

2

DTIC FILE COPY

AD-A227 161

EVALUATING THE ARMY'S
ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS
(RESOURCES AND CONSTRUCTION)
INTERN PROGRAM

Report AR908R1

July 1990

Eric M. Small
Debra E. Goldstone

DTIC
ELECTE
SEP 20 1990
E D
S
Co

Prepared pursuant to Department of Defense Contract MDA903-85-C-0139.
The views expressed here are those of the Logistics Management Institute at
the time of issue but not necessarily those of the Department of Defense.
Permission to quote or reproduce any part must - except for Government
purposes - be obtained from the Logistics Management Institute.

LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
6400 Goldsboro Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20817-5886

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

Executive Summary

EVALUATING THE ARMY'S ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS (RESOURCES AND CONSTRUCTION) INTERN PROGRAM

The U.S. Army Engineering and Housing Support Center (EHSC) monitors the facilities component of the Engineers and Scientists (Resources and Construction) intern program. LMI evaluated this program – the primary source for Army civilian employees in facilities functions – through a survey of current and former interns.

We found that the adverse impact of low starting salaries is being compounded by weak recruiting. Improvements to the recruiting process would help the program attract more high-quality interns. We also found a lack of consistency among installations in how the program is being managed and administered. Where the program is run well, the interns see it as being of significant value; where it is run poorly, the interns see it as being of little or no value. Finally, we found that interns are not being given enough information or supervision. This situation prevents the interns from taking advantage of available opportunities, leads them to make poor decisions, and generally hampers their professional development.

On the basis of our findings, we believe that EHSC can take a number of actions (in conjunction with participating major commands, installations, and activities) to improve the intern program. Our recommendations include the following:

- *Increase on-campus recruiting*
- *Emphasize program strengths*
- *Institute comprehensive interviewing*
- *Increase the proportion of interns with grade point averages of 2.9 or above*
- *Distribute Army Regulation 690-950, Civilian Personnel Career Management*
- *Promote training*
- *Establish rotation planning guidelines*

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	vii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1- 1
Intern Program Description	1- 1
Study Design and Implementation	1- 1
Organization of Report	1- 3
Chapter 2. Results	2- 1
Recruiting	2- 1
Training	2- 4
Rotation	2- 6
Development	2- 9
Placement	2-12
Opinions	2-13
Chapter 3. Conclusions and Recommendations	3- 1
Conclusions	3- 1
Recommendations	3- 3
Summary	3- 5
Appendix A. Sample Survey Questionnaire	A-1 – A- 9
Appendix B. Frequency Distributions for All Respondents	B-1 – B-35
Appendix C. Frequency Distributions for Program Completers	C-1 – C-21

TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
2- 1. Recruiting Results by Year of Entry	2- 2
2- 2. Recruiting Results by Initial MACOM	2- 3
2- 3. Training Results by Year of Entry	2- 5
2- 4. Training Results by Initial MACOM	2- 6
2- 5. Rotation Results by Year of Entry	2- 7
2- 6. Rotation Results by Initial MACOM	2- 8
2- 7. Development Results by Year of Entry	2-10
2- 8. Development Results by Initial MACOM	2-11
2- 9. Placement Results by Year of Entry	2-12
2-10. Placement Results by Initial MACOM	2-13
2-11. Opinion Results by Year of Entry	2-14
2-12. Opinion Results by Initial MACOM	2-15

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

INTERN PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The U.S. Army Engineering and Housing Support Center (EHSC) monitors the facilities functional component of the Engineers and Scientists (Resources and Construction) (ESRC) intern program for Department of the Army (DA) civilian employees. Funds and manpower spaces are allocated by DA Headquarters to the appropriate major commands (MACOMs) or activities, which are responsible for recruiting.

Most ESRC facilities interns begin at grade GS-5 or GS-7 and work for the Directorate of Engineering and Housing (DEH) or equivalent organization at an Army installation (ESRC interns in nonfacilities functional areas are typically assigned to an Army Corps of Engineers division or district office). During their internship (normally 3 years), they are promoted noncompetitively while being prepared for target-level (GS-11) positions in various facilities functions.

According to Army Regulation (AR) 690-950, *Civilian Personnel Career Management*, each intern should receive a basic orientation, on- and off-the-job training, and rotational assignments of progressively increasing responsibility. The program is designed to equip interns with the knowledge and skills needed to perform effectively in their target positions. Interns should be given periodic appraisals, along with oral evaluations and individual counseling, to measure their performance, monitor their progress, and provide feedback.

STUDY DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

As the primary source for career employees in facilities functional areas, the ESRC intern program is very important to EHSC, to the DEH community, and to the Chief of Engineers. LMI was therefore asked by EHSC to assess how effectively this program is being run. LMI and EHSC agreed that the best source of information concerning the program would be the interns themselves (both current and former).

Because of the number and geographical distribution of these interns, the only practical way to reach them was by using a mail survey.

Since this was the first systematic attempt to obtain ESRC facilities intern feedback, the survey questionnaire was designed to be comprehensive. Topics covered by the questions included intern characteristics, recruiting and hiring, orientation, training and development, rotational work assignments, appraisals and counseling, placement and post-internship experiences, and program strengths and weaknesses. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix A.

At the request of EHSC, a list of everyone who had been an ESRC intern was generated from the Army's Civilian Personnel Information System. However, this list contained far too many names, and further investigation revealed that many Engineers and Scientists (Nonconstruction) interns (Career Program 16) were wrongly coded as having been ESRC interns (Career Program 18).

It was therefore necessary to introduce an additional step into the survey distribution process. Instead of sending questionnaires directly to the people on the original list, EHSC sent sets of questionnaires to all appropriate DEHs along with the names of those persons identified as having been interns there. Each DEH receiving such a package was asked to (1) revise the list for that installation, making deletions and additions as appropriate, and (2) distribute questionnaires to each person on the revised list.

Survey packages (blank questionnaires, return envelopes, and site-specific uncorrected intern lists) were sent out by EHSC in early October 1989 to DEHs throughout the world, followed by reminder messages during the subsequent weeks. Although 261 responses were received by February 1990, the analysis was restricted to 237 interns who had entered the program since 1984. Using a more recent cutoff date would have significantly reduced the sample size, while using an earlier cutoff date would have jeopardized the data quality (by asking people to describe events which occurred over 5 years ago).

Because of the coding problem noted earlier, EHSC does not have an accurate total of ESRC interns from 1984 to 1989, so the true response rate cannot be determined. Our best estimate is based on the numbers of first- and second-year ESRC intern spaces authorized by DA. Using this approach, the response rate was higher for more recent interns: the 64 responses from 1984 and 1985 entrants

represent 47 percent of the 136 spaces authorized for FY85, while the 83 responses from 1988 and 1989 entrants represent 69 percent of the 121 spaces authorized for FY89. The estimated overall response rate is 54 percent, but the actual rate may be considerably higher, since some authorized spaces were not utilized (particularly in 1988, when funding problems prevented a number of spaces from being filled).

ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

We have summarized the intern program and our methodology. Chapter 2 discusses the results of our survey, while Chapter 3 presents our conclusions and recommendations. There are three supporting appendices: Appendix A is a copy of the survey questionnaire; Appendix B displays frequency distributions of the answers given to all of the survey questions by all of the respondents; and Appendix C displays frequency distributions of the answers given to a subset of the survey questions by those respondents who had completed the program.

CHAPTER 2

RESULTS

Following the logic of the questionnaire, the discussion of the survey results focuses on six subjects: recruiting, training, rotation, development, placement, and opinions. Tables summarizing the key findings for each subject, broken down by year of entry and initial MACOM, are included in this chapter.¹ Breakdowns by other intern characteristics (college major, entry grade, years since graduation, etc.) are not included in our report because they generally reflect differences between initial MACOMs. As noted earlier, Appendix B contains tabulations of all questions for all respondents, while Appendix C contains tabulations of most questions for respondents who had completed the program.

RECRUITING

The vast majority of current and former interns had graduated from public universities and had received Bachelor of Science degrees (see pages B-5, B-6, B-7, and B-9). Many came from schools located close to Army installations (for example, eight of the nine interns initially assigned to Fort Leonard Wood had graduated from the nearby University of Missouri-Rolla). As shown in Tables 2-1 and 2-2, over half of all responding interns had majored in civil or mechanical engineering; less than half had an overall grade point average (GPA) of 2.9 or higher; over three-quarters had previous work experience; and over one-quarter had been out of college for at least 3 years.

The interns first learned about the ESRC program in a variety of ways, with no single source predominating (a few did not know they had been hired into an intern program until they started work). Almost half had been interviewed by a DEH representative, while almost one-quarter were never interviewed, and almost one-quarter did not receive their job offer until over 3 months after being interviewed. Almost half were hired at grade GS-5, including a number who were

¹Statistics in these tables represent the percentage of respondents giving a certain answer. Survey question numbers (Qxx) are included in the descriptive labels. The results for all subjects except recruiting are based only on those respondents who had finished the program, since the other responses were not based on complete experiences.

TABLE 2-1

RECRUITING RESULTS BY YEAR OF ENTRY

	Year of entry into program (Q1)						Total
	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	
Civil or mechanical engineering major (Q7)	54.3	62.1	60.6	50.0	40.0	54.8	54.7
Overall GPA of 2.9 or higher (Q9)	42.9	37.9	48.5	43.6	40.0	46.3	44.1
No previous work experience (Q10)	20.0	7.1	27.3	17.9	50.0	24.7	21.7
Hired 3 + years after college (Q6)	28.6	31.0	18.2	30.4	20.0	35.6	29.7
Initial info. from advertisement (Q3)	11.4	10.3	20.6	5.4	0.0	8.2	9.7
Initial info. from placement office (Q3)	2.9	10.3	14.7	12.5	0.0	19.2	12.7
Initial info. from OPM announcement (Q3)	22.9	3.4	11.8	14.3	20.0	15.1	14.3
Initial info. from CPO visit (Q3)	11.4	20.7	20.6	23.2	10.0	11.0	16.5
Interviewed by DEH representative (Q4)	51.4	44.8	48.5	48.2	55.6	41.7	46.6
Never interviewed for program (Q4)	17.1	17.2	30.3	19.6	11.1	25.0	21.8
Initially hired at grade GS-5 (Q11)	57.1	48.3	38.2	37.5	60.0	43.8	44.7
Offer more than 3 months after interview (Q16)	35.3	22.2	30.3	20.0	10.0	20.5	23.7
Location very important (Q14)	54.3	58.6	55.9	41.1	50.0	47.9	49.8
Job content very important (Q14)	54.3	55.2	61.8	69.6	60.0	56.2	59.9
Job security very important (Q14)	57.1	37.9	44.1	50.0	30.0	49.3	47.7
Promotion potential very important (Q14)	74.3	51.7	70.6	62.5	60.0	71.2	66.7
Responsibility very important (Q14)	68.6	55.2	64.7	62.5	70.0	68.5	65.0

Notes: Numbers in table are percentages of all respondents. OPM = Office of Personnel Management. CPO = civilian personnel office.

apparently qualified (by having a year of education beyond the Bachelor's level, a year of experience, or an overall GPA of at least 2.9) for the GS-7 level.

TABLE 2-2

RECRUITING RESULTS BY INITIAL MACOM

	Initial major command (Q12)					Total
	AMC	FORSCOM	TRADOC	USAREUR	Other	
Civil or mechanical engineering major (Q7)	52.0	46.7	56.4	65.1	65.2	54.7
Overall GPA of 2.9 or higher (Q9)	20.0	47.1	34.0	61.9	50.0	44.1
No previous work experience (Q10)	32.0	25.6	14.8	11.6	30.4	21.7
Hired 3 + years after college (Q6)	20.0	24.4	30.9	51.2	17.4	29.7
Initial information from advertisement (Q3)	4.0	4.4	3.6	34.1	4.3	9.7
Initial information from placement office (Q3)	20.0	21.1	5.5	2.3	8.7	12.7
Initial information from OPM announcement (Q3)	4.0	17.8	20.0	6.8	13.0	14.3
Initial information from CPO visit (Q3)	12.0	17.8	23.6	4.5	21.7	16.5
Interviewed by DEH representative (Q4)	54.2	62.9	52.7	4.7	39.1	46.6
Never interviewed for program (Q4)	20.8	13.5	14.5	53.5	13.0	21.8
Initially hired at grade GS-5 (Q11)	56.0	54.4	45.5	6.8	65.2	44.7
Offer more than 3 months after interview (Q16)	8.0	15.9	17.0	65.1	8.7	23.7
Location very important (Q14)	64.0	50.0	45.5	59.1	26.1	49.8
Job content very important (Q14)	60.0	60.0	76.4	38.6	60.9	59.9
Job security very important (Q14)	56.0	48.9	61.8	29.5	34.8	47.7
Promotion potential very important (Q14)	52.0	73.3	69.1	59.1	65.2	66.7
Responsibility very important (Q14)	56.0	70.0	76.4	52.3	52.2	65.0

Notes: Numbers in table are percentages of all respondents. AMC = Army Materiel Command. FORSCOM = Forces Command. TRADOC = Training and Doctrine Command. USAREUR = U.S. Army, Europe.

At least three-fifths of the interns cited either promotion potential, job content, or responsibility as a very important reason for entering the program. Location and job security were also cited as very important by almost half of the interns. On the negative side, low starting salaries were an obvious problem. Over half of the interns

said that their salaries were lower than other offers they had received, and almost two-thirds said that their salaries were lower than offers that others had received (see page B-16).

Table 2-1 reveals no obvious trends over time, but Table 2-2 shows that intern characteristics and recruiting patterns varied by initial MACOM. Almost all U.S. Army, Europe (USAREUR) interns were hired at grade GS-7, reflecting their higher GPAs and greater previous work experience. The appeal of working in Europe (with the accompanying benefits of paid housing and transportation) was apparently enough to offset the limited recruiting by USAREUR installations (over half of the USAREUR interns were never interviewed, and almost two-thirds of the USAREUR interns who were interviewed waited over 3 months before receiving an offer).

At the other extreme, U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) installations hired more interns directly out of college, relying more heavily on placement offices. AMC interns tended to have lower GPAs and less previous work experience; over half were hired at grade GS-5. Interestingly, the proportion of interns citing location as being a very important factor was slightly higher for AMC than for USAREUR; this may have reflected a desire to stay near home and/or school.

TRAINING

As shown in Tables 2-3 and 2-4, less than half of the former interns had received a specific training plan, and one-tenth did not receive any plan. While almost all interns received some training, almost two-fifths did not take either of the Facilities Engineering (FE) courses (FE Basics or FE Management), almost two-thirds did not take the intern leadership course, and almost one-fifth did not take any formal technical courses.

Of those former interns who took technical courses, the majority had over five such courses and felt that these courses were relevant to their work and career. Over one-third of the interns reported that they had frequently been unable to take scheduled training courses because of funding constraints; other reasons for being denied training included course quotas, course cancellations, and work considerations. When training did occur, it tended to happen by request more often than automatically.

TABLE 2-3

TRAINING RESULTS BY YEAR OF ENTRY

	Year of entry into program (Q1)				Total
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Received a specific training plan (Q19)	50.0	32.1	53.3	42.1	53.3
Did not receive any training plan (Q19)	8.8	10.7	10.0	10.5	10.0
Had no training at all (Q20 & Q21)	2.9	3.6	3.3	2.6	3.1
Did not take either FE course (Q20)	41.2	39.3	40.0	36.8	39.2
Did not take intern leadership course (Q20)	94.1	78.6	56.7	34.2	64.6
Had no formal technical courses (Q21)	17.6	14.3	26.7	18.4	19.2
All courses taken were relevant (Q22)	60.7	62.5	63.6	67.7	63.8
Often unable to attend: funds (Q23)	17.6	35.7	33.3	63.2	38.5
Often unable to attend: quota (Q23)	8.8	32.1	26.7	26.3	23.1
Often unable to attend: cancel (Q23)	2.9	14.3	13.3	15.8	11.5
Often unable to attend: work (Q23)	5.9	21.4	13.3	15.8	13.8
Training occurred automatically (Q24)	50.0	37.5	45.5	35.5	41.9

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers.

Table 2-3 reveals that these findings varied by year of entry. However, the only clear trends were the decrease in the proportion not taking the intern leadership course (reflecting the fact that this is a relatively new course) and general increases in the proportions unable to take scheduled courses (particularly because of funding constraints).

Table 2-4 reveals much larger variations by initial MACOM. In particular, AMC interns were the least likely to have received a specific training plan, the least likely to have attended training courses, the least likely to have found the courses they did attend relevant, and the least likely to have had their training occur automatically. On the other hand, U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) and

TABLE 2-4
TRAINING RESULTS BY INITIAL MACOM

	Initial major command (Q12)					Total
	AMC	FORSCOM	TRADOC	USAREUR	Other	
Received a specific training plan (Q19)	11.1	55.8	50.0	22.2	61.5	44.6
Did not receive any training plan (Q19)	44.4	4.7	18.4	0.0	0.0	10.0
Had no training at all (Q20 & Q21)	33.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	3.1
Did not take either FE course (Q20)	88.9	46.5	50.0	3.7	23.1	39.2
Did not take intern leadership course (Q20)	66.7	65.1	68.4	55.6	69.2	64.6
Had no formal technical courses (Q21)	44.4	7.0	5.3	55.6	7.7	19.2
All courses taken were relevant (Q22)	20.0	75.0	69.4	41.7	50.0	63.8
Often unable to attend: funds (Q23)	66.7	34.9	44.7	25.9	38.5	38.5
Often unable to attend: quota (Q23)	22.2	20.9	21.1	25.9	30.8	23.1
Often unable to attend: cancel (Q23)	11.1	7.0	7.9	18.5	23.1	11.5
Often unable to attend: work (Q23)	22.2	14.0	15.8	7.4	15.4	13.8
Training occurred automatically (Q24)	20.0	52.5	33.3	33.3	50.0	41.9

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers.

U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) interns seem to have had the best training experiences.

ROTATION

As shown in Tables 2-5 and 2-6, only half of the former interns who rotated said that their rotations had occurred automatically (as opposed to at their request), and over one-third spent all of their time in one area (i.e., never rotated). The most common assignment was in the engineering division/branch; over two-thirds of the interns had spent some time there, with one-sixth spending all of their time there.

TABLE 2-5

ROTATION RESULTS BY YEAR OF ENTRY

	Year of entry into program (Q1)				Total
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Rotation occurred automatically (Q25)	65.0	43.7	76.2	16.7	52.0
Spent all time in any one area (Q26)	32.4	37.0	27.6	42.9	35.2
Spent any time in ERMD (Q26)	61.8	48.1	51.7	40.0	50.4
Spent all time in ERMD (Q26)	11.8	18.5	3.4	5.7	9.6
Spent any time in engineering (Q26)	73.5	63.0	79.3	68.6	71.2
Spent all time in engineering (Q26)	14.7	18.5	13.8	20.0	16.8
Spent any time in plan./prog. (Q26)	44.1	40.7	55.2	34.3	43.2
Spent all time in plan./prog. (Q26)	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.8
Spent any time in environment (Q26)	50.0	37.0	37.9	28.6	38.4
Spent all time in environment (Q26)	5.9	0.0	3.4	5.7	4.0
Spent any time in oper./maint. (Q26)	44.1	37.0	55.2	22.9	39.2
Spent all time in oper./maint. (Q26)	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	1.6
Spent any time in other areas (Q26)	52.9	51.9	62.1	57.1	56.0
Spent all time in other areas (Q26)	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	2.4
All assignments were meaningful (Q27)	41.4	50.0	52.0	54.8	49.5
No assignments were meaningful (Q27)	4.2	11.1	17.4	4.3	9.1

Notes: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers. ERMD = Engineer Resources Management Division

The second most common assignment was in Engineer Resources Management Division (ERMD); about half of the former interns had spent some time there, with one-tenth spending all of their time there. Fewer interns had been assigned to other divisions or branches of their DEHs, and many of these rotations had been very brief

TABLE 2-6
ROTATION RESULTS BY INITIAL MACOM

	Initial major command (Q12)					Total
	AMC	FORSCOM	TRADOC	USAREUR	Other	
Rotation occurred automatically (Q25)	100.0	65.2	46.7	29.6	88.9	52.0
Spent all time in any one area (Q26)	44.4	34.1	62.9	0.0	30.8	35.2
Spent any time in ERMD (Q26)	0.0	56.1	31.4	92.6	30.8	50.4
Spent all time in ERMD (Q26)	0.0	9.8	17.1	0.0	15.4	9.6
Spent any time in engineering (Q26)	100.0	58.5	65.7	88.9	69.2	71.2
Spent all time in engineering (Q26)	44.4	12.2	28.6	0.0	15.4	16.8
Spent any time in plan./prog. (Q26)	33.3	34.1	14.3	88.9	61.5	43.2
Spent all time in plan./prog. (Q26)	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Spent any time in environment (Q26)	11.1	31.7	31.4	85.2	0.0	38.4
Spent all time in environment (Q26)	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.0	4.0
Spent any time in oper./maint. (Q26)	11.1	39.0	20.0	77.8	30.8	39.2
Spent all time in oper./maint. (Q26)	0.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
Spent any time in other areas (Q26)	22.2	53.7	34.3	96.3	61.5	56.0
Spent all time in other areas (Q26)	0.0	4.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	2.4
All assignments were meaningful (Q27)	57.1	58.8	67.9	14.8	54.5	49.5
No assignments were meaningful (Q27)	20.0	16.7	5.9	3.7	0.0	9.1

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers

(i.e., 1 week or less). Half of those who rotated felt that all of their work assignments had been meaningful, while a few felt that no assignments had been meaningful.

As shown in Table 2-5, the rotation results varied somewhat by year of entry, but the only discernible trend over time was a slight increase in the proportion

stating that all assignments had been meaningful. However, Table 2-6 shows considerable differences among initial MACOMs.

USAREUR interns seem to have had the worst experience, with the lowest proportion being rotated automatically and the lowest proportion being given meaningful assignments. None of them spent all of their time in any single area, and more of them spent some time in almost every area, but it appears that many of these assignments had been too brief to be of value. TRADOC interns most frequently spent all of their time in one area; yet those who rotated had the highest opinions of their assignments. AMC interns were never rotated at their own request (they were either rotated automatically or not at all) and most often felt that none of their assignments had been meaningful.

DEVELOPMENT

As shown in Tables 2-7 and 2-8, less than one-third of the interns received a copy of AR 690-950 at the beginning of the program, and over one-third never received a copy. Over one-third had not received written appraisals at least twice a year, three-fifths had not received any oral appraisals, and less than half had received career counseling. Three-fourths were working toward their professional engineering (PE) licenses, but only half had been actively encouraged to do so, and only half felt that their intern work experience had been relevant to professional registration. Two-fifths of the interns named the deputy DEH (DDEH) as having been effectively in charge of the program at their installations, while the remaining interns named division/branch chiefs, civilian personnel office staff, or others.

Over half of the former interns wished they had learned more about the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Many also wished they had learned more about the ESRC career program, the civilian personnel system, the relationship between the Army and their installation DEH, the ESRC intern program, and/or specific technical areas. Over three-fourths said that additional contact with fellow interns would have also been beneficial.

Table 2-7 shows that the proportion receiving no oral appraisals decreased with each successive cohort of interns. There were no clear trends over time in other aspects of intern evaluation and development, or in the interns' desire to have learned more about various subjects.

TABLE 2-7

DEVELOPMENT RESULTS BY YEAR OF ENTRY

	Year of entry into program (Q1)				Total
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Received AR 690-950 at beginning (Q18)	23.5	28.6	20.7	35.1	27.3
Never received AR 690-950 (Q18)	44.1	28.6	44.8	37.8	39.1
Oral appraisals: none received (Q28)	77.4	66.7	56.0	40.6	60.0
Written appraisals: less than 2/year (Q28)	32.4	39.3	30.0	39.5	35.4
Career counseling: none received (Q29)	48.4	60.0	65.4	58.6	57.7
DDEH effectively in charge (Q30)	38.2	64.3	43.3	23.7	40.8
Not encouraged to pursue PE license (Q36)	45.5	42.9	40.0	57.9	47.3
Not currently working on PE license (Q37)	34.5	20.8	21.4	30.3	27.2
Work wasn't relevant to professional registration (Q38)	59.4	39.3	40.0	55.6	49.2
Learn more: Army and installation DEH (Q39)	29.4	35.7	30.0	21.1	28.5
Learn more: Corps of Engineers (Q39)	55.9	46.4	60.0	55.3	54.6
Learn more: ESRC career program (Q39)	44.1	35.7	33.3	44.7	40.0
Learn more: civilian personnel system (Q39)	41.2	28.6	20.0	28.9	30.0
Learn more: ESRC intern program (Q39)	23.5	25.0	10.0	28.9	22.3
Learn more: technical area (Q39)	26.5	35.7	30.0	18.4	26.9
More intern contact beneficial (Q50)	72.7	72.0	85.7	81.1	78.0

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers

As shown in Table 2-8, development experiences varied by initial MACOM. AMC interns were least likely to have received AR 690-950, least likely to have received career counseling, least likely to have been encouraged to pursue – or to be working on – professional registration, and most likely to wish they had learned more about specific technical areas. FORSCOM interns were most likely to have

TABLE 2-8
DEVELOPMENT RESULTS BY INITIAL MACOM

	Initial major command (Q12)					Total
	AMC	FORSCOM	TRADOC	USAREUR	Other	
Received AR 690-950 at beginning (Q18)	33.3	32.6	24.3	26.9	15.4	27.3
Never received AR 690-950 (Q18)	55.6	34.9	35.1	50.0	30.8	39.1
Oral appraisals: none received (Q28)	55.6	61.0	52.9	60.0	81.8	60.0
Written appraisals: less than 2/year (Q28)	55.6	9.3	50.0	37.0	61.5	35.4
Career counseling: none received (Q29)	87.5	54.1	60.6	45.5	63.6	57.7
DDEH effectively in charge (Q30)	0.0	55.8	31.6	55.6	15.4	40.8
Not encouraged to pursue PE license (Q36)	66.7	55.8	28.9	59.3	33.3	47.3
Not currently working on PE license (Q37)	50.0	38.5	6.2	36.4	15.4	27.2
Work wasn't relevant to professional registration (Q38)	44.4	51.2	29.7	69.2	61.5	49.2
Learn more: Army and installation DEH (Q39)	44.4	32.6	28.9	14.8	30.8	28.5
Learn more: Corps of Engineers (Q39)	33.3	55.8	52.6	55.6	69.2	54.6
Learn more: ESRC career program (Q39)	44.4	39.5	42.1	44.4	23.1	40.0
Learn more: civilian personnel system (Q39)	22.2	27.9	26.3	37.0	38.5	30.0
Learn more: ESRC intern program (Q39)	33.3	20.9	21.1	14.8	38.5	22.3
Learn more: technical area (Q39)	55.6	25.6	23.7	22.2	30.8	26.9
More intern contact beneficial (Q50)	77.8	82.9	69.4	76.0	91.7	78.0

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers.

received frequent written appraisals; TRADOC interns were most likely to be pursuing their PE licenses and most likely to have been given encouragement and relevant work assignments (the emphasis on professional registration coming at the expense of rotation, as noted earlier); and USAREUR interns were least likely to have had work that was relevant to professional registration (reflecting the Army's

use of local nationals who understand European design standards) and least likely to wish they had learned more about the Army or the ESRC intern program.

PLACEMENT

As shown in Tables 2-9 and 2-10, almost seven-eighths of the former interns were placed in target positions at the installations where they had spent their internships, but almost one-third did not find out about their target positions until less than 1 month before they graduated. Virtually all are still Army employees (see Appendix C), and most are currently at grade GS-11, although almost one-sixth have advanced to grade GS-12 or higher. Over two-thirds describe their current positions as nonsupervisory. Almost half of the former interns have made position moves since graduating, but less than one-quarter have made geographical moves.

**TABLE 2-9
PLACEMENT RESULTS BY YEAR OF ENTRY**

	Year of entry into program (Q1)				Total
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Placed at different installation (Q41)	11.8	17.9	16.7	13.2	14.6
Under 1 month notice of placement (Q42)	34.4	37.5	25.0	25.7	30.3
Present position is grade GS-12/13 (Q46)	41.2	17.9	0.0	0.0	14.6
Present position is nonsupervisory (Q47)	58.8	67.9	73.3	81.6	70.8
Changed position since graduating (Q48)	61.8	67.9	37.9	21.1	45.7
Changed location since graduating (Q49)	32.4	32.1	14.3	13.9	23.0

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers.

As shown in Table 2-9, placement experiences varied by year of entry. The proportions employed at grade GS-12 or making position/geographical moves have been falling, while the proportion employed in nonsupervisory positions has been rising. However, it is important to note that these trends undoubtedly reflect

TABLE 2-10

PLACEMENT RESULTS BY INITIAL MACOM

	Initial major command (Q12)					Total
	AMC	FORSCOM	TRADOC	USAREUR	Other	
Placed at different installation (Q41)	22.2	4.7	7.9	33.3	23.1	14.6
Under 1 month notice of placement (Q42)	60.0	26.2	41.7	15.4	30.0	30.3
Present position is grade GS-12/13 (Q46)	11.1	7.0	7.9	29.6	30.8	14.6
Present position is nonsupervisory (Q47)	100.0	83.7	78.9	33.3	61.5	70.8
Changed position since graduating (Q48)	33.3	31.0	47.4	70.4	46.2	45.7
Changed location since graduating (Q49)	11.1	11.9	13.5	53.8	33.3	23.0

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers.

differences in the amount of time since graduation, rather than any underlying changes in the program itself.

Table 2-10 displays the differences by initial MACOM. AMC interns were most likely to have been given short notice about their target positions and to currently be in nonsupervisory positions. FORSCOM interns were least likely to have been placed at different installations or to have changed positions since graduating. USAREUR interns were least likely to have been given short notice about their target positions but most likely to have been placed at different installations. In addition, USAREUR interns are most likely to be in supervisory positions and to have changed positions and/or location since graduating.

OPINIONS

As shown in Tables 2-11 and 2-12, many of the former interns were unhappy with the ESRC program. Over one-third said that it was worse than they had expected; over one-fifth said that it was worse than other DEH internships; over one-sixth said that they would "definitely" or "probably" not still have joined the program, and over one-fourth said that they would "definitely" or "probably" not encourage their friends to join. Almost one-sixth felt that the program did not benefit

their careers, almost half felt that they would have been better off in the Corps of Engineers intern program, and less than half felt that the program had made them more competitive.

TABLE 2-11
OPINION RESULTS BY YEAR OF ENTRY

	Year of entry into program (Q1)				Total
	1984	1985	1986	1987	
Program worse than expectations (Q31)	20.0	44.0	25.0	42.4	33.6
Program worse than other internships (Q35)	21.4	19.2	3.6	40.0	21.4
Prob./def. not still join program (Q33)	20.6	25.0	6.7	18.4	17.7
Prob./def. not still recommend (Q34)	34.4	40.7	16.7	19.4	27.2
Program did not benefit career (Q43)	18.8	35.7	3.4	5.4	15.1
Better off in Corps intern program (Q44)	56.5	43.5	48.1	46.7	48.5
No more competitive because of program (Q45)	62.1	56.0	46.7	54.8	54.8

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers.

The survey also included open-ended questions asking the respondents what they liked most and least about the program, along with any additional comments. Answers to these open-ended questions are shown on pages B-34, B-35, C-19, C-20, and C-21. The responses have not been broken down by year or MACOM because of their variety, their qualitative nature, and the large numbers of multiple or overlapping responses. Positive aspects included training, exposure to the whole DEH, and advancement. Negative aspects included being denied training, being rotated too rarely (or too often), being given meaningless work, being poorly treated and supervised, and being underpaid.

The most common suggestions for improving recruiting and hiring were more/better contact with schools, more/better program information, and higher

TABLE 2-12
OPINION RESULTS BY INITIAL MACOM

	Initial major command (Q12)					Total
	AMC	FORSCOM	TRADOC	USAREUR	Other	
Program worse than expectations (Q31)	60.0	28.9	21.9	45.0	50.0	33.6
Program worse than other internships (Q35)	60.0	19.0	21.9	9.1	36.4	21.4
Prob./def. not still join program (Q33)	33.3	14.0	13.2	14.8	38.5	17.7
Prob./def. not still recommend (Q34)	33.3	21.4	20.0	30.8	53.8	27.2
Program did not benefit career (Q43)	33.3	9.5	16.2	15.4	16.7	15.1
Better off in Corps intern program (Q44)	28.6	56.8	41.9	43.7	58.3	48.5
No more competitive because of program (Q45)	80.0	58.5	58.8	43.5	41.7	54.8

Note: Numbers in table are percentages of program completers.

starting pay. The most common suggestions for improving rotation and utilization were more planning and monitoring of rotation, more rotation (although several wanted fewer rotations of longer duration), and better treatment/use of interns. The most common suggestions for improving placement and career development were more help/information, more time/notice, more training, and a choice of installations.

With regard to the closed-ended opinion questions, Table 2-11 shows that interns who entered in 1985 were the most likely to say the program was worse than they expected, the least likely to say that they would either still join or recommend the program, and the most likely to say that the program did not benefit their careers. However, the opinions of these interns were less harsh in some other areas (better/worse than other DEH internships, better/worse off as Corps of Engineers intern, more/less competitive because of program), and there were few clear trends over time.

Table 2-12 shows differences among initial MACOMs that reflect some of the results discussed earlier in this chapter. AMC interns were the most likely to say that the program had been worse than they expected and worse than other DEH

internships, the least likely to say that they would either still join or still recommend the program, the most likely to say that the program did not benefit their careers, and the least likely to say that they were more competitive because of the program. At the other extreme, FORSCOM and TRADOC interns seemed to generally have the best opinions of the ESRC program.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Three overall conclusions can be drawn from the findings presented in Chapter 2. First, the recruiting process is weak, limiting the program's ability to attract high-quality interns. Second, there is a lack of consistency among installations in the management and administration of the ESRC intern program. Third, interns are not given enough information about the program, about their performance, about their working environment, or about their career options. All three of these problems have been evident for several years, without getting notably worse or better during that time.

It is no criticism of current or former interns to conclude that the overall quality level is constrained by the recruiting process. School contacts are not being properly utilized; too many people are being hired without having been interviewed; too much time is elapsing before an offer is made; and too many people who are qualified for GS-7 positions are being offered jobs at grade GS-5.

The low starting salary mandated by the Federal civil service system is the other major barrier to improving intern quality. In 1988, new ESRC interns received \$19,700 at grade GS-5 and \$24,300 at grade GS-7, while average starting salaries nationwide ranged from \$25,400 for new civil engineering graduates to \$31,000 for new chemical engineering graduates.¹ In 1990, new ESRC interns will receive \$21,200 at grade GS-5 and \$26,300 at grade GS-7,² while average private-sector salaries for new graduates are expected to range from \$27,700 for civil engineers to

¹*Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1989, Table No. 265 (Source: College Placement Council, Inc., Bethlehem, Pa.).

²These figures reflect across-the-board increases of 4.1 percent effective 1 January 1989 and 3.6 percent effective 1 January 1990.

\$33,400 for chemical engineers.³ The gap does appear to close over time; the median annual earnings of all engineers in 1989 ranged (by specialty) from \$36,900 to \$42,000,⁴ while a GS-11 engineer's annual salary in 1989 ranged (by step) from \$32,700 to \$41,700.

The way the program is run also needs to be substantially improved at many installations. Where the program adhered to AR 690-950, everyone seemed to benefit. The DEH received DA-funded labor of its own choosing, while the intern received training (both classroom and on-the-job), meaningful and varied work assignments, counseling, and automatic advancement into a target position. However, too many interns received little or no training, meaningless work assignments, inadequate counseling, and lax overall management. These interns may have been useful to their DEHs, since they were DA-funded for their first 2 years, but they gained very little from being in the program, and many were quite bitter about their experiences.

Differences in program administration between initial MACOMs cannot simply be attributed to individual installations, since at least 10 installations were represented for each initial MACOM. AMC installations tended to hire the lowest quality interns, at least in terms of their credentials, and also tended to treat them the poorest once they were hired. USAREUR installations tended to hire the highest quality interns (apparently more as a result of the appeal of working in Europe than as a result of better recruiting) but did not necessarily treat them well. FORSCOM and TRADOC installations hired the most interns and seemed to treat them the best.

Finally, many interns are not aware of all their options or opportunities. Some are not being properly informed about the program during the recruiting process, some are not getting any orientation, some are not being given a copy of the basic program regulations, some are not receiving enough counseling or supervision, and some are not given sufficient notice or choice regarding their target positions.

³*Washington Post*, 12 December 1989, page C1 (Source: Michigan State University, Career Development and Placement Services Office).

⁴U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Labor Force Statistics.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given these problems, we believe that EHSC can do a number of things (in conjunction with participating MACOMs, installations, and activities) to improve the ESRC intern program. Our specific recommendations are described below.

Increase On-Campus Recruiting

On-campus recruiting should be increased. More use should be made of college placement offices and student pre-professional groups (out of 46 schools with student Society of American Military Engineers posts, only 17 were represented in our sample). Having recent or current interns visit their alma maters could also be effective. EHSC (and/or MACOM) resources may be needed to help recruit at schools not located near Army installations.

Emphasize Program Strengths

The ESRC intern recruiters should emphasize the program's strengths. These strengths include geographic flexibility and mobility, interesting and responsible work assignments, and secure employment with automatic advancement. Promoting the program's positive aspects should make it easier to attract high-quality interns and should help offset the relatively low starting salaries.

Institute Comprehensive Interviewing

Every prospective intern should be interviewed to ensure that the intern knows what he/she should expect, while giving the interviewer a chance to personally evaluate each prospective intern. The length of time between the interview and the offer should also be reduced to minimize the risk of losing attractive candidates to other employers.

Increase the Proportion of Interns with GPA of 2.9 or Above

The proportion of interns hired with a grade point average of 2.9 or above (thereby eligible for grade GS-7) should be increased. Although GPA is not a sure-fire predictor of success, it is one of the few available measures of quality for new college graduates. Raising the program-wide average GPA is a tangible and achievable goal that should increase the overall quality level of ESRC interns. Interns starting at grade GS-7 can also reach their target level (GS-11) faster and become

fully productive. Furthermore, everyone qualified for GS-7 should be hired at that grade.

Distribute AR 690-950

Every intern should be given a copy of AR 690-950 when hired. Distributing this regulation will help ensure that each new intern knows what to expect (and what not to expect) from the program and will help graduating interns make informed choices about their careers. In addition, this will help increase the accountability of ESRC program management (both installation- and headquarters-level) by spelling out what each intern is entitled to receive. To ensure that interns are not discouraged from reading a lengthy Army regulation, it may be worthwhile to separately distribute copies of the two most relevant chapters.

Promote Training

EHSC – in conjunction with the MACOMs – should communicate to installation DEHs the need to promote intern training. Although training is one of the cornerstones of the program, our survey has shown that too many interns received too little training. In particular, too many interns are not taking either of the two core FE courses, while a number of others are not taking any formal technical courses. We also recommend that EHSC aggressively monitor funding levels and course quotas to minimize the number of instances where interns are unable to take scheduled classes.

Establish Rotation Planning Guidelines

EHSC should develop specific guidelines for planning and monitoring rotations. A balance must be struck between too few rotations (which can result in very limited knowledge of the DEH) and too many rotations (which can result in meaningless work assignments). Ranges should be created for the total number of assignments (e.g., 4 to 8), and for the length of each assignment (e.g., 3 to 6 months). Formal rotation plans should be established at the same time that formal training plans are established, and interns should be allowed some input into the selection and scheduling of their assignments.

Improve Installation-Level Supervision

EHSC should communicate to participating MACOMs, installations, and activities the importance of improved intern supervision. This means giving frequent performance appraisals and career counseling, encouraging the pursuit of professional registration, adhering to training and rotation plans, and providing sufficient notice (and choices, if possible) regarding target positions. Although interns are perceived by many DEHs as "free" labor for their first 2 years, DEH investments of time and training are required, and most interns will end up as career employees at the same place where they were hired. It is therefore in everyone's best interests to make sure that interns receive enough training, experience, and guidance.

Provide Central Oversight and Coordination

Finally, EHSC should take a more active role in overseeing and coordinating the program. To this end, we recommend that EHSC develop and maintain a file with the names, locations, and status (including training and rotation progress) of all interns in the program at any point in time. Periodic updating and review of this file should be supplemented by both routine and special site visits.

We also recommend that EHSC institute an ongoing feedback process. This process should involve at least two steps: (1) have incoming interns complete a brief questionnaire addressing their backgrounds, recruiting, and orientations; and (2) have graduating interns complete another brief questionnaire addressing their training, development, rotation, placement, and opinions. The responses could be used to identify problems, monitor the effects of any changes, and demonstrate a headquarters-level interest in the program and its participants.

SUMMARY

Weak recruiting, inconsistent management, and insufficient information are severely undermining the potential benefits of the ESRC facilities intern program, a key source of career civilian employees for DEHs at Army installations worldwide. In this report we have provided a brief overview of the program, a summary description of its participants, and an analysis of how it is currently administered. By implementing our recommendations, EHSC can improve the intern program and enhance the quality and morale of the overall DEH work force.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

**ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS
(RESOURCES AND CONSTRUCTION)
INTERN PROGRAM SURVEY**

1. Are you now, or have you been, an intern in the Engineers and Scientists (Resources and Construction) (ESRC) Career Program?
- A. Yes _____ If yes, what year did you begin the program? _____
- B. No _____

IF YOU RESPONDED "YES" TO QUESTION 1, PLEASE GO ON TO QUESTION 2. IF YOU RESPONDED "NO" TO QUESTION 1, YOU DO NOT NEED TO ANSWER THE REMAINING QUESTIONS. PLEASE RETURN THIS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ATTACHED ENVELOPE.

2. What type of intern were you? (Base your answer on the source of funds/space, not on the location of your job; most interns are DA-funded.)
- A. DA _____
- B. MACOM _____
- C. Local _____
3. How did you *initially* find out about the Intern Program?
- A. Newspaper/magazine advertisement _____
- B. College Placement Office _____
- C. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Announcement _____
- D. Friend/Family member _____
- E. Civilian Personnel Office (CPO) visit _____
- F. Job Fair _____
- G. Other (Please specify) _____
4. Who interviewed you for the Intern Program? (Check all that apply)
- A. A representative of CPO _____
- B. A representative of the Directorate of Engineering and Housing (DEH) _____
- C. A MACOM representative _____
- D. A representative of OPM _____
- E. Other (Please specify) _____
- F. Not interviewed _____
5. From what college did you graduate? _____
6. What year did you graduate? _____
7. What was your major area of study? _____
8. What degree did you receive? _____
9. What was your overall Grade Point Average? _____ out of a possible _____

10. What previous *relevant* work experience did you have? (Check all that apply)
- A. Government Summer-hire _____
 - B. COOP Student _____
 - C. Junior Fellowship _____
 - D. Private Sector _____
 - E. Other (Please specify) _____
 - F. None _____
11. What GS grade were you hired at?
- A. GS-5 _____
 - B. GS-7 _____
12. What installation were you assigned to when you entered the Intern Program? _____
-
13. Are you still at the same installation?
- A. Yes _____
 - B. No _____
14. How important were each of these factors in your decision to take the job?
(Scale: 1 = Very Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Not Important)
- A. Compensation _____
 - B. Location _____
 - C. Job Content _____
 - D. Manager/Supervisor _____
 - E. Co-Workers _____
 - F. Job Security _____
 - G. Promotion Potential _____
 - H. Opportunities for Increased Responsibilities _____
 - I. Geographic Mobility Opportunities (CONUS/OCONUS) _____
 - J. Alternative Job Offers Received _____
 - K. Other (Please specify) _____
15. How would you rate the starting salary of this job compared to other jobs?
(Scale: 1 = Higher, 2 = Similar, 3 = Lower, 4 = Don't Know/Not Applicable)
- A. Compared to other offers you received _____
 - B. Compared to offers received by your peers/classmates _____
16. How soon after your interview/application submission were you offered the position?
-
17. Who gave you an orientation when you began employment? (Check all that apply)
- A. Supervisor _____
 - B. CPO _____
 - C. Other (Please explain) _____
 - D. No one (No orientation) _____

18. When did you receive a copy of Army Regulation 690-950 (Career Management)?
- A. At beginning of intern program _____
 - B. Later in intern program _____
 - C. After graduating from intern program _____
 - D. Never received _____
19. What type of Intern Training Plan did you receive when you entered on duty?
- A. A plan written specifically for you _____
 - B. A generic, master plan _____
 - C. A copy of another intern's plan _____
 - D. Other (Please explain) _____
 - E. None (No plan received) _____
20. Which of these courses did you attend as an intern? (Check all that apply)
- A. Facilities Engineering Basics _____
 - B. Facilities Engineering Management _____
 - C. Intern Leadership _____
 - D. None of the above _____
21. Did your training as an intern include formal technical courses?
- A. Yes _____ If yes, how many courses? _____
 - B. No _____
22. Were these courses relevant to your work and career? (Check one)
- A. All technical training courses were relevant _____
 - B. Some technical training courses were relevant _____
 - C. No technical training courses were relevant _____
 - D. Did not attend any technical training courses _____
23. How often were you unable to take scheduled training courses for any of the following reasons?
(Scale: 1 = Frequently, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Never)
- A. Lack of funds _____
 - B. Course quota not available _____
 - C. Course canceled _____
 - D. Overriding work considerations _____
 - E. Other (Please explain) _____
24. How did your training courses usually occur? (Check one)
- A. Automatically _____
 - B. At my request _____
 - C. Not applicable (No training) _____
25. How did your rotational assignments usually occur? (Check one)
- A. Automatically _____
 - B. At my request _____
 - C. Not applicable (Never rotated) _____

26. How long did you work in each of the following areas as an intern?
- A. ERMD _____
 - B. Engineering (Design, Construction Inspection/Management) _____
 - C. Contract Administration _____
 - D. Master Planning/Programming _____
 - E. Environment _____
 - F. Operations & Maintenance (Buildings & Grounds, Utilities) _____
 - G. Fire Prevention and Protection _____
 - H. Family Housing Office _____
 - I. Office of DEH/DDEH-Special Projects (CA, Reorganization) _____
 - J. District/Area Engineer _____
 - K. MACOM Engineer Office _____
 - L. Other (Please specify) _____
27. Was the work given to you in these assignments meaningful? (Check one)
- A. All assignments were meaningful developmental experiences _____
 - B. Some assignments were meaningful developmental experiences _____
 - C. No assignments were meaningful developmental experiences _____
28. How often were you given performance appraisals during your internship?
- A. Orally: _____
 - B. In writing: _____
29. How often were you given career counseling as an intern? _____
30. Who is the person you consider to be effectively in charge of the Intern Program at your installation? (Check one)
- A. The DEH _____
 - B. The Deputy DEH _____
 - C. One of the Division/Branch Chiefs _____
 - D. A member of the CPO staff _____
 - E. Another Engineer in the DEH organization _____
 - F. Other (Please explain) _____
31. How did your internship compare with what you were led to expect?
- A. Better than expected _____
 - B. About the same as expected _____
 - C. Worse than expected _____
 - D. Didn't know what to expect _____
32. In what ways (if any) did it differ from what you were led to expect?
- _____
- _____
33. Knowing what you do now, would you still have joined the ESRC Intern Program?
- A. Definitely _____ Why? _____
 - B. Probably _____ Why? _____
 - C. Probably not _____ Why? _____
 - D. Definitely not _____ Why? _____

34. Would you encourage your friends/classmates to join the ESRC Intern Program?
 A. Definitely _____ Why? _____
 B. Probably _____ Why? _____
 C. Probably not _____ Why? _____
 D. Definitely not _____ Why? _____
35. How do you think your internship compared with that of other DEH interns Army-wide?
 A. Better than other interns _____
 B. About the same as other interns _____
 C. Worse than other interns _____
 D. Don't know/not applicable _____
36. Have you been encouraged to pursue Professional Registration?
 A. Yes _____
 B. No _____
37. Have you obtained Professional Registration?
 A. Yes _____
 B. No _____ If no, are you working on it? Yes _____ No _____
38. Was your work experience as an intern relevant to the pursuit of Professional Registration?
 A. Yes _____
 B. No _____
39. Which of the following subjects would you have liked to have learned more about as an Intern?
 (Check all that apply)
 A. The structure and mission of the Department of Army and where your installation DEH fits in _____
 B. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers _____
 C. The ESRC Career Program _____
 D. The Civilian Personnel System _____
 E. The ESRC Intern Program _____
 F. Specific technical areas (Please specify) _____
 G. Other (Please specify) _____
40. Have you completed the Intern Program?
 A. Yes _____ What year? _____
 B. No _____ Why not? _____

IF YOU RESPONDED "YES" TO QUESTION 40, PLEASE GO ON TO QUESTION 41. IF YOU RESPONDED "NO" TO QUESTION 40, PLEASE SKIP AHEAD TO QUESTION 50.

41. Were you placed at the installation where you were trained?
 A. Yes _____
 B. No _____ Why not? _____
42. How long before you graduated from the Intern Program did you find out where your target position would be? _____
43. Has the Intern Program been beneficial to you from a career standpoint?
 A. Yes _____ Why? _____
 B. No _____ Why? _____

44. Do you think you would be better off had you decided to enter the Corps of Engineers Intern Program rather than the DEH Intern Program?
- A. Yes _____ Why? _____
- B. No _____ Why? _____
45. How competitive do you think you are with other ESRC intern graduates as a result of your participation in the Intern Program? (Check one)
- A. Have a competitive advantage _____
- B. About the same _____
- C. At a competitive disadvantage _____
- D. Don't know _____
46. What is your present employment status? (Check one)
- A. Army employee _____ Grade? _____
- B. Other Federal Government Employee _____ Grade? _____
- C. Other (Please explain) _____
47. How would you describe your present position? (Check one)
- A. Supervisory _____
- B. Nonsupervisory _____
48. How many position moves have you made since graduating from the program? _____
49. How many geographic moves have you made since graduating from the program?
- A. CONUS _____
- B. OCONUS _____
50. Would additional contact with fellow interns have been beneficial?
- A. Yes _____ Why? _____
- B. No _____ Why? _____
51. What did you like most about the Intern Program?
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
52. What did you like least about the Intern Program?
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

53. Do you have any additional comments on the following subjects?

A. The recruiting and hiring of interns:

B. The rotation and utilization of interns:

C. The placement and career development of interns:

D. Anything else related to the ESRC Intern Program:

**THIS CONCLUDES THE SURVEY. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ATTACHED ENVELOPE.**

APPENDIX B

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT YEAR DID YOU BEGIN PROGRAM?

BEGYEAR	Frequency	Percent
1984	35	14.8
1985	29	12.2
1986	34	14.3
1987	56	23.6
1988	10	4.2
1989	73	30.8

WHAT TYPE OF INTERN WERE YOU?

TYPE	Frequency	Percent
DA	154	66.4
MACOM	52	22.4
Local	23	9.9
Multiple	3	1.3

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW DID YOU FIRST LEARN ABOUT PROGRAM?

INITIAL	Frequency	Percent
Advertisement	23	9.7
Placement Office	30	12.7
OPM Announcement	34	14.3
Friend/Family	38	16.0
CPO Visit	39	16.5
Other/Multiple	73	30.8

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHO INTERVIEWED YOU FOR PROGRAM?

INTERV	Frequency	Percent
CPO Represent.	17	7.3
DEH Represent.	109	46.6
MACOM Represent.	9	3.8
OPM Represent.	5	2.1
Other/Multiple	43	18.4
Not Interviewed	51	21.8

Frequency Missing = 3

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT COLLEGE DID YOU GRADUATE FROM?

COLLEGE	Frequency	Percent
ADAMSON U	1	0.4
ALABAMA A&M	1	0.4
AUBURN U	3	1.3
BRIGHAM YOUNG U	3	1.3
C.F.M. - ROMANIA	1	0.4
CA POLY-POMONA	2	0.9
CA POLY-SAN L	1	0.4
CA STATE-FRESNO	2	0.9
CARNEGIE-MELLON	2	0.9
CLARKSON COLL TE	1	0.4
CLEVELAND STATE	1	0.4
COLORADO STATE U	1	0.4
DREXEL U	1	0.4
E CNTRL U-DOMREP	1	0.4
GENEVA COLLEGE	1	0.4
GEORGIA INST TEC	2	0.9
HAMPTON U	2	0.9
ILLINOIS INST TE	1	0.4
IOWA STATE U	2	0.9
KANSAS STATE U	7	3.0
LAMAR U	1	0.4
LAWRENCE TECH U	1	0.4
LEHIGH U	1	0.4
LOUISIANA STATE	3	1.3
MANHATTAN COLL	1	0.4
MICHIGAN INST TE	2	0.9
MICHIGAN STATE U	1	0.4
MISSISSIPPI ST	1	0.4
MONTANA SCH M&T	1	0.4
MONTANA STATE U	1	0.4
MONTANA TECH	2	0.9
N CAROLINA A&T S	6	2.6
N CAROLINA STATE	5	2.1
NEW JERSEY INST	4	1.7
NEW MEXICO STATE	3	1.3
NEW YORK POLY IN	2	0.9
NORTH DAKOTA ST	1	0.4
NORTHEASTERN U	2	0.9
NUREMBURG	1	0.4
OHIO U-ATHENS	1	0.4
OKLAHOMA STATE U	1	0.4
OLD DOMINION U	2	0.9
OREGON STATE U	1	0.4
PENN STATE U	2	0.9
PORTLAND STATE U	1	0.4
PURDUE U	2	0.9
RENSSELAER POLYT	2	0.9

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT COLLEGE DID YOU GRADUATE FROM?

COLLEGE	Frequency	Percent
RUTGERS U	1	0.4
S DAKOTA SCH M&T	1	0.4
SAN DIEGO STATE	2	0.9
SOUTH DAKOTA ST	1	0.4
SOUTH ILLINOIS U	1	0.4
SOUTHEASTRN MASS	1	0.4
SOUTHERN U	2	0.9
ST MARTINS COLL	4	1.7
STATE U NY-BUFF	1	0.4
STATE U NY-ST.BR	1	0.4
STATE U NY-SYRAC	1	0.4
TEMPLE U	3	1.3
TENNESSEE STATE	1	0.4
TEXAS A&I U	3	1.3
TEXAS A&M U	5	2.1
TEXAS TECH U	2	0.9
TUSKEGEE U	1	0.4
U ALABAMA-BIRM	2	0.9
U ALABAMA-TUS	4	1.7
U ALASKA-ANCHRGE	2	0.9
U ALASKA-FAIRBNK	1	0.4
U ARKANSAS	1	0.4
U BRIDGEPORT	1	0.4
U CALIF-BERKELY	1	0.4
U CALIF-LOS ANGL	1	0.4
U CALIF-SAN DIEG	1	0.4
U COLORADO	1	0.4
U DELAWARE	1	0.4
U EVANSVILLE	1	0.4
U HAWAII-HONO	3	1.3
U HAWAII-MANOA	1	0.4
U HOUSTON	2	0.9
U IDAHO	1	0.4
U ILLINOIS-CHICG	1	0.4
U ILLINOIS-UR	1	0.4
U IOWA	1	0.4
U KANSAS	3	1.3
U KENTUCKY	5	2.1
U LOUISVILLE	3	1.3
U LOWELL	1	0.4
U MAINE-ORONO	1	0.4
U MARYLAND	1	0.4
U MARYLAND-BALT	1	0.4
U MASS-AMHERST	3	1.3
U MIAMI	1	0.4
U MINNESOTA	2	0.9
U MISSOURI-COLUM	1	0.4

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT COLLEGE DID YOU GRADUATE FROM?

COLLEGE	Frequency	Percent
U MISSOURI-ROLLA	10	4.3
U N CAROLINA-CHA	1	0.4
U NEBRASKA-LINCN	2	0.9
U NEBRASKA-OMAHA	1	0.4
U NEVADA-RENO	1	0.4
U NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	0.4
U OKLAHOMA	2	0.9
U PITTSBURGH	4	1.7
U PORTLAND	1	0.4
U PUERTO RICO	1	0.4
U S ALABAMA	2	0.9
U SAIGON	1	0.4
U SOUTH COLORADO	1	0.4
U SOUTH FL-TAMPA	1	0.4
U SOUTHERN CA	1	0.4
U TENNESSEE-KNOX	1	0.4
U TEXAS-ARLINGTN	2	0.9
U TEXAS-AUSTIN	2	0.9
U TEXAS-EL PASO	2	0.9
U TEXAS-S.ANTON	3	1.3
U TOLEDO	1	0.4
U VIRGINIA	1	0.4
U WASHINGTON	4	1.7
U WISC-MADISON	1	0.4
U WISC-MILWAUKEE	1	0.4
US MILITARY ACAD	1	0.4
VA MILITARY INST	2	0.9
VILLANOVA U	1	0.4
VIRGINIA TECH	4	1.7
WEST TEXAS STATE	1	0.4
WEST VIRGINIA TE	1	0.4
WEST VIRGINIA U	5	2.1
WIDENER U	1	0.4
WORCESTER POLYTE	1	0.4
YOUNGSTOWN STATE	2	0.9

Frequency Missing = 3

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT YEAR DID YOU GRADUATE?

GRADYEAR	Frequency	Percent
Pre-1983	52	22.0
1983	26	11.0
1984	24	10.2
1985	27	11.4
1986	37	15.7
1987	35	14.8
1988	21	8.9
1989	14	5.9

Frequency Missing = 1

HOW LONG AFTER GRADUATING DID YOU BEGIN?

OUTYEARS	Frequency	Percent
Same Year	57	24.2
1 yr. Later	66	28.0
2 yrs. Later	43	18.2
3 or more yrs.	70	29.7

Frequency Missing = 1

WHAT WAS YOUR MAJOR AREA OF STUDY?

MAJOR	Frequency	Percent
Architecture	7	3.0
Civil Eng.	72	30.5
Multiple Major	5	2.1
Electrical Eng.	32	13.6
Chemical Eng.	6	2.5
Industrial Eng.	26	11.0
Mechanical Eng.	57	24.2
Non-Engineering	7	3.0
Other Eng.	24	10.2

Frequency Missing = 1

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

WHAT DEGREE DID YOU RECEIVE?

DEGREE	Frequency	Percent
Bach. of Science	212	89.8
Bach. - Other	10	4.2
Master's	14	5.9

Frequency Missing = 1

WHAT WAS YOUR OVERALL G.P.A.?

GPA	Frequency	Percent
Under 2.600	63	27.5
2.600 to 2.899	54	23.6
2.900 to 3.199	57	24.9
3.200 or Higher	55	24.0

Frequency Missing = 8

WHAT PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE DID YOU HAVE?

PREVWORK	Frequency	Percent
COOP Student	15	6.4
Private Sector	86	36.6
Other/Multiple	83	35.3
None	51	21.7

Frequency Missing = 2

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT GS GRADE WERE YOU HIRED AT?

GSGRADE	Frequency	Percent
GS-5	106	44.7
GS-7	127	53.6
GS-9/Other	4	1.7

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT WAS YOUR INITIAL INSTALLATION?

INITINST	Frequency	Percent
ABERDEEN PVG GD	2	0.9
ANNISTON DEPOT	5	2.1
BAYONNE TERMINAL	1	0.4
CEHSC-FU-E	1	0.4
DE-OS HELSTF	1	0.4
DETROIT ARSENL	1	0.4
EPS&E	2	0.9
FITZSIMONS MED C	1	0.4
FT BEN HARRISON	1	0.4
FT BENNING	4	1.7
FT BLISS	4	1.7
FT BRAGG	16	6.8
FT CAMPBELL	5	2.1
FT CARSON	2	0.9
FT DETRICK	1	0.4
FT DEVENS	6	2.6
FT DIX	4	1.7
FT DRUM	2	0.9
FT EUSTIS	7	3.0
FT GILLEM	1	0.4
FT HOOD	16	6.8
FT IRWIN	1	0.4
FT JACKSON	2	0.9
FT KNOX	4	1.7
FT LEAVENWORTH	4	1.7
FT LEE	2	0.9
FT LEONARD WOOD	9	3.8
FT LEWIS	15	6.4
FT MCPHERSON	1	0.4
FT MEADE	4	1.7
FT MONMOUTH	6	2.6
FT MONROE	7	3.0
FT McCLELLAN	3	1.3
FT MccOY	3	1.3
FT McNAIR	2	0.9
FT ORD	6	2.6
FT POLK	1	0.4
FT RILEY	8	3.4
FT RITCHIE	1	0.4
FT RUCKER	1	0.4
FT SAM HOUSTON	3	1.3
FT SILL	3	1.3
NATICK RD&E CENT	2	0.9
OAKLAND ARMY BAS	1	0.4
PICATINNY ARSENL	2	0.9
RED RIVER DEPOT	2	0.9
SEOUL KOREA	5	2.1

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT WAS YOUR INITIAL INSTALLATION?

INITINST	Frequency	Percent
TOOELE DEPOT	3	1.3
TRAFFIC MGMT CMD	1	0.4
USACE-DETROIT	1	0.4
USASCH	1	0.4
USMCA ANSBACH	3	1.3
USMCA BAD KREUZN	1	0.4
USMCA BAD TOELZ	1	0.4
USMCA BAMBERG	1	0.4
USMCA BAUMHOLDER	2	0.9
USMCA DARMSTADT	2	0.9
USMCA FRANKFURT	1	0.4
USMCA GIESSEN	2	0.9
USMCA GOEPPINGEN	1	0.4
USMCA GRAFENWOEH	1	0.4
USMCA HANAU	1	0.4
USMCA HEIDELBERG	1	0.4
USMCA HEILBRONN	2	0.9
USMCA HOHENFELS	1	0.4
USMCA KAISERSLAU	1	0.4
USMCA KARLSRUHE	2	0.9
USMCA LIVORNO	1	0.4
USMCA MANNHEIM	2	0.9
USMCA MUNICH	1	0.4
USMCA NEW ULM	3	1.3
USMCA NUERNBERG	2	0.9
USMCA PIRMASENS	2	0.9
USMCA SCHWEINFUR	1	0.4
USMCA STUTTGART	3	1.3
USMCA WORMS	2	0.9
USMCA WUERZBURG	3	1.3
USMCA ZWEIBRUECK	1	0.4
WAFB	1	0.4
WHEELER	1	0.4
WHITE SANDS MISS	1	0.4

Frequency Missing = 3

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHAT WAS YOUR INITIAL MAJOR COMMAND?

MACOM	Frequency	Percent
AMC	25	10.5
FORSCOM	90	38.0
TRADOC	55	23.2
USAREUR	44	18.6
OTHER/UNK.	23	9.7

ARE YOU STILL AT SAME INSTALLATION?

CURRINST	Frequency	Percent
Yes	199	84.0
No	38	16.0

IMPORTANCE OF COMPENSATION?

COMPENS	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	67	28.3
Some Important	133	56.1
Not Important/NA	37	15.6

IMPORTANCE OF LOCATION?

LOCATION	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	118	49.8
Some Important	73	30.8
Not Important/NA	46	19.4

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

IMPORTANCE OF JOB CONTENT?

CONTENT	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	142	59.9
Some Important	69	29.1
Not Important/NA	26	11.0

IMPORTANCE OF MANAGER/SUPERVISOR?

MANAGER	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	43	18.1
Some Important	92	38.8
Not Important/NA	102	43.0

IMPORTANCE OF CO-WORKERS?

COWORKER	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	18	7.6
Some Important	109	46.0
Not Important/NA	110	46.4

IMPORTANCE OF JOB SECURITY?

SECURITY	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	113	47.7
Some Important	89	37.6
Not Important/NA	35	14.8

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

IMPORTANCE OF PROMOTION POTENTIAL?

PROMOTE	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	158	66.7
Some Important	59	24.9
Not Important/NA	20	8.4

IMPORTANCE OF MORE RESPONSIBILITIES?

RESPONS	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	154	65.0
Some Important	55	23.2
Not Important/NA	28	11.8

IMPORTANCE OF GEOGRAPHIC MOBILITY?

MOBILITY	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	61	25.7
Some Important	79	33.3
Not Important/NA	97	40.9

IMPORTANCE OF ALTERNATIVE OFFERS?

OFFERS	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	34	14.3
Some Important	97	40.9
Not Important/NA	106	44.7

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

IMPORTANCE OF OTHER FACTORS?

OTHERWHY	Frequency	Percent
Very Important	10	4.2
Some Important	2	0.8
Not Important/NA	225	94.9

SALARY COMPARED TO OTHER OFFERS?

OFFERSAL	Frequency	Percent
Higher	15	6.3
Similar	58	24.5
Lower	119	50.2
Unknown/NA	45	19.0

SALARY COMPARED TO OTHER PEOPLE?

OTHERSAL	Frequency	Percent
Higher	7	3.0
Similar	43	18.1
Lower	155	65.4
Unknown/NA	32	13.5

HOW SOON AFTER INTERVIEW WAS OFFER MADE?

OFFERDAT	Frequency	Percent
Under 1 Month	88	37.9
1 to 3 Months	89	38.4
4 to 6 Months	23	9.9
Over 6 Months	32	13.8

Frequency Missing = 5

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHO GAVE YOU ORIENTATION AT BEGINNING?

ORIENT	Frequency	Percent
Supervisor	65	27.4
CPO	22	9.3
Supervisor & CPO	109	46.0
Other/Multiple	34	14.3
Nobody	7	3.0

WHEN DID YOU RECEIVE AR 690-950?

ARMYREG	Frequency	Percent
Start of Program	68	29.1
Later in Program	49	20.9
After Graduating	12	5.1
Never Received	105	44.9

Frequency Missing = 3

WHAT TRAINING PLAN DID YOU RECEIVE?

TRAPLAN	Frequency	Percent
Specific Plan	102	43.0
Generic Plan	31	13.1
Another's Plan	49	20.7
Other/Misc.	27	11.4
No Plan	28	11.8

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WHICH INTERN COURSES DID YOU TAKE?

COURSES	Frequency	Percent
FE Basics	11	4.7
FE Management	41	17.6
Intern Leader.	39	16.7
Basics/Manage.	16	6.9
Basics/Leader.	10	4.3
Manage./Leader	25	10.7
Bas./Man./Lea.	7	3.0
None	84	36.1

Frequency Missing = 4

DID YOU HAVE FORMAL TECHNICAL COURSES?

TECHYES	Frequency	Percent
Yes	176	76.5
No	54	23.5

Frequency Missing = 7

HOW MANY TECHNICAL COURSES DID YOU HAVE?

TECHNUM	Frequency	Percent
1 Course	27	16.6
2 Courses	23	14.1
3 Courses	23	14.1
4 or 5 Courses	27	16.6
Over 5 Courses	63	38.7

Frequency Missing = 74

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WERE COURSES RELEVANT TO WORK/CAREER?

RELEVANT	Frequency	Percent
All Relevant	125	71.0
Some Relevant	48	27.3
None Relevant	3	1.7

Frequency Missing = 61

DENIED COURSES - LACK OF FUNDS?

FUNDS	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	72	30.4
Rarely	57	24.1
Never/NA	108	45.6

DENIED COURSES - UNAVAILABLE QUOTA?

QUOTA	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	44	18.6
Rarely	65	27.4
Never/NA	128	54.0

DENIED COURSES - CANCELLATIONS?

CANCEL	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	17	7.2
Rarely	51	21.5
Never/NA	169	71.3

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

DENIED COURSES - WORK CONSIDERATIONS?

WORK	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	24	10.1
Rarely	44	18.6
Never/NA	169	71.3

DENIED COURSES - OTHER REASONS?

OTHERNO	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	11	4.6
Rarely	1	0.4
Never/NA	225	94.9

HOW DID TRAINING USUALLY OCCUR?

TRAOCCUR	Frequency	Percent
Automatically	78	44.6
At My Request	88	50.3
Other	9	5.1

Frequency Missing = 62

HOW DID ROTATION USUALLY OCCUR?

ROTOCCUR	Frequency	Percent
Automatically	64	54.2
At My Request	46	39.0
Other	8	6.8

Frequency Missing = 119

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

HOW LONG WORKED IN ERMD?

ERMD	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	125	56.6
Under 3 Months	33	14.9
3 to 11 Months	39	17.6
1 Year or More	24	10.9

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN ENGINEERING?

ENGINEER	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	77	34.8
Under 3 Months	29	13.1
3 to 11 Months	51	23.1
1 Year or More	64	29.0

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN CONTRACT ADMIN.?

CONTRACT	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	176	79.6
Under 3 Months	29	13.1
3 to 11 Months	12	5.4
1 Year or More	4	1.8

Frequency Missing = 16

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

HOW LONG WORKED IN PLANS/PROGRAMS?

PLANPROG	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	132	59.7
Under 3 Months	47	21.3
3 to 11 Months	32	14.5
1 Year or More	10	4.5

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN ENVIRONMENT?

ENVIRON	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	149	67.4
Under 3 Months	44	19.9
3 to 11 Months	13	5.9
1 Year or More	15	6.8

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN OPERATIONS/MAINT.?

OPMAINT	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	143	64.7
Under 3 Months	36	16.3
3 to 11 Months	32	14.5
1 Year or More	10	4.5

Frequency Missing = 16

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

HOW LONG WORKED IN FIRE PREV./PROT.?

FIREPREV	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	184	83.3
Under 3 Months	37	16.7

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN FAMILY HOUSING?

FAMHOUS	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	173	78.3
Under 3 Months	40	18.1
3 to 11 Months	6	2.7
1 Year or More	2	0.9

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN (D)DEH OFFICE?

DEHDDEH	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	175	79.2
Under 3 Months	24	10.9
3 to 11 Months	18	8.1
1 Year or More	4	1.8

Frequency Missing = 16

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

HOW LONG WORKED IN DIST./AREA ENGINEER?

DISTAREA	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	198	89.6
Under 3 Months	19	8.6
3 to 11 Months	4	1.8

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN MACOM ENGINEER?

MACOMENG	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	199	90.0
Under 3 Months	14	6.3
3 to 11 Months	4	1.8
1 Year or More	4	1.8

Frequency Missing = 16

HOW LONG WORKED IN OTHER AREAS?

OTHERROT	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	190	86.0
Under 3 Months	16	7.2
3 to 11 Months	10	4.5
1 Year or More	5	2.3

Frequency Missing = 16

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

WERE WORK ASSIGNMENTS MEANINGFUL?

MEANING	Frequency	Percent
All Meaningful	64	44.4
Some Meaningful	70	48.6
None Meaningful	10	6.9

Frequency Missing = 93

HOW OFTEN GIVEN ORAL APPRAISALS?

ORALAPPR	Frequency	Percent
None Received	135	65.5
Less Than 2/Year	20	9.7
At Least 2/Year	51	24.8

Frequency Missing = 31

HOW OFTEN GIVEN WRITTEN APPRAISALS?

WRITAPPR	Frequency	Percent
None Received	44	19.8
Less Than 2/Year	55	24.8
At Least 2/Year	123	55.4

Frequency Missing = 15

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

HOW OFTEN GIVEN CAREER COUNSELING?

COUNSEL	Frequency	Percent
None Received	118	60.5
Less Than 2/Year	45	23.1
At Least 2/Year	32	16.4

Frequency Missing = 42

WHO IS EFFECTIVELY IN CHARGE OF PROGRAM?

INCHARGE	Frequency	Percent
Deputy DEH	89	38.0
Div/Branch Chief	54	23.1
CPO Staff Member	37	15.8
Other/Multiple	54	23.1

Frequency Missing = 3

COMPARE INTERNSHIP TO EXPECTATIONS?

EXPECT	Frequency	Percent
Better	38	20.4
Same	91	48.9
Worse	57	30.6

Frequency Missing = 51

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WOULD YOU STILL HAVE JOINED PROGRAM?

STILLJOI	Frequency	Percent
Definitely	105	45.3
Probably	90	38.8
Probably Not	25	10.8
Definitely Not	12	5.2

Frequency Missing = 5

WOULD YOU STILL RECOMMEND PROGRAM?

STILLREC	Frequency	Percent
Definitely	79	35.0
Probably	95	42.0
Probably Not	37	16.4
Definitely Not	15	6.6

Frequency Missing = 11

COMPARE INTERNSHIP TO OTHER DEH INTERNS?

COMPARE	Frequency	Percent
Better	67	37.4
Same	81	45.3
Worse	31	17.3

Frequency Missing = 58

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

ENCOURAGED TO PURSUE PROFESSIONAL REG.?

PURSUEPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	128	54.9
No	105	45.1

Frequency Missing = 4

HAVE YOU OBTAINED PROFESSIONAL REG.?

OBTAINPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	16	6.9
No	215	93.1

Frequency Missing = 6

ARE YOU WORKING ON PROFESSIONAL REG.?

WORKONPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	153	74.6
No	52	25.4

Frequency Missing = 32

WAS WORK RELEVANT TO PROFESSIONAL REG.?

RELEVPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	117	54.2
No	99	45.8

Frequency Missing = 21

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

LEARN MORE ABOUT ARMY AND DEH?

MOREARMY	Frequency	Percent
Yes	78	32.9
No/Missing	159	67.1

LEARN MORE ABOUT CORPS OF ENGINEERS?

MORECORP	Frequency	Percent
Yes	132	55.7
No/Missing	105	44.3

LEARN MORE ABOUT ESRC CAREER PROGRAM?

MORECARE	Frequency	Percent
Yes	93	39.2
No/Missing	144	60.8

LEARN MORE ABOUT CIV. PERSONNEL SYSTEM?

MOREPERS	Frequency	Percent
Yes	59	24.9
No/Missing	178	75.1

LEARN MORE ABOUT ESRC INTERN PROGRAM?

MOREINTP	Frequency	Percent
Yes	59	24.9
No/Missing	178	75.1

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

LEARN MORE ABOUT TECHNICAL AREAS?

MORETECH	Frequency	Percent
Yes	60	25.3
No/Missing	177	74.7

LEARN MORE ABOUT OTHER SUBJECTS?

MOREOTH	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	7.6
No/Missing	219	92.4

HAVE YOU COMPLETED PROGRAM?

COMPLETE	Frequency	Percent
Yes	130	55.8
No	103	44.2

Frequency Missing = 4

WHAT YEAR DID YOU COMPLETE PROGRAM?

COMPYEAR	Frequency	Percent
1985	4	3.1
1986	22	16.9
1987	24	18.5
1988	30	23.1
1989	50	38.5

Frequency Missing = 107

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

WERE YOU PLACED AT INST. WHERE TRAINED?

PLATRAIN	Frequency	Percent
Yes	113	85.6
No	19	14.4

Frequency Missing = 105

ADVANCE NOTICE OF YOUR TARGET POSITION?

WHENFIND	Frequency	Percent
Under 1 Month	36	30.3
1 to 3 Months	31	26.1
4 to 6 Months	26	21.8
Over 6 Months	26	21.8

Frequency Missing = 118

WAS PROGRAM BENEFICIAL TO YOUR CAREER?

BENEFIT	Frequency	Percent
Yes	107	83.6
No	21	16.4

Frequency Missing = 109

BETTER OFF IN CORPS INTERN PROGRAM?

CORPSINT	Frequency	Percent
Yes	50	48.5
No	53	51.5

Frequency Missing = 134

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

HOW COMPETITIVE ARE YOU DUE TO PROGRAM?

COMPETE	Frequency	Percent
More Competitive	52	45.2
Same Competitive	54	47.0
Less Competitive	9	7.8

Frequency Missing = 122

WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS?

EMPSTAT	Frequency	Percent
Army Employee	127	96.9
Other	4	3.1

Frequency Missing = 106

WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT JOB GRADE?

EMPGRADE	Frequency	Percent
GS/GM-9	11	8.4
GS/GM-11	101	77.1
GS/GM-12 or 13	19	14.5

Frequency Missing = 106

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE PRESENT POSITION?

PRESPOS	Frequency	Percent
Supervisory	38	29.0
Nonsupervisory	93	71.0

Frequency Missing = 106

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

OF POSITION MOVES SINCE GRADUATING?

PMOVES	Frequency	Percent
0 Moves	72	55.0
1 Move	32	24.4
2 or More Moves	27	20.6

Frequency Missing = 106

NUMBER OF CONUS MOVES SINCE GRADUATING?

CMOVES	Frequency	Percent
0 Moves	118	90.8
1 Move	10	7.7
2 or More Moves	2	1.5

Frequency Missing = 107

NUMBER OF OCONUS MOVES SINCE GRADUATING?

OMOVES	Frequency	Percent
0 Moves	108	84.4
1 Move	14	10.9
2 or More Moves	6	4.7

Frequency Missing = 109

MORE CONTACT WITH FELLOW INTERNS?

MCONTACT	Frequency	Percent
Yes	163	76.9
No	49	23.1

Frequency Missing = 25

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS**

WHAT DID YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT PROGRAM?

NUM51	Frequency	Percent
Variety/Rotation	29	15.0
Learn/Exposure	46	23.8
Training	52	26.9
Promote/Advance	18	9.3
Other/Multiple	48	24.9

Frequency Missing = 44

WHAT DID YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT PROGRAM?

NUM52	Frequency	Percent
Rotation	15	8.9
Work Content	27	16.0
Treatment/Mgmt.	41	24.3
Lack of Train.	35	20.7
Low Grade/Pay	25	14.8
Other/Multiple	26	15.4

Frequency Missing = 68

RECOMMENDATIONS: RECRUITING/HIRING?

NUM53A	Frequency	Percent
Higher Pay/Grade	13	15.5
Better/More Info	16	19.0
Contact Schools	21	25.0
Improve Contact	15	17.9
Other/Multiple	19	22.6

Frequency Missing = 153

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS: ROTATION/UTILIZATION?

NUM53B	Frequency	Percent
Less Rotation	8	8.0
Plan/Monitor Ro.	38	38.0
Treat/Use Better	14	14.0
More Rotation	24	24.0
Other/Multiple	16	16.0

Frequency Missing = 137

RECOMMENDATIONS: PLACEMENT/DEVELOPMENT?

NUM53C	Frequency	Percent
Choice of Inst.	8	13.6
More Help/Info	15	25.4
More Time/Notice	9	15.3
More Training	10	16.9
Other/Multiple	17	28.8

Frequency Missing = 178

APPENDIX C

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS
FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS**

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS**

WHAT YEAR DID YOU BEGIN PROGRAM?

BEGYEAR	Frequency	Percent
1984	34	26.2
1985	28	21.5
1986	30	23.1
1987	38	29.2

WHAT GS GRADE WERE YOU HIRED AT?

GSGRADE	Frequency	Percent
GS-5	54	41.5
GS-7	75	57.7
GS-9/Other	1	0.8

WHAT WAS YOUR INITIAL MAJOR COMMAND?

MACOM	Frequency	Percent
AMC	9	6.9
FORSCOM	43	33.1
TRADOC	38	29.2
USAREUR	27	20.8
OTHER/UNK.	13	10.0

WHEN DID YOU RECEIVE AR 690-950?

ARMYREG	Frequency	Percent
Start of Program	35	27.3
Later in Program	31	24.2
After Graduating	12	9.4
Never Received	50	39.1

Frequency Missing = 2

**ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS**

WHAT TRAINING PLAN DID YOU RECEIVE?

TRAPLAN	Frequency	Percent
Specific Plan	58	44.6
Generic Plan	14	10.8
Another's Plan	31	23.8
Other/Misc.	14	10.8
No Plan	13	10.0

WHICH INTERN COURSES DID YOU TAKE?

COURSES	Frequency	Percent
FE Basics	4	3.1
FE Management	29	22.3
Intern Leader.	15	11.5
Basics/Manage.	15	11.5
Basics/Leader.	8	6.2
Manage./Leader	16	12.3
Bas./Man./Lea.	7	5.4
None	36	27.7

DID YOU HAVE FORMAL TECHNICAL COURSES?

TECHYES	Frequency	Percent
Yes	105	80.8
No	25	19.2

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HOW MANY TECHNICAL COURSES DID YOU HAVE?

TECHNUM	Frequency	Percent
1 Course	5	5.1
2 Courses	14	14.1
3 Courses	8	8.1
4 or 5 Courses	17	17.2
Over 5 Courses	55	55.6

Frequency Missing = 31

WERE COURSES RELEVANT TO WORK/CAREER?

RELEVANT	Frequency	Percent
All Relevant	67	63.8
Some Relevant	37	35.2
None Relevant	1	1.0

Frequency Missing = 25

DENIED COURSES - LACK OF FUNDS?

FUNDS	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	50	38.5
Rarely	43	33.1
Never/NA	37	28.5

DENIED COURSES - UNAVAILABLE QUOTA?

QUOTA	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	30	23.1
Rarely	50	38.5
Never/NA	50	38.5

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

DENIED COURSES - CANCELLATIONS?

CANCEL	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	15	11.5
Rarely	34	26.2
Never/NA	81	62.3

DENIED COURSES - WORK CONSIDERATIONS?

WORK	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	18	13.8
Rarely	27	20.8
Never/NA	85	65.4

DENIED COURSES - OTHER REASONS?

OTHERNO	Frequency	Percent
Frequently	7	5.4
Rarely	1	0.8
Never/NA	122	93.8

HOW DID TRAINING USUALLY OCCUR?

TRAOCCUR	Frequency	Percent
Automatically	44	41.9
At My Request	55	52.4
Other	6	5.7

Frequency Missing = 25

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HOW DID ROTATION USUALLY OCCUR?

ROTOCCUR	Frequency	Percent
Automatically	36	50.0
At My Request	33	45.8
Other	3	4.2

Frequency Missing = 58

HOW LONG WORKED IN ERMD?

ERMD	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	62	49.6
Under 3 Months	19	15.2
3 to 11 Months	24	19.2
1 Year or More	20	16.0

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW LONG WORKED IN ENGINEERING?

ENGINEER	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	36	28.8
Under 3 Months	21	16.8
3 to 11 Months	27	21.6
1 Year or More	41	32.8

Frequency Missing = 5

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HOW LONG WORKED IN CONTRACT ADMIN.?

CONTRACT	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	94	75.2
Under 3 Months	17	13.6
3 to 11 Months	10	8.0
1 Year or More	4	3.2

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW LONG WORKED IN PLANS/PROGRAMS?

PLANPROG	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	71	56.8
Under 3 Months	27	21.6
3 to 11 Months	21	16.8
1 Year or More	6	4.8

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW LONG WORKED IN ENVIRONMENT?

ENVIRON	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	77	61.6
Under 3 Months	28	22.4
3 to 11 Months	8	6.4
1 Year or More	12	9.6

Frequency Missing = 5

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HOW LONG WORKED IN OPERATIONS/MAINT.?

OPMAINT	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	76	60.8
Under 3 Months	23	18.4
3 to 11 Months	21	16.8
1 Year or More	5	4.0

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW LONG WORKED IN FIRE PREV./PROT.?

FIREPREV	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	95	76.0
Under 3 Months	30	24.0

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW LONG WORKED IN FAMILY HOUSING?

FAMHOUS	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	92	73.6
Under 3 Months	26	20.8
3 to 11 Months	6	4.8
1 Year or More	1	0.8

Frequency Missing = 5

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HOW LONG WORKED IN (D)DEH OFFICE?

DEHDDEH	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	93	74.4
Under 3 Months	17	13.6
3 to 11 Months	12	9.6
1 Year or More	3	2.4

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW LONG WORKED IN DIST./AREA ENGINEER?

DISTAREA	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	105	84.0
Under 3 Months	16	12.8
3 to 11 Months	4	3.2

Frequency Missing = 5

HOW LONG WORKED IN MACOM ENGINEER?

MACOMENG	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	106	84.8
Under 3 Months	12	9.6
3 to 11 Months	4	3.2
1 Year or More	3	2.4

Frequency Missing = 5

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HOW LONG WORKED IN OTHER AREAS?

OTHERROT	Frequency	Percent
No Time Spent	105	84.0
Under 3 Months	10	8.0
3 to 11 Months	5	4.0
1 Year or More	5	4.0

Frequency Missing = 5

WERE WORK ASSIGNMENTS MEANINGFUL?

MEANING	Frequency	Percent
All Meaningful	32	37.2
Some Meaningful	48	55.8
None Meaningful	6	7.0

Frequency Missing = 44

HOW OFTEN GIVEN ORAL APPRAISALS?

ORALAPPR	Frequency	Percent
None Received	69	60.0
Less Than 2/Year	13	11.3
At Least 2/Year	33	28.7

Frequency Missing = 15

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HOW OFTEN GIVEN WRITTEN APPRAISALS?

WRITAPPR	Frequency	Percent
None Received	2	1.6
Less Than 2/Year	41	32.3
At Least 2/Year	84	66.1

Frequency Missing = 3

HOW OFTEN GIVEN CAREER COUNSELING?

COUNSEL	Frequency	Percent
None Received	64	57.7
Less Than 2/Year	28	25.2
At Least 2/Year	19	17.1

Frequency Missing = 19

WHO IS EFFECTIVELY IN CHARGE OF PROGRAM?

INCHARGE	Frequency	Percent
Deputy DEH	53	40.8
Div/Branch Chief	27	20.8
CPO Staff Member	22	16.9
Other/Multiple	28	21.5

COMPARE INTERNSHIP TO EXPECTATIONS?

EXPECT	Frequency	Percent
Better	22	20.6
Same	49	45.8
Worse	36	33.6

Frequency Missing = 23

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

WOULD YOU STILL HAVE JOINED PROGRAM?

STILLJOI	Frequency	Percent
Definitely	59	45.4
Probably	48	36.9
Probably Not	16	12.3
Definitely Not	7	5.4

WOULD YOU STILL RECOMMEND PROGRAM?

STILLREC	Frequency	Percent
Definitely	44	35.2
Probably	47	37.6
Probably Not	24	19.2
Definitely Not	10	8.0

Frequency Missing = 5

COMPARE INTERNSHIP TO OTHER DEH INTERNS?

COMPARE	Frequency	Percent
Better	40	35.7
Same	48	42.9
Worse	24	21.4

Frequency Missing = 18

ENCOURAGED TO PURSUE PROFESSIONAL REG.?

PURSUEPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	68	52.7
No	61	47.3

Frequency Missing = 1

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

HAVE YOU OBTAINED PROFESSIONAL REG.?

OBTAINPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	10	7.8
No	119	92.2

Frequency Missing = 1

ARE YOU WORKING ON PROFESSIONAL REG.?

WORKONPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	83	72.8
No	31	27.2

Frequency Missing = 16

WAS WORK RELEVANT TO PROFESSIONAL REG.?

RELEVPR	Frequency	Percent
Yes	64	50.8
No	62	49.2

Frequency Missing = 4

LEARN MORE ABOUT ARMY AND DEH?

MOREARMY	Frequency	Percent
Yes	37	28.5
No/Missing	93	71.5

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

LEARN MORE ABOUT CORPS OF ENGINEERS?

MORECORP	Frequency	Percent
Yes	71	54.6
No/Missing	59	45.4

LEARN MORE ABOUT ESRC CAREER PROGRAM?

MORECARE	Frequency	Percent
Yes	52	40.0
No/Missing	78	60.0

LEARN MORE ABOUT CIV. PERSONNEL SYSTEM?

MOREPERS	Frequency	Percent
Yes	39	30.0
No/Missing	91	70.0

LEARN MORE ABOUT ESRC INTERN PROGRAM?

MOREINTP	Frequency	Percent
Yes	29	22.3
No/Missing	101	77.7

LEARN MORE ABOUT TECHNICAL AREAS?

MORETECH	Frequency	Percent
Yes	35	26.9
No/Missing	95	73.1

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

LEARN MORE ABOUT OTHER SUBJECTS?

MOREOTH	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	10.8
No/Missing	116	89.2

WHAT YEAR DID YOU COMPLETE PROGRAM?

COMPYEAR	Frequency	Percent
1985	4	3.1
1986	22	16.9
1987	24	18.5
1988	30	23.1
1989	50	38.5

WERE YOU PLACED AT INST. WHERE TRAINED?

PLATRIN	Frequency	Percent
Yes	111	85.4
No	19	14.6

ADVANCE NOTICE OF YOUR TARGET POSITION?

WHENFIND	Frequency	Percent
Under 1 Month	36	30.3
1 to 3 Months	31	26.1
4 to 6 Months	26	21.8
Over 6 Months	26	21.8

Frequency Missing = 11

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

WAS PROGRAM BENEFICIAL TO YOUR CAREER?

BENEFIT	Frequency	Percent
Yes	107	84.9
No	19	15.1

Frequency Missing = 4

BETTER OFF IN CORPS INTERN PROGRAM?

CORPSINT	Frequency	Percent
Yes	50	48.5
No	53	51.5

Frequency Missing = 27

HOW COMPETITIVE ARE YOU DUE TO PROGRAM?

COMPETE	Frequency	Percent
More Competitive	52	45.2
Same Competitive	54	47.0
Less Competitive	9	7.8

Frequency Missing = 15

WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS?

EMPSTAT	Frequency	Percent
Army Employee	126	96.9
Other	4	3.1

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

WHAT IS YOUR PRESENT JOB GRADE?

EMPGRADE	Frequency	Percent
GS/GM-9	11	8.5
GS/GM-11	100	76.9
GS/GM-12 or 13	19	14.6

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE PRESENT POSITION?

PRESPOS	Frequency	Percent
Supervisory	38	29.2
Nonsupervisory	92	70.8

OF POSITION MOVES SINCE GRADUATING?

PMOVES	Frequency	Percent
0 Moves	70	54.3
1 Move	32	24.8
2 or More Moves	27	20.9

Frequency Missing = 1

NUMBER OF CONUS MOVES SINCE GRADUATING?

CMOVES	Frequency	Percent
0 Moves	116	90.6
1 Move	10	7.8
2 or More Moves	2	1.6

Frequency Missing = 2

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

NUMBER OF OCONUS MOVES SINCE GRADUATING?

OMOVES	Frequency	Percent
0 Moves	106	84.1
1 Move	14	11.1
2 or More Moves	6	4.8

Frequency Missing = 4

MORE CONTACT WITH FELLOW INTERNS?

MCONTACT	Frequency	Percent
Yes	96	78.0
No	27	22.0

Frequency Missing = 7

WHAT DID YOU LIKE MOST ABOUT PROGRAM?

NUM51	Frequency	Percent
Variety/Rotation	13	11.5
Learn/Exposure	26	23.0
Training	31	27.4
Promote/Advance	12	10.6
Other/Multiple	31	27.4

Frequency Missing = 17

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

WHAT DID YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT PROGRAM?

NUM52	Frequency	Percent
Rotation	11	11.6
Work Content	11	11.6
Treatment/Mgmt.	30	31.6
Lack of Train.	20	21.1
Low Grade/Pay	7	7.4
Other/Multiple	16	16.8

Frequency Missing = 35

RECOMMENDATIONS: RECRUITING/HIRING?

NUM53A	Frequency	Percent
Higher Pay/Grade	8	14.8
Better/More Info	9	16.7
Contact Schools	17	31.5
Improve Contact	12	22.2
Other/Multiple	8	14.8

Frequency Missing = 76

RECOMMENDATIONS: ROTATION/UTILIZATION?

NUM53B	Frequency	Percent
Less Rotation	5	7.8
Plan/Monitor Ro.	24	37.5
Treat/Use Better	8	12.5
More Rotation	18	28.1
Other/Multiple	9	14.1

Frequency Missing = 66

ESRC FACILITIES INTERN SURVEY (1984-1989 ENTRANTS)
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR PROGRAM COMPLETERS

RECOMMENDATIONS: PLACEMENT/DEVELOPMENT?

NUM53C	Frequency	Percent
Choice of Inst.	5	14.7
More Help/Info	10	29.4
More Time/Notice	5	14.7
More Training	7	20.6
Other/Multiple	7	20.6

Frequency Missing = 96

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE June 1990	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Evaluating the Army's Engineers and Scientists (Resources and Construction) Intern Program			5. FUNDING NUMBERS Contract MDA903-85-C-0139	
6. AUTHOR(S) Eric M. Small Debra E. Goldstone				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Logistics Management Institute 6400 Goldsboro Road Bethesda, MD 20817-5886			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AR908R1	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Engineering and Housing Support Center Kingman Building, Room 2A01 Fort Belvoir, VA 22060			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT A			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The U.S. Army Engineering and Housing Support Center (EHSC) monitors the facilities functional component of the Engineers and Scientists (Resources and Construction) intern program for Department of the Army civilian employees. Funds and manpower spaces are allocated by Department of the Army Headquarters to the appropriate major commands or activities, and individual installations are responsible for recruiting. A survey of current and former interns led us to three overall conclusions regarding this program. First, the adverse impact of low starting salaries is being compounded by weak recruiting. Second, there is a lack of consistency among installations in how the program is being managed and administered. Third, interns are not being given enough information or supervision. On the basis of our findings, we believe that EHSC can take a number of actions (in conjunction with participating major commands, installations, and activities) to improve the intern program. Our recommendations include the following: increase on-campus recruiting, emphasize program strengths, institute comprehensive interviewing, maximize interns with grade point average of 2.9 or above, distribute Army Regulation 690-950, (Civilian Personnel Career Management) promote training, establish rotation planning guidelines, improve installation-level supervision, and provide central oversight and coordination.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Army Civilian Personnel, Engineers and Scientists, Interns, Survey			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 95	16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	