

<b>EVALUATION OF EMPLOYEE SUGGESTION</b> <i>(Submit in duplicate)</i>	SUGGESTION NO.  <b>60-97</b>
--	------------------------------------

TO: Executive Secretary Suggestion Awards Committee	FROM: <b>Office of Personnel</b>
--	----------------------------------

**INSTRUCTIONS**

IN ORDER TO GUIDE THE SUGGESTION AWARDS COMMITTEE IN MAKING FINAL DETERMINATION, YOUR EXPLICIT COMMENTS ARE NECESSARY. "ACTION RECOMMENDED" SHOULD BE COMPLETED. IF TANGIBLE BENEFITS ARE INVOLVED, AN ANALYSIS OF THE ANTICIPATED FIRST YEAR'S SAVINGS SHOULD BE SHOWN. IF INTANGIBLE BENEFITS ARE DERIVED, PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT OF BENEFIT AND DEGREE OF APPLICATION AS DEFINED IN THE GUIDE ON THE REVERSE SIDE.

ACTION RECOMMENDED	
ADOPT FOR USE <i>(Date adopted or to be adopted)</i>	FURTHER STUDY REQUIRED <i>(Expected date of completion)</i>
ALREADY IN EFFECT BUT THIS SUGGESTION MAKES ADDED CONTRIBUTION	REFER SUGGESTION TO <i>(Component)</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DISAPPROVED FOR ADOPTION	ACTION TAKEN AS A DIRECT RESULT OF THIS SUGGESTION <i>(Specify below)</i>
ALREADY IN EFFECT AND NO PART OF THIS SUGGESTION MAKES ADDED CONTRIBUTION	OTHER <i>(Specify below)</i>
ALTHOUGH NOT ADOPTED, STIMULATES AN IMPROVEMENT <i>(Specify below)</i>	

**REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION**

1. Our understanding of this proposal is that all engineers with Top Secret clearances working for various Government agencies be considered as a pool to which short-term or long-term problems might be referred. The proposal is also made that this plan be extended to other shortage categories.

2. It seems to us that the proposal is not feasible for a number of reasons, including the following:

a. It appears to assume that members of the pool are not engaged in full-time duty and are thus available for assignment as needed to work on such matters as might be presented. Particularly in "shortage" categories, we believe this would not be the case.

b. It appears to overlook principles of compartmentation and need-to-know in assigning problems to the entire pool.

c. We doubt that employment in a pool could be made sufficiently attractive to obtain and retain competent personnel. The uncertainties of assignments and advancement opportunities, the lack of an identifiable employer having an interest in the individual's career and development, and the lack of a specific program or mission with which the individual could associate himself are illustrative of the drawbacks from the individual's point of view. It is difficult to obtain nonprofessional personnel, such as typists and stenographers, who are willing to work under such arrangements; undoubtedly, professional personnel would object even more.

3. While there has been much publicity about shortages in various professional occupations, such shortages tend to narrow down to shortage in specialties within the occupation rather than the general field. Students are encouraged to enter such fields and, within a period of a few years, the "shortage" category is in oversupply.

DATE <b>24 SEP 1959</b>	SIGNATURE OF EVALUATION OFFICER <span style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 100px; height: 1.2em; vertical-align: middle;"></span> <i>(title)</i> <b>Deputy Executive Officer</b> <b>Office of Personnel</b>	STAT  STAT
----------------------------	--	------------------

STAT

Approved For Release 2003/05/23 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000300050082-8

Approved For Release 2003/05/23 : CIA-RDP80R01731R000300050082-8

This appears to be taking place in engineering and we believe it would be a mistake to set up such an elaborate employment system to accommodate a temporary problem.

4. We believe that the rosters of scientists and other professional personnel maintained by the National Science Foundation and by professional organizations plus the various university facilities and consulting firms equipped to handle special research problems form a practical solution to the problem addressed by this proposal. Where these facilities cannot tap sufficient competent personnel to meet such situations, we believe that a Government-sponsored pool could not be staffed.

5. Accordingly, we consider the suggestion a less practical solution than is already available to a problem which we view as temporary. Therefore, we propose that the suggestor be advised that his proposal has been considered but will not be sponsored by the Agency for the reason that we believe highly specialized needs are best met through other resources and that a pool arrangement is impractical from a personnel point of view because of the lack of attraction in such employment and from the point of view of administering and allocating work assignments.



STAT



STAT



Mr. Allen Dulles

2430 E St NW

Washington

DC.