

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

FR-01

CLASSIFICATION/TITLE OF POSITION

General Investigator

DATE OF BIRTH

01-22-20

POST OR ORGANIZATIONAL SYMBOL

AID/W SA/RD

OFFICER'S FUNCTIONAL OR ORGANIZATIONAL TITLE

(if any) General Investigator

DATE OF ARRIVAL AT POST

05-26-69

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT

January 1, 1972 to December 31, 1972

DATE REPORT SUBMITTED TO AGENCY

RATING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE

Robert H. Nooter

REVIEWING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE

TYPED NAME

TYPED NAME

Robert H. Nooter

No appropriate reviewer

TYPED CLASS, TITLE Assistant Administrator,
Bureau for Supporting Assistance EX-04

TYPED CLASS, TITLE

I have read this report.

RATED OFFICER'S SIGNATURE

Robert H. Nooter

DATE

March 6, 1973

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, with modification that the Bureau for East Asia was eliminated during the period of this report, and incumbent has since worked under the Bureau for Supporting Assistance.

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 MAN-
AGEMENT
RESPONSIBILITIES

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.

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.

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.

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.)

In many aspects of job performance, does not meet the demands for adequate performance.

RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY

GENERAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS AND ABILITIES <u>Considerations:</u> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
	Directs his functions very effectively and usually meets all requirements of areas of management considerations mentioned above in an exemplary manner. <input type="checkbox"/>
	Skill and ability in all aspects of management are acceptable, meeting the needs of the situation to the satisfaction of the rating officer. <input type="checkbox"/>
	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.) <input type="checkbox"/>
	In most aspects of management operations, fails to meet general requirements for adequate performance or operations. <input type="checkbox"/>
RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY	
PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES AFFECTING PERFORMANCE <u>Considerations:</u> 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. <input type="checkbox"/>
	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. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Accepts changes and anticipates problems or prospects based on routine analysis of project; uses limited and some what unenthusiastic initiative in such situations, but can be relied upon to follow directives honestly. <input type="checkbox"/>
	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.) <input type="checkbox"/>
	In many or critically required personal attributes needed for more than adequate performance in the foreign service of AID, fails to meet Agency standards. <input type="checkbox"/>
RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY	
EFFECTIVENESS WITH PEOPLE <u>Considerations:</u> 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. <input type="checkbox"/>
	Lives and works without serious personality problems between himself and other persons or groups, creating a general impression favorable to the U.S. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Has no particular impact on others by virtue of personality factors. Fits quietly into the American Community and local situations. <input type="checkbox"/>
	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.) <input type="checkbox"/>
	Personality traits are sufficiently negative to create problems in either internal operations, external operations, or be inimical to U.S. interests. <input type="checkbox"/>
RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY	
COMMUNICATIONS <u>Considerations:</u> 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. <input type="checkbox"/>
	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. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	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. <input type="checkbox"/>
	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.) <input type="checkbox"/>
	General ability to convey ideas or requirements persuasively does not satisfy requirements for adequate performance in context of Agency needs. <input type="checkbox"/>
RATER'S CLARIFYING COMMENTS, IF ANY	



Staple attachments to the BACK through this corner.

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.

SEE ATTACHED

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 thru his single sheet only.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Rated Officer: Ogden Williams
Rating Officer: AA/SA - Robert H. Nooter
Post: Washington, D.C.
Period Covered: January 1, 1972 to December 31, 1972

PART III - NARRATIVE COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE

A. Association With Rated Officer

I have known Mr. Williams slightly for about three and a half years, with more intensive association during the last year in his role as Special Assistant for Narcotics matters.

B. Performance Summary

Mr. Williams' job in 1972 has been concerned with the monitoring and backstopping of narcotics prevention programs, as well as the mounting of additional programs in other countries administered by the Supporting Assistance Bureau. In his somewhat novel capacity Mr. Williams quickly and thoroughly learned the many aspects affecting the narcotics trade and suppression techniques. He has used considerable initiative in mounting new programs in this field.

Earlier in the year, the Office of the Deputy Administrator assumed direct control of narcotics operations worldwide. The new arrangement very largely diminished the autonomy and initiative which Mr. Williams had previously enjoyed in mounting and monitoring narcotics suppression programs. In view of this reduction in function which was further restricted by the transfer of responsibility for certain countries to the Asia Bureau, Mr. Williams felt that his position as Special Assistant for Narcotics Control Operations was no longer essential and requested reassignment in May. Pending resolution of this request, he continued to carry out narcotics responsibilities within the Bureau. These responsibilities became increasingly routine and lacking in the creative opportunities which had marked the earlier period. Since Mr. Williams' entire career in the Agency had involved extensive field action assignments (plus one Washington tour as Director of the Vietnam Training Center),

the restricted scope of his narcotics assignment was for him a considerable frustration. By nature he does not tolerate easily the absence of challenge and clear action authority and responsibility. In this respect his current assignment has required of him great patience and good humor. He has had little opportunity to exercise his talents or obtain the satisfaction or recognition which would result therefrom, but he has borne this situation with commendable stamina and a good spirit.

C. Limiting Factors

Mr. Williams has no limiting factors of which I am aware.

D. Leadership and Executive Capabilities

Mr. Williams' assignment as a Special Assistant has not provided much opportunity to observe his leadership or executive capabilities. Nevertheless, he is a mature and responsible individual who has demonstrated the capacity to take on new and challenging assignments and carry them through to completion.

E. Growth Capacity

Mr. Williams' age and training make it appear that he is now at the peak of his career. He should now be reassigned to another function, preferably a challenging field assignment, in view of the attenuated nature of his present role.

F. Advancement Potential

Mr. Williams is already at the top class as an FSR-1.

G. Effectiveness in Carrying Out Equal Employment Opportunity Responsibility

There has been no opportunity to observe this factor, but I have little doubt that Mr. Williams would be fair in every instance in equal opportunity matters.



Robert H. Nooter

Assistant Administrator

Bureau for Supporting Assistance

March 5, 1973