

**CONFIDENTIAL**

MINUTES

OF THE

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

26th Meeting, Thursday, 17 May 1956, 4:00 p.m.  
Room 154, Administration Building

Present: Harrison G. Reynolds, D/Pers, Chairman  
 25X1A9a Matthew Baird, D/TR, Member  
 [REDACTED] COP-DD/P, Alt. for DD/P, Member  
 25X1A Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, IG, Member  
 H. Gates Lloyd, ADD/S, Alt. for DD/S, Member  
 [REDACTED] D/Commo, Member  
 [REDACTED] SA/DDI/AD, Alt. for DD/I, Member  
 [REDACTED] Executive Secretary  
 [REDACTED] Reporter

DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
 NO CHANGE IN CLASS.   
 DECLASSIFIED  
 CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S *2011*  
 NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 AUTH: HA 70-2  
 DATE: *26/06/81* REVIEWER: 018995

GUEST

[REDACTED] Executive Officer, O/Pers. 25X1A9a

1. The minutes of the 24th and 25th meetings of the CIA Career Council were approved as distributed.
2. The Inspector General distributed copies of a bill to amend the Central Intelligence Act of 1949 (Senate Bill 3851), which had been introduced into the Senate and referred to the Armed Forces Committee. An identical bill has also been introduced into the House. Mr. Kirkpatrick quoted Senator Russell as saying that the bill stood a good chance of passage. It contains all of the measures recommended by the Career Council except that which pertains to retirement. The Council agreed that everything reasonable should be done to publicize within CIA this proposed legislation since it is the first time that measures designed to implement the Career Service program have been placed before Congress.
3. The Council briefly considered the bill to amend the U.S. Information Agency Act (Senate Bill 3638) which contains proposed legislation on retirement with respect to the question of whether action of the Bureau of the Budget was consistent in granting approval to USIA to seek liberalized retirement and withholding such approval from CIA. It was felt that perhaps the USIA bill did not have a very good chance of being acted on favorably by the Congress. [The USIA bill has subsequently been passed by the Senate and forwarded to the House for action.]

~~SECRET~~

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Minutes of 26th Meeting of CIA Career Council

4. The Chairman transmitted a proposed Notice on Supervision to the Acting Deputy Director (Support) which had been approved by General Cabell and which was to be signed by the Director. Copies were distributed to the members of the Council. The Inspector General stressed the extreme importance of improving the quality of supervision throughout the Agency, of being frank with the individual to let him "know where he stands," and of the necessity of carefully following an orderly procedure in documenting sub-standard performance so that if separation of an individual from the Agency becomes necessary or desirable, the action may be carried out with dispatch. He also stressed the impact of "ceiling" on the desires of a supervisor to improve the quality of his work force. The Council agreed that the Notice should receive "All Employee" distribution and should be classified Confidential.

5. The Council briefly discussed separations that occur each month (January, 7; February, 7; March, 8; April, 4). These are technically voluntary separations since the individual resigns but has been induced to take this action through impending formal disciplinary actions or impending formal Board hearings. The Council also considered the effect of selection for membership into the Career Staff, wherein 113 persons as of 30 April 1956 had either been denied membership in the Career Staff, or their applications had been deferred, on the overall grounds of unsuitability. It was tentatively agreed that at least all cases of denied memberships - "C" cases - should be reviewed to determine whether separation action should be instituted or not.

6. Item 3 on the Agenda which contained four topics (a. separation actions; b. the problem of handling mediocrity; c. how can the fitness report be more effectively used; d. disciplinary actions) was discussed by the Council. There had been no background papers distributed. A chart "Proposed Separation Procedures for Administrative Reasons" was distributed. The flow of action as proposed in this chart would result in streamlining special employment review board cases that were brought before it on the grounds of "mediocrity". The procedural flow would also ensure that each employee had a fair and equitable hearing but would at the same time strengthen the authority of the Director to take the required action. In detail the steps are as follows:

- (a) Supervisor initiates charges and recommends termination.
- (b) Director of Personnel reviews (a) sufficiency and adequacy and determines under which authority final decision should be made.
- (c) Supervisor prefers charges.
- (d) Employee has opportunity to request hearing in reply to charges.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- (e) Hearing, if requested, before Advisory Committee appointed by Director of Personnel.
- (f) Consideration of employee's reply and of recommendation of Advisory Committee, with decision and action by the Director of Personnel.
  - (1) If the individual is not entitled to CSC appeal and separation is to be effected by normal Government-wide authorities, the decision by the Director of Personnel would be subject only to appeal and review by the Director of Central Intelligence if the employee concerned desires to appeal the decision.
  - (2) If the individual is entitled to CSC appeal and separation is to be effected through the authority conveyed by Section 102(c) of the National Security Act of 1947, the Deputy Director (Support) will review the record and refer the case to a special employment review board or recommend to the Director that separation be effected under authority of Section 102(c). The decision of the Director of Central Intelligence would be final. If the case is referred to the special employment review board, that board would make its recommendation to the Director.

7. In essence, then, the employee would always have the opportunity of a hearing before a three man advisory committee appointed by the Director of Personnel. If the case were subject to an appeal, the case would be reviewed by the special employment review board which would conduct a further hearing of the employee if he requested it but would certainly review the recommendation of the advisory committee. Put another way, the employment review board would review the record of the case by the advisory committee when it was deemed desirable.

8. The Council discussed the use of the term "mediocrity" and it was agreed that this term was subject to misinterpretations and misunderstandings. The terms "marginal," "unsatisfactory," "inadequate," "incompetent," etc., are also vague and subject to different interpretations. The Council, therefore, recommended that criteria be developed to implement a statement such as the following: "Below CIA standards for the grade, for the following reasons". It also agreed that proper supervision and adequate documentation of substandard performance in the earlier stages were essential to the effective separation of substandard employees. The Council recommended that the Office of Personnel establish a focal point where intermediate or senior supervisors could get authoritative advice on the techniques and procedures for handling cases of substandard performance that might lead to separation.

9. The Council discussed the use of assessments by the A&E Staff to determine the cause of substandard performance and recommended that assessments be used to as great an extent as the A&E Staff was capable. The effect that too rapid promotion in the past with the resultant overgrading had on performance was noted.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

10. There was introduced to the Council a proposed "Superior and Inferior Suitability Watch List" to enable the Director of Personnel more effectively to keep track of outstandingly superior as well as outstandingly inferior performance as reported in current fitness reports. The Council requested that this be revised to eliminate reference to superior performance. [A weekly substandard performance watch list based on criteria contained in the Fitness Report as approved by the Council has since been instituted in the Office of Personnel.]

11. The Council concluded that the basic mechanics and procedures of the Agency for handling substandard performance and separations existed but that there was much still to be done in the education of supervisors and middle echelon executives. It also concluded that methods and procedures could be simplified.

12. The Council adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

25X1A9a

  
Executive Secretary  
CIA Career Council

4

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL