

AID 4-98 (10-69)

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT
 Foreign Service Reserve Officers
 Foreign Service Staff Officers and Employees
 DEPARTMENT OF STATE
 AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHECK ONE BOX

- ☒ Regular Report
☐ Interim Report
☐ Departure of Rated Officer
☐ Departure of Rating Officer
☐ Change of Duty

NAME OF OFFICER BEING RATED (Last, First, Middle) WILLIAMS, Ogden		OFFICER'S CLASS FR41810-1	CLASSIFICATION TITLE OF POSITION General Investigator
DATE OF BIRTH 01-22-20	POST OR ORGANIZATIONAL SYMBOL AID/W SA/IR/RD		OFFICER'S FUNCTIONAL OR ORGANIZATIONAL TITLE (if any) General Investigator
DATE OF ARRIVAL AT POST 05-26-69	PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT August 1, 1971 to December 31, 1971		DATE REPORT SUBMITTED TO AGENCY
RATING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE <i>Roderic L. O'Connor</i>		REVIEWING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE	
TYPED NAME Roderic L. O'Connor		TYPED NAME NO APPROPRIATE REVIEWER	
TYPED CLASS, TITLE EX-Level-IV Coordinator, Bureau for Supporting Assistance		TYPED CLASS, TITLE	
I have read this report.	RATED OFFICER'S SIGNATURE <i>Ogden Williams</i>		DATE Jan 14, 1972

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Rater must read official instructions on performance evaluation before completing form.
2. Prepare in triplicate—original for Washington, copy for post, copy for employee. For foreign service personnel assigned to Washington, prepare in duplicate only.
3. Evaluate the officer on the basis of the difficulty of the duties he was required to perform; give due consideration to his personal rank.

PART I - DESCRIPTION OF MAJOR DUTIES

List in descending order of importance the major duties of the rated officer's position. Amount of time spent is not necessarily an indication of the relative importance of duties performed.

Item No.	
	SEE ATTACHED POSITION DESCRIPTION

Number and types of employees supervised:

PART II. RATING AREAS

Evaluate the officer's performance with respect to the five areas listed below. For each area check (✓) the one box representing the descriptive statement which most accurately applies to the rated officer. Read carefully the Considerations in each area before selecting the most descriptive statement. Note that one of the statements in each area, if checked, requires you to identify specific weaknesses by striking out all other words which do not describe a weakness of the rated officer. The spaces headed "Rater's Clarifying Comments, If Any," are intended to permit the rater to modify any element checked, if he feels the descriptive statement is not sufficiently precise.

JOB PERFORMANCE EXCLUDING MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES Considerations: Knowledge of field of work, job responsibilities, decisiveness, judgment, resourcefulness, accuracy, productivity.	Has full knowledge of subject matter field; knows all aspects of job assignment; functions decisively, rapidly, accurately, with exceptional judgment at top productivity and is notably resourceful in meeting new or unusual problems.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Has thorough knowledge of his job and superior background in his field of work. Solves problems accurately and produces at a level which meets exacting requirements for speed and maturity in judgment and response to unexpected situations.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Fundamental knowledge and understanding of the job in hand are acceptable and meet reasonable requirements for judgment, solutions of problems with sufficient production to keep program advancing.	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Considering total complex of requirements inherent in the job and identifiable objectives, satisfies most or many demands but is weak in knowledge of field of work, job objectives, decisiveness, judgment, accuracy, resourcefulness, productivity. (Cross out those which do not apply.)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	In many aspects of job performance, does not meet the demands for adequate performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY		

GENERAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS AND ABILITIESConsiderations:

Competence in planning, organizing, supervising, evaluating both subordinates and programs.

Plans and organizes exceptionally well; constantly and objectively evaluates and adjusts programs; gets the best out of his subordinates; submits sound unbiased evaluations on time; effectively sponsors innovations. ☐

Directs his functions very effectively and usually meets all requirements of areas of management considerations mentioned above in an exemplary manner. ☒

Skill and ability in all aspects of management are acceptable, meeting the needs of the situation to the satisfaction of the rating officer. ☐

Does not demonstrate equal skill in all facets of management. Although adequate in some respects, suffers some weakness in planning, organizing, follow-up, supervision, employee evaluation, program evaluation. (Cross out those which do not apply.) ☐

In most aspects of management operations, fails to meet general requirements for adequate performance or operations. ☐

RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY

Not fully applicable, has no subordinates in present job.

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES AFFECTING PERFORMANCEConsiderations:

Adaptability, versatility, analytical ability, initiative, acceptance of responsibility, dependability, attitude toward job, ability to anticipate.

Is completely flexible; can do or adjust to any change or assignment; analyzes facts or situations expertly; accepts responsibility enthusiastically; promotes new approaches and gets them underway on time and as requested; works happily outside normal field of expertise. ☐

Is willing to try new suggestions and accept responsibility in new areas. Can be relied upon to use personal ingenuity to promote suggested changes based on own analysis of projected operations. Cooperates fully in application of concepts which he may have opposed. ☒

Accepts changes and anticipates problems or prospects based on routine analysis of project; uses limited and somewhat unenthusiastic initiative in such situations, but can be relied upon to follow directives honestly. ☐

In the light of personal attributes affecting value to AID, possesses many of those desirable to successful prosecution of AID's program, but is weak in versatility, ability to anticipate, analytical ability, initiative, acceptance of responsibility, dependability, positive job attitude, adaptability. (Cross out those which do not apply.) ☐

In many or critically required personal attributes needed for more than adequate performance in the foreign service of AID, fails to meet Agency standards. ☐

RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY

EFFECTIVENESS WITH PEOPLEConsiderations:

Ability to deal effectively with Americans; ability to establish and maintain good relations with all non-Americans; ability to project a good impression of the U.S. publicly, privately, formally and informally.

Operates actively and positively with a minimum of friction between himself and other Americans, official or unofficial, and non-Americans of any nationality and status, to the positive advantage of the U.S. Government. ☒

Lives and works without serious personality problems between himself and other persons or groups, creating a general impression favorable to the U.S. ☐

Has no particular impact on others by virtue of personality factors. Fits quietly into the American Community and local situations. ☐

Relationships and impact on work or local situation although ordinarily adequate, fluctuate based on some weakness in relations with Americans, with non-Americans, in representation, official or unofficial. (Cross out those which do not apply.) ☐

Personality traits are sufficiently negative to create problems in either internal operations, external operations, or be inimical to U.S. interests. ☐

RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY

COMMUNICATIONSConsiderations:

Oral and written communication, negotiations, technical advice, local business dealings, skill in local language.

Is completely articulate, skilled in writing, conveys technical advice clearly and persuasively to local nationals, and has no misunderstandings with local businessmen or officials by virtue of skill in communication, either through interpreters or own knowledge of local language, and is clearly skilled in negotiations. Is equally skilled in dealing with fellow Americans. ☐

Can convey thoughts, concepts, and information or desired objectives cogently and with above average success to co-workers or local nationals in virtually all situations and circumstances. Negotiating skill exceeds job requirements. ☒

Communicates satisfactorily in the jargon of his field to fellow Americans. Reaches local nationals through interpreters without major misunderstandings, though possessing little ability in local language. ☐

Although ability in communication seems to meet requirements, is weak in oral communication, written communications, negotiations, conveying technical advice, conducting local business transactions, required facility in local language. (Cross out those which do not apply.) ☐

General ability to convey ideas or requirements persuasively does not satisfy requirements for adequate performance in context of Agency needs. ☐

RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY

PART III - NARRATIVE COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE

Give statement containing your responses to items A and B, using the headings shown below. As you respond to item B, observe carefully the instructions contained in agency guides to rating officers for selected occupations, where applicable. If more space is needed, use additional sheets; identify each sheet at the top by the name of the officer rated, the name or initials of the rating officer, the mission, and the period covered by the report.

A. ASSOCIATION WITH RATED OFFICER. Indicate how long you have known the officer and the nature of your association.

B. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY. Describe the depth, breadth, and quality of the officer's performance in relation to the duties listed in Part I, pointing up strengths and weaknesses. Discuss those factors in Part II which were particularly significant, and especially those rated high or low. Give concrete examples whenever possible.

A. ASSOCIATION WITH RATED OFFICER.

The rated officer joined this Bureau as a Special Assistant for Narcotics in June of this year. As a result of the very great interest shown this year by the Administration in international aspects of the drug problem, and particularly because of the major impact of this issue in East Asia, I originated this position and personally selected the rated officer to fill it. In that capacity, I have dealt with the rated officer frequently over the last six months and have kept closely informed regarding the problems with which he is dealing.

B. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY.

I selected the rated officer for his present assignment because, although he has never worked for me before, I knew a good deal of his previous record and his ability to function effectively in a somewhat unstructured situation. Mr. Williams has some unique qualifications. He is an exceptionally well-trained lawyer who spent three years in the practice of his profession. He is a highly trained intelligence officer, with a thorough knowledge of all of the techniques of covert operations. He is thoroughly familiar with, and has served in almost all of the countries of Indochina and in Thailand. Most importantly, he is a man of keen intellect and excellent analytical ability who is quite prepared to grapple with new problems and to recommend new solutions. Thus, from my point of view, he had to a unique degree the attributes needed to grapple with the extremely complex and difficult problems of the drug traffic in East Asia--problems which are totally new to our bureaucracy and which can only be dealt with by a high degree of innovative thinking.

Mr. Williams' performance in his assignment has fully justified my expectations when I persuaded him to join my staff. He has established excellent working relations with an Interagency Committee devoted to this subject. Because of his excellent knowledge of the locality and personalities of the Indochina area, he has been able to make major contributions to the deliberations of the Committee and has been highly effective in working out many of the complex proposals submitted to it. He was the person primarily responsible for initially drawing up an overall set of plans which have now been adopted as U.S. Government policy in this area.

PART IV – REVIEWING OFFICER'S STATEMENT

The primary role of the reviewing officer concerning this report is to ensure the application of appropriate and equitable rating standards. When the rating officer has completed his report, including adjustments he may want to make after discussion of differing views with the reviewing officer, the latter prepares his own evaluation according to the instructions below – and signs page 1 of the form. If more space is needed, additional sheets may be attached, identified at the top by the name of the officer rated, the name or initials of the reviewing officer, the mission, and the period covered by the report.

- A. The reviewing officer is required to indicate (1) the extent to which he concurs in the officer's report and to explain any differences. He should comment on (2) the extent of his observation of the rated officer's work, (3) whether because of differences in locations, absences, vacancies in the supervisory position or for other reasons the rated officer received less than normal supervision and guidance, (4) whether the rating officer's report appears unduly strict or lenient, and (5) any other matters he deems pertinent.
- B. The reviewing officer should summarize his own evaluation of the officer's performance if he has sufficient basis and observation for doing so.

PART V – REVIEW PANEL

Was review panel used?

Yes ☐

No ☐

PANEL COMMENTS (USE ADDITIONAL SHEETS, IF NECESSARY)

PANEL MEMBERS (NAME, TITLE, CLASS)

SIGNATURE

for the Review Panel

DATE

Staple top, left corner of attachments here to this single sheet only.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

	Page	5
Rated Officer	Ogden Williams	<i>W</i>
Rating Officer	Roderic L. O'Connor	
Period covered	8/1 - 12/31/71	

PART III - NARRATIVE COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE (cont'd)

Perhaps Mr. Williams' major contribution, and it has been an essential one, has been his ability to maintain an overall sense of purpose in our approach to the drug problem in East Asia. Because the problem is new, and because the USG bureaucracy has not had clear lines to deal with it, there were a great many projects proposed which were of rather dubious value. Moreover, there is a great deal of pressure to show results. Mr. Williams has been a tower of strength among his colleagues in keeping our work in this area centered on basic objectives and at the same time seeing to it that we achieve as rapid progress as possible in maintaining those objectives. In this respect, I think Mr. Williams has made an absolute, invaluable contribution.

C. LIMITING FACTORS.

None that I have observed in the present assignment.

D. LEADERSHIP AND EXECUTIVE CAPABILITIES.

a. In his present capacity, Mr. Williams is operating in a staff capacity with no subordinates and, therefore, has no opportunity to do much delegation to, or supervision or development of, subordinates. On the other hand, much of Mr. Williams' work has been within the context of an Interagency Committee on which he is the AID representative. In the work of this Committee, Mr. Williams has demonstrated marked leadership ability, has consistently demonstrated a keen analytical capacity, and has been able to effectively organize his efforts towards the efficient accomplishment of the assigned objectives. I have sent to his personnel file a copy of a letter sent to me by Mr. Ed Masters of the State Department, who was Chairman of the Committee, highly commending the excellent work of the rated officer on the Committee.

b. Mr. Williams is a man of strong convictions and is willing to take unpopular steps if he feels they are necessary. On the other hand, he is well able to adapt to new policies and new situations and demonstrates an excellent combination of firmness and flexibility

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Page 6
Rated Officer Ogden Williams
Rating Officer Roderic L. O'Connor
Period covered 8/1 - 12/31/71

PART III - NARRATIVE COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE (cont'd)

in negotiations. I have known Mr. Williams for many years and know that he has a deep interest in and an excellent understanding of major world social and political problems, as well as economic development processes.

E. GROWTH CAPACITY.

Mr. Williams is a man of strong intellect with a well-trained and well-organized mind. He is also a man quite willing to take on additional responsibilities and to assume the burdens of leadership. He is a man capable of gaining great advantage from additional training; therefore, I would strongly recommend that he be given an academic year's training in development economics which I think would equip him very well for service as a Mission Director.

F. ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL.

Mr. Williams is already at the highest professional rank in our Agency. Unfortunately, he is still in the limited category. I strongly recommend that Mr. Williams be accorded permanent status in our Foreign Reserve Service and believe that he has excellent advancement potential and is suitable for advancement to positions of broadest responsibility.

G. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT.

Although in his present capacity the rated officer has had virtually no opportunity to hire new employees, I know that Mr. Williams' personal convictions and attitudes are most sympathetic to minority group members.

M.C. 206.5 abolished the East Asia Bureau effective August 1, 1971 and in its place established two organizations - the Bureau for Supporting Assistance and Office of East Asia Development Programs. Although this reorganization was accomplished on paper, the working relationship functions and responsibilities have continued much the same as those that existed prior to the reorganization.

12/31/71