

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CANDIDATES ELIMINATED THROUGH TESTS AND INTERVIEWS BY WORKING COMMITTEE

25X1A9a

1. [REDACTED]

Disapproved, largely for lack of demonstrated interest in JCD Program. Test scores relatively high; seemed more interested in overseas assignment for which he was being considered in Budget and Finance. Committee opinion was: "His record of achievement in CIA is unimpressive." Also, "Does not possess sufficient executive potential to profit from the JCD Program." Not assessed. Mr. Saunders had recommended as "an excellent candidate."

25X1A9a

2. [REDACTED]

Disapproved by Working Committee, despite "relatively high preliminary tests" largely because he was "lacking in vigor, and in interest in the Program." The Committee observed that "he had applied because he was asked to do so." Mr. [REDACTED] said, that despite the projected plan of career development he worked out in support of his own application, "he had no significant plan for his future," resting rather on a feeling "that if he did his job well, he would make adequate progress." The Working Committee felt that "he lacked the capacity and ability desired in participants in the Program." He was tested and interviewed but not recommended for assessment. Application was disapproved. Mr. Saunders had recommended Mr. [REDACTED] as a "good candidate" for the Program.

25X1A9a

3. [REDACTED]

Disapproved by Working Committee, despite their observation that he "has demonstrated strong determination to succeed." It was the Committee's note that "his preliminary test scores indicate that he is rather limited in his intellectual powers." However, the Committee again commented favorably on "his constructive attitude" during their interview with Mr. [REDACTED], but added that he seemed to be "literal-minded, lacks flexibility," and does not "have qualities of leadership." Then they observed that "it is interesting to note that he was asked to apply for the Program."

Significant in Mr. [REDACTED] failure to qualify was the Committee's opinion, countersigned by Messrs. Baird and Reynolds, that since Mr. [REDACTED] had drafted his career development plan in such a way that it would ultimately return him to his old job after 12 months, "any training Mr. [REDACTED] requires should be arranged through his own Career Board." Here, it appears that the Selection Committee has made an interpretation that I am unable to find the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
EVES ONLY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

basis for in either the enabling Agency Notice setting up the JCD Program, or in any of the opinions of the Administration Career Board, which favorably endorsed his application. Judging from this, any training plan which does not result in the employee going to a job at the conclusion of it that is different from the one he held at the time of entering, is subject to disapproval.

25X1A9a

Mr. Saunders had recommended Mr. [REDACTED] as "a very good candidate."

25X1A

25X1A9a

4. [REDACTED]

Disapproved by Working Committee as result of tests and interview. Although Mr. [REDACTED] showed up moderately well on half the tests, he "was very low on the intellectual side (of them)." In the interview he was "very alert and frank," but "disappointed in his present assignment," and "he had not been able to follow his desires for a career in CIA (which desires lie in the administrative field)." Again the Committee noted that "he had not heard of the Program until. . . asked to apply for it." Strongest indictment of Mr. [REDACTED] lay in the Committee's observation that: "(he was) rather inconsequential, somewhat frustrated and unhappy. . . lacking strength of personality and executive interest."

25X1A9a

The Committee's final conclusion that Mr. [REDACTED] be disapproved was as follows: "The Working Committee is of the opinion that Mr. [REDACTED] has neither the capacity or the ability to profit from participation in this Program."

25X1A9a

Mr. Saunders had recommended Mr. [REDACTED] as a "good candidate."

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

5. [REDACTED]

Disapproved by Working Committee. Test scores in bottom half of norm group; training records "ordinary." The Committee found him to be "somewhat indecisive and lacking in interest." Mr. [REDACTED] gave the Committee to understand that he had been requested to apply for the Program and that since making application "he has not considered its possibilities seriously." The Committee also felt that "he lacked ambition."

25X1A9a

The Committee's final statement, in disapproving his application, was that Mr. [REDACTED] "does not possess the requisite executive potential or capacity for the Program."

25X1A9a

Mr. Saunders had recommended Mr. [REDACTED] as a "very good candidate."

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~
EYES ONLY

~~SECRET~~
EYES ONLY

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a

6. [REDACTED]

Disapproved by Working Committee, which questioned his "low test scores," and his "limited capacity and ability." [REDACTED] was described as "steady and persevering, pleasant and clean cut," yet the Committee found him "not outstanding in any respect." It is doubtful that either his college degree in physical education or his average grades in night law school locally helped his application. Additionally, the Committee observed that "his original motivation for Agency employment was not strong, since he apparently thought at first that employment here would eliminate any military obligation." His application was disapproved with the notation that: "Mr. [REDACTED] cannot be regarded as having executive potential. . . lacking in breadth and depth."

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

Mr. Garrison had strongly endorsed Mr. [REDACTED] application.

~~SECRET~~

EYES ONLY

~~SECRET~~

EYES ONLY

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP78-04718A001700150023-4

~~SECRET~~

CANDIDATES TESTED, INTERVIEWED AND ASSESSED
PRIOR TO DISAPPROVAL

25X1A9a

7.

25X1A9a

Disapproved as the result of assessment evaluation. Mr. [REDACTED] made a logical and effective presentation of his career development plan in the interview with the Working Committee, which then recommended him for assessment, despite low test scores. His intellectual performance was "below average according to Agency standards." While citing him for the quality of his work, the Committee noted that it was "limited in quantity." He was ranked among the lowest in ability to influence and persuade, according to the evaluation supplied by his fellow JCD candidates. Also noted were Mr. [REDACTED] reported inability to: "think on his feet" and to deal with other than concrete situations.

In summing up, the final disapproval noted his "moderate ambition and fair abilities," but doubt was expressed that "he will ever develop into the executive level."

25X1A9a

Mr. [REDACTED] had been recommended by Mr. Saunders and Mr. [REDACTED], COA/NEA, as "an excellent candidate."

25X1A9a

8.

Disapproved as the result of assessment evaluation and interview with Working Committee. Again, the principal reason why Mr. [REDACTED] was recommended for assessment after his interview with the Working Committee was that he made a "logical and orderly presentation of his career development plan, which he had thought out rather carefully." His intellectual ability was judged to be "significantly below the CIA average." His pleasant and forthright manner was noted, but it was felt that "the farther up he moves in the scale of advancement the less effective (he will be)."

The Working Committee criticized Mr. [REDACTED] narrow interests, i.e., Inspector General's Office and/or Inspection and Review Staff, and said that this limited range was not compatible with the requirements of people "with executive caliber." They also observed "little evidence of leadership qualities," though they did note that "his record of achievement in the Agency is good."

In rejecting his application, the Working Committee said that they felt that he has been and could be an effective member of his parent office,

- 4 -

~~SECRET~~
EYES ONLY

Approved For Release 2001/08/07 : CIA-RDP78-04718A001700150023-4

and that the Administration Career Board "should be encouraged to take positive steps to develop him."

25X1A9a

Mr. [redacted] had been endorsed by Mr. Saunders as a "good candidate."

25X1A9a

9. [redacted]

25X1A

25X1A9a

Mr. [redacted] application had been forwarded without favorable endorsement by the Administration Career Board. His application was therefore assiduously examined by the Working Committee, lest they be accused of bowing to the action of the Board. In fact, the final report said that assessment was requested solely in the interests of being completely objective. Mr. [redacted] "performed fairly well on intellectual tests," but the Committee noted "lack of breadth of interest and limited horizons and background." They felt that his answers were all geared to ingratiate, and they noted that "there was little evidence of leadership or ability to persuade others," despite what they called "a facile mind, but not a thoughtful one." The reaction of the Committee to Mr. [redacted], as a person, was uniformly negative. His over-all performance on the assessment was disappointing.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

Mr. [redacted] had been sponsored by Mr. [redacted] agreeing with the recommendation of Mr. [redacted] immediate supervisor.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

10. [redacted]

25X1A

25X1A9a

Mr. [redacted] was finally disapproved for the JCD Program, but not until the final selection, which narrowed down to four candidates, of whom he ranked third. However, the final report notes that the four were adjudged to have met the "minimum requirements" for participation, and though Mr. [redacted] was third out of four, there "was considered to be a great distance between him and the other two ranked above him." In interviewing him, the Working Committee said that he was "poised, friendly, serious about the Program, anxious to improve himself, and thoughtful." The Committee believed that he was well motivated for work in CIA, and described his ambition as "considerable."

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

Mr. [redacted] tests were of "strong average general intellectual capacity." The Committee apparently was not too impressed with Mr. [redacted] personally, despite the adjectives above. Principal concern expressed was over his ability to withstand stress in situations that were not compatible with his interest pattern, i.e., how he would do if assigned to a job he did not like.

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

The final report rejecting him noted that "he is a worthy member of CIA and deserves much encouragement."

25X1A9a Mr. [redacted] had agreed with Mr. [redacted] immediate supervisor, in attesting to this candidate as being "especially well-qualified for the Program." 25X1A9a

25X1A9a 11. [redacted] 25X1A

25X1A9a Despite "definitely unfavorable intellectual tests," the Working Committee decided to request assessment of Mr. [redacted] in the interests of objectivity and because Mr. [redacted] made a favorable impression on the Committee through his presentation before them, his good motivation, apparent drive and good reputation in his parent office. However, the "evaluation of the assessment was highly negative," and contained "a lack of positive indication that this man is high level potential." Instead, they recommended that the Security Career Board "take steps to capitalize on his high motivation and ambition." 25X1A9a

25X1A9a Mr. [redacted], Chief, Special Security Division, and Colonel Edwards had both endorsed Mr. [redacted] application as being "excellent material for JCD," and a person possessing apparent "good potential for this Program." 25X1A9a

25X1A9a 12. [redacted] 25X1A

25X1A9a Mr. [redacted] impressed the Working Committee as "rather alert, aggressive, ambitious. . . fairly good intelligence and wide range of interests." His interest in the Program seemed sincere, though the Committee did think that his career plan "suggests superficiality and his statement of objectives is not always to the point." The Committee said that he presented his plan well, though he was inclined to be verbose, albeit pleasant, and they were disturbed by "his over-anxious manner, and a tendency to make ill-considered statements." His maturity was questioned by them as well.

25X1A9a The assessment report "confirmed the Working Committee's suspicions that Mr. [redacted] has emotional problems," and that "he is not deemed to be a clearly superior or outstanding individual in terms of the very high standards which the Committee believes should be maintained for this Program. . . (therefore) approval is not recommended."

25X1A9a Both Mr. [redacted] and Colonel Edwards endorsed Mr. [redacted] application attesting to his "promise and potential for development." 25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~EYES ONLY~~

EYES ONLY