

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

11 February 1955

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, Administration Career Board

SUBJECT : Report on December 1954 Selections for the Program for the Career Development of Junior Personnel

REFERENCE : (a) Agency Notice No. [redacted] dated 26 May 1954, as amended, copy attached
(b) Synopses of Reports of Working Committee on Selection for JCD Program, in the cases of eleven candidates from the DD/A organization, attached (classified EYES ONLY)

25X1A

1. Under the authority of reference (a), there were selected in mid-December 1954, two candidates for the Junior Career Development Program, for which the Deputy Director (Administration) organization supplied 12 candidates, 11 of them with favorable endorsement by your Board. Neither of the successful nominees was from the components under the purview of the Administration Career Board; both were from the Deputy Director (Intelligence) organization. Candidates from the Deputy Director (Administration) organization were supplied by the following Offices and Staffs:

Management Staff	2 (only one was endorsed)
Comptroller	7
Logistics Office	1
Security Office	2.

2. A total of 15 candidates was entered into the competition, 12 from DD/A, 1 from DD/P and 2 from DD/I. Of this number, initial tests and interviews by the Working Committee on Selection eliminated 7. Of the remaining 8 candidates, all of whom were subjected to the additional screening of a complete assessment, conducted by the Assessment and Evaluation Staff, Office of Training, 6 were from DD/A.

3. Following assessment, selection was narrowed to 4 candidates, of whom 2 were from DD/A, ranked third and fourth respectively. The first and second choices were the only ones accepted, based partially on what the Working Committee regarded as "considerable distance" in relative qualifications between the second and the third candidates.

4. The number of candidates competing for the Program was generally disappointing. Part of the trouble lay with the system for distributing the enabling Agency Notices. Although it should have received widest

944-013

<input type="checkbox"/> No Change in Class. <input type="checkbox"/> Reclassified Class. Changed to: TO S Next Review Date: <i>1968</i> Auth.: HR 78-3 Date: <i>28 Dec 54</i>

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

distribution, it was not sent out on an "All Employees" basis, and in some offices it is doubtful that it reached even as far as the division level. Unfortunately, this has not even been corrected in the revised issuance of the Notice, dated 28 January 1955.

5. I have carefully reviewed the reports of the Working Committee on Selection for all 15 candidates, and have read in detail the assessment reports on the 8 men so examined. There appear to me to be several reasons why the DD/A organization did not fare better in the final selection:

a. For the most part, the DD/A candidates did not seem to represent the best available manpower in the appropriate grade range from the Offices and Staffs supplying them. I cannot escape the conclusion that at least several of these people were sponsored for this Program on the theory that it represented a reasonable reassignment that would be in the best interests of all concerned. This is borne out in the reports of selection, and is evidenced by the fact that several candidates openly admitted that in competing for the Program they were motivated solely by a desire to "make a change - any change."

b. A good many DD/A candidates revealed under questioning by the Working Committee that their "career development plans" attached to their applications did not represent their real career aims at all; that they had been written in an attempt to "sell" the Committee, or under the direction of a supervisor or training officer who did not really know the applicant's intentions.

c. Despite the fact that the enabling Notice points out that it is the responsibility of the Head of the respective Career Service to "nominate . . . individuals . . . by requesting them to submit applications . . ." and that nearly all of the DD/A applicants were thusly encouraged to apply, the Working Committee reports take pains to point out that they discovered a very low interest level on the part of about half of the DD/A applicants, who gave them to understand that they discovered "under pressure," and that consequently, they knew little or nothing about the Program and were passive about their chances for success in being selected. Those who did the best in the interviews with the Working Committee were the applicants who made a real effort to "sell" themselves and their career plans.

6. I also believe that the selection process and the criteria employed by the Working Committee are not without blemish. Principal among my critical observations are these:

a. The Working Committee, composed of [redacted] Chief, Junior Officer Training Division, OTR, Dr. [redacted] Chief, Assessment and Evaluation Staff, OTR, and Mr. [redacted] Chief, Placement and Utilization Division, OP, with the quondam support of Dr. [redacted], Deputy Chief, Junior Officer Training Division, OTR, and Mr. [redacted], Placement Officer, PUD/OP, appeared to be largely on its own in developing and administering selection criteria, without the benefit of any strong policy guidance from above. To the best of my knowledge, the Director of Training and the Assistant Director for Personnel participated only twice in the selection, once at a preliminary organization meeting establishing the Working Committee, and again in an interview with the four finalists.

b. As a corollary to the above, it should be mentioned that the unofficial Chairman of the Working Committee, Dr. [redacted], observed to me that he felt the enabling Notice was "far too broad and non-definitive" in setting up what the exact purposes of the Program were (cf., paragraph 1.a. of reference (a)) and in the absence of clear-cut definitions, the Working Committee "had tried to approximate what they thought would be the proper screening criteria." Additionally, the Chairman stated that the Committee "had chosen to view the JCD Program as a form of valuable intra-Agency scholarship," and that therefore their sights had been set extremely high. I cannot but observe with the personal backgrounds of several of the members of the Working Committee and other parties to the final selection mechanism, that there appeared to be a strong predilection toward "admission criteria" not dissimilar from those utilized in a first class educational institution when considering applicants for admission through financial aid. The result was intense concentration on the sheer intellectual capabilities of the applicants, to the exclusion of some of those other important qualities which often distinguish valuable contributors to the Agency's welfare.

c. Both final selectees were apparently well-qualified young research types from the DD/I organization, with whose credentials any graduate school dean would have been pleased. One of them, a Mr. [redacted] is himself a former Junior Officer Trainee, who worked under the supervision of the Chairman of the Working Committee, and whose past performance had already been thoroughly evaluated by the Office of Training.

d. Lastly, I believe that the Working Committee on numerous occasions fell into a trap of their own making - resort to inclusive catch phrases and bromides to describe their own impressions of the candidates. Terms such as "first-rate candidate," "inconsequential

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a
25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

person," "lacking in executive potential," "little evidence of leadership qualities," and "lacks high level potential," "lacks strength of personality," "lacks breadth and depth" abounded in their reports, frequently in contradiction to earlier stated personal reactions of the Committee to the applicant: "friendly, open, congenial, frank, etc." On questioning the Chairman of the Working Committee about the use of these terms, he admitted that some of their reactions may have appeared stereotyped, but this was a function of the difficulty in reducing human behavior to a set of descriptive terms (cf., Fitness Reports).

7. While I have no doubt that the Working Committee was sincere in its efforts, I cannot but express some doubts about the judgment they displayed on several occasions, as evidenced by their reports. What they were really shooting for was selection of Junior Officer Trainees, using the highest standards applied in that area. I feel that they were too unwilling to take a chance on individuals who had less than what the Committee regarded as requisite formal education and social intelligence.

8. The following are the criteria embodied in the actual request for assessment of candidates who survived the initial tests and interviews by the Working Committee. It was with these things in mind that each candidate was evaluated during the full assessment of nearly three days in the Office of Training:

- a. Interest in CIA as a career.
- b. Amount of ambition and drive.
- c. Measure of "executive potential" (not further defined).
- d. Stability under stressful situations.
- e. Adaptability, flexibility.
- f. Potential for growth within the organization.
- g. Initiative and originality.
- h. Ability to "get along" with other people.
- i. Leadership and persuasiveness capabilities.
- j. Facility with ideas.
- k. Willingness to assume responsibility.

9. For the information of the Chairman, Administration Career Board, and for the membership of the Board, I have attached synopses of the final reports of the candidates from the DD/A organization. These are EYES ONLY documents and should be protected accordingly.

10. SUMMARY: The failure of the DD/A organization to place anyone in the initial JCD selection appears to be a function of nomination of less than maximally qualified candidates, and the vagueness of the Working Committee in establishing valid selection criteria, with the net result that all their selections tended in the direction of picking an "intellectual Jack Armstrong," with leadership potential not less than at the Assistant Director level.

11. RECOMMENDATION: If the Board agrees with what has been said, I propose two steps, designed to improve the chances of the Deputy Director (Support) organization in the forthcoming (March 1955) selections:

a. Candidates from the DD/S organization be carefully selected by their Offices and Staffs with a view to nominating only those outstanding individuals who would fall in the category of "ambitious young people I would hate to lose." It is suggested that the JCD Program not be regarded as a device to promote the reassignment of individuals who may be miscast in their present job.

b. Proposed that discussions be held between the Assistant Deputy Director (Support) acting for the Administration Career Board, the Director of Training and the Assistant Director for Personnel, to attempt to more clearly define the purposes of the JCD Program, so that eventually it be structured so as to serve the purposes of all Major Components in the development of sound junior and senior supervisory personnel with qualifications particular to the needs of each Component.


Special Assistant to the
Deputy Director (Support)

25X1A9a