~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

COPY 1 OF 3 COPIES

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

19th Meeting

Thursday, 28 January 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

19th Meeting

Thursday, 28 January 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General
Chairman

Matthew Baird
Director of Training
Member

25X1A9a [redacted]
Deputy Chief, PP
Member

25X1A9a [redacted]
Chief of Operations
Alternate for DD/P, Member

25X1A9a [redacted]
Special Assistant to AD/CO
Alternate for AD/CO, Member

Harrison G. Reynolds
AD/Personnel, Member

Huntington Sheldon
AD/CI, Member

Lawrence K. White
Acting DD/A, Member

25X1A9a [redacted]
Special Assistant, DD/I
Alternate for DD/I, Member

25X1A9a [redacted]
Executive Secretary

25X1A9a [redacted]
Secretariat

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1A9a [redacted]
Office of Personnel

25X1A9a [redacted]
Chairman, Honor Awards Board

25X1A9a [redacted]
Office of Personnel

25X1A9a [redacted]
Office of Training

25X1A9a [redacted]
Chairman, Professional Selection Panel

25X1A9a [redacted]
Reporter

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

I N D E X

SECRET

. . . The 19th Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., 28 January 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Gentlemen, we have a pretty full schedule so we will get started right away.

1 The first item on the agenda is the minutes of the 17th meeting. Are there any corrections or amendments? If not, we will consider them approved as submitted.

2 Item 2 on the agenda is the minutes of the 18th meeting. Are there any corrections or changes in these minutes? If not, we will consider those approved as submitted.

3 Item 3 on the agenda is the selection of a rotating member of the CIA Career Service Board to succeed Mr. Huntington Sheldon.

MR. SHEIDON: I'd like to nominate George Carey.

MR. REYNOLDS: I saw George Carey just before the meeting. He's going on a trip so would like to substitute [redacted] name for his. 25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is that agreeable with you, Ting?

MR. SHEIDON: I think that is quite alright.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any comment on the nomination of Mr. [redacted] 25X1A9a Hearing none, we will consider the nomination approved as submitted.

4 Item 4 is the memorandum from the Chairman, CIA Career Service Board on the report of the Women's Task Force. Do I have any comments on this particular report?

MR. WHITE: I had only one, minor change, Kirk, in paragraph 2. I thought the last or third sentence was a little gratuitous. I didn't think it added anything to the letter. It's a very minor point, but if I were writing it I would leave that out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think probably it would be best to leave that out, too. Does anybody feel strongly about keeping it in? Alright, let's take it out.

Are there any other comments on the report of the Women's Panel?

Now the handling of this raises several questions which I would like to present my views on for your concurrence or nonconcurrence. In the first place, I think this group of ladies did an excellent job in their report. They

SECRET

have given us some statistics and details which I would think would be valuable. I would recommend the Board send a letter of commendation to the group as a whole, and a copy of that can be put in their personnel folders.

Secondly, the question arises as to whether the Director should raise this problem in an AD's meeting or elsewhere. My view is that inasmuch as the Director has commented on this several times at orientation discussions, there really is no further purpose to be served by raising it specifically. I think everybody in a supervisory position in the Agency knows that this Panel has met and the problems they have raised. So I would recommend that the burden of the proof go where it should belong, and that is to the Personnel Office, to see what can be done toward improving the situation of women, if such needs be done. Any dissent from that view?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] The last sentence of paragraph 3a comes out, is that correct?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

Now, the last sentence of the entire report raises a red flag with me, to a certain degree, and that is this business of statistical trends on the status of women. My general impression of that is along the lines of a great deal of labor for probably not a very great result. The change in the status of women in the Agency is not going to be a result of a lot of statistical studies, it's going to be the result of a determined effort on the part of supervisors and the Personnel Office to be sure women are put in positions where they are qualified. And it is my guess the statistics won't change a lot in a short time.

25X1A9a MR. WHITE: I was wondering--Mr. [redacted] here would know--whether you do all this statistical business anyway, if he knows what kind of a breakdown you want. I should think maybe how many women you have and what their grades are could go into your regular statistical report, with very little effort because you are doing that anyway.

I think your point, Kirk, is well-taken. What's the use of preparing a separate study semi-annually if you could, with very little increased effort, modify your present statistical reports to reflect that information, which I think might be worthwhile doing.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Semi-annually it wouldn't interfere because semi-annually

we prepare statistics on age and grade distribution of male and female, so there is a comparative review there that is possible semi-annually.

MR. WHITE: That would be contained in a report you are going to do anyway.

4

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that would be sufficient.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] That is what we had in mind, Kirk.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Good.

Any other comments on this? The Board considers this approved, then, with the changes as indicated. *

Item 5 on the agenda is a memorandum from the Chairman, Special Task Force on Evaluations, with recommendations on evaluation reports. Now, we have this Task Force with us today and I think that probably the quickest way to join this issue is to have some comments by Mr. [redacted] Bill? 25X1A9a

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] I think one of the things that worried people about the initial Form that we worked out was that it seemed to duplicate, in many respects, the present PER - Personnel Evaluation Report. On studying this problem it occurred to us that probably the simplest solution was to use this Form, which is designed to evaluate a person during the first three years of his service with the Agency before he becomes a member of the career service, and then after he has entered the career service use the present Personnel Evaluation Report, which is more of a tool to help in planning his career and assignments than it is as an evaluation or examination of his ability. We spent a good deal of time trying to come up with an actual Form which would be most useful. I'd

5

25X1A9a like to ask [redacted] to explain the Form itself to you since he is more or less the designer of it.

25X1A9a [redacted] I expected to be charged with the responsibility for it, since no one likes to have anything to do with these problems of evaluation of people. But while the members of the Professional Selection Panel and this Task Force may indignantly deny any connection, they helped me a great deal by their positive and negative attitudes as we wrestled with the problem of how to propose a system which would be equitable and fair to the individual and, at the same time, safeguard the interests of the Agency.

I'd like to make two or three statements before taking up the Form itself. First I'd like to remind ourselves what an evaluation report of any type is. We always want to remember that it is simply a recorded painting of

one person about another, and hence has a good many limitations of human judgment. So we will never get one that very many people will be satisfied with.

Secondly, I'd like to stress why we have one. Why do we have evaluation reports at all? That is simply owing to the fact that we have a number of problems. If one person has three people under his supervision and he can take all the actions with respect to them then no form is ever needed. It is only when information is needed by a higher echelon and where a number of supervisors are involved that we need to make any record and formalize it at all. A supervisor dealing with three people never has any problem. He can tell who he wants for each assignment.

Thirdly, I'd like to stress the fact that forms are only a partial answer to this problem and are not the most important. The most important factors in training evaluations are the spirit in which the supervisor approaches his job and the policies which surround their use. That is one reason the Task Force has stressed in its memoranda it is desirable to have this report not shown to the individual, and should be seen by as few people as possible. I think it can be demonstrated that evaluation systems for the purpose for which this one is going to be used, will be more successful that way.

I might add one more thing, that this Form is presented in the hope that it will be a little better than working without one. None of us have any illusions that this Form will reduce the discussion of evaluations or criticisms, in the process.

I take it you have seen the Form and that we need not pause on the section concerning identification. The remaining sections of the Form are based on two very simple principles. First, we are trying to ask questions in different ways, which get at essentially the same thing, so that we might have some way of checking what the supervisor says in one section against another section. Secondly, we are trying, at least in one section, to be extremely explicit in stating what we want the supervisor to say in terms of the purpose for which it is to be used. I will refer to that when we come to section 5.

Section 2 is the one that I think anyone that has had experience in working in a large agency, would see the need for. There we ask the supervisor to indicate how he uses the individual. A person who knows the characteristics of the task that is being done in that particular section of the Agency, will be able to evaluate, in one sense, or infer how much the supervisor thinks of

the individual by how he uses him. Does he assign him to important tasks or does he assign him to run of the mill tasks, or does he consistently use him on tasks which do not make very great demands upon him? I think we are all familiar with the fact that we can rely on people we think are the best. That gives us one clue as to what the supervisor thinks of the individual.

Section 3 is probably the one that is most controversial. There we are simply making the effort to ask a number of specific questions about the characteristics of this individual, so that they may be logically interpreted, and that will provide the basis for another overall assessment of the individual, which may or may not be consistent with what is said in other sections. Now the reason we have put in 25 blocks there is not under any illusion that people can make that fine a distinction about those traits. One reason for using it, and the minor one, is that some supervisors insist on making the shading, whether we feel it is meaningful or not. The second reason, and the main one for our purpose, is that it gives us an opportunity of studying a little more fully how this Form is used by the supervisors so that we would be in a position to advise the panels a little better on what the actions mean. Also, of course, the section has a certain logical meaning in terms of the traits used. The most important thing about these traits is how they were derived. These were not made up by the Task Force, sitting in armchairs. We drew up a questionnaire of 133 characteristics of people which seemed of importance to people working in the Agency. The members of the Professional Selection Panel circulated this questionnaire to members of their own Offices, asking them to react to each of these 133 descriptions in two ways: First, could they observe it about their relatively young people under their own supervision - could they actually observe the individual concerning that particular trait? Secondly, we asked them to rate them on how important they thought they were. On the basis of those figures we reduced that list to the 50 plus in the two samples that you see there, so that these traits are, to the best of our knowledge, considered observable by most of the supervisors that we contacted, and are considered of some importance for the jobs that they are doing.

Section 4 concerns specific questions designed to bring out even more outstanding things about the individual. You will note the first question is: What are his outstanding strengths? If they are not indicated in this list we have here let's put them down here - the thing that we think the individual is

most outstanding for. His outstanding weaknesses are obviously of concern. Question "C" we are quite interested in: Indicate if you think that any single strength or weakness outweighs all other considerations? That is frequently the case for some assignments. I think you can all imagine what one thing might outweigh any other desirable characteristics and should veto any other provision that is made.

Question "D" - I think it is obvious there what we are getting at: Do you feel he requires close supervision? Yes, no - and if so, why? Is it because he is new or because you can't trust him to carry out his assignments?

"E" is simply a space where they can say anything else they think is important to assist the examining panels to reach a decision as to whether an individual should be retained in the Agency or brought into career service.

Section 5 has explicitly stated rating scales, which are particularly pertinent to how this is going to be used. First, how well did he perform his job? Second, how much potential do you think this man has? Third, his attitude toward the Agency. And, finally, an overall statement - the supervisor's explicit recommendation as to whether he should or should not be retained in the Agency. We have made those as explicit as we can, and there can be no doubt that the supervisor will know what he said in his final recommendation and the Panel will know what he meant to say.

I would say, in one final word, that I personally would urge--and I believe the Task Force would agree with me--that in the use of this Form provision should be made for constant study to see how the supervisors are using it, so that the very latest interpretations can be given to the Panel.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I noticed at the end there are two blank spaces indicating signed by one and reviewed by another. Is it your general idea that the Branch Chief would fill out the Form and the Division Chief would review it?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] The immediate supervisor will fill out the Form. It is sent to the next echelon only for authentication purposes, with no intent that it be changed or endorsed in any sense. The philosophy of the Task Force was that the more we could make the supervisor feel that this was his responsibility, the more likely he would take it extremely seriously and not try to pass the buck to his own superior to say the bad things about individuals, or the good things, as the case may be. Personally I would go even further, but

the Task Force talked me out of it. I would say to send it directly from the supervisor and not have it endorsed at all. We know it should be at least seen by the supervisor's supervisor to eliminate, as much as possible, the opportunity to knife somebody without anybody knowing about it, which opportunity would be provided by the other procedure.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it is almost mandatory to eliminate personalities.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Just sign without commenting or anything else, which means the supervisor must show it to his boss and that will eliminate most of the opportunities to treat someone unfairly.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to comment on it from two aspects, using my two hats for the moment. From the Inspector General point of view I would rate a very large majority of Agency problems as being in the nature of personnel management problems. The lack of a thorough, comprehensive Personnel Evaluation Report has been one of our biggest headaches, added to the fact that most supervisors, being human beings--which I suppose we can't change--have a tendency to give everybody a good record. Now that we have a ceiling on us we are going to be looking at somebody else who is better and want to bring him in but have a full TO, so suddenly they are going to start downgrading efficiency reports, something that happened in many instances.

Switching hats, again, to that of supervising the Agency's Congressional liaison, this is also one of the problems that will raise most of our difficulties with the Congress--and has. Nearly every case that we get now where a member of the Congress writes us a letter raising some question about the propriety of an Act, relates very specifically to an employee performance, and I would say that is 90 per cent of the problem up there. Therefore, I would conclude that it is highly important that we get an evaluation report or form which we all consider to be satisfactory and which should be very, very thorough. In looking at this, this Form seems to be pretty close to filling the bill.

One other comment, in working on this Executive Inventory the PER's that were filled out to assist that, in very few instances were much assistance, I think simply because of the vagueness of the PER itself. Something like this Form would have been much more appropriate, and certainly would be a

much better guide to the Director when he is looking at an individual's background, because here you get right down to brass tacks.

The only thing this leaves out which I have thought of as possibly being desirable, is making the supervisor go even further by saying how many employees he supervises and where he would rank this man. You come awfully close to that, but not in so many words. This is just as good as a test of the supervisor as it is of the individual he is rating.

Well, gentlemen, what are your views on this?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Mr. Chairman, isn't it correct that both this Form and the PER are illegal unless we obtain an exemption on that Performance Rating Act of 1950?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Right.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Therefore, shouldn't the first step be that this Board see that that exemption is requested?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What are the technicalities of getting that?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] We have to go to Congress.

MR. WHITE: The Civil Service Commission is all for it. I mean, they won't stand in our way. They admit that they can't stand in our way. But in the meantime I personally feel we aren't running any great risk because our skirts are clean as far as the Civil Service Commission is concerned. They know what we are doing.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] But if someone is removed at the end of the year because we say he is not satisfactory, and he chooses to bring an action, if our exemption doesn't exist--

MR. WHITE: There are all sorts of ways to skin a cat.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Public Law 873, 81st Congress, has an Act on this particular item, and the pertinent section, Section 4, says: (Reading)

> No officer or employee of any department shall be given a performance rating, regardless of the name given to such rating, and no such rating shall be used as a basis for any action, except under a performance-rating plan approved by the Civil Service Commission as conforming with the requirements of this Act.

So what I propose we do is to approve of this type of report and get it into operation, and ask our Legislative Counsel to get us a rider on a Bill which will give us this exclusion. And, Red, I understand from you that the Civil

Service Commission approves of doing that?

MR. WHITE: Yes, they do.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And Chairman Rees of the House Civil Service Committee being a very close friend of the Agency, I don't think it would be any problem. But I think we ought to get this rolling immediately because it's going to take months to get it into operation, particularly overseas.

MR. WHITE: It's not going to be any more illegal than the present one.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted]: But it might put us a little bit more in jeopardy by reason of the way in which this is devised.

MR. BAIRD: It's only one of the bases of an action. Your action isn't based on this solely.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] This is really just a guideline.

25X1A9a [redacted] It seems to me that the Selection Board is functioning much as promotion boards in the Army. They get information on the efficiency reports and the board takes the action. This is only one piece of information.

MR. WHITE: I think we all agree with Harry that we should get this exemption and get legal as soon as we can.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, Rud, will you prepare a memorandum to the Legislative Counsel telling him the Board requests that a rider be sent to Congress on this subject?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] That is apart from the Legislative Program--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, apart from it. I think this can go ahead on its own, and should.

Now, as to this report Form itself, any comments?

MR. WHITE: Is there any idea of a score to be developed?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: IBM scoring?

25X1A9a [redacted] Our approach to that would be that if we could devise one that we thought would help the Board in its task, we would put one on. But this would be only for the CIA Board itself. It might be an aid to them to select which individual should be interviewed, and it would be used in that way only. But there is no thought, at least in my mind, yet, of trying to put any arbitrary, quantitative figure on this.

MR. WHITE: There is one question in my mind. I'm not sure that I

fully understand the reason why you recommend using this Form for the first three years and then the present one after that. What that philosophy seems to me to be saying is that once you are in the career service it's alright from then on. I wonder what the reasoning behind that is, that you only use this detailed Form the first three years and then you use something which we now consider unsatisfactory, I understand, for the remaining period.

MR. BAIRD: They weren't asked to do anymore than that.

25X1A9a [redacted] I'd be happy to try to answer that, because I think it is a basic question.

MR. WHITE: It's just a question I had in my mind.

25X1A9a [redacted] For the first three years have a selection-in or selection-out process, which we are not geared to in the present PER. After the first three years then we have a career development problem, and the present problem is intended toward that objective.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But I don't think we should ever lose sight of the fact that at anytime after those first three years anybody can be selected out when they start to stack their arms.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] We were concerned primarily with the selection process.

MR. WHITE: I thought I read in here somewhere you recommended using this for the first three years?

25X1A9a [redacted] There are, I would say, a number of reasons. The Personnel Evaluation Reports' success or failure will depend on how well they are designed to suit their purpose. I am glad you brought that up because I would like to say a good word on the PER as it stands. The PER as it stands is designed to help the supervisor deal with the individual. Now there are a lot of things that he wants to put down that should have no quantitative or comparative or competitive reference whatsoever. When you are evaluating a person you have an entirely different situation and you have to design your Form for it, because experience has shown us that when you try to put the two purposes in the same form it never works because they are incompatible. One reason for that is the supervisor can't keep a consistent point of view. When he starts making out a PER he might want to say some extremely disagreeable things, in an evaluative sense - he says, "Now I would rate him pretty low on this. Then he sits back and says, "Well, I have to live with him."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the best argument I have heard for the discontinuation of this form, because to start to tamper with the judgment of an individual--because he has to live with him--is perhaps the basic reason why we are getting false efficiency reports.

MR. WHITE: The PER was not designed, I think, to primarily serve career planning. It was designed, as the title implies, as a personnel evaluation, not a career planning program. I think we may be confusing the two here. I know from my experience what you say is certainly true, that you don't get on a personnel evaluation what a supervisor really thinks, because he has to live with the guy. I'm not sure we are being very smart to say we will only do this for three years, though.

25X1A9a

MR. [redacted] I think Mr. [redacted] can contribute information on that. 25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. [redacted] I am one of the people to blame for the PER because I was in on the work that went into it. I think for the past couple of years we have, as an Agency, lost track of the purpose for which it was basically designed, and I think most of the faults we find with it come from trying to expect of it the kind of thing that this rating Form will do.

I have here some of the older materials and I'd like to read what the purpose was at that time. It states here that personnel evaluation in CIA is the supervisor's considered and judicious appraisal of the performance and capabilities of each individual. It is not a performance or an efficiency rating in the sense that individuals are compared on the basis of a predetermined, adjectival or numerical scale. The significance of a personnel evaluation lies in the constructive action which will be taken to develop and use each individual's abilities and potentialities most effectively.

Under specific uses one of the most important was that it was to promote discussions between supervisors and employees, to identify aptitudes and ability, to serve as a basis for individual plans for career development.

Now at the same time that we have been critical of the PER as a rating device, we have also been critical of the fact that very few career plans are being developed. It would seem to me that if we picked up the PER as it was originally intended and use it as the basis for career planning, which is what it was designed for, I think we would find it would prove quite effective. And if we don't use the PER we will have to devise something else to do that, and I don't think we will come up with anything much better for

that purpose.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we are on a fairly fundamental issue, and that is whether this should displace the PER at the end of three years. I would recommend the Board accept this Form and put forward to a future Board agenda the question as to the continuation of the PER after the three-year period, or whether this continues or whether both are used. But I would like to urge everybody to consider very seriously the burden we are starting to put on supervisors for filling out forms, and whether we are going to get both done well. Obviously every supervisor won't have a large number of less than three-year employees, except that the statistics of the Agency happen to show that we are 67 per cent three-years and under. So that will give you an indication of exactly what your supervisors' burden will be with these forms. Then you add to that his PER's with everybody three years and up.

The point I am trying to make is that we want the supervisors to devote their best effort and greatest wisdom to the evaluation of their personnel, and I don't think we want to make it so complicated for them that they are going to throw up their hands in disgust before they sit down to do it.

So I would recommend, if the Board is of such a mind, that we approve this report Form to go into effect as quickly as possible, as the evaluation form for all personnel up to three years. Then, put on a future agenda the discussion of whether this should be used after three years, and the future of the PER.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] has one question concerning the content of the Form. Since this is a vehicle for selection of a member for the career service it appears to him it might be desirable to include in this one vehicle an appropriate space for the reviewing authority so that it is all bound in one document, - the question then being an appropriate space for the approval by the Panel and the approving authority. Then it would all be in this one document.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is very sound, to have it all tied together in one package.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Of course, the Panel won't entertain the matter until they have had three of these. I don't believe it would be effective to have the approving authority included in this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But the Form could be made sufficient so that endorsements and other statements made, regardless of who is making it, would be attached--I think that is his point.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] That is the recommendation, so that it is in one package.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Did you have some comment, Mat?

MR. BAIRD: No, Kirk, I'm waiting. I just want to make sure of the other actions that go with the Form. I am assuming you are approving now or are going to discuss now the selection of permanent career. In other words, there are two parts to Item 5 on the agenda. Are you taking that up separately or is that included in this approval of the Form?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, I would say the Form goes by itself.

Is there any further comment on the Form.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] One point on this question of adding a place for endorsements, etc. I think we may run into a problem on doing that, if we have to add an additional page. What might be better is to let the CIA Selection Board, when it is set up, devise an appropriate sheet for action, with endorsements, and after it gets to the Selection Board just attach that sheet.

5

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is alright.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] It would be something of a design problem to add anything more to this.

MR. BAIRD: It might give it more distribution than you have recommended.

25X1A9a [redacted] I would just like to say one thing regarding the use of a different type of form after the probationary period. It seems to me worthwhile considering the morale of the people when they are at the point where they are accepted as full members of the intelligence community, and at that point if the screening process has been done well the problems of separation, etc., can be taken up as separate actions, rather than having to have an evaluation form. That is why I was arguing for keeping the two separate, and very seriously considering the PER type of thing for the future.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other comment on the Form?

Now let's proceed to the paper dated 8 January 1954 on the Career Staff, entitled "Selection of Permanent Career Staff."

6

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] I have a question for [redacted] As regards 25X1A9a the establishment of examining panels, do we understand that that is to

extend to Field Missions, etc.? In other words, is it world-wide in its concept?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] There is no intent that there would be examining panels in the field, - only in Washington.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I know exactly what [redacted] is getting 25X1A9a at, and that is, how about your people abroad.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] They get examined when they next report in Washington.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But supposing your three-year period goes by the board in the interim? Then you don't become career until you get back to Washington. Then we must be very careful when we christen this ship that we make it understood that if you happen to be out of Washington when the three-years are up, you haven't gotten the grip yet.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] It is also anticipated that if a man is about to reach the end of the three-year period and he has to leave Washington, he can be examined by the Panel prior to his departure, but he still is not a member until his three-year period is up. There can be pre-examination in certain cases.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then at the end of the three years they can go ahead and approve of him and he is accepted then?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Isn't that correct, Bill?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Yes.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] It's kind of a logistical problem which the Panel has not come to grips with.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It's a morale problem.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Provided it's clear, there is no problem.

MR. WHITE: Maybe this is an inappropriate time and maybe a question that nobody has the answer to, but I've thought a lot about it recently. What if we do go ahead and promulgate most of these rules and regulations and then find that only 15 per cent of the people in the Agency are willing to sign up for them? Then where is your Career Service? Is there any way to feel the pulse or to find out if we are right?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I get at least a fairly constant throbbing of the pulse in my office, and what the pulse indicates is: Tell us what the Career Service Program is about. We want a Career Service Program. How do we get into it?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] I think they are waiting for action.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am going to hand out a little piece of literature at the end of the meeting which was the result of last Friday's snowstorm, and in that I say, without using those words, that the time has come to stop talking about Career Service and do something about it. You know what the paper is, Red.

MR. WHITE: If you end up with only a minority of the Agency who want to be in the Career Service there is no way to get rid of the rest of the people and you don't have a healthy situation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's join that battle when we get to it.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] This paper looks pretty good.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I like this paper. This paper shows an excellent approach.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] It has just been editorially revised as the Board asked that it be done.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further comment on it?

We have a pretty full agenda here, - a two weeks' agenda, so does the Board wish to approve this paper as presented, then?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Yes.

MR. WHITE: Yes.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Including the [redacted] on the Panel of Examiners? 25X9

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think that is exactly firm yet.

I'd like to express the appreciation of the Board to the members that participated in the development of this paper and of the Form. I think we have made a real step forward.

MR. BAIRD: Kirk, if this is the bowing out of the Selection Panel I would like to say that I think they have done the Agency an outstanding job, with the greatest trials and handicaps that could be imposed on one body.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If the Board approves, I'd like to ask the Executive Secretary to prepare a memorandum to the Director telling what they have done and what they have accomplished.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Unfortunately the Panel can't bow out because we still have about 10 cases.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Now, for reasons which will become apparent later

I will skip item 6 on the agenda, the proposed policy statements on evaluation and promotion.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] I would, too. (Laughter)

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And I will go on to item 7, the Staff Study from the Chairman, Honor Awards Board, on the classification of the National Security Medal, dated 24 December 1953.

25X1A9a You had disseminated to you by Mr. [redacted] on 28 January the revised Staff Study put on at the request of General Cabell. I think I can give you the gist of that very quickly--and [redacted] can fill in--inasmuch as I discussed the original paper at some length with General Cabell. He took exception to it on the basis that the highest award was not one for valor, and he also excepted the principle of adding a device to the Medal to indicate valor. He thought there ought to be a clear delineation and distinction between awards for valor and awards for merit. Consequently, I presume that that is the basis on which this was re-drafted.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] That is correct, Kirk. General Cabell asked for an opportunity to discuss his views with the Honor Awards Board, and at a meeting yesterday in [redacted] office he explained his view, which in fact coincided very closely with the views of the original working group on Honor Awards which were set forth a year ago last summer. Those recommendations involved the establishment of one valor award to be the senior award, and then several degrees of awards for meritorious service and/or achievement. In the interim the National Security Medal was created by Presidential order. Under the frame of reference that had accompanied the rejection of the original study prepared by the working group, an additional Staff Study--which was the first one submitted--was prepared. It provided for two CIA Medals, each of which could be awarded for valor or meritorious service, or for achievement. General Cabell pointed out that in his view, and calling on his experience in the military service, the award for valor should take first place and there should be a clear-cut, well-established valor award. The Honor Awards Board then revised its original study and came up with the product distributed to you today.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Kirk, in view of General Cabell's feeling I can't see the slightest disadvantage in adding this award which has been suggested. I don't think it can hurt the program, Agency, or anything else. It does make a

clear distinction and will probably be something only given in wartime. There should certainly be no objection to having it on the books, as I see it, and it does serve to take care of all the conflicting views on this question. It seems to me the thing to do is to approve it, get this thing set up, and get the Medals designed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any dissent from that view?

Well, then, consider this paper approved by the Board as presented, and we will push it through.

The next item is on the supplemental agenda, the request for a Career 25X1A9a Development Slot for [redacted] OSI. In addition, there is attached a Career Development Slot Status Report dated 25 January 1954. Is there anyone to present this request for a slot?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] I have the papers. This is a request signed by Dr. Chadwell for a Career Development Slot which has been approved by the Assistant Director of Personnel and by the Director of Training, according to the procedures of the Board.

25X1A9a [redacted] is from the Nuclear Energy Division of Scientific Intelligence and has already, by agreement with SR Division, done a tour of duty in the Office of the DD/P. It is necessary for a Career Development Slot since SR Division does not have a slot available for this purpose, and OSI must fill 25X1A9a the job which Mr. [redacted] occupied during the two-year tour which he will be on on rotation duty with SR.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Do I hear any objection?

Incidentally, I think you should note, gentlemen, that we have 40 slots. This will be the 25th to be filled. One automatically reverts back 25X1A9a as of this month--that's [redacted] No. 22, and 5 more revert back between now and June, so that actually the pressure of slots is not very great.

Hearing no objection we will consider the Board has approved the 25X1A9a development slot for [redacted]

MR. SHELDON: Kirk, may I make one comment on the 5th slot here of 25X1A9a [redacted]? Since I understand there is no super-grade available in this group of slots it is really academic to consider [redacted] on a rotation slot. 25X1A9a We are carrying him on our TO and, in effect, you have an additional vacancy there. I think the record should be squared away on that.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] You don't have to carry him. No super-grade action may be taken.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] You have somebody in that job and this aids you in being able to fill that, - for ceiling purposes.

MR. WHITE: I thought we had discussed that and it was understood that it doesn't help anybody and that it just uses up a slot unnecessarily.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted]: The Board did approve--

MR. SHELDON: But they had no power to implement it, as far as I am concerned.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Far be it from us to argue with you for giving up this rotation.

12

MR. SHELDON: It doesn't help me any.

MR. WHITE: But that doesn't help Ting, because he has a ceiling.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] Then he didn't need the slot.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Since Mr. Sheldon is being ungrateful about the

25X1A9a procedures (Laughter) -- just remove [redacted] name.

MR. BAIRD: Kirk, I have one other problem and that is that I don't want anything to do with promotions on this thing. In the first place, I wouldn't know anything about the individuals, and I don't see why I should have to initiate or even pass upon the promotions other than to say the funds are available.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is that a problem?

MR. BAIRD: There has been a problem. That came up with [redacted] of 25X1A9a OSI. The Office of Training was asked to initiate the promotion and I just turned it back to them. I wouldn't approve it because I haven't any authority. The originating office should carry on just as usual on that.

MR. WHITE: I should think that would be taken care of by the Personnel Office.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It certainly isn't an Office of Training problem.

13

Item 2 on the supplemental agenda is the OTR Monthly Report dated December 1953. This Report is now prepared by the Office of Training on the various individuals in training from the Division offices in the Agency. This relieves all of the offices of the obligation and necessity for preparing such a Report. Is there any comment on it?

MR. BAIRD: I might comment to the effect that it would be more

meaningful -- in other words, these courses that are listed under Program G, and A, etc., should at least have the language or the area, and wherever the form will permit we will identify the training program in something that makes a little more sense than just a code name.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Mat, a statistical study like this, to my mind, always succeeds or fails on the basis of the utilization of it. This one obviously requires considerable man-hours to prepare. So I would recommend that we give it a trial of three or four months to see whether it is utilized or of value, and if it isn't then just turn the whole matter back to you.

MR. BAIRD: This one took 16 man-days.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] I would agree with Kirk that we ought to try it for three months, but I question right now the general utility of it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It's an interesting statistic, but if it's not of value let's not waste 16 man-days.

MR. BAIRD: Look now, I didn't ask this be done.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] No one is picking on you.

13

MR. BAIRD: This form was made at your request, wasn't it, Rud?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted]: It was made in order to explore the possibility of relieving the Career Service Boards from spending about 32 to 48 man-days in reporting training to this Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: All right, we have had one liberation in getting the Career Service Boards liberated from doing it, now let's see if we can't accomplish a second by eliminating Training from it. Let's give it a trial of a couple of months, and then in March if the view is that it is of no practical value, then let's eliminate it.

MR. BAIRD: I have to make a report to the DDCI. This report goes to the DDCI. The subsequent runnings of this report obviously won't take as long because the devising of the form is the thing that takes the man-hours. The next one will just be filling in, so the next one won't take 16 man-hours.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted]: Let's accept the suggestion to try it for three months and then have it reviewed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Now we come to the new business. As the first item on the new business I would like to welcome Mr. Harrison Reynolds, and I hope that before too long Mr. Reynolds can take over the job of running the Career Service Board.

Item 2, we have been trying to decide when is the best time for this Board to meet. There have been some mutterings about the fact that when we meet at 4:00 o'clock certain members have to battle the Constitution Avenue traffic to get back to their offices. I'd like to get a statement of sentiment as to whether the Board as a whole would like to change the hour. I understand that Mr. [redacted] raises one very strong objection to giving up an hour on his last free morning, and I can't sympathize with him more completely. 25X1A9a

Is there any strong sentiment to change the hour of the meetings?

MR. [redacted] Why not meet at 5:00 o'clock? 25X1A9a

MR. BAIRD: If you could hold it at such a time as it would be too late to get back to our offices -- in other words, 6:00 o'clock instead of finishing at 5:00.

MR. [redacted] Mr. Amory can never come at this time on Thursdays. 25X1A9a

MR. [redacted] That is the chief problem. He was hoping that we could set a time when he wasn't at the Planning Board. 25X1A9a

MR. WHITE: I might say that of course it is convenient for me, but it does necessitate keeping chauffeurs overtime to get these people back down there, and it happens everytime we get a meeting here we have to keep the cars in the pool. I'm for changing the time.

14

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is a better time? We probably used up more valuable executive time trying to change the hour of this meeting than would pay the chauffeurs the next couple of years.

Rud has a master plan here.

MR. [redacted] Thursday morning at 11:00, but Mr. [redacted] doesn't like that hour. 25X1A9a 25X1A9a

MR. [redacted] If I am going to be the only one that is going to ruin that I certainly would be glad to review it. But what Kirk said is absolutely true, that I have literally no mornings left in the week. By the time the Director's meeting is over, and the meeting below, then it's lunch time. 25X1A9a

MR. [redacted] Then if not Thursday morning at 11:00 it will have to be in the afternoon, and then it's a question of whether it should be held immediately after lunch. 25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But everybody's lunch hour varies. This is really not a major morale problem.

MR. [redacted] We have been getting out regularly at 5:00 o'clock, and 25X1A9a

some of us have to get back to our offices to sign cables.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We will continue the meetings at 4:00 p.m. on Thursdays.

The paper which I wish to present now represents my views on the Career Service Program. I took the occasion of getting snowed-in last Friday to just sit down and get on paper what I feel. I think I would be perfectly safe in saying I don't think any of you will agree with all of them. I think some of you will agree with a lot of it, and I think some of you will disagree with a lot of it. But I feel very strongly that we are at the cross-roads where we should look very carefully at the magnitude of the organization we have working on a Career Service Program and start seeing that the accomplishments get down to the fellow on the working level, and cut down on the amount of paper work that we are doing, which is purely policy and philosophy. I think the Selection Panel has made a major step in that direction, but I would like to see the whole program launched as of a specific date, at which time we go into the three-year selection period and all of the other factors involved in this.

I think one thing which I probably didn't make clear enough to the Director--although I think he appreciates it--is that basically speaking we have exactly one thing to sell to our people which is not true of any other government agency, and that is, simply, that we have a more fascinating type of work, and that we hope we can have a better run Agency. But we don't have any benefits that the others don't have, and actually we have a little less than the others mainly because of the security factor and everything related thereto. But I present this to you with the hope that you will read it and with the suggestion that we do devote a future meeting to hammering out what is proposed herein in the way of future reorganization, and see if we can't--in the next few weeks--get down to a firm decision as to when the Career Service Program should be launched, if it should be launched.

Now, the last item is the Insurance Task Force.

25X1A9a

MR. [redacted] The Insurance Task Force is about to call the actuaries into active consultation. Statistics are being prepared now under the direction of the actuaries. They have not actually worked on the premises but the Task Force has been preparing this material so that when they do

come they can most efficiently consider it with the expenditure of the least amount of time, since their time is extremely valuable in terms of dollars.

It's almost impossible, Kirk, to be sure of when the Task Force will be ready to make its final report, but I would guess within a month.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, they are just about to start getting down to brass tacks with the actuaries?

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] That is correct.

16

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I think that is important, because we may be able to come up with something concrete in the way of a career benefit that we don't have today.

25X1A9a MR. [redacted] The statistical analysis of deaths, hospitalizations, and so on, is completed, and is being done according to the requirements that the actuaries have specified, so that all of these statistical analyses have been made and it may be that the actuaries can do their job in just a very few hours after they sit down, but we can't be positive of that. They will, of course, be indoctrinated by Mr. [redacted] 25X1A9a of the Security Office.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other new business?

We stand adjourned. Thank you, gentlemen, for attending.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. . . .