

DATE 10-5-83



*- Thanks in  
By all means, let's  
save for our next  
look at this problem*



*Interesting review*

RETURN TO:



MEMORANDUM FOR:



This is my draft of the  
"background history" on recruiting  
& EOD processing that you  
requested.

Even though our follow-up  
now appears to be deferred, this  
summary should be useful to  
the next team that pursues it.



Date 10/5

25X1-

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

SECRET

5 October 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Inspector General

FROM: 

25X1

SUBJECT: Background for Follow-up Inspection of EOD Processing: Summary Review of Previous Agency Efforts on this Subject

1. General dissatisfaction with the recruitment and processing of new employees is an issue which has been the focus of much attention and effort by senior Agency managers over many years. As our office is about to revisit this problem, we believe that a brief historical survey would bring a useful perspective to the major issues involved.

2. Three major studies have dealt with this topic within the past five years: the N.A.P.A. team survey on Personnel Management (mid-1978 to March 1979); the IG inspection on Recruitment (April 1979 to May 1980); and the IG inspection on EOD processing (July 1982 to January 1983). Each of these efforts resulted in a published report, and a comparative summary of their major findings is attached.

3. The N.A.P.A. Report dealt with the entire spectrum of personnel issues, but contained several major findings and recommendations concerning recruitment and processing. Soon after this report was released, the IG began a detailed, year-long survey of the Agency's recruitment system. One of the major--and most controversial--recommendations of this inspection report was the establishment of a pilot program to train line managers and substantive personnel for rotational duty in field recruitment. The purpose of this approach was to determine whether early authoritative judgments on applicants in the field would screen out marginal candidates before they entered the processing pipeline.

4. The D/PPPM objected to this proposal on the grounds that: (a) the existing system was already satisfying almost all Agency recruiting needs; (b) a roster of substantive officers from all components had been assembled to assist recruiters with hard-to-get categories of applicants; and (c) OPPPM was about to implement a new systems model (designed by ) to improve applicant processing. The D/PPPM was subsequently given a year to demonstrate that his ongoing efforts would actually

25X1

SECRET

SECRET

bring about substantial improvements, and action on the IG proposal was deferred.

5. This inspection also generated a major controversy over the validity of the PATB test which is used to screen many Agency professional applicants. Following a recommendation of the earlier N.A.P.A. report, the IG team contracted the services of [redacted] who found defects both in the test's internal validity and in its use by the Agency. The Psychological Services Division objected strongly and countered with a favorable report on the PATB by its own team of consultants. An acrimonious exchange of memoranda on this issue continued for almost a year, with no apparent resolution of the purported problems.

25X1

6. The Executive Committee met in April 1981 to review the recruitment issue, but there is no record that action was ever taken on the major, unresolved issues that emerged from this inspection.

7. In response to (then-departed) Admiral Inman's concern that our applicant processing system was disaffecting highly qualified candidates, the IG conducted an inspection between July 1982 and January 1983 which focused on EOD processing. This survey team found a lack of accountability, coordination and communication among all components dealing with applicants. The report recommended a combination of procedural and structural changes that would (a) overhaul and streamline the processing system itself, (b) require greater direct involvement and exercise of authority by hiring components, and (c) consolidate all processing components under a single authority.

8. In March 1983, the Executive Committee met to discuss the recommendations of the IG report on EOD processing and to review the progress of the CT Task Force. Later that same month, the DCI ordered a thorough reevaluation of recruiting methods-- with particular emphasis on our efforts to obtain Career Trainees. With regard to the latter point, the DCI expressed a belief that increased direct recruiting by line offices was necessary because "personnel officer types are not likely to do well at this."

9. In May the DDCI forwarded his decisions on the EOD Processing Survey, in which he deferred action on the major recommendation outlined above (para. 7), and also on a recommendation to transfer the Psychological Services Division to the Office of Personnel. Final decisions on these issues were to be contingent on the findings of an IG review of progress in EOD processing at the end of the year. In a related move, the DDCI ordered the D/PERS to reduce the number of field recruiters and to rely increasingly on TDY recruiting efforts from Headquarters.

SECRET

2

SECRET

10. It is also worth noting that the questions surrounding the Agency's use of the PATB test for applicant screening-- although not a major issue in the EOD survey--have still not been resolved. In response to an informal query from the Deputy Inspector General, the General Counsel's Office submitted an opinion that the absence of clear guidelines governing the use of the PATB test leaves the Agency open to charges of non-compliance with EEO "uniform guidelines" in hiring procedures. PSD now also agrees, in fact, that the PATB is not validated for all of the positions for which it is used as a screening device. The technical complexities of these questions are so great, however, that we do not plan to address this issue in our follow-up examination of EOD processing.

### SUMMARY

11. A sense of frustration is the single, unifying theme that appears to be shared by all who have studied or tried to improve the Agency's recruitment and processing of applicants. It is true that our overall quantitative EOD objectives are being met (except for CTP and hard-to-get categories); but the cost of the system, in terms of inefficiency and disaffection of quality applicants remains high.

12. How could so much effort by so many talented and well-intentioned people have failed to produce major improvements in the system over the past several years? All evidence to date indicates that the fragmentation of resources and authority is the fundamental source of inefficiency.

- Even at the basic stage of planning, there is no coherent authority to establish, and enforce recruiting goals.
- The multiple <sup>lines</sup> lives of authority and communications among processing components are a source of inefficiency which cannot be overcome by improved technology alone. It is difficult to generate a sense of teamwork and shared achievement among all participants in such a system.
- The system thus also lacks a unified reward structure, either for the achievement of clearly understood goals or for the generation of new ideas.
- Many hiring components, despite having ultimate hiring authority, participate only marginally in the whole process. This lack of assertiveness creates a basically passive system.
- The lack of coherence is communicated all too clearly to many applicants, who have no single source of authorita-

SECRET

3

SECRET

tive information. The applicant calculates his "time in process" from his initial contact, whereas processing components are focused only their slice of the pipeline.

13. Our follow-up inspection will focus on measuring the demonstrable results achieved in applicant processing in the past six months, as seen from both the applicants' and the processors' viewpoint. We should, however, have little to add to the list of detailed prescriptions and remedies that have been put forth in previous studies. If clear signs of progress are not evident, it would appear that efforts at fine-tuning the existing system must be abandoned in favor of major initiatives toward four goals:

- consolidation of recruiting/applicant processing resources
- establishment of unified authority at the Office level, over those resources, and accountability for their work.
- requirement of more active and authoritative involvement of hiring components.
- establishment and enforcement of recruiting goals, and development of a reward structure and sense of teamwork that will ensure achievement of those goals.

SECRET

4

**Page Denied**

Next 6 Page(s) In Document Denied