

PD-ABN-642

92698

EVALUATION REPORT  
ON THE  
FIFTH PROJECT MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAM

April 22 through May 31, 1985  
Khon Kaen and Chiang Mai

Prepared for

The Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation  
Office of the Prime Minister  
Royal Thai Government

by

Ian Mayo-Smith, Ph.D.  
Director, IPS International

IPS International,  
Institute of Public Service,  
University of Connecticut,  
1800 Asylum Avenue,  
West Hartford,  
CT 06117

June 1985

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

A

## Introduction

The purpose of this evaluative report on the Fifth Project Management Training Program, held at Khon Kaen and Chiang Mai from April 22 through May 31, 1985, is to provide feedback and a basis for future decision making by the agencies concerned in sponsoring, organizing, funding, designing and delivering the program and any future similar programs.

The information in the report is derived from information and opinions provided by participants, instructors, facilitator and DTEC personnel. The inputs to this evaluation include formal written evaluations from participants, the results of formal tests, informal comments by participants and others, discussions held with DTEC and IPS International staff and personal observation.

The preparer of this report gratefully acknowledges the help and assistance provided by Khun Achariya Yuktanandana, Director of the USA Sub-Division of DTEC, and his staff, and of his colleagues at IPS International.

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

June 20, 1985.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary ... ..	1
I. Description of the Program ... ..	5
A. General Background ... ..	5
B. Participant Selection ... ..	6
C. Results of Needs Assessment Questionnaire ...	8
D. Program Contents and Activities ... ..	8
E. Materials ... ..	10
F. Faculty ... ..	10
G. Facilities ... ..	11
H. Assessment of Participant Performance ... ..	11
I. Logistics ... ..	12
J. Evaluation of the Program by Participants ...	13
II. Criteria for Evaluation ... ..	14
A. DTEC's Mission and Purpose ... ..	14
B. Participant Performance ... ..	15
C. Participant Evaluations ... ..	15
III. Participant Performance ... ..	16
A. Test Results and Learning Gain ... ..	16
B. Quality of Project Work ... ..	16
C. Overall Final Results ... ..	16
D. Informal Observation by Instructional Team ...	17
E. Conclusions ... ..	17
IV. Participant Evaluation of the Program ... ..	18
A. Interim Evaluation ... ..	18
B. Final Evaluation - Overall Reaction to the Program	18
C. Most and Least Valuable Parts of the Program	19
D. Application of Learning to Jobs ... ..	19
E. Relevance of Courses to Participants' Jobs ...	20
F. Presentation Quality ... ..	20
G. Length of Time Spent on Each Module ... ..	20
H. Instructors... ..	21
I. Facilitator ... ..	21
J. Field Trips... ..	21
K. Text Books ... ..	21
L. Organization of the Program and Logistical Support	22
M. Living Arrangements ... ..	22
N. Length of the Training Program ... ..	22
O. Open-Ended Questions... ..	22
P. General Conclusions Based on Participant Evaluations of the Program... ..	23

V. Overview and Recommendations... ..	24
A. General .. .. .	24
B. Selection of Participants .. .. .	24
C. The Instructional Team... .. .	24
D. Program Design... .. .	26
E. Training Materials... .. .	26
F. Training Facilities and Locations... .. .	27
G. Logistical Support for the Program .. .. .	27
H. Conclusion... .. .	27

### APPENDICES

Appendix A	List of Participants Attending Project Management Program V
Appendix B	Needs Assessment Questionnaire
Appendix C	Program Outline and Details of Instructional Modules
Appendix D	Interim Evaluation Form
Appendix E	Tabulated Results of Interim Evaluation
Appendix F	Final Evaluation Form
Appendix G	Tabulated Results of Final Evaluation
Appendix H	List of Books Provided
Appendix I	Handout on Program Certificates and Grading
Appendix J	List of Participants' Final Grades.

## Executive Summary

The Fifth Training Program in Project Management was held from April 22 through May 31, 1985. The first three weeks of the program were held in Khon Kaen and the last three weeks were held at Chiang Mai. Thirty participants attended the program. As with the four previous programs, the training course was organized by the USAID Sub-Division of the Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation, Office of the Prime Minister. The training was designed and delivered by IPS International, the international wing of the Institute of Public Service, University of Connecticut. The program was largely supported through funds provided by the United States Agency for International Development.

The objectives of the training program were basically similar to those of the four previous programs, i.e. to develop participants' skills in all aspects of project management, including the implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation of development projects, and to provide a basic understanding of the methods used to analyze, appraise, design and select projects. A short introduction to micro-computer applications in project management was included in the training. Field trips to three development projects were organized.

The program was intensive. In addition to a regular six hours of class instruction, five days a week, evening classes were held and extensive use was made of out-of-class assignments which involved many hours of work individually and in groups. Participants worked many hours in excess of the 30 hours per week spent in the formal classes and often worked until very late at night.

All 30 participants successfully completed the program. The group as a whole produced work of an exceptionally high quality and achieved outstanding overall results. Average overall grades were higher than on any previous program. Final overall grades were three of A+, eighteen of A, eight of A- and one of B-.

Judging by the very high standards achieved by the participants and also by the evaluations of the program by participants at the mid-point and end of the training, the program was largely successful in meeting its objectives.

The following general conclusion and recommendations may be drawn.

### **Participant Selection**

- Levels of English language capability were higher than on previous programs. This is considered to be one of the main reasons for the superior performance of this group.
- Having almost equal numbers of male and female participants contributed to the high level of general active participation throughout the program.
- The mix of headquarters and field staff added to the quality of the program and resulted in increased learning for all participants.
- Participant selection should follow similar lines for any future program.

### **Instruction and Program Activities**

- The course design is basically sound. The Computer Applications sub-module was improved over that on the third and fourth programs, but still does not meet participants' needs adequately. A solution for any future program maybe to divide the group into absolute beginners and those with some knowledge of computer use and conduct different sub-modules for the two groups. ✓
- The length of the working day and the length of the program are appropriate, despite the fact that some participants feel that the program is too short for the amount of material covered.
- The field trips were better organized than on the previous program and contributed to the learning process.

### **Instructional Team**

- The team of Ian Mayo-Smith, Peter Delp and Nancy Ruther again received high ratings from participants. Owing to other commitments Professor Delp and Ruther were unable to be in Thailand for the desirable length of time. The team was therefore augmented (at no charge to DTEC) by a junior faculty member, Judy Buffolino, who also received favorable ratings.
- If possible, the same team of three should be retained for any future programs. Two of the three member teams should be present through the entire program.
- A Thai facilitator, Khun Abhichata Bensubha, assisted the

instructors from the second through fourth week. Khun Abhichata proved to be an outstanding facilitator.

- In any future program it is desirable to have two facilitators present throughout the whole program. They should be chosen from among the best participants on recent programs.

#### **Training Materials and Books**

- The quality of handouts and books was commented on favorably by participants. Unfortunately, some books did not arrive until after the program was half completed.
- As far as possible, in any future program, all handouts should be prepared in advance on word-processing equipment and air freighted to Thailand to arrive in good time before the program start date. Books should be ordered well in advance so as to be in Thailand before program start dates. This requires IPS International to be given at least 3 months notice before a program commences. ✓

#### **Assessment of Participant Performance**

- The current, revised system of assessing participant performance is considered satisfactory.

#### **Training Locations and Facilities**

- The program was again held in two different locations. Both locations, the Khon Kaen Hotel, Khon Kaen, in North East Thailand, and the Chiang Inn Hotel, Chiang Mai, were satisfactory from from the point of view of training facilities and living accommodation. At both hotels the managements were helpful and responsive to the needs of participants instructional staff and DTEC personnel.

#### **Logistical Support**

- The logistical support provided by DTEC was, as usual, of a very high standard. Three different officials handled the on-site coordination at different points. A very efficient secretary, Khun Nongyao, worked with the program staff throughout the program. Photocopying and duplicating facilities were adequate for the program needs.

## Evaluation

- Interim and final evaluations were conducted. Both indicated a very high degree of participant satisfaction with the program, higher in fact than for any previous program.
- If possible, a further follow-up evaluation should be conducted after the participants have been back at work on their jobs for at least six months, in order to assess the impact of the training on their actual job performance.

## I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

### A. GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Fifth Project Management Program was held from April 22 through May 31, 1985. The training site for the first three weeks of the program was the Khon Kaen Hotel, Khon Kaen. The last three weeks were conducted at the Chiang Inn Hotel, Chiang Mai. 30 mid-level officials completed the program. In common with the four previous programs, held in 1980, 1981, 1983 and 1984, the program was organized by the USAID Sub-Division, Department of Technical and Economic Cooperation (DTEC), Office of the Prime Minister, in collaboration with IPS International, Institute of Public Service, University of Connecticut, who designed the program and provided instructional services under a contract with DTEC. The program was once again supported through funds provided by the United States Agency for International Development.

Apart from some minor changes in certain modules of the program, it followed a similar design to the fourth program. The basic objectives were to develop participants' skills in all aspects of the management of development projects, including the monitoring and evaluation of such projects. Additionally it was designed to provide an understanding of the methods used to analyze, appraise, design and select projects. A short introduction to micro-computer applications in project management was included in the program. The training included the development of individual performance improvement projects by each participant. Three field trips were also included to provide a realistic context for the learning process. Altogether the management aspects of project management were emphasized more than the economic and financial analysis aspects. Considerable importance was again attached to project monitoring and evaluation.

The University of Connecticut instructional team included the three faculty members who conducted the 1983 and 1984 programs, i.e. Professor Ian Mayo-Smith, Professor and Director of IPS International, as Team Leader, with Professor Nancy L. Ruther, Associate Director of IPS International, and Professor H. Peter Delp. Owing to the fact that other commitments made it impossible for Professor Ruther to be in Thailand for more than two weeks and for Dr Delp to be there for more than three

weeks, the services of an additional faculty member, Ms Judy Buffolino, were provided at no charge to the Royal Thai Government. Ms Buffolino was present for the first four weeks of the program and assisted Dr Mayo-Smith with the intensive module on Specific Project Strategies which involves much one-on-one tutorial work with participants.

The instructional team was assisted, during the second to fourth weeks, by a Thai facilitator, Khun Abhichata Bensusubha, of the Department of Aviation, Ministry of Communication. Khun Abhichata had been an outstanding participant on the fourth program and proved to be an outstanding facilitator.

The organization and coordination of the program was dealt with by different members of DTEC staff at different periods. These officials were Khun Chittimas Hinjiranandana, Khun Malinee Intarangi and Khun Unchalee Chayasthit. Khun Nongyao Jirunporn was secretary to the coordinator and instructors throughout the program.

## B. PARTICIPANTS

The criteria for selection of participants was similar to that of previous programs, except that a higher standard of English language skill was required. (This had a most noticeable effect on the general standards of participant performance, which were higher than on any previous program.) Officials of PC level 4, 5 & 6 were selected for the program. Education to at least bachelors' degree level was required. All the participants had three or more years service. Sixteen participants were male and fourteen were women. Two participants held doctoral degrees (one in dentistry and the other a Ph.D. in agriculture), twelve had Masters's degrees and the remainder had bachelors' degrees, (with, in some cases, additional professional training). Almost equal numbers were working in central administration and in the field. The Ministries and organizations represented were:

- Office of the Prime Minister
  - Secretariat
  - Bureau of the Budget
  - Office of the Civil Service Commission
  - Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board
  - Office of the Narcotics Control Board

- Ministry of Finance
  - Fiscal Policy Office

- Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
  - Office of the Permanent Secretary
  - North East Regional Office of Agriculture
  - Department of Agricultural Extension

Ministry of Interior  
Office of the Permanent Secretary  
Office of Policy and Planning  
Department of Public Welfare  
Department of Local Administration

Ministry of Science, Technology and Energy  
Office of the National Environment Board

Ministry of Education  
Non-formal Education Department

Ministry of Public Health  
Office of the Permanent Secretary  
Department of Health

Ministry of Industry  
Office of the Permanent Secretary

The Metropolitan Waterworks Authority

The Provincial Waterworks Authority

Bank for Agriculture and Agricultural Cooperatives

Bangkok Metropolitan Administration

Khon Kaen University

Fourteen participants had lived or travelled abroad. Six had English scores between 80 and 89, seven between 71 and 80, seven between 61 and 70, two between 56 and 60, and eight between 51 and 55. It is understood that these scores are not directly comparable with previous scores owing to a restructuring of testing procedures by the DTEC language institute. It was clear in the classroom work that average English standards were much higher than for the fourth program. This resulted in much better general participation in classroom discussions and exercises and in a higher overall performance.

Participants selected as their leader Dr Sawat Thummabood of the Ministry of Agriculture. The group developed an excellent team spirit, which resulted in a number of enjoyable out of class activities, including sports days and picnics. They produced an imaginative publication, on the lines of a high school year book, to commemorate the program. All in all the group was considered by the instructional team to be outstanding.

A complete list of participants is given at Appendix A.

### C. RESULTS OF NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

A Needs Assessment Questionnaire was completed by all participants at the start of the program. This was designed to find out as much as possible about the actual work performed by participants in their jobs. Thirty tasks were listed and participants were asked to indicate which they performed and/or supervised. They were also asked to indicate by a number of 1 to 3, whether the task was of low, medium or high importance in their work. Twenty-four participants indicated that they were responsible to "Coordinate activities of different agencies" and that this was a task of medium to high importance. Twenty-two indicated that they had to "Prepare project proposals". Twenty-two also indicated that they had to "Determine demands for projects". Twenty-one marked "Determine goals or objectives for Project Proposals".

Other tasks marked by at least half the participants were:

- "Develop monitoring and control systems" (17)
- "Develop organizational design for project implementation/operation" (17)
- "Identify resources needed in project implementation/operation" (17)
- "Develop project information systems" (17)
- "Analyze organizational needs for project implementation" (16)
- "Conduct post project evaluation" (15)
- "Manage the implementation of projects" (15)

Although all the tasks listed were marked by seven or more candidates as being tasks they either performed or supervised, there were a number that only involved a minority of ten or fewer participants. These were:

- "Conduct financial analysis of projects" (7)
- "Conduct economic analysis of projects" (7)
- "Assess training needs" (8)
- "Determine selection criteria for projects" (9)
- "Develop strategy for post-project evaluation" (9)
- "Allocate funding for project proposals" (10)
- "Conduct training programs" (10)
- "Appraise the performance of project staff" (10)
- "Organize the participation of peasants in a project" (10)
- "Ensure that interpersonal problems are dealt with and develop teamwork between project members" (10)

A copy of the Needs Assessment Questionnaire form is at Appendix B.

### D. PROGRAM CONTENTS AND ACTIVITIES.

Apart from minor modifications the instructional design followed the same model as for the fourth program. A list of the eight instructional modules, together with details of each, is attached at Appendix C.

The classroom schedule called for 6 hours of instruction on Mondays through Fridays. In addition evening sessions were scheduled as needed, both by the University of Connecticut instructional team and the facilitator. Participants also organized informal evening working sessions themselves from time to time in the classroom, in addition to the evening work which they did singly or in groups in their rooms. Field trips were arranged on two Saturdays. The first two field trips were arranged during the first part of the program, centered at Khon Kaen, and the third field trip was arranged on the last Saturday of the program.

The presence of the Thai facilitator and a second IPS International instructor during the Specific Project Strategies module was essential to the success of the program. Performance Improvement Projects, completed during this module, were of a notably higher quality than those completed on the fourth program. This module requires much individual attention from members of the instructional team to individual participants as they worked on their projects. Khun Abhichata was a particularly effective tutor to the participants in this module.

The three field trips, to the North Eastern Small Scale Irrigation Project (NESSI), the North Eastern Rainfed Agricultural Development Project (NERAD), and the Highland Coffee Research and Development Center at Chang Khian, were valuable in providing a frame of reference to which class room instruction could be related. Thorough briefings were given by project staff members at each project.

Instructional methods included lectures, practical exercises, games and simulations, group assignments, individual assignments, case studies, performance improvement projects, and tests. A micro-computer laboratory session was arranged one evening through the courtesy of Chiang Mai University who made the facility available and provided three instructors to assist with instruction.

The program began with team building exercises and a program overview and preliminary skills assessment. Four formal tests were held during the program. An interim evaluation by participants was held after three weeks and a final evaluation was conducted at the end of the program. (The form used in the interim evaluation is at Appendix D; a summary of the interim evaluation is at Appendix E; the form used for the final evaluation is at Appendix F; and the results of the final evaluation are tabulated at Appendix G.)

The program finished with a formal ceremony at which participants received Certificates of Achievements, issued jointly by DTEC and the University of Connecticut, together with transcripts detailing their individual performance.

## E. MATERIALS

All participants were provided with a set of books, a pocket electronic calculator and extensive sets of handouts, most of which were prepared in advance at IPS International and air freighted to Thailand. Additional sets of materials were provided for DTEC. Other materials, such as prepared overhead transparencies and an audio-visual presentation on the time-value of money, were brought out by the instructional team.

Unfortunately, owing to late delivery by the suppliers, some books arrived during the middle of the program. In the case of one book, this meant that it arrived almost too late to be of value to the program. Every effort needs to be made to prevent this occurring again on any future program.

As with the previous program, in addition to the text books used on the program, of which every participant received copies, a number of other books were brought out as resource material, available to those participants who wished to read them. These books have been left behind for incorporation into DTEC's library.

A list of the books provided is at Appendix H.

## F. FACULTY

As mentioned above the faculty team from IPS International included Professors Ian Mayo-Smith, Nancy Ruther and Peter Delp, the same team who conducted the third and fourth programs and received high ratings from participants. Dr Mayo-Smith has, in fact, been a member of the instructional team for all five programs and Dr Delp has been an instructor on all except the first program. On this occasion, owing to other commitments Professor Ruther and Delp were not able to spend as much time in Thailand as was desirable for the success of the program. IPS International, therefore provided the services of an additional junior faculty member, Ms Judy Buffolino, at no charge to DTEC. In this way it was possible to arrange that at least two IPS International faculty members were present at all times during the program.

Ian Mayo-Smith was present throughout the program and remained behind in Bangkok for several days after the program to prepare the report of the final evaluation by participants and for discussions with DTEC personnel. Peter Delp was present for the first three weeks of the program. Judy Buffolino was present for the first four weeks. Nancy Ruther was present for the final two weeks. The facilitator, Khun Abhichata Bensubha, was present from the second through fourth weeks. Instructional coverage for the program is illustrated in the chart below.



were informed at the beginning of the program how they would be assessed. The categories used were the same as for the third and fourth programs but the weighting was slightly different. The categories and weighting attached to each category were:

Active participation in Class	20% (15% on PM4)
Test Scores	25%
Quality of Project Work	25%
Quality of Assignments	10% (15% on PM4)
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). Within each letter grade + and - signs were used to differentiate further. Thus A+ represented outstanding performance and C- a minimum bare pass.

Participants' active participation was checked by the instructors. Participation was generally very good, with equal participation by participants of both sexes. Formal tests were held on four occasions in examination conditions.

The quality of the PIP projects on this program was high. Having a team of three instructors (Mayo-Smith, Buffolino and Abhichata) to work with the participants throughout their PIP work no doubt contributed to this. The timing of the PIP project work was designed to avoid the clash of PIP with other activities that occurred on the fourth program. Participants put in many long hours of work after class to complete their PIP projects, all of which were completed on time.

Overall this was an outstanding group and they performed exceptionally well. One factor that undoubtedly contributed to the outstanding results obtained by the group was the higher level of English language skills. In addition to this they worked extremely hard both as individuals and in groups on group assignments. They developed excellent interpersonal relations with each other and with members of the instructional team. Their sense of team work was remarkable. Their final overall grades of 3 A+s, 18 As, 8 A-s and 1 B- has never been equalled on any previous program and has probably never been equalled on any other program conducted by IPS International. The preparation and production of a publication on the lines of a high school year book by the group was one further piece of evidence of the team effectiveness of the group.

A complete list of all participants final grades is given at Appendix J.

## I. LOGISTICS

There were no logistical problems at either training site. Adequate office space was provided. Photocopying and duplicating facilities were available as required (though the amount of photocopying was kept to a minimum).

An extremely efficient full time secretary was available throughout the program. Excellent support was also provided by DTEC coordinating staff both in the field and in headquarters.

#### J. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM BY PARTICIPANTS

Written evaluations were held at the mid-point and end of the program. The evaluation questionnaires followed basically the same design as has been used on previous program with only minor modifications. The results of these evaluations are at Appendices E (interim evaluation) and G (final evaluation). Both of these evaluations indicate an extremely high degree of satisfaction with the program.

## II. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

The same three criteria will be used for evaluating this program as have been used for evaluating the previous four programs. They are:

1. The extent to which the program fulfills the mission of DTEC and DTEC's 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 skills of mid-level officials in managing, monitoring and evaluating development projects in Thailand and to give them a basic understanding of the principles of project analysis, appraisal, design and selection. The extent to which this purpose has been achieved for the Fifth Project Management training program can be assessed partly through an examination of participant performance on the program and partly through the participants' own evaluation of the extent to which they acquired the desired skills and understanding.

A secondary purpose for DTEC, as in the case of previous programs, was to provide cost effective in-country training. As in previous cases, this may certainly be said to have been achieved. If a comparison is made between the cost of this program and the cost of sending an equivalent number of participants to a similar program in the United States, it is clear that the in-country training program is much more cost effective. (For example, to send thirty participants from Thailand to IPS International's summer program in Project Management for Local Development at the University of Connecticut Greater Hartford campus would cost well in excess of \$300,000 allowing only for program fees, round trip air fares and per diem allowances at current USAID rates.) The budgeted figure for IPS International's charges plus the air fares for Professors Mayo-Smith, Ruther and Delp amounts to \$71,271. Allowing for the additional expenses incurred by DTEC in respect of hotel charges, local per diem payments to participants and DTEC personnel, local travel costs, equipment and supplies, etc, it seems safe to say that the training was carried out at somewhere in the neighbourhood of one third of the cost of equivalent overseas training.

## B. PARTICIPANT PERFORMANCE

It has already been stated above that participant performance on this program was outstanding. Satisfactory learning gains, as judged by the difference in scores in the preliminary skills assessment and in the four formal tests conducted during the program, were made by all participants. A detailed assessment follows in Section III below.

## C. PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

In Section IV below a detailed analysis is given of the participants' evaluations of the program. This covers all aspects of the training, including relevance, quality of instruction, and also logistical matters.

All in all the participants on this program rated the program more highly than participants have rated any previous program, and all have been favorably rated. The following brief table, giving sample ratings from all five programs, makes this clear.

On a six point scale, where 1 is the highest rating and 6 the lowest (with 2 and 3 being favorable and 4 and 5 unfavorable ratings), average ratings over the past five years have been as follows:

PM1 (80) Hua Hin	PM2 (81) Hua Hin	PM3 (83) Pattaya	PM4 (84) Pattaya & Chiang Mai	PM5 (85) Khon Kaen & Chiang Mai
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Effectiveness of the training program

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

2.52	2.19	1.88	2.16	1.32
------	------	------	------	------

Overall ratings for the three person IPS International instructional team

1.77	1.52	1.41	1.48	1.40
------	------	------	------	------

Overall ratings for facilitator(s)

2.85	2.09	1.7	2.3	1.63
------	------	-----	-----	------

This upward trend is reflected throughout the entire final evaluation with the 1985 being the most favorably rated program of the series. No doubt this reflects both the increased familiarity of the instructional team with many aspects of project management in Thailand and the quality of the participants. The more able the participants, the more they are able to obtain from the training and, in consequence, the more highly they rate the program.

### III. PARTICIPANT PERFORMANCE

#### A. TEST RESULTS AND LEARNING GAIN

Four tests were given during the program, during the second, third, fourth and sixth weeks. All were taken under examination conditions. Participants were allowed to use dictionaries and, for the first two tests, compounding and discounting tables but they were not allowed to refer to any other books or to course notes or handouts when taking the tests. When the results of these tests were compared with the results of the "Preliminary Skills Assessment" (pre-test) given at the start of the program, it was seen that all participants had made important learning gains. One participant failed one test but was given the opportunity of taking it again after further study and passed.

As on previous courses there appeared to be a definite correlation between English skills on the one hand and test results and learning gains on the other. The general English levels of this group was notably higher than the previous group and this fact was clearly reflected in test results as well as other aspects of their performance.

#### B. QUALITY OF PROJECT WORK

All participants completed individual PIP projects of good quality. Three completed outstanding projects and received A+ gradings for them. Nine received A grades, thirteen received A- and five received B+. As these grades indicate, the quality of project work was considerably higher than on the previous program. In addition to the high quality of the PIP projects, it is also worth noting that all were completed on time and no extensions of time had to be granted, as has been the case on previous programs.

#### C. OVERALL FINAL RESULTS

As has already been stated the overall performance of this group was outstandingly high with all but one participant receiving overall final grades within the range of A+ to A-. (The one participant who obtained a lower grade was experiencing worrying personal problems which almost certainly affected his performance.) The overall grades of three A+s, eighteen As, eight A-s and one B- represent a group achievement that has not been matched on any previous project management program.

#### D. INFORMAL OBSERVATION BY INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM

The instructional team noted and commented on the following points:

1. The English language skills of this group was higher than that of other groups. This resulted in better comprehension, a better level of active participation by virtually all members of the group, higher test scores, better quality PIPs, and, indeed, better all round performance.
2. The group, in common with previous groups, was extremely hardworking and conscientious and put in many hours of work outside the classroom.
3. The almost equal proportions of male and female participants resulted in better all round participation by participants of both sexes. Neither sex predominated, in contrast to the PM4 (where the men predominated and active participation by women participants was inhibited) and PM3 (where the women predominated and participation by the men appeared somewhat inhibited).
4. The fairly even balance between headquarters and field personnel added to the effectiveness of the training with each side gaining insights from the other. The inclusion of officials from operating Ministries, such as Agriculture and Cooperatives, Public Health, Interior and Education, and from agencies such as the Provincial Water Authority, added to the richness of the program and was beneficial to the learning process.
5. The group was exceptionally cohesive and developed an excellent team spirit and feeling of belonging at an early stage. It is not possible to say exactly what caused this to happen, though the democratic leadership style of the group leader may have been an important factor. This team spirit was undoubtedly beneficial to the learning process.

#### E. CONCLUSIONS

The extremely high overall final grades, the excellent learning gains and the high quality of the individual PIP projects serve as an indication of the increased skills and knowledge gained by the participants on the program. Part of this increase in knowledge and understanding arises from the interchange of ideas between participants of different backgrounds.

#### IV. PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

Reports giving the results of the interim and final evaluations of the program are at Appendices E and G.

##### A. INTERIM EVALUATION

The interim evaluation indicated that participants were well satisfied with the quality of the program at the mid-point. The four general questions dealing with course material, content, relevance and usefulness received responses that were on average higher than on any previous program, although the answers to question 3 ("The contents of the course are relatively easy to understand") indicated that this group considered the course material somewhat less easy to understand than did their predecessors on PM4. The two IPS International faculty members provided under the contract, Professors Mayo-Smith and Delp, received higher overall ratings than they had received on any previous program. (1.21 for Mayo-Smith, 1.74 for Delp) Judy Buffolino, whose services were provided without additional charge by IPS International and who acted as an assistant to the senior faculty members, received the favorable overall rating of 1.97. Khun Abhichata Bensubha received a rating of 1.47, a very high rating for a facilitator. Ratings on the logistical aspects of the program also indicated a high degree of satisfaction. All in all this was the most favorable interim evaluation of any of the series of five programs.

##### B. FINAL EVALUATION - OVERALL REACTION TO THE PROGRAM

In general the final evaluation of the program was more favorable than for any previous program. Participants were given the option of putting their names on the evaluation forms or completing them anonymously. It is interesting to note that twenty-one participants out of thirty put their names on the form and only nine chose to complete it anonymously.

Two keys questions are designed to discover participants overall reaction to the program. The first is question number 3, which asks "If the program were to be offered again, would you recommend that others in your organization should be sent to the program?" One participant did not answer this question. All twenty-nine others answered positively, in many cases emphasizing their positive response or suggesting specific people or groups of people who should attend.

The second question is number 5 which uses (like many other questions on the form) a six point scale to indicate to what extent the respondent agrees with a given statement. (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = mildly agree, 4 = mildly disagree, 5 = disagree and 6 = strongly disagree.) The statement in question 5 is "The program has increased my knowledge and

skills in project management".

There were nineteen responses of 1 and nine of 2 to this statement (and two who did not answer). This results in a mean response of 1.32, notably higher than on any previous program.

The very positive responses to these two questions are reinforced and confirmed by the responses to other questions in the other parts of the questionnaire.

### C. MOST AND LEAST VALUABLE PARTS OF THE PROGRAM

In answer to the question that asked participants to list the most valuable and least valuable parts of the program, three participants indicated that all modules (or parts) of the program were "most valuable". "Project Monitoring and Evaluation" received 21 mentions, Performance Improvement Programming (also referred to by the module title of "Specific Project Strategies" or Management by Objectives) received 20 mentions. Other topics receiving ten or more mentions were:

Systems Approach to Project Management	16 mentions
Communications	15 mentions
Human Relations Aspects of Project Implementation	13 mentions
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis	10 mentions
Project Appraisal and Selection	10 mentions
Information Management	10 mentions

In the "Least Valuable" category "Computer Applications" was listed by 7 participants. Human Relations Aspects, Project Appraisal and Selection, and Financial Aspects of Project Analysis each received 2 mentions. "Computer Applications" also received the most "Least Valuable" mentions from PM4 and it is clear that the appropriate design and format for this sub-module has not yet been found.

Full tabulated details of all the responses to this question can be found in Appendix G.

### D. APPLICATION OF LEARNING TO JOBS

In question 2 participants were asked to list specific things they had learnt that they will apply on their jobs. Specific Project Strategies (or PIP or MBO) was mentioned 19 times. Additionally specific methods included in this module were mentioned, including Brainstorming (2 mentions), Force Field Analysis (2 mentions) and Action Programs (1 mention). Project Monitoring and Evaluation received 19 mentions. Human Relations Aspects received 12 mentions and 3 topics taught in this module were mentioned additionally. These were "The Rules of the Road", Team

Work and Team Effectiveness.

Other items receiving five or more mentions were:

Communications	8 mentions
Information Management Systems	7 mentions
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis	6 mentions
Project Appraisal and Selection	6 mentions
Project Scheduling and Budgeting	6 mentions

#### E. RELEVANCE OF COURSES TO PARTICIPANTS' JOBS

Part of question 4 asked participants to rate each module as being "Very relevant, relevant, or not relevant" to their work. "Computer Applications" was considered the least relevant part of the program, receiving 10 ratings of "Not relevant". Other modules receiving more than three "Not relevant" ratings were Facilitator Tutorials with 8, Financial Aspects of Project Analysis with 6, and Project Scheduling and Budgeting with 6.

At the top end of the scale for relevance were Project Monitoring and Evaluation with 20 "Very relevant" ratings and Human Relations Aspects with 18.

#### F. PRESENTATION QUALITY

The second part of question 4 asked participants to rate each module as being "Well presented", "Adequately presented" or "Poorly presented". The best presented modules were considered to be Human Relations Aspects with 24 ratings of "Well presented", Communications with 21, Systems Approach to Project Management with 19, Project Scheduling and Budgeting with 17, Financial Aspects of Project Analysis with 17 and Project Appraisal Methodologies with 16.

At the other end of the scale, Computer Applications (with 7 ratings of "Poorly presented") and Project Monitoring and Evaluation (with 4) were considered the least well presented modules.

#### G. LENGTH OF TIME SPENT ON EACH MODULE

The third part of question 4 asked participants whether they considered the amount of time spent on each module was "Too much", "Just right" or "Too little". A number of modules were considered to have had too little time spent on them. They were Computer Applications (28 ratings of "Too little time"), Project Monitoring and Evaluation (21), Financial Aspects of Project Analysis (15), Project Appraisal and Selection (14), Project Scheduling and Budgeting (13) and Facilitator Sessions (13).

## H. INSTRUCTORS

Eight questions asked participants to rate various aspects of the performance of the instructors. The overall mean ratings given indicate an extremely high participant satisfaction with the instructional team. Individually, Peter Delp and Ian Mayo-Smith received the highest ratings they have received on any of the programs with Delp getting an overall rating of 1.41 (1.57 in PM4) and Mayo-Smith getting 1.1 (1.19 in PM4). Nancy Ruther received an overall rating of 1.68, exactly the same rating as for PM4. The combined overall average ratings for the three instructors provided under the contract was 1.40, the highest average yet received. Judy Buffolino, who assisted the senior faculty members and whose services were provided at no charge, received an overall rating of 2.11.

Full details of these ratings are in Appendix G.

## I. FACILITATOR

The six questions regarding the facilitator resulted in a high overall mean rating of 1.63. (Overall rating for the facilitator team on PM4 was 2.30.) This indicates a high degree of participant satisfaction with Khun Abhichata's performance.

## J. FIELD TRIPS

Question 22 asked participants to rate the value of the field trips to the learning process and question 23 asked for rating of the arrangements for the field trips. The NESSI field trip was rated most highly for its value to the learning process with a mean rating of 1.83. The Coffee Development Project received 2.13 and NERAD 2.67. As regards the arrangements for the field trips the Coffee Development Project rated highest with an mean rating of 1.83, closely followed by NESSI with 1.87. NERAD scored 2.6.

The scores (detailed in Appendix G) indicate that the majority of participants found all three field trips worth while and well arranged, but with markedly less enthusiasm for the NERAD project than for the other two. (Very probably the reason for this was that, due to the season of the year, there was less to see at NERAD than at the other two project sites.)

## K. TEXT BOOKS

Questions 24 and 25, which related to the usefulness of the texts books on the course and as reference books in the future, drew very favorable responses. The question on the helpfulness of the books to the course received a mean rating of 1.37 (1.59 on PM4) and the question on their use as resource books in the future a mean rating of 1.17 (1.44 on PM4).

#### L. ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

The questions regarding the organization of the program, the training facilities and the support given by DTEC personnel drew favorable ratings. For the organization and management of the program the mean rating was 1.63 (1.77 on PM4), for the training facilities it was 1.76 (2.19 for PM4), for DTEC personnel at the training site the combined average was 1.61. (Individual mean ratings were Khun Chittimas 2.27, Khun Malinee 1.63, Khun Unchalee 1.13 and Khun Nongyao 1.23. The mean rating for PM4 was 2.07.) For DTEC headquarters personnel the mean rating was 2.23. (1.85 for PM4)

#### M. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

The living arrangements at both hotels were considered good with mean ratings of 1.67 for the Khon Kaen Hotel and 1.76 for the Chiang Inn Hotel. For quality of lunch the mean ratings were 1.6 for the Khon Kaen Hotel and 2.33 for the Chiang Inn. On the suitability of the two hotels for future programs the ratings were 2 for the Khon Kaen Hotel and 2.67 for the Chiang Inn. These ratings are much higher than those received by the Chiang Mai Orchid Hotel after PM4 and somewhat higher than those received by the Royal Cliff Beach Hotel.

#### N. LENGTH OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Thirteen out of thirty participants considered the duration of the program too short from the point of view of the contents of the program. Two considered it too long. The remaining fifteen considered it just right. From the point of view of personal and family circumstances the majority (22) of the participants considered the program length just right. Seven considered it too long and one considered it too short. Similarly the majority (22) considered the length of the working day just right, while six considered it too long and one considered it too short. One person did not answer this question.

#### O. OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

The questionnaire ended with open-ended questions asking for comments and suggestions on a number of aspects of the training program, the first being the program itself. Full details are in Appendix G. Most of the comments were favorable. Three people commented on the computer applications module, suggesting that this should be covered in more detail.

Secondly, comments were invited on the instructors. Generally these comments were enthusiastic with Peter Delp and Ian Mayo-Smith receiving

especially warm praise. Similarly, in response to the invitation to comment on the facilitator there was much praise for Khun Abhichata. Three people commented that the facilitator should not grade PIPs. These was due to a misunderstanding. Although the facilitator made written comments on PIPs, he did not grade them.

The comments on the training program arrangements indicated a generally high degree of satisfaction. As regards the field trips, the reaction was varied and rather inconclusive. As regards the living arrangements at the hotels, the majority of comments were favorable, with Khon Kaen Hotel attracting the most favorable comments.

A final question, asking for any other comments or suggestions, elicited praise for Khun Unchalee, Khun Malinee, Khun Nongyao and for the instructional team.

#### P. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS BASED ON PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS OF THE PROGRAM

It is clear from the participant evaluations that their satisfaction with the program as a whole was extremely high. Ratings were higher in almost every respect than the ratings for previous programs. In particular it is clear that the general feeling was that:

1. the program was relevant to their work;
2. skills and knowledge gained on the program will be applied to their work;
3. the instructional design was basically sound, though the computer application module needs to be improved;
4. the quality of instruction was high;
5. the facilitator was helpful to the learning process;
6. living conditions and training facility were good;
7. logistical support from DTEC was good.

## V. OVERVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. GENERAL

Judging by participant performance and by the participants' evaluations of the program, the Fifth Project Management Program was the most successful of the series. It is therefore worth considering the factors which made this program outstanding. Among these factors are the selection of participants, the composition of the instructional team (including the facilitator), the program design, the training materials, training facilities and locations, and the logistical support for the program.

### B. SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The selection of a group of participants with higher levels of English language skills than previously was undoubtedly a major factor influencing the excellent participant performance. Other factors were the more or less even distribution of men and women participants, which facilitated active participation by all; the mix of field and headquarters personnel; and the mix of operating Ministries (Public Health, Interior, Agriculture and Cooperatives, Education, Science, Technology & Environment, and Industry) and central planning and regulatory agencies (Bureau of the Budget, Civil Service Commission, N.E.S.D.B., Fiscal Policy Office). This made for an excellent mix of participants which resulted in much learning from each other and an enlarging of the perspectives of the participants, so that field staff gained a greater appreciation of the work of headquarters personnel and vice versa.

The number of participants on the program, thirty, was the maximum size for the program without running the risk of a loss of quality.

#### Recommendation:

If any further programs are to be conducted the same level (or higher) of English skills and the same mix of participants should be selected. The group should again be between 25 and 30.

### C. THE INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM

In the participants' evaluation an overall mean rating of above 2 is satisfactory. An overall evaluation above 1.5 is excellent. Of the three IPS International team members whose services were provided under the contract, Ian Mayo-Smith and Peter Delp both received overall mean ratings above 1.5 (Ian 1.1, Peter 1.41). Nancy Ruther received an overall mean rating of 1.68. Judy Buffolino, whose services were provided at no

charge to DTEC, in order to reinforce the team during the period where otherwise Ian Mayo-Smith would have been the sole instructor, received an overall mean rating of 2.11, an overall favorable rating. (Miss Buffolino conducted three classroom sessions and assisted in the tutorial work involved in the development of individual PIP projects. Without her assistance the quality of the PIP projects would almost certainly have been less high.) Khun Abhichata, as facilitator, received an overall mean rating of 1.63, an unusually high rating for a facilitator which has only once been exceeded. He proved to be an extremely sensitive and capable facilitator.

The ratings for Professors Delp and Mayo-Smith have steadily risen over the years, pointing to the advantage of having instructors with experience in teaching the program in Thailand. Professor Delp's previous work with the World Bank has given him much detailed knowledge and insights into development projects in Thailand.

Unfortunately, on this program Peter Delp was only able to be present for the first three weeks of the program and Nancy Ruther was only able to be there for the last two weeks. Judy Buffolino was there for the first four weeks, until Nancy Ruther arrived. Ian Mayo-Smith was there throughout and provided continuity. A three person instructional team is most appropriate. At least two of the three people should be present for the entire period of the program. All members of the team should be senior and experienced instructors. Between them they should have a good mixture of practical experience of planning, analyzing, selecting, implementing, managing, monitoring and evaluating development projects. Previous experience in Thailand or other countries in South East Asia would be an advantage. If it is possible to keep the team of Ian Mayo-Smith, Peter Delp and Nancy Ruther for any future programs, this would be advantageous. The instructional team should, if possible, be supplemented by a team of two Thai facilitators. The facilitators should be present throughout the program. They should be chosen from among outstanding participants on recent programs who are suited by personality and/or training to act as tutors to the participants. (Three participants from PM5 who may be suitable for this role are Khun Mathee Wonapradit, Khun Nitaya Surakoat and Khun Chutanuj Yenbamroong.)

#### Recommendations:

In any future program, the team of Mayo-Smith, Delp and Ruther, should, if possible, be retained. If not possible, at least two members of this experienced and highly rated team should be retained. Any new member of the team should possess the qualifications outlined in the paragraph above.

The instructional team should consist of three IPS International faculty members. At least two of the three members should be present throughout the entire program.

There should be a team of two facilitators who should be present

throughout the program.

#### D. PROGRAM DESIGN

No program design is going to be the ideal for all the participants, owing to the variations in their jobs. Some would prefer a greater emphasis on the economic factors, some would prefer less, etc. The existing program design seems a satisfactory compromise and appears to suit the majority of participants well. Although the program is very intensive, and many participants felt that the time was too short for the amount of subject matter covered in the program, six weeks is considered to be a suitable length for many practical reasons.

The one part of the program for which the correct formula has not yet been found is the sub-module dealing with micro-computer applications. Although this program was considered to be better than previous programs in this regard, it is clear from participants comments, that the sub-module still does not meet participants needs adequately. For any future program, further discussion should be held between DTEC and the IPS International instructional team and the sub-module should be redesigned.

Part of the problem appears to be the very different levels of knowledge and experience of micro-computers of different members of the group. Another problem is the very limited availability of micro-computer equipment to provide hands-on instructions. It might be advantageous in any future program to split the class into two groups for this submodule, with one group consisting of those who had no experience of micro-computers and the other group consisting of those who did have at least some experience.

#### Recommendation:

For any future program, the design of the program should be left basically unchanged, except that the sub-module on Computer Applications should be revised. The length of the program should remain at 6 weeks.

#### E. TRAINING MATERIALS

In general the training materials and text books were found to be appropriate and their quality was found to be high. The handout materials prepared at IPS International on a word processor came in for particular praise. Owing to late delivery by the suppliers, some text and reference books did not arrive until half way through the program.

#### Recommendations:

Apart from handout materials generated on the program itself,

which cannot be produced in advance, all handout materials should be produced in advance and air freighted to Thailand in advance of any future program. All should be in a format that fits easily into a three ring binder. All should be produced to the same quality.

All books should be ordered well in advance so that complete sets of texts and reference books are available from the start of the program. This necessitates IPS International being given a minimum of three months notice before a program is due to commence.

#### F. TRAINING FACILITIES AND LOCATIONS

Both locations for the program were satisfactory and would be suitable for future training programs. Of the locations and facilities used since the start of the Project Management series of programs in 1980, the most suitable facilities have been the Royal Cliff Beach Hotel, Pattaya, the Khon Kaen Hotel, Khon Kaen, and the Chiang Inn Hotel, Chiang Mai. The Merlin Hotel, Pattaya, at which the assessment workshop was held, preceding PM4, was also a suitable training facility.

#### G. LOGISTICAL SUPPORT FOR THE PROGRAM

The standard of logistical support from DTEC was again high. The arrangements of the field trips showed great improvement over PM4. The availability of the computer laboratory at Chiang Mai University helped to improve the quality of the sub-module on Computer Applications. The assistance given by DTEC staff, both on site in Khon Kaen and Chiang Mai, and at headquarters in Bangkok was at all times helpful to the smooth running of the program. Khun Nongyao provided a very high standard of secretarial support throughout.

#### H. CONCLUSION

In terms of participant selection, participant performance, instructional quality and design, living arrangements and training facilities, and logistical arrangements, the Fifth Project Management Program appears clearly to have been the best of the series. Judging by participants' comments the need for others in their organizations to receive the same training still exists. Provided that funding is available, there seems to be every reason to hold at least one more program in 1986 on the same lines as the 1985 program.

APPENDIX A  
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
PROGRAM V

April 22 - May 31, 1985

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
 ATTENDING PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM V  
 April 22 - May 31, 1985

AGENCY	NAME OF PARTICIPANT	TITLE
<b>Office of the Prime Minister</b>		
The Secretariat of the Prime Minister	Mr Somboon Burapatanin	Public Relations Officer 5
The Bureau of Budget	Mrs Siriwan Nikoolkarn	System Analyst 5
Office of the Civil Service Commission	Mrs Yaowapa Juntima	Examiner 6
Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board	Miss Pranee Seangsri	Policy and Planning Analyst 5
Office of the Narcotics Control Board	Mr Mathee Wongpradit	Policy and Planning Analyst 5
	Miss Chutanuj Yenbamroong	Policy and Planning Analyst 5
<b>Ministry of Finance</b>		
The Fiscal Policy Office	Mr Vichai Mittongtare	Economist 4
<b>Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives</b>		
Northeast Regional Office of Agriculture	Dr Sawat Thummabood	Animal Husbandry Researcher 6
	Mr Chalermchai Prasartsee	Agricultural Technologist 6
Department of Agriculture Extension	Mrs Supranee Chandratat	Subject Matter Specialist 6
Office of the Permanent Secretary	Miss Ratana Waewswang	Plan and Policy Analyst 4

### **Ministry of Interior**

Department of Public Welfare	Mr Saksith Sasibutra	Public Welfare Official 5
	Mr Satawat Sathitpiansiri	Public Welfare Official 5
Office of the Permanent Secretary	Mr Sarote Wararat	Policy and Planning Analyst 5
Department of Local Administration	Mr Danai Kulampakorn	Government Official 5
	Mr Roong Sopsamai	Government Official 5
Office of Policy and	Miss Supanee Techadamrongsin	Statistician 5

### **Ministry of Science, Technology and Energy**

The Office of National Environmental Board	Mr Kittisak Meekun-Iam	Environmental Officer 5
	Mr Sermsak Chantem	Environmental Planning 5

### **Ministry of Education**

Non-Formal Education Department	Miss Supattra Yingyuenyong	Instructor 5
---------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------

### **Ministry of Public Health**

Department of Health	Mrs Malinee Chulvachana	Environmental Specialist 6
Office of the Permanent Secretary	Mrs Waroonee Karnjanaharuetai	Health Technician 5
	Mrs Nitaya Surakoat	Health Promotion Officer 4
	Dr Ruchira Pucharasupa	Dentist 6

### **Ministry of Industry**

Office of the Permanent Secretary	Mr Chaloepporn Rungkawipa	Statistician 4
The Metropolitan Waterworks Authority	Mr Pichit Poopichpong	Engineer 4
The Provincial Waterworks Authority	Mr Ritthirong Jaiyasin	Assistant Director of PWA Regional Office 5

Bank for Agriculture  
and Agricultural  
Cooperatives

Mr Panomsakdi Thayatham Planning Officer 7

Bangkok Municipal  
Administration

Miss Warunee Utanut Policy and Planning  
Analyst 6

Khon Kaen University

Mrs Sutida Srungboonmee Lecturer 6

APPENDIX B  
NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

NAQ/IMS/1

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management Program  
Thailand, 1985

### Needs Assessment Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to provide the instructional team from the University of Connecticut with information which will help us ensure that the training meets the needs of the participants. Please complete the form before coming to the training location and bring it with you.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Position Title and Civil Service Class: \_\_\_\_\_

Highest Educational Attainment. (Circle one)

PhD or MD

MA or MS

BA or BS

Other (please specify)

What additional professional training have you had ? \_\_\_\_\_

Length of service in present post \_\_\_\_\_

Total length of service \_\_\_\_\_

On the following pages, please indicate (in the left hand columns) which of the tasks listed you perform or supervise. Please also indicate (in the right hand columns) the frequency with which the task is performed (or supervised) and the importance attached to the task. Frequency should be indicated on a scale of 1 to 3, in which 1 signifies a task which you perform or supervise about once per year, 2 a task which you perform or supervise about every six months, and 3 a task which you perform or supervise every month. For importance also use a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 signifying a task of low importance, 2 a task of medium importance and 3 a task of great importance.

P E R F O R M	S U P E R V I S E	DO NOT P E R F O R M O R S U P E R - V I S E	T A S K	F R E Q U E N C Y	I M P O R T A N C E
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Determine goals or objectives for Project Proposals</li> <li>2. Determine costs and benefits of projects as a basis for making decisions</li> <li>3. Determine demand for projects</li> <li>4. Review and approve budget requests for project proposals</li> <li>5. Determine project budget</li> <li>6. Allocate funding for project proposals</li> <li>7. Analyse project financing alternatives</li> <li>8. Analyse organizational needs for project implementation</li> <li>9. Develop organizational design for project implementation/operation</li> <li>10. Conduct surveys for project evaluation</li> <li>11. Develop monitoring and control systems</li> <li>12. Make control decisions for project implementation</li> <li>13. Prepare project proposals</li> <li>14. Conduct financial analysis of project</li> <li>15. Conduct economic analysis of project</li> <li>16. Determine selection criteria for project</li> <li>17. Make recommendations for organizational changes</li> </ol>		

- |  |  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  |  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>18. Identify resources needed in project implementation/operation</li><li>19. Develop strategy for post-project evaluation</li><li>20. Conduct post-project evaluation.</li><li>21. Assess training needs</li><li>22. Conduct training programs</li><li>23. Coordinate activities of different agencies</li><li>24. Develop project information systems</li><li>25. Appraise the performance of project staff</li><li>26. Manage the implementation of projects</li><li>27. Gather support for a project from local leaders</li><li>28. Persuade colleagues in other departments of the importance of a project</li><li>29. Organize the participation of peasants in a project</li><li>30. Ensure that interpersonal problems are dealt with and develop teamwork between project team members</li></ol> |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

Please list any additional tasks below:

- |  |  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  |  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>31.</li><li>32.</li><li>33.</li><li>34.</li><li>35.</li><li>36.</li><li>37.</li><li>38.</li></ol> |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

Please list your five most important tasks:

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

What skills, needed in your work, do you hope to develop through participation in the training program ?

---

---

---

**APPENDIX C**  
**PROGRAM OUTLINE AND DETAILS OF INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES**

OUTLINE/IMS/1

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## PROGRAM OUTLINE

### List of Modules

Systems Approach to Project Management (SAPM)

Specific Project Strategies (SPS)

Communication, Information and Computer Applications  
(CICA)

Project Budgeting and Control (PBC)

Project Monitoring and Evaluation (PME)

Human Relations Aspects of Project Implementation  
(HRAPI)

Financial Aspects of Project Analysis (FAPA)

Project Appraisal and Selection (PAS)

The program also includes:

Tutorial Sessions

Review Sessions

Learning Progress Assessments

OUTLINE/IMS/2

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## SYSTEMS APPROACH TO PROJECT MANAGEMENT (SAPM)

### Part 1. Fundamentals of Management

#### Learning Objectives

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

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

#### Course Outline

In the course of this part of the 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 and the attempts to reconcile and integrate personal and organizational goals.

Principal instructor for this part of the module will be Ian Mayo-Smith.

## Part 2: The Systems Approach

### Learning Objectives

This module is designed to provide participants with a systematic way of thinking about the complex situation facing Thai officials charged with managing projects. Specifically, by the end of this part of the module participants will be able to:

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

### Course Outline

Class discussion and exercises will cover the following topics:

1. Overview of Systems Thinking;
2. Systems and sub-systems: different perspectives;
3. Characteristics of a system;
4. Exercise in defining a system;
5. The Systems Approach and Systems Tools
6. Analysis of an issue using the systems approach.

Instructors for this part of the module will be Peter Delp.

### Part 3: The Project as a System

#### Learning Objectives

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

1. 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;
2. describe the project approach using systems concepts and 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.

Principal instructor for this part of the module will be Peter Delp.

OUTLINE/IMS/3

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

### SPECIFIC PROJECT STRATEGIES (SPS)

#### Learning Objectives

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

1. describe the basic components and characteristics of an MBO system;
2. describe the stages and steps in Performance Improvement Programming;
3. write mission statements, goals and purposes, and objectives;
4. determine appropriate performance indicators and set targets;
5. determine the key result areas of a managerial position;
6. carry out a force field analysis of an actual problem and develop appropriate strategies;
7. lead a structured brainstorming session and use brainstorming as a technique to generate strategies and action plans for implementation;
8. plan strategies and action programs related to specific objectives and targets, together with detailed arrangements for their implementation and monitoring;
9. carry out a network analysis and utilize a critical path network for project planning and control.

## Course Outline

This module includes theoretical presentations, practical demonstrations and exercises, a live group project and the development of individual performance improvement projects with faculty tutorial assistance. The topics covered include:

1. MBO considered as a system of management;
2. Definitions:  
mission, goals and purposes and objectives;  
performance indicators and targets;  
key result areas,  
strategies and action programs;
3. Identifying key result areas;
4. PIP considered as an adaptation of MBO appropriate for the management of development projects; the four stages of PIP;
5. Force Field Analysis;
6. Structured Brainstorming as a problem solving technique;
7. The application of network analysis to project planning and control.

Principal instructor for this module will be Ian Mayo-Smith. In addition to class presentations, the instructional team will work closely with participants in developing their individual projects.

OUTLINE/IMS/4

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## COMMUNICATION, INFORMATION AND COMPUTER APPLICATIONS (CICA)

### Part 1. Communication Skills

#### Learning Objectives

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

1. draw a diagram of a basic communication model;
2. formulate and apply rules for effective person to person communication;
3. identify and avoid or overcome barriers to effective communication;
4. make decisions on the most appropriate modes and forms of communication to use in managing projects.

#### Course Outline

This part of the module will use exercises and games to enable participants to discover for themselves important principles of effective communication. These will be supplemented by lecturettes and readings to provide the theoretical base for these discoveries. The linkage between the two parts of the module (i.e. between "communication" and "information") will be explained and discussed. Topics covered will include:

1. The basic communications model;
2. One way and two way communication;
3. Perception;
4. Information sharing;
5. Knowledge and assumption;
6. Chains of communication;
7. The limitations of memory.

8. Listening and feedback;
9. Verbal and visual communication;
10. Non-verbal communication;
11. A Framework for understanding interpersonal communication;
12. Modes of written communication.

Principal instructor for this part of the module will be Ian Mayo-Smith.

## Part 2. Information Systems

### Learning Objectives

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

1. explain the difference between the data and information resources and various transformation methods;
2. explain critical considerations to keep in mind in designing or improving project information systems, including essential equipment and procedures;
3. identify the potentials and limits of a variety of information technologies in project information systems;
4. communicate with a variety of experts in the records and information technology fields.

### Course Outline

This part of the module will use class exercises and case problems as well as lecturettes to cover the following topics:

1. Managing the Information Resource System:
  - a) Characteristics of the information resource;
  - b) Simple project information resource model with purpose and control elements;
  - c) Innovation information resource management model;
  - d) Key assumptions in designing information systems;
  - e) Essential and non-essential information;
  - f) Typical problems in implementing information systems.
2. Information Technologies:
  - a) Technology and change;
  - b) Evolution of information handling technologies;
  - c) Applications of various technologies to improve project management;

d) Considerations in introducing new technologies for handling information.

Principal instructor for this part of the module will be Nancy Ruther.

### Part 3. Computer Applications for Project Management

#### Learning Objectives

By the end of this part of the module, participants will be able to describe the applications in project management of

- a) spreadsheets,
- b) word processing, and
- c) file and data-base management systems.

#### Course Outline

1. The characteristics and uses of spreadsheet programs.
2. The essentials of word-processing programs.
3. The uses of file and data-base management programs.
4. Integrated software packages.
5. The uses of software application programs in project management.

If possible, participants will be given some hands-on experience of micro-computers using software application programs during this part of the module.

Principal instructor for this part of the module will be Nancy Ruther.

OUTLINE/IMS/5

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## PROJECT BUDGETING AND CONTROL (PBC)

### Learning Objectives

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

1. specify and arrange project activities into a logical implementation sequence, using techniques such as -  
work breakdown structures and precedence diagrams;
2. construct a project Gantt chart;
3. develop a program budget;
4. describe alternative project cost control techniques and evaluate their applicability in various situations.

### Course Outline

By means of lecturettes, class discussion and practical exercises, this module will cover the following topics:-

1. The structure and sequence of project activities; introduction to work breakdown structures and network diagramming techniques;
2. Resource levelling with Gantt charts;
3. Program budgeting;
4. Introduction to project cost control techniques.

Principal instructor for this module will be Peter Delp.

OUTLINE/IMS/6

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION (PME)

### Learning Objectives

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

1. explain the reasons for using one or more methods for monitoring and evaluating projects in different situations;
2. relate the information from the project monitoring and evaluation system to the different levels of decision-making and control;
3. explain some of the critical considerations to keep in mind when designing a system to monitor and evaluate their projects, and to make appropriate decisions.

### Course Outline

This module will cover:-

1. Introduction to monitoring, on-going evaluation and ex-post evaluation techniques;
2. Use of logical framework;
3. The requirements for the design of an effective project monitoring and evaluation system:
  - a) matching decision needs with information outputs;
  - b) matching data-gathering models with resource availability (in terms of time, skills and money);
4. Case exercises in monitoring and evaluation.

Principal instructor for this module will be Nancy Ruther.

OUTLINE/IMS/7

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## HUMAN RELATIONS ASPECTS OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION (HRAPI)

### Learning Objectives

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

1. diagnose an organization's climate;
2. confront and resolve conflict within a project organization;
3. develop the effectiveness of project teams;
4. describe alternative organizational designs for project organizations;
5. describe and utilize strategies for gaining support from key persons in project implementation.

### Course Outline

This module will use lecturettes, games and practical exercises to increase participants understanding of the interpersonal interactions that are involved in project management and to give them the necessary set of techniques to manage project more effectively. Topics covered with include:-

1. Organization climate: symptoms of healthy and unhealthy organizations;
2. Organizational design and its effect on project performance; the advantages and disadvantages of different types of design;
3. Strategies for obtaining support; the "political" aspects of project management;
4. Issues in team effectiveness:-
  - a) stopping "games";
  - b) goal, role, procedural and interpersonal issues;
  - c) assessing team effectiveness;
  - d) resolving conflict.

Principal instructor for this module will be Ian Mayo-Smith.

OUTLINE/IMS/8

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF PROJECT ANALYSIS (FAPA)

### Learning Objectives

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

1. explain the basic concepts of the time value of money and opportunity costs;
2. compute discounted cash flows;
3. identify typical benefits and costs of a project and compute cashflows with and without the project;
4. compare and contrast different financial decision criteria for selecting between projects.

### Course Outline

The module will cover the following topics:-

1. The Time Value of Money and Opportunity Costs;
2. Discounted Measures of Project Worth - net present worth, and rate of return analysis;
3. Measures for Project Selection;

Principal instructor for this module will be Peter Delp.

OUTLINE/IMS/9

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

## PROJECT APPRAISAL AND SELECTION (PAS)

### Learning Objectives

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

1. describe, compare and contrast project appraisal methodologies such as:-  
cost effectiveness analysis,  
financial analysis, and  
economic analysis;
2. identify the structure of relevant social benefit and cost factors for a typical development project, and describe steps necessary to measure and assess them, including the use of shadow prices;
3. examine the distributional aspects of a typical project and the spread of benefits in the light of project objectives.

### Course Outline

The module will cover the following topics:-

1. A framework for identifying project costs and benefits;
2. Concepts of cost-effectiveness analysis;
3. An introduction to economic versus financial analysis and shadow pricing;
4. Alternative approaches to social cost/benefit analysis.

Principal instructor for the module will be Peter Delp.

APPENDIX D  
INTERIM EVALUATION FORM

DTEC/IPS INTERNATIONAL  
PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM  
KHON KAEN AND CHIANG MAI, 1985

*Interim Evaluation*

*This interim evaluation is designed to give DTEC and IPS International staff feedback on various aspects of the program.*

*Please complete the form. You may do so anonymously or, if you wish, you may write your name on the form.*

\*\*\*\*\*

*Please indicate, by circling the appropriate number whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:*

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

		Agree			Disagree		
1. The course material is stimulating.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
2. The course content is well designed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. The contents of the course are relatively easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4. The contents of the course are relevant to my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5. The lessons from the course will be useful to me in my work in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6. The duration of the course is (check one)				Too long	Just right	Too short	
7. The instructor is generally well prepared for class:							
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6	
8. Explanation of basic concepts and principles is clear and easy to follow.							
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6	

	Agree			Disagree		
9. The instructor is able to create interest in the course material.						
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. The instructor is generally enthusiastic in teaching.						
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The instructor has excellent knowledge of the subject.						
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. The instructor's handouts are helpful.						
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. The instructor allows enough question time and all questions are answered satisfactorily.						
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. There is no difficulty in understanding the instructor.						
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. The instructor speaks (check the appropriate responses)	Ian	Peter	Judy			
1. Too fast	1	1	1			
2. At the right speed	2	2	2			
3. Too slow	3	3	3			
1. Too loud	1	1	1			
2. Just right	2	2	2			
3. Too softly	3	3	3			
1. Uses simple language	1	1	1			
2. Uses too many technical terms	2	2	2			
1. Speaks clearly	1	1	1			
2. Speaks indistinctly	2	2	2			

	Agree			Disagree		
16. Use of the microphone is very helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. The facilitator (Abhichuta) was well prepared.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The facilitator has a good knowledge of the subjects.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. The facilitator could give all necessary explanations to participants.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. The facilitator was helpful and necessary for the course.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. The facilitator was enthusiastic in facilitating training.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Enough evening facilitator sessions were held.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. There was good coordination between the instructors and the facilitator.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. The training program was well organized and managed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. The training facilities were satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. The text books are useful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. DTEC personnel at the training site were helpful and gave good support to the course.						
Chittimas	1	2	3	4	5	6
Malinee	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nongyao	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. DTEC preparations for the training program were satisfactory	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. The living arrangements at the hotel are satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. The quality of lunch at the hotel is good.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. The field trips were well organized by DTEC	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. The field trips were relevant to the training course.	1	2	3	4	5	6

33. The briefings for the field trip were	NERAD Project	NESSI Project
1. Too short	1	1
2. Just right	2	2
3. Too long	3	3

34. Do you have any suggestions about the course ?  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

35. Any suggestions about the instructors ?  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

36. Any suggestions about the facilitators ?  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

37. Any suggestions about the training program arrangements ?  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

38. Any suggestions about the living arrangements ?  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

39. Other comments ?  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

\*\*\*\*\*

APPENDIX E  
TABULATED RESULTS OF INTERIM EVALUATION

Interim Evaluation

An interim evaluation was held on Monday, May 13, after the first three weeks of the six week program had been completed.

The results of the evaluation are tabulated below.

In questions 1 through 5, 7 through 14, and 16 through 33 a six point scale was used where

- 1 = Strongly agree (most favorable rating)
- 2 = Agree
- 3 = Mildly agree
- 4 = Mildly disagree
- 5 = Disagree
- 6 = Strongly disagree (most unfavorable rating)

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>		
1. The course material is stimulating.	1	12	1.77		
	2	13			
	3	5			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	-			
2. The course content is well designed.	1	13	1.67		
	2	14			
	3	3			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	-			
3. The contents of the course are relatively easy to understand.	1	2	2.73		
	2	13			
	3	10			
	4	2			
	5	2			
	6	1			
4. The contents of the course are relevant to my job.	1	12	1.9		
	2	12			
	3	4			
	4	1			
	5	1			
	6	-			
5. The lessons from the course will be useful to me in my work in the future.	1	18	1.47		
	2	10			
	3	2			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	-			
6. The duration of the course is (check one)	Too long	-			
	Just right	14			
	Too short	16			
7. The instructor is generally well prepared for class:	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Ian</u>	<u>Peter</u>	<u>Judy</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	1	27	12	4	Ian 1.1
	2	3	14	19	Peter 1.8
	3	-	3	6	Judy 2.13
	4	-	-	1	Combined 1.68
	5	-	1	-	
6	-	-	-		

8. Explanation of basic concepts and principles is clear and easy to follow.	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
	1	23	7	1	Ian 1.23
	2	7	18	13	Peter 2.03
	3	-	3	14	Judy 2.57
	4	-	1	2	Combined 1.94
	5	-	1	-	
	6	-	-	-	

9. The instructor is able to create interest in the course material.	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
	1	22	10	3	Ian 1.27
	2	8	18	16	Peter 1.73
	3	-	2	10	Judy 2.24
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.75
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
	No ans.	-	-	1	

10. The instructor is generally enthusiastic in teaching.	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
	1	28	24	23	Ian 1.1
	2	1	4	5	Peter 1.27
	3	1	2	2	Judy 1.3
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.22
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	

11. The instructor has excellent knowledge of the subject.	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
	1	29	22	8	Ian 1.03
	2	1	8	13	Peter 1.27
	3	-	-	8	Judy 2.07
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.46
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	

12. The instructor's handouts are helpful	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
	1	24	17	15	Ian 1.2
	2	6	6	11	Peter 1.67
	3	-	7	3	Judy 1.59
	4	-	-	-	Combined 1.49
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	-	-	
	No ans.	-	-	1	

13. The instructor allows enough question time and all questions are answered satisfactorily.	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
	1	22	13	10	Ian 1.28
	2	6	10	14	Peter 1.9
	3	1	4	4	Judy 1.79
	4	-	1	-	Combined 1.66
	5	-	-	-	
	6	-	1	-	
	No ans.	1	1	2	

14. There is no difficulty in understanding the instructor.	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
	1	19	6	5	Ian 1.43
	2	9	15	14	Peter 2.23
	3	2	6	8	Judy 2.17
	4	-	2	2	Combined 1.94
	5	-	1	-	
	6	-	-	-	

15. The instructor speaks	Rating	Ian	Peter	Judy	Mean
1. Too fast	1	1	17	10	
2. At the right speed	2	29	12	17	
3. Too slow	3	-	-	3	
	No ans.	-	1	-	

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Ian</u>	<u>Peter</u>	<u>Judy</u>	<u>Mean</u>
1. Too loud	1	-	1	-	
2. Just right	2	29	26	22	
3. Too softly	3	-	-	7	
	No ans.	1	3	1	
1. Uses simple language	1	30	16	27	
2. Uses too many technical terms	2	-	13	2	
	No ans.		1	1	
1. Speaks clearly	1	30	19	20	
2. Speaks indistinctly	2	-	11	9	
	No ans.			1	

  

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>
16. Use of the microphone is very helpful.	1	24	1.2
	2	6	
	3	-	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
17. The facilitator (Abhichata) was well prepared.	1	16	1.47
	2	14	
	3	-	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
18. The facilitator has a good knowledge of the subjects.	1	12	1.6
	2	18	
	3	-	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
19. The facilitator could give all necessary explanations to participants.	1	15	1.63
	2	11	
	3	4	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
20. The facilitator was helpful and necessary for the course.	1	24	1.23
	2	5	
	3	1	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
21. The facilitator was enthusiastic in facilitating training.	1	19	1.4
	2	10	
	3	1	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
22. Enough evening facilitator sessions were held.	1	10	2.07
	2	15	
	3	2	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
	No ans.	1	

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>		
23. There was good coordination between the instructors and the facilitator.	1	15	1.67		
	2	10			
	3	5			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	-			
24. The training program was well organized and managed.	1	10	1.8		
	2	17			
	3	2			
	4	1			
	5	-			
	6	-			
25. The training facilities were satisfactory.	1	12	1.73		
	2	15			
	3	2			
	4	1			
	5	-			
	6	-			
26. The text books are useful.	1	17	1.57		
	2	10			
	3	2			
	4	1			
	5	-			
	6	-			
27. DTEC personnel at the training site were helpful and gave good support to the course.	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Chittimas</u>	<u>Malinee</u>	<u>Nongyao</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	1	10	24	17	C. 1.97
	2	13	6	12	M. 1.2
	3	6	-	1	N. 1.47
	4	-	-	-	
	5	1	-	-	
6	-	-	-		
28. DTEC preparations for the training program were satisfactory	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>		
	1	8	2.13		
	2	13			
	3	7			
	4	1			
	5	1			
6	-				
29. The living arrangements at the hotel are satisfactory.	1	10	1.77		
	2	17			
	3	3			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	-			
30. The quality of lunch at the hotel is good.	1	13	1.7		
	2	13			
	3	4			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	-			
31. The field trips were well organized be DTEC	1	4	2.43		
	2	16			
	3	5			
	4	4			
	5	-			
	6	1			

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>
32. The field trips were relevant to the training course.	1	3	2.2
	2	20	
	3	5	
	4	2	
	5	-	
	6	-	

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>NERAD</u>	<u>NESSI</u>
33. The briefing's for the field trip were			
1. Too short	1	13	-
2. Just right	2	11	17
3. Too long	3	6	13

Overall Mean Ratings

Instructors:

Ian 1.21  
Peter 1.74  
Judy 1.97

Overall Combined Instructors Mean Ratings : 1.64

Facilitator: Abhichata 1.47

## Interim Evaluation

### Part 2

Questions 34 to 39 asked for comments from the participants.  
The comments made were as follows:

34. Do you have any suggestions about the course ?

- The course is very useful.
- About cost-benefit analysis should be 2 week.
- The course is quite tense and concentrate on grading more than knowledge obtained, so interest is on how to get more scores than to increase knowledge or creative thinking.
- This course should be arranged for the head officer.
- Please expand duration of SPS Modules because it may help many persons' jobs.
- None
- No
- Peter's course is too short but too many things to cover.
- The course ought to longer than this so that participants can close follow and understand.
- Not enough time to describe in some module.
- Too much contents in this Duration.
- In this course participants came from different agencies. I'd like DTEC to give participants some basics concept before they take a course. Some participants complain to me that they can't understand especially Peter's course because they haven't known the basic concept before. But I have no problem I satisfy most of the course.
- This course should have more time, it should be 8 weeks. Some parts should have details for we're better understand.
- This course should be train the higher level participant. The course is too short.
- The course has much content but we have no much time to study handout and books. If we have enough time this course is more useful than now.
- Peter's time should longer than this.
- This course should be longer and covered more useful materials (which are left out for this short of time course.).
- Time schedule for the first two weeks was too tight, I meant the lecture parts so that we can not organized material well, the things are too fast.
- Some module should be given more hours such as PBC. Communication used more hours than necessary.
- The course duration is rather short when compare with the contents. It will be better if eliminate some contents and keep the duration the same.
- It is too short. It should take about 3 months and have to take place in the United States (if possible). Because the participants are able to gain more knowledge in U.S.A. than in their country.
- Time of course is rather short because the participants are different knowledge. They used the times for understand not equal.
- Cover more time on Peter's part.

35. Any suggestions about the instructors ?

- None
- Increase amount of instructors, however, they are really nice.
- Peter is a good teacher, and very genius engineer.
- They are wonderful instructors, with high knowledge, teaching skill, human relation and understanding of local culture as well as high encouraging and helpful.
- Strongly agree and satisfy.
- Head teacher is the best teacher. But sometimes it makes 'small teacher' has less self confidence.

35. Any suggestions about the instructors ?

- No
- No comment
- Peter will teach slowly please.
- Some Peter's handout was not clear.
- It should be more instructors.
- Judy she goes too fast, if possible just slow down on material a little and can question individual in the class.
- For Peter, Use too often of overhead projector may cause participants cannot follow with explanation. For Judy, not good sequence in explanation.
- O.K. for Ian and Peter, but Judy need more experience in teaching oversea.
- All of them have to study Thai, in order to get more understanding between them and the participants.
- Some instructor teach rather fast.

36. Any suggestions about the facilitators ?

- Suitable.
- Facilitators ought to come since the first week and stay until finish the course.
- Good enough.
- Need more facilitators.
- More facilitators are required.
- He tries best, but not many participants look for his facilitating, may be they ashame to question him.
- It should be 2-3 facilitators for the whole course.
- Good.
- No comment.
- No comment.
- No
- He had a hard time in Khon Kaen. (Be advisor 'til midnight)
- Strongly agree and I'd like to have 2-3 facilitators.
- Facilitators are necessary for this course.
- According to the different background of knowledge some specific knowledge like Economic, Computer are difficult to those who have no background. The basic concept introduce by the facilitators will be useful.
- Should have 2 facilitators for 6 weeks.
- Characteristic and attitude of facilitators are as important as their knowledge, Khun Abhichata is example of qualified facilitator.
- He is very good.
- Provide some movies concerning the subject.
- None

37. Any suggestions about the training program arrangements ?

- None.
- It's rather too tight.
- It is very useful for my job.
- Too rush for arrangement, the selection of participants should be performed earlier and information about the courses should be received ahead.
- Satisfy.
- Nearly good.
- Lack of sport & games facilities.
- No.
- No comment.
- Nearly good.
- Good.
- The course should be longer so we can learn more.
- Too tight program. The period of training should be extended.
- Quite well

APPENDIX F  
FINAL EVALUATION FORM

IPS International  
Institute of Public Service  
University of Connecticut

Department of Technical and  
Economic Cooperation  
Royal Thai Government

Project Management Program, 1985

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.

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 specific things you have learnt which you will apply on your job

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

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

	Relevance to your work		Presenta - tion quality					Length of time spent		General Comment
	VERY RELEVANT	RELEVANT	NOT RELEVANT	WELL PRESENTED	ADEQUATE PRESENTATION	POOR PRESENTATION	Too Much Time	Just Right	Too Little Time	
Systems approach to Project Management (SAPM) (Ian, Peter)										
Specific Project Strategies (SPS) (Ian, Judy)										
Communication(C.I.C.A.) (Ian)										
Information (Nancy)										
Computer Application (Nancy)										
Project Monitoring & Evaluation (PME)(Nancy)										
Project Scheduling & Budgeting (PSB) (Peter)										
Human Relations Aspects of Project Management (Ian)										
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis (Peter)										
Project Appraisal Methodologies (Peter)										
Facilitator Tutorial Sessions (Abhichata)										

For questions 5 to 32 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

5. The program has increased my knowledge and skills in project management 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. 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
  - Judy 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. 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
  - Judy 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. 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
  - Judy 1 2 3 4 5 6
9. 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
  - Judy 1 2 3 4 5 6
10. 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
  - Judy 1 2 3 4 5 6
11. The instructor's handouts are helpful.
- Ian 1 2 3 4 5 6
  - Nancy 1 2 3 4 5 6
  - Peter 1 2 3 4 5 6
  - Judy 1 2 3 4 5 6
12. 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
  - Judy 1 2 3 4 5 6

13. There is no difficulty in understanding the instructor.						
Ian	1	2	3	4	5	6
Peter	1	2	3	4	5	6
Judy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nancy	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Use of microphone is very helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. The facilitator was well prepared. (Abhichata)	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. The facilitator has a good knowledge of the subject.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. The facilitator could give all necessary explanations to participants.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The facilitator was helpful to the learning process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. The facilitator was needed to facilitate learning.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. The facilitator was enthusiastic in facilitating training.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Enough evening facilitator sessions were held.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. The field trips were valuable and helpful to the learning process.						
NESSI	1	2	3	4	5	6
NERAD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Coffee Project	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. The arrangement for the field trips were satisfactory						
NESSI	1	2	3	4	5	6
NERAD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Coffee Project	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. The text books were helpful to the course.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. The text books will be useful to me as reference books in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. There was good cooperation between the instructors and facilitators.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. The instructors and Thai facilitators were sufficiently available for consultation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. The training program was well organized and managed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. The training facilities were satisfactory.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. DTEC personnel at the training site were helpful and gave good support to the course.						
Chittimas	1	2	3	4	5	6
Malinee	1	2	3	4	5	6
Anchalee	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nongyao	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. DTEC headquarters personnel were helpful and gave good support to the course.	1	2	3	4	5	6

32. The living arrangements at the hotel were satisfactory.

Khon Kaen Hotel	1	2	3	4	5	6
Chiang Inn Hotel	1	2	3	4	5	6

33. The quality of lunch at the hotel is good.

Khon Kaen Hotel	1	2	3	4	5	6
Chiang Inn Hotel	1	2	3	4	5	6

34. Would you recommend the same training sites for future training programs ?

Khon Kaen Hotel	1	2	3	4	5	6
Chiang Inn Hotel	1	2	3	4	5	6

35. 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

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

Too long

Just right

Too short

37. The length of the working day is

Too long

Just right

Too short

38. Do you have any other practical suggestions or comments ?

a) About the program, e.g. content additions to or deletions from the program, training materials and handouts, books, etc.

b) About the instructors.

c) About the facilitator.

d) About the training program arrangements.

e) About field trips.

f) About the living arrangements.

g) Any other comments or suggestions.

IPS International  
Institute of Public Service  
University of Connecticut

Department of Technical &  
Economic Cooperation  
Office of the Prime Minister  
Royal Thai Government

## PROJECT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM V, 1985

### Final Evaluation

A final evaluation was held on Friday, May 31, the final day of the program. The results of this evaluation are tabulated below.

Participants had a choice whether to complete the evaluation form anonymously or whether to put their names on the form. 9 completed the form anonymously and 21 put their names on the form.

1. The first question asked participants to list those parts of the program they found most valuable and those parts which they found least valuable.

Three people indicated that all modules (or parts) of the program were "most valuable".

Of individual topics **Project Monitoring and Evaluation** was listed by 21 participants. **Performance Improvement Programming, Specific Project Strategies and Management by Objectives** (all referring to the same module) received 20 mentions. Other mentions were as follows:

Systems Approach to Project Management	16 mentions
Communications	15
Human Relations Aspects	13
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis	10
Project Appraisal and Selection	10
Information Management (referred to by one participant as "Data and Information")	10
Project Scheduling and Budgeting (referred to also as Project Budgeting and Control)	9
Computer Applications	6
Logframe	1
Facilitator Sessions	1

Two participants referred to making new friends as well as increasing their knowledge of projects. One participant stated "Coordinate with other agency quite well."

In the "Least Valuable" category, 7 participants listed Computer Applications. Human Relations Aspects, Project Appraisal Methodologies and Financial Aspects of Project Analysis received 2 mentions each. Facilitator Sessions, Case Study, Project Scheduling and Budgeting, and Communications each received one mention.

APPENDIX G  
TABULATED RESULTS OF FINAL EVALUATION

2. In question 2, participants were asked to list specific things they had learnt which they will apply on their jobs.

**Specific Project Strategies** (or PIP or MBO) received 19 mentions. In addition specific methods included in this module were mentioned, including Brainstorming (2 mentions), Force Field Analysis (2 mentions) and Action Programs (1 mention). **Project Monitoring and Evaluation** received 19 mentions. **Human Relations Aspects** received 12 mentions and three topics taught in this module were mentioned additionally. These were "The Rules of the Road", Team Work, and Team Effectiveness. **Systems Approach to Project Management** (or "Systems Thinking") received 10 mentions.

Other topics mentioned were:

Communications	8 mentions
Information Management (or Data and Information)	7
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis	6
Project Appraisal and Selection	6
Project Scheduling and Budgeting (or Project Budgeting and Control)	6
Computer Applications	1
Logframe	1
Compounding and Accounting (sic)	1

Other answers were (one mention each):

Every module  
 How to be a good manager  
 How to get up project from start to end of project  
 Doing project appraisal step by step so we cannot miss anything which can block our achievement.  
 Way of specific problem and mapping force and also mapping critical path.

3. In question 3 participants were asked, "If the program were to be offered again, would you recommend that others in your organization should be sent to the program?"

One participant did not answer the question. The remaining 29 all responded affirmatively. Many gave additional suggestions or comments and these are given below.

"Head of Environmental Section since she controls many projects on Environmental Health Control in the rural area."

"Project Engineers (Field Engineers)."

"It is very useful for my organization."

"I think so. It is very useful for my job and my office can apply it."

"I think so. This program is very useful. We gain more knowledge and experience and we have a lot of friends."

"I would like to recommend people from my Division who should have been trained from this program. They are working in various projects which are NERAD, Tung Kula Project, Kolok Basin Project and King's Project."

"Those higher ranking officials, especially who are involved in the project management and international donor agency."

"Sure, if it's possible, all others in my organization."

"Yes, in my department there are some people that have to learn and gain the knowledge in this program. They will improve the quality of work, task in my office."

"Same organization which we have but should be for higher level officer."

"Would strongly recommend."

"Yes, I will recommend that my organization should send the officer to the program because this program is very useful for our job."

"Chief of Health Security Section and Public Health Technician."

"Certainly because my colleagues in my office have not enough experience in work, so if they come to the program they will learn and get more knowledge and experience and improve their capacity in work too."

"Mr Shane Wipatbawornwong, Chief of Recruitment and Promotion Section, Local Affairs Division, Local Administration Department."

"Yes, I recommend the person who are relevant, doing their job concerning to the development project, especially the person who work directly with the project who work in the field rather than the one in Bangkok."

4. Question 4 asked the participants to assess the various modules and tutorials for their "Relevance to Your Work", "Presentation Quality" and the appropriateness of the "Length of Time Spent" on the module by checking the appropriate box in a matrix. General comments on the modules were also invited. The responses are tabulated in the table which follows.

	Relevance to your work			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 (SAPM) (Ian, Peter)	12	18	0	19	10	1	0	23	7	
Specific Project Strategies (SPS) (Ian, Judy)	13	15	2	13	17	0	0	24	6	
Communication (C.I.C.A.) (Ian)	13	14	3	21	9	0	5	19	5	
Information (Nancy)	14	16	0	10	18	2	1	19	10	
Computer Application (Nancy)	7	12	10	8	14	7	0	2	28	
No answer			1			1				
Project Monitoring & Evaluation (PME) (Nancy)	20	9	1	3	23	4	0	8	21	
No answer									1	
Project Scheduling & Budgeting (PSB) (Peter)	14	10	6	17	13	0	0	17	13	
Human Relations Aspects of Project Management (Ian)	18	10	1	24	6	0	2	21	7	
Financial Aspects of Project Analysis (Peter)	11	13	6	17	13	0	0	14	15	
No answer									1	
Project Appraisal Methodologies (Peter)	12	15	3	16	13	1	0	15	14	
Facilitator Tutorial Sessions (Abhichata)	7	11	8	13	15	0	0	15	13	
No answer			4			2			2	

The following general comments were made:

#### **Systems Approach to Project Management**

- Some part of handouts did not well prepared.

#### **Communication**

- Should suggest more about how to create good communication in work.

#### **Information**

- Information Management and communication are most important for rural development projects. More time is needed to learn more in details.

#### **Computer Applications:**

- Not enough time and I have no background. Computer Application is very useful but someone has no background and less time for presentation, so that it's very hard to understand and gain knowledge from this subject.
- Increase time 6 hours.
- I hope that "Computer Applications will make me known how to use computer but at last I don't get it because of poorly presentation. The length of time ought to more than this if you improve teaching but in the case of poorly presented I think it just right in the length of time.
- Required much more time than scheduled. It's no use to put in the program with such a limited time.
- Expected to use in office in 3 years later.

#### **Project Monitoring and Evaluation**

- Cover more in this topic.

#### **Project Scheduling and Budgeting**

- Ought to take more time about 3 hours.
- Though I haven't interest and lack of knowledge in this field, the instructor is very clever and very well teach until I could gain knowledge even though I get low grade and I learned from my mistakes.

### Financial Aspects of Project Analysis

- Though I haven't interest and lack of knowledge in this field, the instructor is very clever and very well teach until I could gain knowledge even though I get low grade and I learned from my mistakes.
- Cover more in this topic.

### Project Appraisal and Selection

- Though I haven't interest and lack of knowledge in this field, the instructor is very clever and very well teach until I could gain knowledge even though I get low grade and I learned from my mistakes.
- Cover more in this topic.

### Facilitator Tutorial Sessions

- Ought to spend all of this course or first 5 weeks.

In questions 5 through 32 the participants were asked to indicate by circling the appropriate number whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statements.

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

In all cases the numbers 1, 2 & 3 indicate varying degrees of favorable response. 4, 5 & 6 indicate varying degrees of unfavorable response.

The responses are tabulated below:

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>
5. The program has increased my knowledge and skills in project management.	1	19	1.32
	2	9	
	3	-	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Ian</u>	<u>Peter</u>	<u>Nancy</u>	<u>Judy</u>	<u>Mean</u>	
6. The instructor is generally well prepared for class.	1	26	17	13	7	Ian	1.10
	2	3	7	13	14	Nancy	1.66
	3	-	5	3	5	Peter	1.59
	4	-	-	-	3	Judy	2.14
	5	-	-	-	-	Combined	1.62
	6	-	-	-	-		
No ans.		1	1	1	1		
7. Explanation of basic concepts is clear and easy to follow.	1	25	17	5	1	Ian	1.17
	2	5	10	13	13	Nancy	2.33
	3	-	3	9	12	Peter	1.53
	4	-	-	3	4	Judy	2.63
	5	-	-	-	-	Combined	1.92
	6	-	-	-	-		
No ans.		1	1	1	1		
8. The instructor is able to create interest in the course material.	1	29	16	12	1	Ian	1.03
	2	1	14	14	16	Nancy	1.77
	3	-	-	3	10	Peter	1.47
	4	-	-	1	2	Judy	2.37
	5	-	-	-	1	Combined	1.66
	6	-	-	-	-		
9. The instructor is generally enthusiastic in teaching.	1	28	25	25	21	Ian	1.07
	2	2	4	5	6	Nancy	1.2
	3	-	1	-	1	Peter	1.17
	4	-	-	-	1	Judy	1.47
	5	-	-	-	1	Combined	1.23
	6	-	-	-	-		
10. The instructor appears to have excellent knowledge of the subject.	1	29	19	26	6	Ian	1.03
	2	1	8	3	14	Nancy	1.47
	3	-	3	1	7	Peter	1.17
	4	-	-	-	3	Judy	2.2
	5	-	-	-	-	Combined	1.47
	6	-	-	-	-		
11. The instructor's handouts are helpful.	1	28	20	25	15	Ian	1.07
	2	2	4	2	6	Nancy	1.57
	3	-	5	3	7	Peter	1.27
	4	-	1	-	1	Judy	1.73
	5	-	-	-	-	Combined	1.41
	6	-	-	-	-		
No ans.					1		
12. The instructor allows enough question time and all questions are answered satisfactory.	1	25	16	16	10	Ian	1.17
	2	5	12	12	15	Nancy	1.47
	3	-	1	1	2	Peter	1.47
	4	-	1	1	3	Judy	1.93
	5	-	-	-	-	Combined	1.5.
	6	-	-	-	-		

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Ian</u>	<u>Nancy</u>	<u>Peter</u>	<u>Judy</u>	<u>Means</u>
13. There is no difficulty in understanding the instructor.	1	25	12	16	5	Ian 1.17
	2	5	9	10	13	Nancy 2.0
	3	-	6	4	8	Peter 1.6
	4	-	3	-	3	Judy 2.4
	5	-	-	1	-	Combined 1.79
	6	-	-	-	-	

Overall Rating of Instructors

Ian	1.10
Nancy	1.68
Peter	1.41
Judy	2.11
Combined	1.58

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>
14. Use of microphone is very helpful.	1	27	1.1
	2	3	
	3	-	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
15. The facilitator was well prepared. (Abhichata)	1	18	1.43
	2	11	
	3	1	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
16. The facilitator has a good knowledge of the subject.	1	9	1.8
	2	18	
	3	3	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	
17. The facilitator could give all necessary explanation to participants.	1	9	1.93
	2	16	
	3	4	
	4	0	
	5	1	
	6	-	
18. The facilitator was helpful to the learning process.	1	16	1.47
	2	12	
	3	2	
	4	-	
	5	-	
	6	-	

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>		
19. The facilitator was needed to facilitate learning.	1	11	1.8		
	2	17			
	3	1			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	1			
20. The facilitator was enthusiastic in facilitating training.	1	19	1.37		
	2	9			
	3	2			
	4	-			
	5	-			
	6	-			
<u>Overall Rating of Facilitator:</u>	1.63				
21. Enough evening facilitator sessions were held.	1	10	1.5		
	2	15			
	3	3			
	4	0			
	5	1			
	6	-			
22. The field trips were valuable and helpful to the learning process.	<u>Rating</u>	<u>NESSI</u>	<u>NERAD</u>	<u>Coffee Project</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	1	8	1	4	NESSI 1.83
	2	19	13	19	NERAD 2.67
	3	3	12	6	C.P. 2.13
	4	-	3	1	
	5	-	1	-	
6	-	-	-		
23. The arrangement for the field trips were satisfactory.	1	9	3	7	NESSI 1.87
	2	16	12	21	NERAD 2.6
	3	5	10	2	C.P. 1.83
	4	-	4	-	
	5	-	1	-	
	6	-	-	-	

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>			
24. The text books were helpful to the course.	1	20	1.37			
	2	9				
	3	1				
	4	-				
	5	-				
	6	-				
25. The text books will be useful to me as reference books in the future.	1	25	1.17			
	2	5				
	3	-				
	4	-				
	5	-				
	6	-				
26. There was good cooperation between the instructros and facilitators.	1	19	1.43			
	2	9				
	3	2				
	4	-				
	5	-				
	6	-				
27. The instructors and Tahi facilitators were sufficiently available for consultation.	1	13	1.73			
	2	13				
	3	3				
	4	1				
	5	-				
	6	-				
28. The training program was well organized and managed.	1	10	1.63			
	2	15				
	3	4				
	4	-				
	5	-				
	6	-				
	No ans.	1				
29. The training facilities were satisfactory	1	12	1.76			
	2	12				
	3	5				
	4	-				
	5	-				
	6	-				
	No ans.	1				
30. DTEC personnel at the training site were helpful and gave good support to the course.	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Chittimas</u>	<u>Malinee</u>	<u>Anchalee</u>	<u>Nongyao</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	1	4	14	26	24	C.2.27
	2	16	13	4	5	M.1.63
	3	8	3	-	1	A.1.13
	4	2	-	-	-	N.1.23
	5	-	-	-	-	
6	-	-	-	-		

	<u>Rating</u>	<u>No. of Responses</u>	<u>Mean</u>	
31. DTEC headquarters personnel were helpful and gave good support to the course.	1	2	2.23	
	2	20		
	3	7		
	4	1		
	5	-		
	6	-		
32. The living arrangement at the hotel were satisfactory.	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Kjon Kaen</u>	<u>Chiang Inn</u>	<u>Mean</u>
	1	13	14	1.67
	2	15	9	1.76
	3	1	5	
	4	1	1	
	5	-	-	
33. The quality of lunch at the hotel is good.	1	17	6	1.6
	2	9	14	2.33
	3	3	6	
	4	1	3	
	5	-	0	
	6	-	1	
34. Would you recommend the same training sites for future training programs?	1	10	6	2
	2	14	11	2.67
	3	3	5	
	4	2	5	
	5	1	1	
	6	-	2	
35. From the point of view of the contents of the course, the duration of the program is	Too long	2		
	Just right	15		
	Too short	13		
36. From the point of view of personal and family circumstances, the duration of the program is	Too long	7		
	Just right	22		
	Too short	1		
37. The length of the working day is	Too long	6		
	Just right	22		
	Too short	1		
	No answer	1		

Question 38 asked for comments from the participants. The comments made were as follows:

38. Do you have any other practical suggestions or comments?

- a) About the program, e.g. content additions to or deletions from the program, training materials and handouts, books, etc.
- From the point of view of relevancy to my work the program should cover more details in SAPM, FAPM, PME, PBC, PAS.
  - It is excellent.
  - Books ought to come early, especially "System Tools."
  - Just right but some subject too little time.
  - For handouts and books are excellent.
  - Increase the length of time in content.
  - Computer: better to be deleted, if not provide more time for basic concept. Handouts and texts some are too small letter (problem with eyes).
  - For me this program is very useful, but I have so little knowledge about it. So it should be more detail in more outline for the basic understanding of the course.
  - Too much handout.
  - Training, materials and handouts, books provided for participants are sufficient but it will be worth if the additional materials will be provided.
  - This program is very useful for my job. Training materials, handouts and books are prepared very well. I hope, this program should be arranged for Thai officers again.
  - Suggestion about another interesting text book.
  - Contents providing's not continuous as it should be, sometimes, It's made me too upset and difficult to understand clearly.
  - I think that the program is useful, I can't delete from the whole program. The things that I would like to be considered is the arrangement of time during the day that how come we can feel that it is not to tight in learning during the day time.
  - The program is very useful, but the schedule should be improved.
  - Should increase the contents of these followigns:  
1. PME 2. FAPA 3. Project Appraisal Methodologies.
  - No comment, they are good.
  - I have comment about handouts, I prefer to have them which prepare from IPS. Because it is easy to read, and same size which will be pretty when put them in file, and easily to comeback to review it again as references.

- O K
- O K
- It should be more M.C. facilities to help practicing and must be more skill training for participants in computer application.
- Computer Application program is very short time to understand clearly. Provide time for the special activity of participants group to the program, it would helpful to Human Relationship.
- Qualify of handout (Peter and Nancy) is not clear.
- Everything is just fine.
- Content additions - Computer section should be described in more details, lengthen the time for practice.
- I need some books that are available for borrow, but not available to give to me. These books are in the library which DTEC prepares for us.

b) About the instructors.

- All instructors are very good.
- They are very well prepare and skillful in teaching with content and fun, a very pleasant climate when studied.
- Ian and Peter the best. Judy ought to make clear herself in subjects which teach. She will have selfconfidence and can make students clear. Nancy, if she present the subjects on step by step, she will make clear everybody.
- Well.
- They are well qualified instructors with knowledge and experience in their fields. Nancy's presentation on monitoring and evaluation is not quite clear. It will be better if making clear on the concept by using easy, simple examples to make participants understanding.
- Peter and Ian teach us very well.
- It will be very useful if the instructors will emphasize the key concept, key work of the content.
- It's very kind of you (all instructors) to try to teach much knowledge to me. Thanks so much and wish you have a good trip, sir.
- The instructors are well performed in instruction and good knowledge. I suggest Dr. Peter should spent more time on his matter. He seemed to hurry to finish his training program.
- The subjects of Ian, Peter and Nancy should be taught in the same duration so that the participatns can understand the aspects as the whole and the instructors should solve the problem about time on schedule.
- None.
- They all are really good especially Ian and Peter, I like the method of going to lesson, which interested me. About Judy, she has a little self-confidence. Nancy, she doesn't emphasize the main point of each issue, so it's very hard to make decision which is the most important and which is the appropriate one to apply in my job.
- Some items, it's difficult to understand so the instructors should have examples. In calculation course, instructors should try to explain 2-3 times because some participants no have basic study in that course before.

- Participants come from different agencies. I think it should be prepared some basic concept before we take course. Especially Nancy teaching about monitor and evaluation the text books is useful for Economist and Statistician. So it will make much trouble for the participants who don't know the basic concept before.
  - All right.
  - Ian is very good, he teaches me understand. Peter and Nancy may be confuse. Judy teaches not clear but she try to.
  - I'm not sure whether Nancy had enough time for contents of monitoring and evaluation or not but the class for this subject should be longer. Contents should cover the methodologies of evaluation and the limited point for using any types of monitoring and evaluation should be presented clearly.
  - Fine.
  - O K.
  - They are all well qualified with an inborn native of teacher.
  - Ian, you're a real "TEACHER", Be warm in heart to be your student. Peter, though you're an engineer (who doesn't like teaching?) your performance is great. Judy, a real Thai girl. You're in our heart. Nancy, glorious teacher, cute! Smart! and have a little bit of lady's feeling.
- c) About the facilitator.
- Most useful man for P.M. 5
  - Pretty good.
  - We have good facilitator but he should not turn to be grader at very last minutes. If he is going to take part he should be well prepared before Otherwise many of us find that he is very bias for those he has favour and his experience and knowledge is still very limited. \*The most important section of course.
  - Request for full-course facilitator.
  - Khun Abhichata is well-fit for the post.
  - He is very good and very helpful in this class.
  - He is good.
  - Ought to have more than 1.
  - The facilitator should be more than one, should be with us all 6 weeks.
  - Just right.
  - Facilitator should join the program at the beginning of the course and leave when the groups finish work book on P.I.P. It's not necessary to stay until the course is over.
  - He is very good to advise during P.I.P. project.
  - One is not enough. May be two. Facilitator should not authorize in any rating such as teh PIP it may be not come out in the objective way. Because he can not guide every participants in the same way during the PIP periods.
  - No comment on him.
  - Facilitator should have no right to give mark in PIP because he did not give instruction to all participants and he did not know all specific job.
  - Should have facilitator be through the period of program.

- O K.
  - Facilitator should be with us all through 6 weeks of the program.
  - He helped us so much, but there are something I would like to comment, is it seems to me that he has a little bias in grading. For next time, it'll be better to have instructors only grading the P.I.P.
  - Facilitator should have more time to participate with us especially in the first - forth week.
  - It's necessary for the program. I think it should be 1-2 facilitator for each program.
  - Should have more facilitators and provided for whole period.
  - Suitable person.
  - The facilitator should stay for the whole course.
  - Good.
  - O.K.
  - He is the right kind of a person for facilitating services.
- d) About the training program arrangements.
- Well arrangement, accept any minor changes should be informed earlier.
  - Just right.
  - Very good.
  - It is quite in a rush, I have not seen even my approval from the Department.
  - The training program arrangements are good.
  - Well.
  - The information before coming to this course is not good, informed in the short period (since sitting for qualified assessment and waiting for the results), that cause to work seriously to clarify my job.
  - Good.
  - Just right.
  - It was very well arrangements.
  - It is very good arrangements.
  - It's O.K. but sometimes we have insufficient time for reading handouts or we have to go to CMU for a computer session why we will have a test tomorrow.
  - I think that after the first 3 weeks session, we should allow 1 week for the family time and then another 3 weeks session, will provide better attitude.
  - Just well.
  - You are O.K., I am no O.K. (It's too short time for me).
  - It's well prepare, but any how I think that good participants help a lot in arrangement during the program. We've got a lot of help from participants in each town.
  - In the last courses of program, instructor should not hurry to teach because some participants could not follow lessons. You should arrange the program that you think it's necessary for us in the long time.
  - Satisfied.

- Too intensive program.
  - Rather well.
  - Everything is very convenient and coordinator is a very capable girl (Khun Anchalee).
  - Should be more recreation activities.
  - O.K.
- e) About field trips.
- Coffee Research should be other project, such as Thai-German project.
  - Just fine.
  - Not so well prepared, anyway we've got much experiences.
  - Should seek the big project and participants can get clear idea about project.
  - It is good.
  - Coffee project has less lesson to learn about Monitoring and Evaluation.
  - Field trips are enough for this program.
  - Well.
  - O.K. for NESSI and Coffee Project. NERAD ought to prepare much more than this.
  - Select well the projects, those have a good management compare with poor management.
  - The trips should be more concerned to the progrma which help us to understand the program better.
  - Not so good.
  - Some field trips are not useful and necessary. The distant between site and hotel is a keyfactor to take to the consideration.
  - I have a good time in Coffee Project and Good entertainment in NESSI.
  - Some field trip is not well arrange such as NERAD. It should have the guide line, question word about the field trip in order to pay attention in those point of view.
  - Field trip in Chiang Mai Province's less useful for the purpose of instructor to get participants to learn and know about Project monitoring and Evaluation.
  - About right.
  - Quite good.
  - Good.
  - O.K.
  - That's nice.
  - Field trip is useful so DTEC or instructor should find 2 project for comparing.
  - Satisfied.
  - O.K.
  - Some filed get a little knowledge, because it jest begin and I can't find the important item.

- No answer.
- Before go to field trip instructor may explain clearly about what we want to know about it.

f) About the living arrangement.

- O.K.
- O.K.
- Good.
- Too much comfortable. That make many of us woke up late.
- It's O.K. for me, I like a first class hotels.
- It is very good.
- Request for common room.
- The living arrangements are good.
- Well.
- Unfortunately for P.M. 5 that can not go to Phuket!
- Very, very good.
- Just right.
- It is very good.
- Khon Kane Hotel; class room -- agree, food -- agree, bedroom -- disagree  
Chiang Inn Hotel; class room -- disagree, food -- disagree, bedroom - agree.
- We spend to much expense on the hotel, I think we can look for the in-expensive than Chiang Inn Hotel and we can save more perdium.
- In Khon Kaen I felt like my home but in Chiang Mai I was not.
- Good.
- Very good.
- O.K.
- This time the living in Khon-Kaen Hotel is satisfy but a Chiang Inn Hotel is not good because the class-room is not suitable for study, sometimes participants feel uncomfortable. If you have this course again, you should notice about the class room and the place for relax such as swimming pool.
- Satisfied.
- Too good, should be arranged at the lower level hotel to save money for more perdium.
- Rather well.
- The bedroom is nice but participants should have more time to use the classroom. The classroom in Chiang Inn Hotel is not good.
- If we have a common room, the big living room for all of participants, we could have passing a hard time better than this one.

g) Any other comments or suggestions.

- Nearly no sport facilities in Khon-Kaen, only some for tennis player. Swimming Pool in Chiang Mai is O.K. The long program of training at least must have indoor sport and games for example; chess, table tennis, and dart.
- No comment.
- Great, to have a chance to be the participants of P.M. 5

- Should continue this program (I mean it should be offered again). Time duration of the course should be longer.
  - We all found P.I.P. a very useful technique that could adapt well to our own job and intend to try. But it would be more useful if the initiation and the instructor work together closely until it is finished to be a good and practical one without grading since the output should be up to standard and ready to use. If it is to be graded, it should be the same person who advise from the beginning. The grader should have full knowledge in that P.I.P. because P.I.P. is very individual and requires full skill in reviewing. It could not explain all in itself - otherwise it needs time to examine and understand since the reader is not the one who will implement. It is very upsetting and really discourages and confuses with the advisor says. 'It's very good' so we go on and labour full effort and times with confidence to the end and was approved with commended 'very good'. Then the graders (who happened to be) says 'It's wrong'. At stage II, if so, how could the advisor let pass at this most important step. It's evidence that those who helped by the graders all got high grade. With such high bias and limited time for close examination to understand the case plus lack of broad knowledge and experience which are out of his field of the graders. Are we sure that the A+ will really work when implemented and those who got confused or low grade of course will never dare to use. So it just wastes labor and time and all the courage.
- It is not just a complementary speaking that I found all the course a complete management and the instructors are really skillful.
- Some of us agree that it is a good example of harmony communication and teamwork among government agencies.
- This training program arrangements are well prepared, especially the instructors: Prof. Ian, Nancy, Peter and Judy. They are enthusiastic in teaching and have increased my knowledge about project management so I thank you very much.
  - If it has much time, this course is more useful, and if the background of participants are in the same basic or the background of participants are not the same basic but have more time for study it will get more useful.
  - Thanks!
  - During instruction I prefer the instructors to: clear assign, better writing down than speaking, not using overhead projector, because difficult to follow.
  - None.
  - Coffee break.
  - Nongyao and Unchalee are very nice to contact with.
  - DTEC personnel on the site are necessary to fully fill this course. DTEC tries a lot to give us the most convenient, this is expensive. It's good, but sometime we should look for the alternative. DTEC looks a lot on Cost and Benefit to the project, but small consideration on participants point of view.
  - None.
  - No.
  - Nongyao could do the best of her job and all of assignment. She should be considered to be permanent ETEC's staff. Anchalee and Malinee are effective DTEC's staff.
  - It will be better in many ways if DTEC and University of Connecticut, IPS can follow up the participants performance whether they use their knowledge from this program to apply in their job or not. This is the most valuable success of the program.

- Better hotel than this time in Chiang Mai.  
Arrange the suitable time in each lesson.  
Keep time to teach.  
Khun malinee and Khun Anchalee and Khun Nongyao are very nice for us, they should be a chance to be the co-ordinators every program.
- The training should be held at University fo Connecticut.
- Some subjects use a little time but more item and some participants don't know before. They can't understand immediate. Should take a long time for subjects.
- Anchalee and Malinee are very capable coordinators and they are necessary but I don't understand why other DTEC officers came for the course on and off without necessity. They use Thai budget or IPS's?

**APPENDIX H**  
**LIST OF BOOKS PROVIDED**

### List of Books Provided for Project Management Program V

The following books were provided as text books:

Title	Author	Copies
Management Approach to Project Appraisal	Imboden	35
Guidelines to Writing Official Reports	Mayo-Smith	35
Compounding and Discounting Tables for Project Evaluation	Gittinger	35
Organizational Psychology: An Experiential Approach	Kolb, Rubin & MacIntyre	35
Preparing a Performance Improvement Project	Mayo-Smith	65
Elements of Project Management	Solomon	35
Analysis Bar Charting	Mulvaney	35
Systems Tool for Project Management	Delp et al	35
Managing Information: International Case Studies	Mayo-Smith & Ruther	35
Managing Information for Rural Development Projects	Imboden	35

The following books were provided for further reading and reference:

Managing With People	Fordyce & Weil	4
Managing Development: The Political Dimension	Lindenberg & Crosby	3
Evaluating Social Project in Developing Countries	Freeman, Rossi & Wright	3
People Centered Development	Korten & Klauss	3
Introduction to Computers and Data Processing	Shelly & Cashman	2
Cost Benefit Analysis	Sassone & Schaffer	3
Managing Information Systems	Hurtubise	3
In Search of Excellence	Peters & Waterman	3
The Next Economy	Hawken	3
The Third Wave	Toffler	3
Megatrends	Naismith	3
Guidelines for Project Evaluation	U.N.I.D.O.	3
Theory Z	Ouchi	3
The Aquarian Conspiracy	Ferguson	3
Winning with People	Jongeward & James	3

**APPENDIX I**  
**HANDOUT ON PROGRAM CERTIFICATES AND GRADING**

GRADING/IMS/1

University of Connecticut  
IPS International

Project Management  
Thailand, 1985

### 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 all program activities, including classroom sessions and field visits. Not more than two unexcused absences will be allowed. Any absence for official business must be supported by a letter to the Instructional Team Leader (Dr Mayo-Smith) from the participant's Head of Department.

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

1. Active Participation in Class	20%
2. Test Scores	25%
3. Quality of Project Work	25%
4. Quality of Assignments	10%
5. Instructors' Overall Assessment	<u>20%</u>
	<u>100%</u>

In grading assignments and in assessing participants, the instructors will use letter grades from A (excellent) through B (very good) and C (satisfactory) to D (unsatisfactory).

NOTE. The Preliminary Skills Assessment is an instrument to help the instructors assess the extent of participants knowledge before the training commences. It has no bearing on a participant's final grades and no letter grades are given. However, as participants usually wish to know how well they did in this pre-test, numerical scores are given by the instructors as feedback to them.

**APPENDIX J**  
**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS FINAL GRADES**

## FINAL GRADES

### Assessment Categories:

1.	Active Participation in Class	20%
2.	Test Scores	25%
3.	Quality of Project Work	25%
4.	Quality ofn Assignments	10%
5.	Instructor's Overall Assessment	20%
6.	Overall Assessment	100%

Name	Grades					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Mr Somboon Burapatanin	A+	A-	A	A	A	A
Mrs Siriwan Nikoolkarn	A	A-	B+	A	B+	A-
Mrs Yaowapa Juntima	A	A-	A	A	A	A
Miss Pranee Seangsri	A	A-	A-	A	A-	A-
Mr Mathee Wongpradit	A	A	A-	A	A	A
Miss Chutanuj Yenbamroong	A	A-	A	A	A	A
Mr Vichai Mittongtare	A	A+	A	A	A+	A+
Dr Sawat Thummabood	A+	A-	A-	A	A	A
Mr Chalermchai Prasartsee	A+	B+	A	A	A	A
Mrs Supranee Chandratat	A+	A-	A-	A	A	A
Miss Ratana Waewswang	A-	A-	B+	A	A-	A-
Mr Saksith Sasibutra	A	B	A+	A	A	A
Mr Satawat Sathitpiansiri	A+	A-	A-	A	A	A
Mr Sarote Wararat	B+	C-	B+	A	B-	B-
Mr Danai Kulampakorn	A+	A-	A	A	A	A
Mr Roong Sopsamai	A	A-	B+	A	A-	A-
Miss Supanee Techadamrongsin	A-	B+	A-	A	A-	A-
Mr Kittisak Meekun-Iam	A	A-	A	A	A	A
Mr Sermsak Chantem	A	A	A-	A	A	A
Miss Supattra Yingyuenyong	A+	A+	A-	A	A+	A+
Mrs Malinee Chulvachana	A+	A-	A-	A	A	A
Mrs Waroonee Karnjanaharuetai	A+	B+	A-	A	A	A-
Mrs Nitaya Surakoat	A	A-	A	A	A	A
Dr Ruchira Pucharasupa	A	A-	A+	A	A	A
Mr Chaloepporn Rungkawipa	A-	B+	B+	A	A-	A-
Mr Pichit Poopichpong	A	A	A-	A	A	A
Mr Ritthirong Jaiyasin	A	A-	A	A	A	A
Mr Panomsakdi Thayatham	A-	B+	A-	A	A-	A-
Miss Warunee Utanut	A	A	A+	A	A+	A+
Mrs Sutida Srungboonmee	A-	A	A-	A	A	A