PN-ARE-270

STAFF STUDY

Improving The Participant "EXIT-INTERVIEW" Evaluation Process

☆

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT PLANNING
International Cooperation Administration
September, 1960

S T A F F S T U D Y

IMPROVING THE PARTICIPANT "EXIT-INTERVIEW" EVALUATION PROCESS

International Cooperation Administration
Office of Management Planning
Program Methods Division
September, 1960

IMPROVING THE PARTICIPANT "EXIT-INTERVIEW" EVALUATION PROCESS

Table of Contents

Summary ii

Introduction 1

"Exit-Interview" Evaluation in ICA/W 2

Chart I - Summary of ICA/W Training Staff Evaluation Activities 3

"Exit-Interview" Evaluation in Participating Agencies. . . 6

Chart II - Time and Cost of Evaluation of Participants by Cooperating Agencies. . . 8

Rationale of "Exit-Interview" Evaluation 9

Conclusions 12

Recommendations. 18

Actions Required 19

SUMMARY

In April 1960, ICA established a program of evaluation for the more than 25,000 participants who have already completed training and returned to their home countries. It is anticipated that improvements in the Participant Training Program will result from the findings of this program.

Another aspect of participant evaluation -- that of the "exit interview", which is conducted by training staffs at the end of the participant's training program immediately prior to his departure from the U.S. -- has not yet been given adequate attention and emphasis.

A review of the "exit interview" evaluation process indicates that under the present system:

- Evaluation is not likely to be performed objectively or impartially.
- There is no uniformity of approach and only spotty coverage.
- Insufficient provision is made for dissemination and application of evaluation findings in Washington.
- There is little indication of utilization of evaluation reports by Missions; some staffs never send evaluation reports to the field.
- There is excessive duplication of effort; some participants being interviewed several times for essentially the same purpose.
- The present process is expensive, occupying much time in ICA/W and participating agencies.

In order to correct these weaknesses and to assure that maximum benefits result from this evaluation process, this study recommends that:

1. <u>This evaluation function be located within O/PT.</u>
2. <u>The four positions in O/IND and the two positions in O/LAF presently devoted to this function be transferred to O/PT.</u>
3. <u>O/PT be authorized an additional four program-funded positions to carry out this function and that immediate attention be given to:</u>

a) reviewing ICA/W training staff ceilings in light of reduction of effort demanded as a result of centralized evaluation, and

b) reducing participating agencies budgets sufficiently to fund at least these four positions.

IMPROVING THE PARTICIPANT "EXIT-INTERVIEW" EVALUATION PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

During the last fiscal year, 5562 participants left the U. S. upon completion of their training programs and returned to their countries of origin. Some of these had been in the U. S. for only a few weeks; the great majority had been here for more than six months; some had been in training for two or three years. For some of these participants the training program had been a success; for others it could only be considered a failure.

In most cases, immediately prior to his departure the participant had, either individually or as a member of a group, been given an "exit interview". It may have been conducted by ICA personnel or by personnel of a participating agency; the length may have varied from 5 minutes to as much as 4 hours; it might have been a real attempt to ascertain the weaknesses and strong points of his training programs or could have been, as one training staff noted, "more in the nature of a warm farewell." In the majority of cases, as this study has revealed, it was not recorded, followed no pattern, and the facts which were brought out during the "exit interview" were not disseminated outside of the immediate area of the particular training staff. In particular, the findings were almost certainly not reported to the Mission concerned.

Comments are repeatedly made that ICA needs to devote more attention and effort to the evaluation of its participant training program. Persons most closely connected with the participant training program continually complain that not enough is being done in this direction. They say they wish they knew more why it is that some programs fail and others succeed. There is, they reiterate, far more effort needed in the field of "exit interview" evaluation.

This study is the report of an examination of the overall efforts of ICA in respect to this function. It concludes that the contrary appears to be true; there is probably too much time and effort devoted to evaluation in ICA/W. It is not from want of effort but rather from misdirection and misapplication of effort that the ICA/W "exit interview" process is both excessively costly and of negligible benefit to the agency.

This study examines the present procedures used in "exit interview" evaluation by ICA/W and participating agency training staff and makes recommendations for organizational and procedural changes designed to make such evaluation an effective technique for improvement of the participant program.

Conduct of "Exit Interview" Evaluation in ICA/W

On November 10, 1959, the former Training Development Staff (O/TDS) queried all ICA/W Training Staffs as to their methods of conducting end-of-training interviews. In addition, those training staffs which were not covered by this memorandum, O/TRANS, O/SS and HD (O/PUB), were queried by M/MP during the course of this study. M/MP has reviewed these replies and has summarized them in the following table to give a brief overall picture of present agency operations in respect to the "exit interview" function.

It is evident that these figures as to duration of interviews are only approximate. Much of this data must of necessity be done by estimate in view of the fact that in many instances no formal reports or records of interviews are made by the training staffs.

The wide diversity of approach and complete lack of uniformity among the training staffs are at once evident and it is difficult to give any indication of what a theoretical "average" exit interview evaluation might look like.

These replies reveal certain important weak points in the present ICA/W evaluation system. Among these are:

(a) Evaluation is not likely to be performed objectively or impartially. In the majority of cases evaluating personnel are continually placed in the position of rating their own performance. It is not fair to ask these persons to go on record as having performed poorly or to bring their own weaknesses or mistakes to the attention of their superiors. The very closeness of evaluating personnel to the training programs and, in the case of project managers, their actual involvement with individual training programs, may prevent them from seeing weakness or error when it occurs. It is quite usual that the person making a mistake is the least likely to be aware of it. To prevent just such a thing from happening, a staff was set up in ICA that was completely divorced from both the DD/O and DD/M areas and was under the direct control of the Director, ICA. Not content even with this degree of disassociation, Congress removed this function entirely from the agency and placed it within the Department of State. The advantages of divorcement are even more apparent in the training activity, where an objective evaluator can look at a participant with a detachment which is impossible to the project manager who has been intimately involved with the participant and his personal problems, anxieties and desires. The impartial analysis at which an objective observer can contribute can be of value to the project manager and complement the latter's subjective experience. Disinterested evaluation will also serve to strengthen the position of the individual training staffs, inasmuch as they will no longer find

SUMMARY OF TRAINING STAFF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

OFFICE	CONDUCTED BY	#PARTICI-PANTS FY-1960	DURATION OF INTERVIEW		WRITTEN REPORT MADE	STANDARD QUESTIONS USED	PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED
			INDIVIDUAL	GROUPS			
A. Offices Responding to O/TDS Query							
O/IND	Evaluation Branch 3 Professional 1 Secretarial	2054*	1-2 hours	2 1/2-3 hours	Yes	No	100
O/FOOD	1 Professional 1 Clerical Project Manager USDA Personnel	1146	1-1 1/2 hours	2-2 1/2 hours	yes	yes	40-50 (by USDA)
O/LAF	Evaluation Branch 1 Professional 1 Clerical	696	45 minutes	4 hours	Yes	No	100
(O/PUB-TATS) Public Health Division	Project Manager	427	45 minutes	1 1/2 hours	Yes	No	100
Education Division	Project Manager	1104	5 minutes	2 hours	Usually not	No	Unknown
Community Development Division	Project Manager	87	45 minutes	2 hours	No	No	100
Public Safety Division	Project Manager	343	1 hour	3 hours	Notes for files	No	100
Public Administration Division	Project Manager	391	30 minutes	30 minutes	No	No	100
B. Offices Queried by M/MP							
O/TRANS	Evaluation Officer	389*	2 1/2 hours	4 hours	Yes	Yes	100
O/SS	Project Manager	1	2 hours	N.A.	Yes	No	100
(O/PUB) Housing Division	Project Manager	101	3-4 hours	4-5 hours	No	No	100

* Included in totals for O/IND are 201 Transportation participants who were interviewed by O/IND Evaluation Branch prior to establishment of O/TRANS.

it necessary to continually defend their own actions. Favorable reports and commendations contained in evaluation reports prepared by a staff outside the training office concerned would be given greater credence throughout the agency and the training staffs would not be thought of as "blowing their own horns" when favorable reports are presented. Evaluation by an outside staff is the best method of assuring that the elements of objectivity and impartiality are present in the evaluation system. It is also the best method of assuring that the basic participant-project manager relationship is maintained. This relationship is one of the chief strong points of the entire participant program. The establishment of rapport between project manager and participant is fundamental to a successful training program and should not be weakened by attempts to transform the project manager from confidant to disinterested observer.

(b) These interviews are not recorded consistently. In one training staff they are never recorded. In only four training staffs are they regularly recorded and analyzed. Unless information obtained through such evaluations is disseminated, and as necessary brought to the attention of top-level staff responsible for the management of the participant training program, much of the value of this process appears to be lost.

(c) Coverage of participants is spotty. Although almost all training staffs indicated that, with certain qualifications, all participants were interviewed, O/FOOD with the second largest number of participants, interviews only 40-50 per cent of their participants; the Education Training Branch (TATS) did not know what percentage of coverage they were obtaining. As discussed in greater detail further in this study, there does not seem to be a strong justification for 100 per cent coverage. There is certainly little justification for non-uniform application.

(d) Without written reports there can, of course, be little effective dissemination of evaluation responses, even within the individual training staff concerned. Certainly there can be no transmission of what might well be important information outside of the particular training area concerned. Effective analysis of operations and detection of trends and recurring problem areas is almost impossible in the absence of written reports. Any attempts at statistical analysis which must be based on ..."as I remember..." and "...to the best of my recollection..." are of little value and might as well not be undertaken.

(e) It is significant that several of these staffs themselves felt that such evaluation was useless to the Missions, and one

staff does not even send reports to USOMs. These staffs commented as follows:

O/LAF	"There is no evidence of utilization by the Missions."
Public Health Division	"No evidence from Missions that the reports are either read or utilized to any extent."
Education Division	"There is little evidence that reports sent to the Missions are either read or utilized."
Public Adm. Division	"Utilization by the field is in most cases remote and uncertain."
Community Development Div.	"...no evaluation reports are sent to the Missions."

(f) There is apparently no agreement among training staffs as to what constitutes adequate evaluation. Average length of interviews varies from 5 minutes to 2 hours for individuals and from one-half hour to 4 hours for teams. Various types of approach are utilized and little attempt has been made to assure, through standardization of conduct, that certain pertinent points are always covered.

(g) The present allocation of personnel for the conduct of this function is unbalanced. O/IND is presently authorized four program-funded positions solely for its evaluation activity. O/LAF has been able to divert two positions allotted to it under its normal training ceiling, based on workload standards for number of participant arrivals, to conduct such evaluations. Other staffs, however, have not been in such a favorable position and are obliged to rely on participating agency evaluations and the limited time which project managers can manage to devote to exit interviewing.

Conduct of "Exit Interview" Evaluation in Participating Agencies

As noted in the replies of the ICA/W training staffs, in most cases the participant is interviewed not once but several times. Recently, O/PT checked with a number of participating agencies to ascertain their present practices in this area. The attached table, from the O/PT report of June 20, 1960, shows the extent and estimated cost to ICA of the evaluation work which some of these agencies are carrying on. This report does not cover all agencies, although it does consider the great majority of agencies concerned, and figures can be considered only as approximate.

It is readily apparent that participating agencies are certainly not likely to reveal any shortcomings in their operations to ICA/W technical offices. On the contrary their reports to ICA/W probably attempt to paint a far rosier picture than may actually exist. Even when their evaluation points up a need for corrective action in the area of overall participant training policy or procedure they are not able to do much about it, since overall policies and procedures are determined by ICA and imposed on the agency. It is all too easy for the agencies to take credit for the good portions of a training program and to indicate to the participant that the blame for bad aspects is due to ICA's imposition of unsound policy or procedure.

Evaluation in regard to the adequacy of ICA's administrative policies and procedures should not be left to a participating agency. Each agency sees only its particular operations and is interested only in how ICA policy affects its operations. It can hardly be expected to understand how a policy that might not be best for it would be necessary because of the operations of another agency. Neither can participating agencies be expected to understand sufficiently the requirements of the entire participant training program; even less can they be expected to understand the requirements of the total ICA program and the necessity for certain controls which, judged solely on their own experience, may appear superfluous. Their role is clearly that of an operating element working within defined policies and although, as is presently done, they should be questioned as to the possible effects of policy changes on their operations, they should not be regarded as policy-making instruments.

It is evidently true that a substantial portion of the times listed in the attached table is devoted by these participating agencies to substantive evaluation; to analysis of the adequacy and suitability of training course content and structure and to accuracy of programming in relation to training program objectives. This form of evaluation is, of course, a requisite for effective training and a proper and desirable function of the participating agency. It is also certain, however, that a significant portion of these times is consumed in evaluation of administrative methods and procedures. A certain amount of informal administrative evaluation of their own work should be done

by the participating agencies; the analysis and improvement of operations is an inherent element of any function. But the amount of formal organized effort devoted to this type of evaluation by the participating agencies as a special and distinct program appear to be unjustified. Evaluation of participating agencies administrative operations should be conducted by a group within ICA and independent in so far as possible of training operations.

TIME AND COST OF EVALUATION OF PARTICIPANTS BY COOPERATING AGENCIES

Agency and Bureau	Total Participants in Trng--9 mos. Period, July'59-Mar'60	Est. Hours Spent in Evaluation with Each Participant	Cost, Computed at Hourly Rate, Base Level of GS-13 ($4.76)	How Performed: Exit Interview	How Performed: Continuing Throughout Program
Dept. of Agriculture	1,379	2	$13,128.08	X	
Federal Communications Commission	39	2	371.28	X	
Housing and Home Finance	102	3	1,456.56	X	
Department of Commerce:					
Office of Business Economics	15	25	1,785.00		X
Bureau of Census	52	4	990.08	X	X
Coast & Geodetic Survey	17	40	,236.80	X	X
Maritime Administration	12	5	,427.20	X	X
Bureau of Public Roads	121	2	,151.92	X	
Bureau of Standards	1	30	142.80	X	X
Weather Bureau	23	1	109.48	X	
Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare					
Office of Education	790	8	,083.20	X	
Public Health Service	725	2	,902.00	X	
Social Security Administration	58	8	,208.64	X	
Vocational Rehabilitation	9	10	428.40	X	
Department of Interior:					
Fish & Wildlife Service	15	5	595.00	X	X
Geological Survey	82	2	780.64		X
Bureau of Mines	21	5	499.80	X	
Bureau of Reclamation	102	3	,456.56	X	
Department of Labor:					
Bureau of Apprenticeship & Training	148	5	,522.40	X	
Bureau of Labor Standards	60	2	571.20	X	
Bureau of Labor Statistics	21	5	499.80		X
International Labor Affairs	50	1	238.00	X	
Army Corps of Engineers	9	1	42.84	X	
TOTALS	3,861	14,778	$73,627.68		

The Rationale of End-of-Training Interviews

It is important to distinguish at the outset the various arguments which are advanced as to the basic purposes and chief benefits of such evaluation.

There are many differing views concerning these purposes. The manner in which interviews are conducted by the individual training staff is reflective of that particular staff's concept of the main purpose to be achieved. This purpose is usually described as one of the following:

1. As a de-briefing or "gripe" session to permit the participant to "get it off his chest" prior to his return. If a disgruntled participant is allowed to tell all about his frustrations, disappointments and dissatisfactions during his training, and the interviewer lends a willing ear, it is assumed that he will feel better about it all and return home without a feeling of bitterness and generally contented. This reasoning argues for 100 per cent coverage of participants and personal or small group interviews. It minimizes the need for notes and reports. It is essentially, however, a negative approach, concerned mostly with attempting to compensate for mistakes that should not have happened -- such as improper selection or program development -- or should have been corrected much earlier in the program -- as in the case of misunderstandings caused by incomplete orientation in the Missions. Evaluations conducted for this purpose can easily become extremely time consuming. Many project managers, in fact, explain that they lose much time in hearing these complaints.

2. As "orientation" sessions to help prepare the participants for his homecoming experience. This covers such things as how to put his new ideas across, and general re-adjustment counseling often including as well a further re-statement of Mutual Security Program objectives and brief lectures on the U. S. and democratic principles. Such sessions evidently need not be individual and are probably more effective when presented to a group. The role of the participant is here a passive rather than an active one and little improvement of training methods and procedures can result from sessions of this type. Their value is doubtful. Orientation concerned specifically with re-adjustment to native country ways and with communication of new knowledges is the subject of the week long seminar presently conducted by Michigan State University under ICA contract. This seminar, conducted by high-caliber professionals in the field of communication, is now a required portion of most participants' programs. Recent comments received from the field have shown an overwhelmingly favorable reaction to these seminars and Missions consider them to be of considerable value in assisting the participant in reajusting to his home country situation and in utilizing his training.

It is extremely doubtful that orientation conducted for this purpose by ICA/W training staffs and/or participating agency staffs could be of the same standard of quality as that given by Michigan State University.

3. As an evaluation of ICA and participating agency administrative arrangements. This makes the evaluation primarily an attempt to determine from the participant whether ICA has been doing a complete job in arranging and administering his program; whether universities and participating agencies are giving satisfactory service. Such evaluation can be quite important since it detects weaknesses and brings to light specific cases where problems occur. This kind of evaluation argues for review of a cross-section of all types of participants and requires preparation of full reports. It also necessitates that these reports be presented to the appropriate office which can ensure that desired changes in administrative policy and procedures are made.

4. As an evaluation of the individual participant and his reaction to his training. Evaluation focused on this aspect attempts to answer such questions as: "Could the participant speak and understand English well enough to benefit from his training?"; "Did he get the type of training which he had expected?"; "Does he know how he will use his training on his return?". Such evaluation requires that reports be made and forwarded to the USOMs. It is generally agreed that poor selection and improper pre-departure orientation is responsible for the failure of many programs. The replies given in evaluation sessions concentrating on this aspect can enable them to save or improve the results of unsatisfactory programs by additional follow-up work with the participant after his return. It should be evident that such ex post facto evaluation will hardly be of benefit inasmuch as the participant has completed his program and the money and effort involved have already been expended. This aspect of evaluation is something that should be done in the "entrance interview' -- a separate phase of participant evaluation which is not covered in this paper -- and from intensive review of participant reports and activities while the program is in process. Such review should be conducted before effort is wasted.

5. An evaluation of the technical content of individual training programs. Some interviews are primarily an attempt to analyze the substantive features of a participant's program -- e.g. "Was the level of training too advanced?" "Was the course of instruction sufficiently comprehensive?" A certain amount of such evaluation is represented in the tabulations of both ICA/W and participating agency training staffs presented in this study. It is difficult to determine what percentage of total evaluation effort this substantive analysis comprises. Most probably it is a significant amount. To be effective, this type of interview must be conducted by persons technically competent in the particular field involved. Consequently this form of evaluation could not be performed by a centralized evaluation staff. No such staff could

be sufficiently conversant with the multitude of very specialized technical areas concerned. It is on the strength of the necessity for performing substantive evaluation of participant programs that some ICA training staffs maintain that exit interview evaluation must be integrally associated with the training staff. The validity of this argument is open to question. The technical experience needed to perform properly substantive evaluation is only rarely found in the training staffs of either ICA/W or the participating agency. This experience is located within the technical offices. It is by professional personnel of the technical offices and not by project managers or other personnel of the training staffs that this kind of evaluation can be carried out most effectively. Substantive evaluation, connected with the technical adequacy and appropriateness of training programs, should definitely be reserved to the appropriate technical office in ICA or in the participating agency; it is, in any event, indivisable from program implementation and supervision and is generally carried on during the entire training program process. The most that could be expected of an evaluation staff as conceived in this paper is to alert the appropriate office when exit interviews reveal the possible need for detailed technical consideration. The responsibilities of the evaluation staff should end at this point. In the final analysis it must be admitted that the USOM is the best judge of whether a participant's training has been satisfactory. In many cases the accurateness of the participant's judgment at the time of the exit interview is open to question, since asking him whether or not the training was adequate for his needs is the same as asking a college graduate on graduation day if his training has prepared him for his future career. In actuality, it is only after a sufficient period of time has elapsed in most cases, and training has been applied that a training program can be rated. Even then it can best be rated not by ICA/W personnel but by the technician and training officer in the USOM who originally indicated the type of training desired. Evaluation of this type, as previously mentioned, is provided for in the overseas evaluation program presently underway.

Conclusions

In summary, a review of the exit interview process indicates that of the five purposes commonly attributed to it, only two appear to have validity. These are those discussed above as: (1) as debriefing sessions to allow the participant to deliver himself of his complaints and general comments prior to departure, and; (2) as an evaluation of ICA and participating agency administrative arrangements.

On these two, the former can best normally be handled by those persons who have been closest to the participant during his training program and have already established a certain rapport with him; in other words, this appears to be a clear-cut function of the project manager. It is difficult to see how this particular type of personal contact could conceivably be divorced from the project manager-participant relationship. Continuous, close observance of the workings of ICA and participating agency training operations over a long period of time, coupled with specific observations made during the course of this study, indicate that any attempts to eliminate this established relationship would be detrimental. At the same time, it is recognized that the participant-project manager relationship may sometimes be unsatisfactory. There certainly are occasions when the participant's chief complaint lies with what he considers to be shortcomings or inconsiderateness on the part of the project manager. It is safe to assume, however, that these compose a very small minority. Provision could be made in the evaluation procedure and organization proposed later in this paper for ascertaining whether such unsatisfactory relationship exists and for taking corrective action in such cases.

Evaluation of the latter type -- to determine the adequacy of ICA-established administrative policies and procedures -- can and should be separated entirely from training operation. Such evaluation would be concerned with monitoring the application of ICA policies and procedures, dealing with such specifics as: adequacy of book and living allowances; completeness of pre-departure orientation; utilization and availability of hospitality and community services; presence and use of participant workbooks, etc. All of these points can be covered in an organized evaluation session and can be of valuable assistance to those persons responsible for the formulation of administrative policies and procedures. Not only would the removal of this function from operating training staffs relieve these staffs of considerable workload but if properly located, it would ensure an honest and impartial review of ICA methods. Unlike evaluation which necessitates an intimate knowledge of a particular technical field (previously outlined as type number five above), this form of evaluation can be conducted by one staff for all training fields.

Organizational Location

There exist several possible organizational locations for such a function. In order to assure objectivity of approach and impartial assessment of training operations, it appears that such a staff should not only be removed from the area of training operations but also from the immediate control of any particular technical office. This is especially desirable in attempting to ensure uniformity in application of training policies and equality in the handling of all participants.

a. Immediate Office of DD/O

Inasmuch as the training program is an assigned responsibility of the Office of the Deputy Director for Operations, it is quite conceivable that a staff be attached to his Office to perform such exit evaluation and to assist him in monitoring the effectiveness of the entire participant program. There are drawbacks to this proposal, however. At present the span of control of the DD/O is excessively extended and the addition of such a staff would serve to aggravate this situation, even though it were to be placed under the supervision of one of the two ADD/Os. Furthermore, the day-to-day activities of this staff would reveal problem areas where immediate action would be indicated on many matters of relatively minor importance to overall DD/O operations but of significant concern to the training program. Many of these matters should receive prompt attention but would not be of sufficient importance to bring to the notice of the DD/O.

b. ADD/O Immediate Office

The function could be placed under an Assistant DD/O. The two ADD/Os do not have direct operating control of their respective areas, but act themselves in a staff capacity. In order to resolve problems, it would be necessary to solicit opinions and recommendations of the various offices concerned, thus delaying action and perhaps necessitating the individual attention of the ADD/O to achieve resolution of conflicting points of view. It appears, therefore, that such location of this function is not desirable.

c. DD/M and other Locations

In order to achieve utmost objectivity, the location of such a staff outside the DD/O area can be envisaged. It could be ssigned within the DD/M area, be established within the Office of the Director, ICA, or, to carry this approach even further, conceivably it could be placed under the control of the Office of Inspector General, and Comptroller, Mutual Security. From a practical standpoint, none of these locations appears to be satisfactory. To

establish the staff in any of these offices would probably remove it too far from the operations of the participant program and, if the functions of this staff were to be adequately carried out, would demand of these offices an attention which they could hardly be asked to devote.

d. Office of Participant Training

Careful consideration of this question indicates that the most appropriate location for this staff would be in the Office of Participant Training. In the recently approved Manual Order setting forth the functions of O/PT, it is stated that:

> "the Office of Participant Training is responsible for the development, coordination, approval and issuance of participant training policies, standards and procedures, and has the authority for assuring adherence to those."

Review and analysis of the operations of the training staffs and of the participating agencies are therefore already within the purview of O/PT. Evaluation of the type proposed, emphasizing the adequacy and the proper application of established training policies and procedures is not only within the authority of O/PT but indeed it is difficult to understand how it can be expected to carry out its functions unless it performs evaluation of this type.

The O/PT functional statement further reveals that:

> "the Orientation and Evaluation Division of the Office of Participant Training is responsible for:
>
> A. Development and supervision of participant training program evaluation and follow-up activities concerned with overall program objectives, the administrative methods employed, the utilization of the training provided, etc., with the assistance of othe ICA/W offices and the USOMs, as appropriate coordinates and supervises same. The Technical Offices are primarily concerned with evaluation of the appropriateness quality of the training provided in their respective fields.
>
> B. Initiating action to correct deficiencies in training program operations revealed by evaluation studies, consulting with other ICA/W offices and the USOMs as necessary."

It appears quite clear that exit interview evaluation as discussed in this study is a function of, and should be assigned specifically to, the Office of Participant Training. Under present organizational arrangements, with an inequitable distribution of such positions within the various training staffs - only O/IND having a ceiling allotted specifically for this activity - evaluation is not, and cannot be performed effectively.

That the Office of Participant Training can perform this function effectively and in a more than satisfactory manner has already been demonstrated. Since November 1959, O/PT has performed all end-of-training interviews for O/TRANS participants. In so doing they have developed a methodology and approach which has proved to be quite effective. A standard questionnaire to be used by the evaluator has been developed by O/PT and recommentations which have been made for improvement have been implemented by O/TRANS. The comments of O/TRANS itself are perhaps the best proof that this system can operate in a perfectly satisfactory manner and refute the oft-heard contention that evaluation must remain within the jurisdiction of the training staff. The following is excerpted from a memorandum of May 13, 1960 from Arthur G. Syran, Director, O/TRANS, to Herman Kleine, ADD/O:

> "In our opinion exit interviewing would best be done in the Office of O/PT and not in the office providing the participant training. It is not likely that colleagues who are called upon to judge each others work would be inclined to recommend improvements. First, because there would be a feeling that a colleague's work should not be criticized because the tables might be turned and, secondly, because the evaluator might be considered as breaking faith with his colleague."

A more detailed discussion of the methods developed by O/PT and of the results obtained has been prepared and is contained in a memorandum of July 22, 1960 from Mr. Victory, Director of the Office of Participant Training to the Deputy Director for Operations.

Staffing Requirements

In order to perform adequately the end-of-training evaluation of an individual participant it is estimated that two and one-half hours of evaluator's time is required. Almost one-fourth of this time should be devoted to review of the PIO/P, Bio-Data, program, and reports from and on the participant (all of which are included in the participant's record file) prior to the actual interview. This

preliminary work is extremely valuable to effective evaluation. The actual interview itself can be performed in three-quarters of an hour or less and the balance of time is devoted to the preparation of the evaluator's report and recommendation for corrective action. In the case of group evaluation, the total time involved appears to be approximately four hours. It is evident that these figures can be considered only as estimates. They have been derived, however, from a review of times furnished by various ICA/W training staffs, conversations with Project Managers who presently perform exit interviews, and from analysis of the O/PT memorandum previously referred to.

In addition to the time spent preparing for, conducting and writing up reports on end-of-training interviews, however, additional factors must be considered in determining amount of staff necessary to carry out this evaluation function. Such additional factors would include time devoted to scheduling interviews, conferences with O/PT staff, ICA/W Training Staff and participating agency officials, review of manual orders and general administration of this function.

It may be anticipated that 6,000+ participants will complete their U.S. training in this coming fiscal year. Of these, about twenty per cent will be members of teams which can readily be grouped for purposes of end-of-training interviews. Using the minimum figure of 6,000 departing participants, of which 4,800 would be individuals and 1,200 in teams, averaging six members per team, interviewing time can be estimated as follows:

	plus	
4800 individuals interviewed		200 teams interviewed
2 1/2 hours/interview		4 hours/interview
12,000 interview hours		800 interview hours

Thus an absolute minimum of 12,800 total interview hours would be necessary if 100 per cent coverage were to be achieved. As previously stated, it appears that such coverage is not necessary and from a practical standpoint, such absolute coverage is impossible to attain. With realistic scheduling, and using as a basis the calculation that 1,338 hours per year* could be devoted by each evaluator to this single aspect of his duties, it is indicated that six man-years of professional time would enable O/PT to conduct interviews at a coverage rate of approximately 75 per cent.

Considering other factors previously mentioned involved in carrying out this function, the following staffing is recommended for the exit-interview training function:

* This figure is that which was developed and explained in the M/MP Staff Study, Workload Standards-Participant Training, June 1960

	7	professional positions (one of which would be filled by the Chief of this Staff)
	3	clerical positions
Total	10	positions (program funded)

The small increase in ceiling necessitated by the adoption of this recommendation would be compensated by a very considerable reduction of time and effort on the part of all ICA/W training staffs, and, as indicated in the following section, this additional ceiling can be recovered by the application of management controls.

Recommendations

To assure, therefore, that maximum benefits are obtained from the exit-interview evaluation process, this study recommends that:

- The end-of-training interview function be centralized with the Office of Participant Training.

- The four positions in O/IND and the two positions O/LAF presently devoted to this function be transferred to the Office of Participant Training.

- The Office of Participant Training be authorized an additional four program-funded positions to carry out this function and that it give immediate attention to:

  a) reviewing ICA/W training staff ceilings in the light of reduction of effort demanded as a result of centralized evaluation, and

  b) reducing participating agencies' budgets to the extent that they are presently performing such functions and sufficiently to fund at least these four positions.

- The Office of Participant Training

  a) proceed immediately to apply the concept and method of participant exit-interview evaluation which it has developed to provide equitable and uniform coverage of participants in all technical fields;

  b) assure that weaknesses revealed by such evaluation are

     1) called to the attention of responsible training elements, in particular the missions, for corrective action, and

     2) corrected through revisions in overall agency training policies and procedures.

Actions Required

Principal actions required to implement these recommentions are:

	Action Office	
	DD/O	DD/M
Approval of Staff Study recommendation		
Transfer of four O/IND and two O/LAF positions to O/PT		DD/M
Allocation of additional four program positions to O/PT		DD/M
Review and reduction of training portion of Participating agency budgets	O/PT	
Revision of functional statements for O/PT and O/IND as well as all other ICA/W training staffs		M/MP