missing the relevant page and another who did not answer any questions on that page. Three participants specifically referred to the need of budget analysts for the training. A number of participants emphasized their answers using phrases such as "strongly recommended".

Another question asked the participants to rate the program on a scale of 1 to 6 in response to the following statement and question:

"The purpose of the program is to increase your knowledge and skills in project management. To what extent has this purpose been realized for you?"

Responses were as follows:

Completely		Partially		Not at all	
1	2	3	4	5	6
7	15	4	-	-	-

This gives a mean rating of 1.88 which indicates that the purpose of the program had been largely realized for the majority of participants.

B. MOST AND LEAST VALUABLE PARTS OF THE PROGRAM

Performance Improvement Programming (PIP) was mentioned 13 times as the most valuable part of the program. In addition 6 mentioned Specific Project Strategies, the module in which PIP was presented, 3 mentioned PIP tutorials and 1 mentioned the related topic of MBO. Thus a total of 23 mentions indicates that the group as a whole found PIP the most valuable part of the program.

The next highest number of mentions was for the module on the Human Relations Aspects of Project Implementation which was mentioned by 12 participants. Systems Approach to Project Management received 9 mentions (plus one for Systems Analysis). The Financial Aspects of Project Analysis was mentioned by 8 participants. The module on Project Appraisal Methodology received 5 mentions with another 3 for Project Analysis. The Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Evaluation module received 5 mentions.

The full list is summarized in Appendix G.

In the least valuable category only one topic was mentioned more than once. This was the module on the Financial Aspects of Project Analysis. Only five topics were mentioned altogether.

C. APPLICATION OF LEARNING TO JOBS

In the questions which asked participants to list the specific things they had learned on the program which they would apply on their jobs, PIP again received the most mentions. (15 for PIP, 1 for PIP tutorials and 1 for Specific Project Strategies, making 18 in all.)

Human Relations Aspects of Project Implementation again was the next highest with 9 mentions plus one for "Transactional Communication". (An introduction to Transactional Analysis formed part of the Human Relations Aspects module.)

Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Evaluation was mentioned by 4 participants; two more mentioned Monitoring; and a further 2 mentioned Project Evaluation, making 8 mentions in all.

Financial Aspects of Project Analysis was mentioned by six participants and a seventh listed Project Financial and Economic Analysis.

Project Appraisal Methodology, and Communication and Information were each mentioned 4 times; Systems Approach was mentioned 3 times; Economic Analysis was mentioned twice; and Logical Framework was mentioned once.

D. RELEVANCE OF COURSES

In the open-ended question which asked if there were courses or classes of little or no relevance to participants in their present job, the financial and economic aspects were mentioned more than the general management topics. In particular Financial Aspects of Project Analysis was mentioned by 8 participants. Project Appraisal was mentioned twice; Economic Analysis, Project Evaluation, Paper Tower (a reference to a learning game), and Systems Approach were each mentioned once.

One participant commented that if his/her actual work really

corresponded to his/her job description, all topics would be relevant.

In a separate question in which participants were asked to indicate in a matrix whether each module was "Very relevant", "Relevant" or "Not relevant" to their needs, Financial Aspects of Project Analysis was listed by 4 participants as not relevant. Other "not relevant" listings were Project Appraisal Methodology (3), Specific Project Strategies (2), Communication and Information (2), and PIP tutorials (1).

E. SUGGESTED ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following suggestions were made for additions to the program. 6 participants suggested that more time should be allowed. A seventh suggested more time for reading assignments. 3 referred to the need for field trips or site visits. The addition of Cost Effectiveness Analysis, social aspects of Project Appraisal Methodology, and Management Science were each suggested once. More case studies were asked for by one participant. There were also suggestions that Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Evaluation should be covered in more detail. The same suggestion was made for Project Evaluation and Social Cost Benefit Analysis.

One other suggestion suggested that the financial and economic aspects should be linked to PIP. Finally there was a suggestion that one of the instructors should go more slowly.

Four suggestions were made for topics to be deleted. Each suggestion was made by one person only. The topics were Human Relations Aspects, Communication and Information, Evaluation Game, and Paper Tower. (The reference to Evaluation Game is not understood by the writer of this report.)

F. QUALITY OF PRESENTATION

Quality of presentation was generally considered good or adequate. 2 persons considered the quality of presentation of Project Appraisal Methodology poor, and there were single listings of poor presentation for Human Resource Aspects, Communication and Information, Financial Aspects of Project Analysis and PIP tutorials. It does appear, however, that the matrix design of this part of the questionnaire caused some confusion. The answers in the matrix do not tally well with the answers to the questions about the instructors.

G. LENGTH OF TIME

A persistent theme throughout the entire evaluation is the need for more time. This applies to the program as a whole and to the time allowed for individual modules. In particular 16 participants felt there was not enough time allowed for Project Appraisal Methodologies; 15 listed Project Scheduling, Monitoring

and Evaluation, and Financial Aspects of Project Analysis as needing more time. For other modules the majority of participants felt that the amount of time spent was just right though in some cases sizable minorities wanted more time.

H. INSTRUCTORS

The ratings of instructors in the seven questions about instructor performance was very high. On a scale of 1 (highest) to 6 (lowest) the combined average rating for the instructional team was 1.41, indicating a very high degree of participant satisfaction with the team. All three members received average ratings of better than 1.5. (Mayo-Smith 1.29, Delp 1.44, Ruther 1.49).

I. FACILITATORS

The ratings for the facilitators varied considerably. Khun Pisamai received the very high rating of 1.35. The combined average rating for all four instructors was 1.7. In an open-ended question three participants criticised one of the facilitators whose average rating in the structured questions was 2.01.

The disadvantage of having a change of the facilitators in mid-course has already been mentioned. It is clear that a competent facilitator can make a major contribution to the program, but a facilitator's ability to make this contribution depends to a large extent on his or her being present from the beginning of the program.

J. ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

A mean rating of 1.74 indicated a generally favorable response to the organization of the program. A very high rating of 1.23 was given to the support received from the DTEC staff on site. In particular Khun Malinee, the full time on-site Co-ordinator received multiple tributes from participants in an open ended question. The support which she gave the instructional team, facilitators and participants was outstanding. In this she was ably assisted by Khun Chaipat Chaipawat and Khun Varee.

K. FACILITIES AND ACCOMMODATION

Living arrangements at the hotel were rated low with a mean rating of only 2.71. In answer to a question whether they would recommend that the same training site be used again, 16 participants responded negatively, and in many cases emphatically so. 10 answered affirmatively and another 3 gave qualified affirmative answers. 2 did not answer the question.

The poor quality of the microphone/public address system in the training room received unfavorable comment. Other complaints referred to the general quality of hotel service, the food, the lack of a telephone system and the lack of hotel transportation.

L. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS BASED ON PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

It is clear from the participant evaluation that the general feeling was that the program was relevant to their work, that the instructional design is basically sound, that the quality of the instructional team is high, that the facilitators were generally satisfactory with one being outstanding, that the on-site logistical support was excellent, but that the living arrangements at the hotel left a great deal to be desired.

V. OVERVIEW OF STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

A. SELECTION

English language capability is a major factor in a participant's ability to gain from the program. The current pass level of 50% should be maintained or, if possible, raised to 55 or 60%. Waivers could possibly be made in very exceptional cases (similar to the case of Khun Suphorn, an experienced officer who in spite of relatively poor English skills managed to make full use of the training opportunity offered and who developed an excellent PIP project.)

The most unusual feature of this group was the preponderance of women participants (26 out of 31). This certainly affected the dynamics of the group (which are very different from the two previous groups) and may have been a reason for the conscientiousness of the group. It is suggested that a somewhat more normal balance between the sexes may be desirable for the next program, but this is not really considered a very significant factor.

A more significant factor was the fact that all participants came from central government agencies involved in the planning and monitoring of projects. No field officials were included nor were representatives of the major operating ministries such as Public Health, Agriculture, Interior and Education. Thus the point of view of the implementers of projects was not represented among the participants. A mix of participants including field personnel, would have many advantages and would help all concerned get a better appreciation of all aspects of project planning, appraisal, monitoring, implementation and evaluation.

It was unfortunate, particularly with a group drawn entirely from central agencies, that no field visits to development projects were possible. This should be planned for in future programs.

The group included a wider range of civil service grade levels than previously. This did not appear in any way to affect the homogeneity of the group and no rank consciousness was observed.

B. SIZE OF GROUP

A group of 25 to 30 is considered optimal. Over 30 is too large and results in participants receiving less individual attention than is desirable. This applies particularly to the PIP tutorials. It also makes it more difficult to supervise and control the structured experiences, learning games and discussions of case studies, and other small group activities.

C. INSTRUCTION AND PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The basic structure of the current program design appears sound, though certain modules require longer time than was possible in a five week program. It is not considered that any part of the present design should be dropped.

The six hour working day is considered satisfactory. Occasional evening classes or tutorials can be given by instructors but as far as possible evenings should be left free for facilitator sessions and for work on assignments. Saturday classes should, if possible, be avoided. Weekends could, however, on occasion be utilized for field trips.

The lack of field trips to development projects on this program was unfortunate. Such visits can be extremely helpful in bringing home to headquarters personnel the realities of project management in the field. Future programs should include visits to development projects as an integral part of program design.

Case study materials in the Thai context were used to a greater extent on this program than on any previous program. There is a need, however, for still further Thai case study materials to be developed.

D. FACULTY

Overall ratings for faculty were the highest ever. The higher ratings for Mayo-Smith and Delp may partly reflect their increased experience in Thailand. Ruther's ratings were very high for an instructor teaching the program in Thailand for the first time. The present team seems to meet the needs of participants very well. If possible the same team should be retained for future programs. If it is not possible to retain the services of all three for the next program not more than one change should be made in the team.

It is desirable that all three instructors continue to extend their knowledge of Thai culture and of project management practices and problems in Thailand. The suggestion has been made by DTEC that two of the instructors should arrive in Thailand two weeks in advance of the next program to develop case materials on project management in Thailand. This suggestion is supported.

There would also be an advantage if the instructors and facilitators could meet in advance of the program.

E. MATERIALS

The quality and quantity of handout materials was better than on either of the two previous programs and most handout material was sent to DTEC in advance of the program. Much more material was specifically adapted to Thai circumstances.

A considerably smaller quantity of books was provided this time. The reasons for this were partly the short notice in which to order books, partly the fact that certain books were not available at reasonable cost and partly an attempt to rationalize the books provided. In retrospect it now appears that changes should be made in the books provided. Texts in project monitoring and evaluation, in the political dimensions of project management, and a new general text in project management should be provided. The UNIDO book on "Guidelines for Project Evaluation" and Gittinger's "Economic Analysis of Agricultural Projects" were found to be not particularly useful for this group and will not be included in future.

Prepared transparencies were brought out. One instructor's transparencies were made in too small print and were difficult to read from the back of the class. In future all prepared transparencies should be in as large lettering as possible.

As in previous programs the amount of reading assignments tended to be greater than many of the participants could cope with. As a result facilitators were sometimes asked to summarize the reading assignments for participants. Greater use should be made of handouts paraphrasing the major points in reading assignments.

F. EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANT PERFORMANCE

The overall assessment of participant performance, using the five categories of performance with different weights attached to each category, which was used on this program differed somewhat from the system for evaluating participants on the two previous programs. The average test result score replaced the former category of "learning gain". The Self Assessment was dropped. "Quality of Project Work" was this time based solely on individual projects, since the group project was eliminated from the program. Thus there were five categories with "Active Participation in Class" counting for 15% of overall grading, "Completion of Assignments" counting for 20%, "Quality of Project Work", for 25%, "Test Scores" for 20%, and "Instructors' Overall Assessment" for 20%.

The evaluation system should again be reexamined. The weighting attached to Test Scores should probably be raised to 25%, making it of equal weight to the Quality of Project Work. Since few written assignments were given and all were completed by all participants, it was difficult to differentiate between participants under this heading. For instructors' overall assessments one instructor tended to give noticeably lower ratings than the other two, who were attempting to rate participants on the same general basis as in IPS International's Hartford based programs. Compromises were reached on the final ratings given under this heading. All participants participated actively in classroom activities, though it was noticeable that those with higher English language capabilities participated more fully in whole group discussions. The participants with lower English scores, however, participated very fully in small group

exercises. In these exercises Thai was frequently used as the medium of communication between participants.

Instructors were satisfied that the final overall assessments did give a fairly accurate picture of the relative performance of participants. The two who achieved A+ gradings were clearly outstanding; those who received As were all excellent participants and merited a slightly higher grading than the large number who obtained A-s. Those who obtained B+s or Bs were good conscientious participants who performed to the best of their ability, but were, in some cases, handicapped by lower English language capabilities.

G. FACILITATORS

Much has already been said about the facilitators in this report. The use of previous outstanding participants is still regarded as the best way to select facilitators. But the desirability of having a team of facilitators who can remain throughout the program cannot be overstressed. A minimum team of two facilitators is needed. Three would be better. Just as instructors have their special areas of strength and no instructor is able to teach all aspects of the program, facilitators cannot be expected to be equally knowledgeable about all parts of the program. The ideal situation would be probably to have one facilitator working primarily with one instructor. Khun Pisamai Chandavimol was an outstandingly good facilitator and, if her services were again available, would be an excellent future choice. Khun Valairat Sriaroon and Khun Suthanone Funatammasan, the two participants who gained A+ overall gradings, appear to have an excellent grasp of all aspects of the program and would also be likely to prove excellent facilitators. Almost any of the participants who achieved As could be considered if none of the above were available. The Team Leader would be happy to discuss choice of facilitator as and when details of timing for the next program are known.

H. FACILITIES

The Jomtien Palace Hotel does have many advantages as a training site. But until the management is prepared to remedy the defects in services that have already been mentioned, it should not be used again. An attractive alternative site in Pattaya is the Island View Hotel. The training room there is not quite as good as at Jomtien Palace, but it has a better and more reliable public address system. They can provide better office space. The hotel service is, reputedly, of a much higher standard. There are telephones in all rooms and satisfactory transportation arranging for getting in to Pattaya City. The hotel appears to have a very competent and businesslike management and the facilities can be made available in the off season at very competitive rates.

The disadvantages of Pattaya as a training site is the lack of suitable development projects that can be visited in the area.

This could be overcome either by including an extended field trip in the program, or by holding the program at another site. Both Korat and Chiang Mai have been suggested as possible alternative sites. Hua Hin is another possible site, but participants on the last program had so many complaints about the Railway Hotel that, unless and until improvements are made, it should not be considered.

I. TIMING

If possible the rainy season should be avoided since holding the program in the rainy season reduces the possibility of field trips to the sites of development projects. Recommended times would be during the period from late October to mid-December, or mid-January through early April, or mid-April through late May.

J. LOGISTICS

Logistics, other than the problems of transportation and telephone communication at the Jomtien Palace Hotel, were satisfactory. The support given by the USAID Sub-Division and the DTEC Coordinator on-site were excellent. All necessary facilities for typing, copying and duplicating were provided, and an extremely efficient secretary was present throughout the program.

At the Jomtien Palace Hotel the training room was good. An adequate overhead projector was provided. There was also a makeshift easel for flipcharts. The one serious weakness was the unreliability of the public address system.

K. EVALUATION

If it is possible for DTEC to carry out a follow-up evaluation on the impact of the training program, it is strongly recommended that this should be done.

One aspect of such a follow-up should be to ascertain the extent to which participants have implemented the individual projects which they prepared on the course. According to estimates, given by participants in class, if only half of the projects are implemented, the savings to the Royal Thai Government will greatly exceed the cost of the training program.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
ATTENDING PROJECT MANAGEMENT
AT JOMTIEN PALACE HOTEL
AUGUST 22 - SEPTEMBER 23, 1983

<u>No.</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Name of Participant</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	<u>Office of the Prime Ministry</u>		
	Office of the Permanent Secretary of Prime Minister's Office	Mrs. Nongkran Chanvanichporn Mrs. Prisna Pongtadsirikul Mrs. Eurmphorn Siriprasert	Policy and Plan Analyst 5 Policy and Plan Analyst 5 Policy and Plan Analyst 5
	Budget Bureau	Miss Valairat Sriaroon Mr. Prisdang Choopen Mrs. Yooktawadee Dhanagom Mrs. Manthanee Yaisawang Miss Nipaporn Lithicharoenporn Mrs. Orawan Chayangkool Mrs. Somjai Dhiratayakinant Mrs. Anong Grisanarungkoon	Budget Analyst 6 O & M Analyst 5 Training Officer 4 Systems Analyst 5 Budget Analyst 4 Budget Analyst 6 Budget Analyst 6 Budget Analyst 6
	Civil Service Commission	Mrs. Pawana Hongmanop Miss Jittsupa Sripromma Nuss Vena Sivakom	Examiner 5 Personnel Analyst 5 Personnel Analyst 5
	National Economic and Social Development Board	Mr. Jaturont Pichitanont Miss Chomphoonut Chawanonondh Miss Srisunun Hounsuwan	Policy and Planning Analyst 4 Policy and Planning Analyst 4 Policy and Planning Analyst 4
	Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation	Mrs. Chitrapa Soontornpipit Mrs. Pranissorn Hosakul Mrs. Suthanone Funtammasan Mr. Chaipat Chaipawat Miss Chintana Natratud	Technical Cooperation Officer5 Technical Cooperation Officer5 Technical Cooperation Officer4 Technical Cooperation Officer3 Technical Cooperation Officer3
2	<u>Ministry of Finance</u>		
	Comptroller General Fiscal Policy Office	Mrs. Suparat Thanyanuwat Miss Jaree Patomburana Mrs. Wantanee Wanapun Miss Punna Junprajao	Fiscal Technician 6 Economist 4 Economist 4 Economist 4
3	Office of the Auditor General	Mr. Tanet Srijan Miss Revadee Noparutruangden Mr. Suporn Phatanabhumirichai	Auditor 6 Auditor 4 Auditor 6
4	USAID/Thailand	Mrs. Supanee Artchinda Ms. Pornsiri Chatyanonda	Economist Assistanct Program Officer

APPENDIX B

DTEC English Test Scores

1.	Mrs Prisna Pongtadsirikul	87.00%
2.	Miss Valairat Sriaroon	86.66%
3.	Mrs Suthanone Funtammasan	85.33%
	Mr Prisdang Choopen	85.33%
5.	Mrs Yooktawadee Dhanagom	82.66%
	Miss Jaree Patomburana	82.66%
7.	Mrs Pawana Hongmanop	82.33%
8.	Mr Jaturont Pichitanont	81.00%
9.	Mrs Manthaneeyaisawang	75.66%
10.	Miss Jittsupa Sripromma	74.33%
11.	Mrs Pramissorn Hosakul	74.00%
12.	Mrs Wantanee Wanapun	71.33%
	Miss Chomphoonut Chawanonondh	71.33%
14.	Miss Chintana Nettasna	70.33%
15.	Miss Nipaporn Lithicharoenporn	70.00%
16.	Mrs Orawan Chayangkool	68.33%
17.	Mr Chaipat Chaisawat	67.00%
18.	Mrs Eurmphorn Siriprasert	66.66%
19.	Miss Srisunun Hounsawan	65.66%
20.	Mrs Somjai Dhiritayakinant	64.66%
21.	Mrs Supparat Thanyanuwat	63.00%
22.	Miss Vena Sivakor	61.00%
23.	Mr Tanet Srijan	59.00%
24.	Mrs Anong Grisanarungkoon	58.00%
25.	Mrs Chitrapa Soontornpipit	55.66%
26.	Miss Revadee Noparutruangden	54.33%
27.	Miss Punna Jundrajao	53.66%
28.	Mrs Nongkran Chanvanichpon	50.33%
29.	Mr Suphorn Patanaghumivichai	48.00%

Note: Mrs Supanee Artchinda and Ms Pornsiri Chatiyononda of USAID/Bangkok did not take the DTEC English test.

APPENDIX C

PROGRAM MODULES AND TEXT BOOKS

LIST OF MODULES

Systems Approach to Project Management
Specific Project Strategies
Communication and Information for Project Success
Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Evaluation.
Human Relations Aspects of Project Implementation
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis
Project Appraisal Methodologies

The program also includes:

Review Sessions
Learning Progress Assessments
Tutorials

Thai facilitator sessions will be given in the evenings as and when required.

SYSTEM APPROACH TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT

PART I FUNDAMENTALS OF MANAGEMENT

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

By the end of this module participants will be able

1. to identify at least ten major responsibilities of a manager in the traditional view;
2. to describe the essential differences of managerial attitudes reflected in McGregor's Theories X and Y and to describe the implications of these attitudes;
3. to summarize changes in the concepts of managerial roles and responsibilities as a result of the work of McGregor, Drucker and later theorists.

COURSE OUTLINE:

In the course of this module participants, during guided discussion will

1. formulate their own ideas as to the functions and role of managers,
2. assess their own attitudes as managers in the light of the ideas of Douglas McGregor and later theorists,
3. discuss and evaluate the changes in the concepts of management which involve attempts to reconcile and integrate personal and organizational goals (such as MBO and OD).

PART II: THE SYSTEMS APPROACH

This module is designed to provide participants with a systematic way of thinking about the complex situation facing project managers in developing countries. One which stresses the wholistic, future-oriented and inter-relatedness of development activities. Specifically, participants will be able:

- 1) to explain the principle concerns facing the managers who apply a systems approach to their work.
- 2) to conceptualize a hypothetical situation in a systems context including - purpose; interacting variables and environmental factors; cause and effect relationships and feedback.
- 3) to compare and contrast the systems approach to the traditional approaches to management citing advantages and disadvantages of both.

Outline

This module will use class discussion and exercises to cover the following topics:

- 1) Overview of systems thinking.
- 2) Systems and sub-systems : different perspectives.
- 3) Characteristics of systems.
- 4) Exercise in defining a system.
- 5) Analysis of an issue using the systems approach.

PART III: THE PROJECT AS A SYSTEM

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

To describe the life cycle of a typical project, comparing and contrasting the processes implemented by the Royal Thai Government with project cycles of the bilateral and multilateral donor agencies.

To describe the project approach using systems concepts and to summarize advantages and limitations of the project format to development.

COURSE OUTLINE:

1. The project cycle and development planning.
2. Projects and the Systems Concept.
3. The project environment : technical, institutional, social, commercial, financial and economic aspects.
4. Limitations to the Project approach.
5. Projects and Thai development experience.

(Participant Panel)

SPECIFIC PROJECT STRATEGIES

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

At the end of this workshop the participants will be able

1. to describe the basic components and characteristics of an MBO system;
2. to describe the stages and steps in Performance Improvement Planning;
3. to write objectives, determine appropriate performance indicators and set targets;
4. to carry out a force field analysis of an actual problem;
5. to lead a structured brainstorming session;
6. to plan strategies and action plans related to specific objectives and targets, together with detailed arrangements for the implementation and monitoring of these strategies and plans.
7. to carry out a network analysis and draw a Critical Path Network for a project.

COURSE OUTLINE:

1. What is MBO?
 - a) A systems approach to management.
 - b) Definitions: mission, goals, objectives, targets.
 - c) Basic needs of a manager.
2. What is PIP?
 - a) PIP as a modification of MBO with a proven record of success in developing countries.
 - b) The four stages of PIP.
 - c) Objectives, targets and performance indicators.
3. Force Field Analysis

A practical exercise will be carried out in class.
4. Brainstorming

A practical exercise will be carried out in class.

Specific Project Strategies cont.

5. Network analysis

The concepts of network analysis will be examined and a practical exercise will be carried out in class.

6. Project Work

During this workshop participants will design a group project based on a hypothetical situation. They will also prepare individual projects under faculty guidance. The individual projects will be based on each participant's actual work situation and will be capable of implementation on completion of the program.

COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION FOR PROJECT SUCCESS

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

To enable the participant:

- a) to describe basic communication and information systems.
- b) to formulate and apply rules for effective communication.
- c) to avoid or overcome barriers to effective communication.
- d) to explain the difference between the data and information resources and various transformation methods.
- e) to analyze the relevance of recorded information to achieving project objectives.
- f) to explain critical considerations to keep in mind in designing or improving project information systems including essential equipment and procedures.
- g) to identify potentials and limits of a variety of information technologies in project information systems.
- h) to communicate with a variety of experts in the records and information technology fields.

COURSE OUTLINE:

This module will use lecturettes, class exercises, games and case studies to cover the following topics:

- a) Oral communication, including:
 - Basic Communications model.
 - One way and two way communication
 - Perception.
 - Information Sharing.
 - Chains of Communication.
- b) Non-Verbal Communication.
- c) Managing the Information Resource System including:
 - Characteristics of the information resource.
 - Simple project information system model with purpose and control elements.
 - Innovative information resource management model.
 - Key assumptions in designing information systems.
 - Typical problems in implementing information systems.
- d) Managing the Recorded Information Resource including:
 - Essential and non-essential information.
 - The cycle of recorded information and key management issues.
 - Guidelines for setting standards for effective use of recorded

information.

- e) Information Technologies
 - Technology and change
 - Evolution of information handling technologies
 - Applications of various technologies to improve project management
 - Considerations in introducing new technologies for handling information.

PROJECT SCHEDULING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

By the end of this module, participants will be able:

1. To develop a logically related set of project objectives, sub-objectives, and activities using objective trees, means-ends analysis, and the logical framework techniques.
2. To specify and arrange project activities into a logical implementation sequence using techniques such as work breakdown structures and network diagrams.
3. To develop and analyze a critical path network for project scheduling and control.
4. To describe various project cost control techniques and evaluate their applicability in various situations.
5. To explain the reasons for using one or more methods for monitoring and evaluating projects in different situations.
6. To relate the information from the project monitoring and evaluation system to the different levels of decision-making and control.
7. To explain some of the critical considerations to keep in mind when designing a system to monitor and evaluate their projects.

COURSE OUTLINE:

1. The logic of project objectives and activities - exercises in using tree diagrams, objective trees, and means-ends analysis.
2. The structure and sequence of project activities - introduction to work breakdown structures and network diagramming techniques.
3. Critical Path analysis and resource scheduling.
4. Introduction to project cost control techniques.
5. Introduction to monitoring, on-going evaluation and ex-post evaluation techniques including an exercise on the logical framework matrix for project evaluation.
6. The requirements for the design of an effective project monitoring and evaluation system including matching decision needs with information outputs and data-gathering methods with resource availability (time, skills, money).

HUMAN RELATIONS ASPECTS OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

The participant will be able to diagnose organizational climate, to develop project teams and to employ various strategies to ensure successful project implementation.

COURSE OUTLINE:

1. Organizational climate.
Symptoms of healthy and unhealthy organizations.
2. Team building.
 - a) The dynamics of working groups.
 - b) Strategies for building teams.
3. The consultant role.
 - a) Process consultation.
 - b) Developing a consultant relationship.
4. Planning and managing change.
5. Strategies for obtaining support from local actors.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF PROJECT ANALYSIS

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

1. To understand the basic concepts of the time value of money and opportunity costs and to compute discounted cash flows.
2. To prepare a simple enterprise (farm) budget and determine cashflows with and without the project.
3. To compute measures of project worth such as payback period, net present value, benefit-cost ratio, and internal rate of return.
4. To compare and contrast different financial decision criteria for selecting between projects.

COURSE OUTLINE:

1. The Time Value of money and Opportunity Costs.
2. Undiscounted Measures of Project Worth - payback period
3. Enterprise (Farm) budgets and incremental cash flow analysis
4. Discounted Measures of Project Worth, - net present worth, benefit-cost ratio
5. Measures for project selection
6. Sensitivity analysis and the treatment of risk and uncertainty.

PROJECT APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

By the end of this module participants will be able:

1. To describe, compare, and contrast project appraisal methodologies such as Cost effectiveness analysis, and financial and economic analysis.
2. To identify relevant benefits and costs for typical projects and describe steps necessary to measure and assess them, including the use of shadow prices.
3. To examine the distributional aspects of a typical project and spread of benefits in light of project objectives.

COURSE OUTLINE:

1. Identify project costs and benefits - a framework.
2. Cost-effectiveness Analysis - concepts.
3. Economic vs. Financial Analysis - Shadow prices.
4. Valuing costs, benefits.
5. Social Cost Benefit Analysis Methodology.

List of Text Books

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Elements of Project Management USDA/USAID.

Kolb, Rubin and Mc Intyre, Organizational Psychology: An Experiential Approach, Prentice-Hall Inc.

Fordyce, Jack, and Raymond Weil, Managing with People, Addison-Wesley (Revised Edition).

Gittinger, Price. Economic Analysis of Agricultural Projects (Revised Edition), Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gittinger, Price. Compounding and Discounting Tables for Project Evaluation, Economic Development Institute, the World Bank.

Mayo-Smith, Ian, Preparing a Performance Improvement Project: A Practical Guide, Kumarian Press Inc.

Delp, Peter et al, Systems Tools for Project Planning, International Development Institute, University of Indiana.

UNIDO, Guidelines for Project Evaluation, United Nations.

Interim Evaluation

An interim evaluation of the program was held at the midpoint, on Thursday, September 8. All 31 participants completed the questionnaire.

The results of the interim evaluation are tabulated below.

In questions 1 through 5, 8 through 14, and 16 through 26 a six point scale was used where.

1	=	Strongly agree
2	=	Agree
3	=	Mildly agree
4	=	Mildly disagree
5	=	Disagree
6	=	Strongly disagree

The lower scores indicate satisfaction with the program and the higher scores indicate dissatisfaction.

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1. The course material is stimulating.	1	11	1.71
	2	19	
	3	-	
	4	1	
	5	-	
	6	-	
2. The course content and support materials are well designed.	1	10	1.81
	2	18	
	3	2	
	4	1	
	5	-	
	6	-	
3. The contents of the course are relatively simple.	1	2	2.87
	2	13	
	3	8	
	4	3	
	5	5	
	6	-	
4. The contents of the course are relevant to my job.	1	9	2.3
	2	8	
	3	10	
	4	1	
	5	2	
	6	-	
	No answer	1	
5. The lessons from the course will be useful to me in my work in the future.	1	18	1.5
	2	10	
	3	1	
	4	1	
	5	-	
	6	-	
	No answer	1	
6. The duration of the course is:	Too long	1	Note: 1 participant indicated it was too long from the point of view of separation from family but too short relative to the content.
	Just right	13	
	Too short	16	

Results of the Interim Evaluation
Page 2

7. Unfortunately question seven on the duration of the working day was omitted during the copying process. This omission was not noticed until it was too late to rectify it.

	Rating	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean
8. The instructor is generally well prepared for class.	1	24	20	23	Ian 1.29
	2	5	8	5	Nancy 1.45
	3	2	3	3	Peter 1.35
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.37
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
9. Explanation of basic concepts and principles is clear and easy to follow.	1	14	5	10	Ian 1.68
	2	13	19	14	Nancy 2.06
	3	4	7	5	Peter 1.9
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.82
10. The instructor is able to create interest in the course material.	1	17	14	13	Ian 1.58
	2	11	15	16	Nancy 1.61
	3	2	2	1	Peter 1.68
	4	1	-	1	Combined 1.62
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
11. The instructor is generally enthusiastic in teaching.	1	24	24	25	Ian 1.23
	2	7	7	6	Nancy 1.23
	3	-	-	-	Peter 1.19
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.22
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
12. The instructor has excellent knowledge of the subject.	1	25	18	24	Ian 1.17
	2	5	11	6	Nancy 1.43
	3	-	1	-	Peter 1.2
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.27
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
13. The instructor allows enough question time and all questions are answered satisfactory.	1	17	9	13	Ian 1.52
	2	12	18	17	Nancy 1.84
	3	2	4	1	Peter 1.61
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.66
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
14. There is no difficulty in understanding the instructor.	1	12	5	9	Ian 1.8
	2	13	19	14	Nancy 2.1
	3	4	4	6	Peter 1.97
	4	1	2	1	Combined 1.96
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
15. The instructor speaks	Too fast	3	10	14	Note: In number of cases the answers to the questions was qualified by "sometimes"
	Just right	28	21	17	
	Too slow	-	-	-	
	Too loud	-	1	1	
	Just right	26	28	27	
	Too soft	3	-	1	
	Uses simple language	31	25	22	
	Uses too many technical terms	-	6	9	
	Speaks clearly	26	24	25	
	Speaks indistinctly	5	7	6	

Results of the Interim Evaluation
Page 3

16. The use of the microphone is very helpful.	<u>Rat- ing</u>			
	1	9*		*One person added "When it works!"
	2	17		
	3	5		
	4	-		
	5	-		
	6	-		
	<u>Rat- ing</u>	<u>Pis- mai</u>	<u>Ru- ja- pong</u>	<u>Mean</u>
17. The facilitator was well prepared.	1	18	9	Pisamai 1.45
	2	12	17	Rujapong 1.9
	3	1	4	Combined 1.68
	4	-	1	
	5	-	-	
	6	-	-	
	18. The facilitator has a good knowledge of the subject.	1	12	10
2		14	15	Rujapong 1.83
3		4	5	Combined 1.78
4		-	-	
5		-	-	
6		-	-	
19. The facilitator could give all necessary explanations to participants.		1	12	6
	2	14	19	Rujapong 2
	3	4	4	Combined 1.87
	4	-	1	
	5	-	-	
	6	-	-	
	20. The facilitator was helpful and necessary for the course.	1	20	16
2		11	13	Rujapong 1.61
3		-	1	Combined 1.48
4		-	-	
5		-	5	
6		-	-	
21. The facilitator was enthusiastic in facilitating.		1	19	14
	2	12	14	Rujapong 1.68
	3	-	2	Combined 1.53
	4	-	1	
	5	-	-	
	6	-	-	
	22. There was good coordination between the instructors and the facilitators.	1	15	
2		15		
3		1		
4		-		
5		-		
6		-		
23. The training program was well organized and managed.		1	15	
	2	11		
	3	5		
	4	-		
	5	-		
	6	-		
	24. The training facilities were satisfactory.	1	11	
2		7		
3		3		
4		-		
5		1		
6		-		

Results of the Interim Evaluation
Page 4

	<u>Rat- ing</u>		<u>Mean</u>
25. DTEC personnel were helpful and gave helpful and gave good support to the course.	1	24	1.26
	2	6	
	3	1	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
26. The living arrangements at the hotel are satisfactory.	1	3	2.77
	2	13	
	3	8	
	4	3	
	5	3	
	6	1	

The overall evaluation of instructors (on the basis of total scores on questions 8 through 14) was as follows:

Ian	1.47
Nancy	1.67
Peter	1.56
Combined team average	1.57

The overall evaluations of the facilitators (based on the total scores on questions 17 through 21) was as follows:

Pisamai	1.53
Rujapong ^{team}	1.81
Combined average	1.67

Questions 27 to 31 were open-ended questions in which participants were asked for their suggestions on the course, the instructors, the facilitators, the training program arrangements and the living arrangements.

<p>27. Do you have any suggestions about the course?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very interesting project, I'm very glad to be in this program. - give more creative ideas than I expect. It's very useful for my job. <p>I think the course takes too short time, so it will be very useful if its duration is long enough to make the participants learn and understand the course well.</p> <p>IPS should have like this course every year for about different subject.</p> <p>There are rather many Course Outline in the program you should eliminate any unnecessary ones or any details and no course at night.</p> <p>It's a useful course.</p> <p>The course should take longer.</p> <p>I don't like the slide at all. It's very difficult to look at. And I have never seen such a small letter before. Another, I would like you to let me the sheet before explain the lesson so I can go along with it.</p> <p>Course material about the projectors present so small alphabets that cannot see and also the instructors write down is too small.</p> <p>The duration of the course should be 6 weeks.</p> <p>I don't think the duration of the course is too short then the instructors give many lessons everyday.</p>

27. (Continued)

It should be provided for the operational agencies too.

- more relevant case studies
- more methodologies to draw "two-way communication"

It is very interesting and helpful to our job.

The duration of the course is too short, so the instructors try to give a lot of the subjects' content in some period.

As far as the amount of works are concerned, the course should provide Diploma instead of certificate.

Has it (this course) every year so that all Thai Government civil servant will talk same language and think systematically.

Sequence of topic (module) that were taught are quite mixed up. It jumped from this point to another quickly. It causes some difficulties to arrange the participant's understanding.

Takes a little longer.

The duration of the course ought to be extended for more workshop training.

Special consideration should be given to those who have no prior knowledge at all about economics or mathematics when giving lectures/exercise. It's difficult to expect them to comprehend and grasp things as quickly.

No.

28. Any suggestions about the instructors?

Ian: be ware of your speaks, at the beginning just right but getting softly in the middle of speech and back again at the end. However you have a lovely tone of voice.

Peter: same as Ian

No suggestions because they are very good.

Please speak slowly and use the simple term to explain.

The instructors give us too much work to do. Although we would like to do but sure that we cannot do all of its.

Will Nancy relates each topic to the former instructed one.
Will Peter speak slower.

Sometimes, Peter and Nancy speak a little bit too fast, I cannot catch up with you.

Excellent

The instructors should allow enough question time for all participants satisfactory.

They are OK and excellent.

- So far every OK but provided some more "philosophy" behind all topics is given, will be better.

Nancy's sequences of explanation was not quite clear sometimes made the participants confused what she was talking about.

Excellent

All one perfect!

28. (Continued)

Should not give assignment too much.

More example papers/or books about various field of project such as industry education, health project etc.

29. Any suggestions about the facilitators?

- good prepare & knowledge
- very helpful with warm personality & friendly
- don't want to change! (keep Pisamai till the end!)

They should be with us till the end of the course.

They should stay all the course.

They should give more time to review.

They are pretty good.

The facilitators should not be change during the course.

The facilitators should be the same people from the beginning until the end of the course. What happen now is when we are going to get familiar with them, they go home!

The facilitators should not change until the course is end.

They are OK and excellent.

Should be able to broaden participants' ideas.

The facilitators suppose to be in class and answer any problem that might be asked instead of disappear and come back when some people leave, then teach before the instructor. It makes me so confuse.

Rujapong should not teach ahead what the instructor will teach because it will miss leading some participants and make them confused.

Every good

Should have same facilitators for the whole training period. It takes time to get to know and to feel to ask easy questions or ask for explanation.

To have one male and one female

Should have 4-5 facilitators

30. Any suggestion about the training program arrangements?

Perfect

lacks of well planning for something such as Educational Material, facilities

Too much content in the short time.

I don't like to have the course at night.

Time is too short, so that cannot get knowledge, prepare lessons and reading assignment effectively.

It should be arranged a seminar or short course for the senior officials.

30. (Continued)

- course materials should be given in advance
- more evening-sessions instead of "cramming" in the day.

Duration of the course should be longer than this.

Timing of the training could be extended about 1-2 weeks.

We need some field trip.

If the level of English understanding of the participants is not so good, the training program should be longer than this so that we don't need evening class. Too sleepy!

Special activities such as guest speaker and trip should be discussed and prepared much earlier.

31. Any suggestions about the living arrangements?

At first, it causes some problems, but after talking with the Hotel manager most of things go along well. Not bad to be back again for the next program! + 1 or 2 transportation vehicles.

The place should be near the city.

Everything is good but there's rather many insects.

It's too far from the market.

The hotel is too far so it takes time if we have dinner out.

I would like to have a place which is more convenient than this (transportation). It's rather difficult to go downtown.

Facilities and services should be improved.

- more 1 better atmosphere for incentives of "learning" e.g. mosquitoes, long distant calls being very inconvenient, and a single bed room.

This hotel is not a very good place to stay for long.

Should look for a better location than this, such as better transportation and better communication especially telephone.

Not Jomtien any more

Change the place, don't come back here. Too far from everything e.g. from the sea!

APPENDIX E

Project Management Program
Pattaya, August 22 to September 23, 1983

Interim Report
by Director, IPS International

General

The interim evaluation completed by participants at the midpoint of the program shows that various aspects of this program were rated somewhat higher than either of the previous two programs held at Hua Hin in 1980 and 1981.

The first five questions elicit comments on the course in general. Comparative mean ratings for the present program and the previous programs are as follows:

Question	Present Program	1981	1980	Change over 1981
1. (Course material stimulating)	1.71	1.75	2.05	+0.04
2. (Content and materials well designed)	1.81	1.79	2.17	-0.02
3. (Contents of the course relatively simple)	2.87	3.25	3.83	+0.38
4. (Contents relevant to my job)	2.3	2.32	2.20	+0.02
5. (Lessons will be useful in the future)	1.5	-	-	-

(Note: Since a lower figure indicates a higher rating, the changes have been indicated by a + sign for an improved rating and a - sign for a less favorable rating.)

The only significant difference is that for question number 3.

Length of Program

A slight majority (16 participants) considered the length of the program too short in relation to its content.

Instructors

Ratings for instructors averaged 1.57 for the team of Mayo-Smith, Ruther and Delp. This is higher than the rating of 1.84 for Mayo-Smith and Delp for the 1981 program and 1.96 for Mayo-Smith and Pena for the 1980 program.

Mayo-Smith	1.47 (1.75 in 1981)
Delp	1.56 (1.93 in 1981)
Ruther	1.67

Language difficulties appear to have been significantly less than previously. The relevant question resulted in ratings of

Mayo-Smith	1.8 (2.71 in 1981)
Ruther	2.1
Delp	1.97 (2.93 in 1981)

Facilitators

Participants ratings of facilitators were not significantly different from those for the 1981 program.

(Khun Pisarnri	1.53	Khun Chadchai (1981)	1.52
(Khun Rujapong	1.81	Khun Siri-orn (1981)	1.88

Facilitators (Cont'd)

It should be noted, however, that from the point of view of the instructional team, Khun Pisamai proved to be an outstanding facilitator.

Coordination between instructional team and facilitators was rated at 1.48 (1.57 in 1981, 2.27 in 1980)

Six participants commented on the desirability for facilitators to stay for the whole program. This view is shared by the instructional team. Facilitators joining the program in mid-course face a number of difficulties and it is much harder for them to be as effective as those who are there from the beginning.

Program Arrangements

The three questions on the training program arrangements resulted in ratings as follows:

	Present	1981	1980	Change
23. (Training program well organized and managed)	1.68	1.89	3.7	+0.23
24. (Training facilities satisfactory)	1.84	1.79	4.10	-0.05
25. (DTEC personal gave good help & support)	1.26	1.50	3.10	+0.24

This indicates a general high level of satisfaction with program arrangements.

Living Arrangements

Question 26 on the living arrangements at the hotel elicited a less favorable response with a mean rating of 2.77. Numerous complaints have been made orally to the instructors and co-ordinator regarding the quality of service at the hotel, transport arrangements, mosquitoes, sewerage odors etc. Some improvements have been made.

Participants

Any comparison between the present group of participants and the previous groups would be meaningless as the composition of the present group is very different.

All participants are working extremely hard and complete all written assignment, though reading assignments are often neglected.

General performance is good with a few outstanding performers. Those with lower English scores do have more difficulty with the material, though some appear to be making extra efforts to overcome this.

Anxiety over their mathematical skills worries some participants.

In general, it is a good group and the standard of PIP projects developed on the program is very high.

APPENDIX F

IPS International
Institute of Public Services
University of Connecticut

Department of Technical and
Economic Cooperation
Royal Thai Government

Project Management Program
Pattaya, 1983

Final Evaluation

This questionnaire is designed to provide feedback to the Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation and IPS International regarding the Project Management Program, and to enable us to make whatever changes may be desirable in any future programs.

You may complete the questionnaire anonymously. Or, if you wish to do so, you may put your name in the space below.

We suggest you read quickly through the questionnaire before starting to fill it in.

If, at any part of the questionnaire, you find you do not have enough space for your comments, please use the back of the sheet.

NAME:

1. Please list the parts of the program that you found most valuable and least valuable.

Most Valuable	Least Valuable

2. List the specific things you have learnt which you will apply on your job.

3. If the program is offered again, will you recommend that others in your organization should be sent to the program?

4. Were there any courses or classes for which learning objectives were not clear? (A list of modules is on the next page.)
If so, what were they?

5. Were there some courses or classes of little or no relevance to you in your present job?
If so, what were they?

6. Do you think anything should be deleted from the program?
If so, what should be deleted.

7. Is there anything that should be added to the program to improve it?

8. Please assess the various modules and tutorials, as listed below, by checking the appropriate boxes. If you need additional space for comments, please use the back of the page.

	Relevance to your needs			Presentation quality			Length of time spent			General Comment
	Very Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant	Well Presented	Adequate Presented	Poorly Presented	Too much time	Just right	Too little time	
Systems Approach to Project Management (Ian, Nancy, Peter)										
Specific Project Strategies (Ian, Nancy)										
Communication and Information for Project Success (Ian, Nancy)										
Project Scheduling, Monitoring & Evaluation (Nancy, Peter)										
Human Relations Aspects of Project Management (Ian)										
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis (Peter)										
Project Appraisal Methodologies (Peter)										
PIP Tutorials (Ian, Nancy)										
Facilitator Tutorial Sessions										
1. Pisanai&Rujapong										
2. Chatchai&Watana										

9. The purpose of the program is to increase your knowledge and skills in project management.

To what extent has this purpose been realized for you.

(Please circle the appropriate number on the scale below)

1 2 3 4 5 6
 Completely Partially Not at all

For questions 10 through 29, please indicate by circling the appropriate number whether you agree with the following statements:

- 1 = strongly agree
- 2 = agree
- 3 = mildly agree
- 4 = mildly disagree
- 5 = disagree
- 6 = strongly disagree

10. The Instructor is generally well prepared for class.

Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6

11. Explanation of basic concepts is clear and easy to follow.

Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6

12. The instructor is able to create interest in the course material.

Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6

13. The instructor is generally enthusiastic in teaching.

Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6

14. The instructor appears to have excellent knowledge of the subject.

Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6

15. The instructor allows enough question time and all questions are answered satisfactory.

Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6

16. There is no difficulty in understanding the instructor.						
	Ian	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Nancy	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Peter	1	2	3	4	5 6
17. Use of microphone is very helpful.		1	2	3	4	5 6
18. The facilitator was well prepared.						
	Pisamai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Rujapong	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Chadchai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Watana	1	2	3	4	5 6
19. The facilitator has a good knowledge of the subject.						
	Pisamai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Rujapong	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Chadchai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Watana	1	2	3	4	5 6
20. The facilitator could give all necessary explanations to participants.						
	Pisamai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Rujapong	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Chadchai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Watana	1	2	3	4	5 6
21. The facilitator was helpful to the learning process.						
	Pisamai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Rujapong	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Chadchai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Watana	1	2	3	4	5 6
22. The facilitator was needed to facilitate learning.						
	Pisamai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Rujapong	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Chadchai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Watana	1	2	3	4	5 6
23. The facilitator was enthusiastic in facilitating training.						
	Pisamai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Rujapong	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Chadchai	1	2	3	4	5 6
	Watana	1	2	3	4	5 6
24. There was good cooperation between the instructors and facilitators.		1	2	3	4	5 6
25. The instructors and Thai facilitators were sufficiently available for consultation outside class hours.		1	2	3	4	5 6
26. The training program was well organized and managed.		1	2	3	4	5 6
27. The training facilities were satisfactory.		1	2	3	4	5 6
28. DTEC personnel were helpful and gave good support to the course.		1	2	3	4	5 6
29. The living arrangements at the hotel were satisfactory.		1	2	3	4	5 6

30. If the course is offered again, would you recommend the same training site (Jomtien Palace Hotel, Pattaya)?

If not, where would you recommend?

31. From the point of view of the contents of the course, the duration of the program is (check one)

Too Long
Just Right
Too Short

32. From the point of view of personal and family circumstances, the duration of the program is

Too Long
Just Right
Too Short

33. The length of the working day is

Too Long
Just Right
Too Short

34. Non-Instructional Components of the Program

(General support from non-teaching staff, receiving mail, communication, lunch, and coffee breaks etc.)

Please list the most and least satisfactory non-instructional components of the program from your point of view.

Most Satisfactory	Least Satisfactory

3. Do you have any other practical suggestions for improving the program?

- a) Suggestions about program content training materials and handouts, including calculators.
- b) Suggestions about the instructors.
- c) Suggestions about the facilitators.
- d) Suggestions about the training program arrangements.
- e) Suggests about the living arrangements.
- f) Any other comments or suggestions.

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY OF FINAL PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

A final evaluation was conducted, using the form at Appendix F, on Thursday, September 22. Participants were given the option of putting their names on the forms or completing them anonymously. Five chose to put their names on the form and twenty-six completed it anonymously.

1. In Question 1 participants were asked to list the parts of the program they found most valuable and those parts which they found least valuable.

The single most common response was PIP which was listed by 13 participants. In addition there were 6 mentions of Specific Project Strategies (the module dealing with Performance Improvement Programming), 3 mentions of PIP Tutorials and 1 of MBO, making a total of 23 mentions.

The next highest score was for Human Relations Aspects of Project Management with 12 mentions, followed by Systems Approach to Project Management with 9 (plus one for Systems Analysis). Financial Aspects of Project Analysis was mentioned 8 times. In the least valuable category, Financial Aspects of Project Analysis was mentioned twice.

A full list, with related responses grouped together is given below.

Most Valuable	Times Mentioned	Least Valuable	Times Mentioned
P.I.P.	13	Financial Aspects of Project Analysis	2
Specific Project Strategies	6	Communication and Information for Project Success	1
P.I.P. Tutorials	3	Paper Tower (exercise)	1
MBO	1	PIP Tutorials	1
Human Relations Aspects of Project Management	12	Ian's last session (on the political aspects of project management)	1
Systems Approach to Project Management	9		
Systems Analysis	1		
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis	8		
Project Appraisal Methodologies	5		
Project Analysis	3		
Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Eval- uation	5		
Communication and Information for Project Success	4		
Economic Analysis	2		
Cost Benefit Analysis	1		
Time Value of Money	1		
Objective Tree	1		
Instructors, Participants, Facilitators, Khun Malinee. Also the program is inter- esting and not boring.	1		

2. Question 2 asked participants to list specific things they had learnt which they would apply on their jobs.

Again P.I.P., received most mentions. Fifteen participants listed P.I.P., another two listed P.I.P. tutorials and one listed Specific Project Strategies, making 18 in all.

Human Relations Aspects came next with 9 mentions plus one mention of Transactional Communication. (Transactional Analysis formed part of the Human Relations Aspects module.)

Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Evaluation was mentioned by four participants and two more mentioned Monitoring, and another two mentioned Project Evaluation.

Financial Aspects of Project Analysis received six mentions and a seventh participant listed Project Financial and Economic Analyses.

Project Appraisal Methodology, and Communication and Information each received four mentions.

Systems Approach received three.

Economic Analysis was mentioned twice.

Logical Framework was mentioned once.

3. Question 3 asked participants whether they would recommend that others in their organization should be sent to the program. Apart from one participant, whose questionnaire was missing page 2, and another who did not answer any questions on Page 2, the remaining 29 participants all responded favorably and indicated they would recommend that others in their organization should attend any future programs. Three referred specifically to the needs of budget analysts to attend.

4. Question 4 asked if there were any courses or classes for which learning objectives were not clear.

The majority of the participants indicated that there were no courses or classes for which the objectives were not clear. Those which were mentioned were:

Communications and Information	2 mentions
Project Appraisal Methodology	2 mentions
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis (One commented "The duration is too short")	2 mentions
"The difference between data and information"	2 mentions
Human Relations Aspects	1 mention
Economic Analysis	1 mention
Project Evaluation	1 mention

5. Question 5 asked if there were courses or classes of little or no relevance to participants in their present job.

The following were mentioned:

Financial Aspects of Project Analysis	8 mentions
Project Appraisal	2 mentions
Economic Analysis	1 mention
Project Evaluation	1 mention
Paper Tower	1 mention
Systems Approach	1 mention

One participant commented "If I actually work as what said in my job description, all will be relevant".

6. Question 6 asked whether anything should be deleted from the program.

Only four topics were mentioned.

Human Relations Aspects	1 mention
Communication and Information	1 mention
Evaluation Game	1 mention
Paper Tower	1 mention

7. Question 7 which asked whether anything should be added to the program to improve it, received more comments.

Six participants referred to the need for more time for the program. Another commented "More time to read assignments".

Three referred to the need for field trips or project site visits.

Other suggestions each mentioned by one participant, were as follows:

- Cost Effectiveness Analysis
- Project Appraisal Methodology, social aspect
- "Slower in Peter's"

The P.I.P., it does not emphasize or tell how to fit the project financial and economic analysis with it. Normally I believe all the project is needed to prove in three aspects or clarify how to make use of these analyses.

- Project Evaluation in more detail, technique and exercise.

- More details of Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Evaluation and Social Cost Benefit Analyses.

- More case studies

- Management Science should be added to the program

It's good right now. (Other participants also expressed general satisfaction with the program.)

8. Question 8 requested participants to assess the instructional modules and tutorials for relevance, presentation quality and length of time by placing check marks in the appropriate boxes. The responses to this question indicate that there may have been some confusion caused by the matrix, as the responses, especially with regard to presentation quality, appear to be at variance with responses to other questions in the questionnaire. This may have been caused by participants placing check marks in the wrong boxes due to the confusing design of the matrix.

The responses were as follows:

	Relevance to your needs			Presentation quality			Length of time spent		
	Very Relevant	Relevant	Not Relevant	Well Presented	Adequately Presented	Poorly Presented	Too Much Time	Just Right	Not Enough Time
Systems Approach to Project Management (Ian, Nancy)	13	18	0	18	13	0	1	27	3
Specific Project Strategies (Ian, Nancy)	11	18	2	15	15	0	0	25	5
Communication and Information for Project Success (Ian, Nancy)	13	16	2	19	11	1	1	23	5
Project Scheduling, Monitoring and Evaluation (Nancy, Peter)	9	22	0	14	16	0	0	15	15
Human Relations Aspects of Project Implementation (Ian)	20	10	1	17	12	1	2	19	9
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis (Peter)	12	15	4	18	11	1	1	15	15
Project Appraisal Methodologies (Peter)	14	14	3	15	13	2	0	14	16
PIP Tutorials (Ian, Nancy)	19	11	1	21	9	0	0	20	8

1) Facilitator Tutorial Sessions (Pisamai and Rujapong)	10+ (+1 for P)	14	2+ (+1 for R)	15+ (+2 for P)	11	0 (+1 for R)	0	24 (+1 for P)	2 (+1 for R)
2) Chadchai and Watana		5		8	17	1	0	16	5

9. Question 9 opened with the statement "The purpose of the program is to increase your knowledge and skills in project management" and asked participants to assess the extent to which this purpose had been realized for them by circling the appropriate number on a scale of 1 (=completely) to 6 (=Not at all)

Responses were as follows:

Completely			Partially			Not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6	
7	15	4	-	-	5	

The mean rating was 1.88

10. For questions 10 through 29 participants were asked to indicate by circling the appropriate number whether they agreed or disagreed with a number of statements.

The scale used was

1	=	Strongly Agree
2	=	Agree
3	=	Mildly Agree
4	=	Mildly Disagree
5	=	Disagree
6	=	Strongly Disagree

The Statements and responses were as follows:

10. The Instructor is generally well prepared for class.

	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean Rating
1	26	22	23	Ian 1.16
2	5	7	6	Nancy 1.3
3	-	1	1	Peter 1.27
4	-	-	-	Combined 1.24
5	-	-	-	
6	-	-	-	
No response	-	1	1	

11. Explanation of basic concepts is clear and easy to follow.

	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean Ratings
1	21	9	14	Ian 1.35
2	9	19	12	Nancy 1.81
3	1	3	4	Peter 1.61
4	-	-	-	Combined 1.59
5	-	-	-	
6	-	-	-	

12. The instructor is able to create interest in the course material.

	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean Rating
1	21	17	15	Ian 1.39
2	8	12	11	Nancy 1.52
3	2	2	4	Peter 1.58
4	-	-	-	Combined 1.49
5	-	-	1	
6	-	-	-	

13. The instructor is generally enthusiastic in teaching.

	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean Rating
1	29	27	28	Ian 1.06
2	2	4	3	Nancy 1.13
3	-	-	-	Peter 1.10
4	-	-	-	Combined 1.10
5	-	-	-	
6	-	-	-	

14. The instructor appears to have excellent knowledge of the subject.

	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean Rating
1	28	21	26	Ian 1.10
2	3	8	5	Nancy 1.39
3	-	2	-	Peter 1.16
4	-	-	-	Combined 1.21
5	-	-	-	
6	-	-	-	

15. The instructor allows enough question time and all questions are answered satisfactorily.

	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean Rating
1	23	18	20	Ian 1.29
2	7	12	9	Nancy 1.45
3	1	1	2	Peter 1.42
4	-	-	-	Combined 1.39
5	-	-	-	
6	-	-	-	

16. There is no difficulty understanding the instructor.

	Ian	Nancy	Peter	Mean Rating
1	14	10	10	Ian 1.68
2	13	17	14	Nancy 1.81
3	4	4	6	Peter 1.94
4	-	-	1	Combined 1.81
5	-	-	1	
6	-	-	-	

The average rating for instructors in questions 10 through 16 was:

Ian	1.29
Nancy	1.49
Peter	1.44
Combined	1.41

17. The use of the microphone was very helpful.

1	15	Mean Rating 2.19
2	7	<u>Note</u> Four participants
3	3	made comments on the un-
4	2	reliability of the micro-
5	2	phone/amplifier system.
6	2	

18. The facilitator was well prepared.

	Pisamai	Rujapong	Chadchai	Watana	Mean Ratings
1	21	6	10	7	Pisamai 1.3
2	9	19	17	19	Rujapong 2.3
3	-	1	3	4	Chadchai 1.77
4	-	-	-	-	Watana 1.9
5	-	2	-	-	Combined 1.82
6	-	2	-	-	
No answer	1	1	1	1	

19. The facilitator has a good knowledge of the subject.

	Pisamai	Rujapong	Chadchai	Watana	Mean Ratings
1	18	13	10	12	Pisamai 1.47
2	11	13	17	14	Rujapong 1.83
3	-	1	3	4	Chadchai 1.77
4	1	2	-	-	Watana 1.73
5	-	1	-	-	Combined 1.70
6	-	-	-	-	
No answer	1	-	-	-	

20. The facilitator gave all necessary explanations to participants.

	Pisamai	Rujapong	Chadchai	Watana	Mean Ratings
1	20	10	8	9	Pisamai 1.37
2	9	14	17	15	Rujapong 2.1
3	1	2	4	5	Chadchai 1.8
4	-	2	1	1	Watana 1.93
5	-	1	-	-	Combined 1.8
6	-	1	-	-	
No answer	1	1	1	1	

21. The facilitator was helpful to the learning process.

	Pisamai	Rujapong	Chadchai	Watana	Mean Ratings
1	24	16	14	14	Pisamai 1.23
2	7	10	14	13	Rujapong 1.87
3	-	1	1	2	Chadchai 1.63
4	-	-	1	1	Watana 1.67
5	-	1	-	-	Combined 1.60
6	-	2	-	-	
No answer	-	1	1	1	

22. The facilitator was needed to facilitate learning.

	Pisamai	Rujapong	Chadchai	Watana	Mean Ratings
1	20	16	14	14	Pisamai 1.43
2	7	8	11	11	Rujapong 1.93
3	3	3	4	4	Chadchai 1.77
4	-	-	-	-	Watana 1.77
5	-	1	1	1	Combined 1.72
6	-	2	-	-	
No answer	1	1	1	1	

23. The facilitator was enthusiastic in facilitating training.

	Pisamai	Rujapong	Chadchai	Watana	Mean Ratings
1	23	15	19	16	Pisamai 1.29
2	7	11	11	14	Rujapong 2
3	1	-	1	1	Chadchai 1.42
4	-	2	-	-	Watana 1.52
5	-	1	-	-	Combined 1.56
6	-	2	-	-	

The average rating for facilitators in questions 18 through 23 was:

Pisamai	1.35
Rujapong	2.01
Chadchai	1.69
Watana	1.75
Combined	1.70

24. There was good cooperation between the instructors and facilitators.

1	13	Mean Rating	1.68
2	15		
3	3		
4	-		
5	-		
6	-		

25. The instructors and Thai facilitators were sufficiently available for consultation outside class hours.

1	14	Mean Rating	1.68
2	13		
3	14		
4	-		
5	-		
6	-		

26. The training program was well organized and managed.

1	11	Mean Rating	1.74
2	18		
3	1		
4	1		
5	-		
6	-		

27. The training facilities were satisfactory.

1	6	Mean Rating	2.1
2	19		
3	3		
4	3		
5	-		
6	-		

28. DTEC personnel were helpful and gave good support to the course.

1	25	Mean Rating	1.23
2	5		
3	1		
4	-		
5	-		
6	-		

29. The living arrangements at the hotel were satisfactory.

1	2	Mean Rating	2.71
2	14		
3	10		
4	2		
5	2		
6	1		

30. Question 30 asked participants, if the course were to be offered again, would they recommend the same training site. If not, where would they recommend.

- 10 participants answered with an unqualified "Yes"
- 3 answered with a qualified "Yes" (e.g. if no where else was available) or a "Maybe"
- 16 gave unqualified (and sometimes emphatic) "Nos".
- 2 did not answer the question.

Other sites recommended were

Villa Navin	3 mentions
Phuket	3 mentions
Chiang Mai	2 mentions (1 specified the Chiang Inn)
University of Connecticut	1 mention
Wong Amat	1 mention
Asia Pattaya	1 mention
Hua Hin	1 mention
Royal Cliff	1 mention

Other replies included "Elsewhere in Pattaya". "A place far from city center" and "a place with transportation and telephone".

31. Participants were asked whether the duration of the course was too short, just right or too long from the point of view of the contents of the course.

- 22 answered Too Short.
- 9 answered Just Right.

32. Participants were asked whether the duration was too short, just right or too long from the point of view of personal and family circumstances.

5 answered Too Short
21 answered Just Right
5 answered Too Long

33. Question 33 asked for opinions on the length of the working day.

3 considered it Too Short
15 considered it Just Right
11 considered it Too Long

One person indicated it as too long on some days and just right on others.

One person indicated it was Too Long with night classes and Too Short with (learning) games.

Two of those who answered "Too Long" qualified their answers. One considered the 1 1/2 hour lunch break was too long and the other considered the day too long when there were evening classes.

Another respondent who answered Just Right, qualified his/her answer by adding "except night class".

34. In question 34 participants were asked to list the most and least satisfactory non-instructional components of the program.

On the most satisfactory side twelve participants named Khun Malinee's service (or DTEC Coordinators) as most satisfactory. A thirteenth listed "Support from non teaching staff". "Receiving mail" was mentioned twice.

"Food", "Coffee breaks in the afternoon", and "Lunch and Coffee breaks" were each mentioned once.

Other responses included

"Everything, especially relationship of participants."
"Hotel staff most willing to accommodate our needs."
"When participants need anything, the Jomtien manager try to help us much as he can."
"Swimming pool and location."
"Personnel Manager."
"PIP and Economic Analysis."

On the least satisfactory side "Communications" was mentioned by 10 participants. Another mentioned "Long distance telephone." Two others listed "Transportation".

The food and other hotel services were also listed by 12

participants. These comments included:

"Breaks and lunch often late."
"No hot water."
"There are so many vermins in the house."
"Lunch." (mentioned three times)
"Coffee breaks"
"Food" (mentioned twice)
"Hotel service"
"Facilities in each house"

Three mentioned "Per diem".

Another comment was "Far from Beach."

Finally one respondent commented "I don't like the Budget Bureau (4 of them) group. They don't try to communicate with others. From the beginning (the first day) they live together in the same house and have lunch together at the same table till the last day."

35. The final question (No. 35) asked for practical suggestions for improving the program. These suggestions were under six headings. The headings and participants' comments are given below. (Four participants noted "OK" against all headings.)

- a) Suggestions about program content, training materials and handouts, books and calculators.

Transparency: too small and difficult to see. Should include study tour. Should give the latest model of calculator. Too many books. Handouts should be given before.

More project analysis by squeezing the other modules.

Too much content in short time, but the handout, books and calculator is good.

Too many books are given and most of the participants may not make use of them as you expect, and they waste the fund.

More time.

OK as it is.

Just right.

Good.

About the implementation of PIP (Very short time). (otherwise) no suggestion, all of them are good.

If it is possible afternoon class should take less hours than this.

b) Suggestions about the instructors.

Should to explain by simple word.

Very good.

Good.

Sometimes Nancy's presentation was very difficult to follow because of the way of arranging the sequence.

Nancy should stay until the end of the course.

Should have single instructor (male).

Too fast speaking.

You have a good team of instructors (good combination) already, don't change.

Peter always use two teaching equipments at the same time, that is may make someone confused.

c) Suggestions about the facilitators.

Facilitators should arrive at the right time and have time for the first and second groups to exchange some views.

Should be same person for whole program.

One lady and one man is good combination for a certain period.

Should be the same person throughout the course.

It should have more facilitators in the same time.

The facilitators should not change during the course.

Very good.

At certain points a facilitator interpreted the meaning of our lecturer wrong and he told the participants according to his understanding.

Good and helpful.

Good.

One of the facilitators (1st period) is not satisfied.

Should select the one who is really willing to provide help and intend to help. Not just come because for the

vacation purpose like Rujapong.

All facilitators suppose to stay and help the instructor for the tutorial but for this course Rujapong didn't spend his time for this purpose and when he taught instead of explain the problem, he treated and tried to say that there are a lot more that hard for participants to understand.

- d) Suggestions about the training program arrangements.

Party every Friday. T.G.I.F.

Be offered in Summer time.

Score by grade would define in a different field of each previous study.

The time duration is too short.

Too much content for short time.

It's better if the program extend to six weeks.

Participants should have higher grade from DTEC examination. (It should be 60%).

Not well preparation.

OK as it is.

Good.

Completely.

Upgrade the participants who will come for the program.

- e) Suggestions about living arrangements.

Ought to choose the appropriate location.

Less facilities.

OK as it is.

Satisfaction.

Satisfy.

Imperfect.

- f) Any other comments or suggestions.

Confusions when you switch from this modules to another.

Ought to give more per diem.

No, because its OK and I'm satisfied, Thank you.

There should be higher per diem.

Excellent Malinee.

APPENDIX H

PROGRAM CERTIFICATES AND GRADING

Certificates of Achievement will be awarded jointly by D.T.E.C. and the University of Connecticut to all participants who successfully complete the Project Management Program.

To qualify for a certificate a participant is required to attend at least 95% of all classroom sessions.

Participants will also receive a transcript listing the courses and workshops in the program and giving an overall rating of their performance plus assessments under the following headings:

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|------------|
| 1. | Active Participation in Class. | 15% |
| 2. | Completion of Assignments. | 20% |
| 3. | Quality of project work. | 25% |
| 4. | Test scores. | 20% |
| 5. | Instructors' Overall Assessment. | <u>20%</u> |

100%

Letter grades from A (excellent) through B (very good) and C (satisfactory) to D (unsatisfactory) will be used in assessing participants.

APPENDIX I

Name	Participation 15%	Completion of Assignments 20%	Project Work 25%	Tests 15%	Instructors Overall Rating 20%	Overall 100%
Nongkran	A	A	A	B+	A-	A-
Prisna	A	A	A-	A	A	A
Eurmphorn	A	A	B	B+	A-	A-
Valairat	A+	A	A+	A+	A+	A+
Prisdang	A	A	C-	B-	B	B
Yooktawadee	A	A	B+	A	A	A
Manthane	A-	A	A-	B+	B+	A-
Nipaporn	A+	A	A-	A-	A+	A
Orawan	A	A	A-	B+	B+	A-
Somjai	A	A	B+	B-	A-	A-
Anong	A-	A	A	B	B+	A-
Pawana	A-	A	A	A-	A-	A-
Jittsupa	A-	A	A-	B+	B+	A-
Vena	A-	A	A	B+	A-	A-
Jaturont	A	A	B-	B+	A-	B+
Chomphoonut	A	A	A+	A-	A-	A
Srisunun	A-	A	A	A-	A-	A-
Chitrapa	A	A	A	B	A-	A-
Prawissorn	A-	A	A-	B	B	B+
Suthanone	A+	A	A	A+	A+	A+
Chaipat	A	A	B+	B-	B	B+
Chintana	A	A	A	B+	A-	A-
Suparat	A-	A	A-	B+	A-	A-
Jaree	A	A	A-	A-	A	A
Wantanee	A	A	A-	B+	A	A-
Punna	A-	A	C+	C+	B	B
Tanet	A	A	B+	B	B+	A-
Revadee	A-	A	A-	B	B+	A-
Suphorn	A-	A	A	C+	B	B+
Supanee	A+	A	A-	A	A	A
Pornsiri	A+	A	A+	B+	A	A