

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

D/OTE
1026 CofC

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

14 May 1986

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DDA
7D24, Hqs.

2.

3. EXDIR
7D55, Hqs.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Thought you might be interested in this thoughtful memo from [redacted] Although this was not a very inspiring or inspired group, most of his points are on the mark.

We must re-do after the next running--more Agency leaders' assessment voluntary [redacted] and others notwithstanding, some SISers find very valuable. I also like the idea of running two groups of 30 each to minimize the impact on Agency speakers.

It's interesting that even among this last uninspired group, there apparently was feeling that all SISers should go to something--even if they are close to retirement. The reaction came to my hint that we were considering disinviting some people.

[redacted]

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

8 May 1986

25X1 TO: OTE/EDS (Attn: [REDACTED])
25X1 FROM: [REDACTED]
ANIO/FDIA
SUBJECT: ELF-IV Critique

1. Did the course meet objectives?

In such a relatively short, unchallenging course, the elements comprising the stated objective of the SIS 1-2 Residential Seminar could not possibly have been met. Rather than dwelling on these one by one, I will suggest a major revamping of CIAs "Charm School," particularly in response to question 6 below.

2. Were these the right objectives?

I do not think so. POCM (and probably "Looking Glass") and the Levinson Seminar address leadership, with the latter focusing on organizational change. Charm School--and I would have expected the OTE course directors as well as the CCL team to be conversant with the relevant experience of the four military services--should be the occasion for the senior management of the Agency to make clear to the new SIS officers what it expects from them, what their vision of the future is, and the likely changes in emphasis if not organization it is anticipating. In addition, there are elements from the present syllabus that are worthy of retention; especially some focus on why executives derail, noting those behavior patterns that contributed to attainment of SIS status but are now most likely to be counterproductive. Thus, as I noted above, a major restructuring of the course is necessary. This course should be a CIA-only show, with all links broken with CCL.

3. Would you send your subordinates to ELF when they reach SIS?

This assumes, of course, that there is a choice. The present course; unfortunately, is largely a waste of time, with too much free time to boot. One afternoon, I drove to New Market to see the battlefield. I found this quite pleasant, but frankly, the piper had to be paid when I returned to my desk. Therefore, unless the course is revamped so as to lead to a rigorous, rewarding week, I would have to answer this question in the negative.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

4. What were the highlights of the week?

25X1 The visits of the D/OP, DDA, and D/OS were far and away the most useful exchanges. During [redacted] 2-1/2-hour review of personal security there was a complete absence of fidgeting. Unfortunately, Bob Magee was not given sufficient time prior to lunch to field questions in response to his provocative remarks. The session with Bill Donnelly--more than two hours after dinner--was just about right. These discussions are exemplars for what I have in mind for the restructured course.

The session with the private-sector executives was fun, but of little use to me. From personal experience and reading the literature, I am well aware of MCI's quality-control problems, which Burt Roberts side-stepped. But more to the point, what is it that he had to say that is more relevant to our Agency's work than senior managers could have provided? (In this company, the Army representative was out of place. Also the Iacocca tape should have succeeded rather than preceded the evening with the "real-life" visitors.)

5. What were the low-points of the week?

The discussion by Dr. Randy White of CCL re derailment was often interesting but of little direct applicability to an SIS-level officer. His derailment reasons and fatal flaws would have better been presented to a group of mid-level managers. A presentation based on government lessons learned would have been much more useful than those based on a limited private-sector sample.

25X1 [redacted] presentation at times, was useful and thought provoking, but her responses to questions from the floor were shallow. Again, government or military experience would have been beneficial. For example, it would have been interesting to hear views expressed on the optimum length of rotational developmental assignments for line managers in staff positions. Parenthetically, during this segment George Allen made a number of useful comments.

25X1 [redacted] segment dealing with an effective leader was too superficial, in general, for an executive-level group, though her several minutes of summation were quite good. The accompanying exercise was ho-hum.

25X1 The exercises for assessments were certainly sub-caliber, a rather unsuccessful attempt to provide grist for the psychologists' mills. The "Red-Green" was much too drawn out and bordering on the simplistic; then the instructor wanted to take a 20-minute break! Indeed, [redacted] stated he had never seen a team such as ours plan ahead, including greens in the last round, but it took him an interminable length of time

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

to say so. For us, the game was over, having been correctly diagnosed, within the first minutes. Likewise, we made short shrift of "Turnaround."

The Tuesday afternoon exercise on detrimental situational behaviors was in my case a complete non-starter. My three colleagues--there should have been five teams of three for optimum exchanges--let it be known in the first eight minutes that they all expected to retire in the next several years. And they were not interested in hearing me out. Therefore, during the next two hours, while the contractors and the OTE faculty sunned themselves, we walked, looked at the scenery, read, and generally unwound. But is this the purpose of the course? (Let me hasten to add, however, that I do not think an age cutoff should be made by OTE for admission to this course. I anticipate working a minimum of seven more years, while others in the course who are younger than I are looking forward to retirement within the next year or so.)

6. Is this course best for the organization or is nothing/something else better?

I strongly believe new SIS officers need an exposure to senior management, and to each other. For instance, I had never seen the new DDA before the course; nor were the majority of the class known to me. Rehashed POCM is not the prescription. What I have in mind is a week largely taken up with sessions a la Donnelly's, which would also include at a minimum the DDI, the DDS&T, the DDO, the Executive Director, the DDCI, and concluding with the DCI. By way of preparation, the SIS officers from the relevant directorate or E Career Service could assemble in "self-managing work teams" early on to prepare a briefing for the class on the problems their entity faces. The questions to the senior managers would then be more intelligent and the exchanges productive.

25X1 Rather than split the course into two sections, I recommend that the new SIS class to the extent feasible go through as a group. This should be logistically possible once the new facility is available [redacted]. The conclusion of the course would be a session with the DCI in his conference room, say on the second Monday. Were any of the other senior managers unavailable for a session at the off-site center, make-up sessions with them at Headquarters could be arranged for that day as well. I would think it preferable not to settle for the ADDs, if possible. In addition, I would bring in, depending on the topics that are then foremost on the Agency's agenda, the appropriate action officer, say the D/OS, the D/OP, the IG, the Comptroller, the GC, etc. As executives serving the Director, the new SIS officers should be made aware of the overriding problems facing the Agency. Most of my classmates did not leave ELF, I suspect, with an Agency perspective.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

Should members of the new SIS group wish to update their POCM psychological profiles, or create them as the case may be, then this option should be made available to them. They could complete the battery of tests, have the subordinate/peer inputs made, and then meet by appointment with an assessor. As noted above, the two exercises for the assessments fell way short of the mark. A week is too short for this to be accommodated in the new Charm School.

I also recommend that the new SIS officers be given priority for enrollment in the Levinson Seminar. (I assume most SIS-3 and -4 officers have had a chance to be exposed to Harry already.)

I would further suggest that all new SIS-1 officers take the new Charm School, unless they expect to retire within six months of the session. Levinson, however, should be reserved for those with no current intention of leaving the Agency within two years.

7. Other comments?

Ed Proctor made a number of very useful comments when he dealt with supervisory failures and the subject for the self-managing work teams (i.e., personal security). In each case, I wanted more. I felt that he really did not want to intrude and so truncated his remarks. He is thoughtful and has a lot to offer, so long as he does not wing it, as he (along with George) did on the last evening. With no formal presentation or point of view as a backdrop, the questions tended to be fatuous. An overly detailed discussion of the NIS program was of no interest to the majority of the class, most of whom never heard of it, and so it was not surprising that two just got up and left. We do need to know more of our history, especially our past mistakes, and even mythology, and both Ed and George among others have much to offer. But this time should not be viewed as a gap-filler between dinner and the poker game; accordingly more attention to these segments is required.

In sum, I offer the foregoing by way of constructive criticism. I hope it will prove useful.

25X1
cc: D/OTE

4
CONFIDENTIAL