1. What assistance could have been given you prior to the beginning of the Conference that was not given?
   a. None
   b. Introductory reading - preliminary reading
   c. Short outline of what talks would be about.
   d. Better directions on how to reach room.
   e. Purpose and scope of conference should have been clearly stated -
      in preliminary material
      in introductory discussions
   f. Distribution of program prior to beginning of conference.
   g. Sell participation on enthusiasm of other group rather than
      "you have been selected".

2. What facilities on services could be improved?
   a. None.
   b. Transportation on time.
   c. Larger dining room for luncheon.
   d. Avoid seating people in drafts.
   e. Provide for better access to and from conference room.
   f. Pentagon parking.
   g. Bibliography of texts mentioned in talks.
   h. Availability of reference books.

3. Do you feel that the general level of the Conference was properly pitched?
   a. Yes
   b. Mr. Barnwell might have more appeal for college level or 2nd Lts. than the level of this group.
   c. The speakers belabored the elementary. This may be because of poor selection of wording of speakers or because of the nature of management training. Several talks seemed inapplicable to the program.
   d. No

4. Which speaker did you enjoy the most? Why?
      Entertainment.
      Most original.
      High level of interest.
   b. Bennett - Penetrating analysis.
      Most capable and specific.
c. Jarman - More beneficial material. 
   Most sincere.
   Interesting and stimulating.

d. Rowland - Most informative and entertaining
   Familiarity with subject.

e. Goodwin - Direct application.

f. Barnewall - Presentation.

g. Kane - Arrangement of data and manner of presentation.

5. Which speaker gave you the most new information? Can you be specific?

   a. Oncken - New ways of approach.
      New material.

   b. Kragger - New material.

      New ideas

   d. Bennett - Explained how to do it.
      New

   e. Barnewall

   f. Rowland

   g. Goodwin - Clearly presented.
      New

   h. Kayser - Clear.

   i. Kane

   j. All

   k. All but Laughlin.

   l. No answer.

   m. None

6. In what ways has the Conference failed to come up to your expectations?

   a. No answer.

   b. None

   c. Too much information in too short a time without group discussion.

   d. Expected a little more of the "how" element to be introduced and discussed

   e. GWU Professors far below expectations in originality, scholarship, command of English etc

   f. Far exceeded.

   g. Too much GWU - Not enough speakers from industry.

   h. Satisfactory.

   i. Too much generalization.

7. In what ways has the Conference exceeded your expectations?

   a. High caliber of the speakers.

   b. More thought provoking - stimulating - interesting.

   c. No answer.

   d. Systematic organization and procedure of whole Conference
      extremely well planned.

   e. Fine setting of conference.
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f. Professional attitude of all concerned.
g. Every way.
h. No expectations.
i. Subjects.
j. Cross contacts of management personnel.
k. Not as dry as expected.
l. More practical.
m. None

8. Please check the words which more nearly describe your over-all opinion of the Conference.
a. Excellent 23
b. Superior 19
c. Good 4
d. No answer. 2

9. Other comments.
a. No answer. 18
b. None 5
c. Handling of staff and little details often overlooked were excellent and did much to add enjoyment of conference. 2
d. More attracted by speakers with experience than with the academic discussions. University speakers weaker. 2
e. Two days would have sufficed for well presented subjects of conference. 2
f. Bill Oncken is a riot - a really entertaining speaker - but I think he relies too heavily on satire and thus obscures the point he is trying to make. 1
g. Six hours daily is too much for anyone to observe - Suggest same over 4 days. 1
h. Suggest questionnaire be passed at beginning of conference so speakers can be rated immediately after talk. 2
i. Lengthen course to include more "cases" and permit more questioning of the individual speakers. 1
j. Follow program with a one day meeting each quarter. 1
k. Suggest questionnaire regarding interest in subjects be submitted after 3 day sessions rather than before. 1
l. More speakers from industry and experienced government organizations. 1
m. Retain speakers for meetings on 4th Tuesday of month. 1
n. Post-speech remarks made by Dr. Jaffe lowered the impact of the speaker and marred the general tone of conference. 1
o. Practically nothing was said about follow-up in weekly meetings - this should have been done so we could be planning. 1
p. One or two high Dept. of Defense speakers would add much. 1
q. Each member should be required to write his solution to the Vandercook case - as homework - and be given a copy of the ideal solution. 1
r. Have 4 times a year and have lower echelons attend. 1
s. More active participation by the student - some lectures skipped for exercises. 1
t. Discussion periods after each lecture would be beneficial if time could be arranged.
u. Most stimulating and enjoyable.
v. Would like to hear more from Bennett.

10. The end result from this Conference is improved management in the National Security Agency. Do you feel you personally have been better equipped and motivated to manage your own activity? If so, what specific steps in this direction do you plan to take?

a. Implement ideas on communications. 10
b. More emphasis in planning, follow-up. 5
c. Better personal contacts to stimulate others. 5
d. Plan to read and study better techniques. 5
e. Will use ideas in everyday Management responsibilities. 4
f. Plan more conferences. 3
g. Utilize hints on conducting better meetings. 3
h. Generate "team feeling". 2
i. Show more interest in jobs. 2
j. More delegation of special duties. 2
k. Revise method of talking with subordinates. 2
l. Review materials and apply them to personnel, management and mission of Division. 2
m. To set aside a definite part of each day for creative thinking. 1
n. Give praise for good work. 1
o. Better training for Supervisors. 1
p. Train a replacement. 1
q. Have asked for copies of all lectures - Branch chiefs have been instructed to read all lectures and attend first Management Conference for which they are eligible. 1

(Seven critiques were not returned.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Too Close</th>
<th>About Right</th>
<th>Too High</th>
<th>Leave As Is</th>
<th>Raise in 2 hrs</th>
<th>Eliminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;National lamp power Situation&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. H. DeWine Kreeger</td>
<td>10 A</td>
<td>28 B</td>
<td>7 C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Executive Development and Executive Appraisal&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. Virgil K. Rowland</td>
<td>21 A</td>
<td>23 B</td>
<td>2 C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;General Management Review&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. Gordon Barnwell</td>
<td>8 A</td>
<td>20 B</td>
<td>16 C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Introduction to Communications&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. William O. Oncken, Jr.</td>
<td>32 A</td>
<td>13 B</td>
<td>0 C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 A</td>
<td>35 B</td>
<td>5 C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Communications Up&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. John J. Corson</td>
<td>12 A</td>
<td>24 B</td>
<td>10 C</td>
<td>12 B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Man Relations&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. Burnette H. Jarman</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>19 B</td>
<td>6 C</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Technology and Power&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. Dan Lovell</td>
<td>6 A</td>
<td>12 B</td>
<td>30 C</td>
<td>36 A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Case Study - Vandercook Case&quot;</td>
<td>Dean Joe L. Jessup &amp; Staff</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>19 B</td>
<td>6 C</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Utilizing Self Motivation&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Kane</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>19 B</td>
<td>6 C</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 A</td>
<td>20 B</td>
<td>18 C</td>
<td>20 A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Theories of Organization&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. Ralph D. Lerner</td>
<td>25 A</td>
<td>19 B</td>
<td>2 C</td>
<td>25 A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Learning the Will to Create Among Scientific Personnel&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. Ralph D. Lerner</td>
<td>24 A</td>
<td>18 B</td>
<td>4 C</td>
<td>24 A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The World Today&quot;</td>
<td>Mr. Elmer R. Kasner</td>
<td>5 A</td>
<td>20 B</td>
<td>18 C</td>
<td>5 A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Can Executive Be Taught to Think?&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. Robert Reardon</td>
<td>17 A</td>
<td>23 B</td>
<td>7 C</td>
<td>17 A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Understanding Group Conviction and Acceptance for Required Action&quot;</td>
<td>Dr. William Oncken</td>
<td>37 A</td>
<td>9 B</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>37 A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Superior  
B - Excellent  
C - Average