Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

☑ UNCLASSIFIED ☒ INTERNAL USE ONLY ☐ CONFIDENTIAL ☐ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)
DDA MAG Comments on the NAPA Report

DD/A Registry File Personnel

FROM: [redacted]
Chairman, ADMAG

EXTENSION: [redacted]

NO.

DATE: 30 April 1979

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. Executive Officer to the DDA 7D18 HQ	4/30			FYI
2.				
3. DDA		5/1		Because of your interest in ADMAG think you should read their NAPA personnel report. No hurry!
4. ADDA (fyi)		5/3		
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

FORM 3-62 610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS ☐ SECRET ☐ CONFIDENTIAL ☐ INTERNAL USE ONLY ☑ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

DD/A Registry
79-0258/8

Administrative - Internal Use Only

30 APR 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

STAT FROM : [redacted]
Chairman, ADMAG

SUBJECT : DDA MAG Comments on the NAPA Report

The DDA MAG (ADMAG) has been requested by the DDCI to provide to your office our views and comments on the NAPA report. We believe MAG inputs are important to any analysis of this report, because they represent, to a greater extent than other respondents, the views of working-level employees in contrast to a management perspective. Unfortunately the MAG mechanism, especially its part-time nature, has not permitted us to give the lengthy and complex NAPA report the detailed and exhaustive analysis it deserves. What follows is an attempt to discuss my impressions, as ADMAG chairman, of what were the main concerns of the members. It should be noted that because of time constraints, ADMAG members have not been able to review this memorandum.

Areas of General Agreement with the NAPA Report: There was general agreement of the ADMAG members with the reports' thesis that the present Agency personnel "system is an essentially sound one and has served the Agency well." The concept of the Agency personnel system as separate and distinct from the federal personnel system was also supported. Members felt that differences with the federal system, where warranted, should continue to be maintained. Members agreed that the Agency should assert its prerogative to take exception to aspects of the federal personnel system when judged in the best interest of the Agency

Administrative - Internal Use Only

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

and when, of course, law and regulations permit. In this regard, the current system of personal rank authority was also supported.

ADMAG members believe the vacancy notice system is an extremely important aspect of the Agency personnel system. It was felt that the current system, as stated in the report, needs to be better thought out and then explained to employees. Members felt strongly that uniform access to vacancy information was an important principle.

Probably topmost in the minds of many Agency employees is the Agency position in regard to personnel reductions and the concept of "flow-through." As discussed in the report, this whole area must be clarified. Employees appear to be very anxious about these vital subjects and the current ambiguous situation is a cause of morale problems. At a minimum, Agency policy must be better defined and made known to employees.

In ADMAG discussions of the panel system, what came out immediately was the great diversity in its implementation across components, even within the Administration Directorate. This made ADMAG members wary of generalizations about the system. There was agreement, however, that as suggested in the report, exceptions to panel recommendations be permitted with approval at a level lower than the DCI for GS-15 or below employees. It was felt by many members (with one strong exception) that this improved the balance between management control and "fairness" in employee evaluations. There was also general agreement that the panel system is a costly one and some thought should be given to eliminating or curtailing it with respect to junior employees.

Disagreements with NAPA Report: The most significant disagreements with the NAPA report concerned recommendations to form new staffs in personnel areas. There was a general feeling that new staffs were counter-productive and the Office of Personnel should provide the required staff services.

A second area of concern, as expressed by several ADMAG members was the impact of certain report recommendations on recruiting standards. High standards

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

are vital to the Agency's ability to perform its mission. Therefore, it was felt that further study was required on 1) the impact on standards of goal systems for woman and minorities and 2) the partitioning of jobs into those for which career potential is a significant factor and those that performance is the overriding factor.

Conclusion: Overall, my impression is ADMAG members believed the NAPA survey and report a very useful effort. The report was viewed quite positively and the opportunity to provide comments was welcomed.

As mentioned earlier, commenting on the NAPA report has been a difficult task. The lengthy and complex report was not available in a sufficient number of copies. The part-time nature of the MAG system did not allow the discussion time as significant a report as this one requires and deserves. In the comments provided above, I have attempted to identify the topics of the report that generated the most discussion and to provide a feel for what I perceived to have been the majority view. Because we have not had the time, this memorandum has not been reviewed, nor agreed to by ADMAG members. As you would expect, views of individual members often disagreed significantly with what I have described above. Finally, one ADMAG member wished to forward some personal comments. Her memorandum is attached.

S

Attachment: a/s

cc: EO/DDA
ADMAG Members

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3

Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3
Administrative - Internal Use Only
Attachment

Comments from ADMAG's OMS Representative on the Conclusions and Recommendations of the NAPA Report

1. The general comments about the effectiveness of the present system appear well-founded.

2. The concept of "flow-through" seems poorly understood by ADMAG members, with several highly conflicting definitions expressed during the discussion. It would be inappropriate to comment about this section until this concept is clearly defined.

3. The role of panels is inadequately understood, as each component's panels appear to operate differently.

4. Recruitment: We in PSS reject the establishment of minimum qualification standards, since we believe we should hire the best, not merely those who meet minimum requirements.

5. "Retreat rights" for CTP applicants does not appear feasible. How would it impact on those hired as replacements for the CTP candidates?

6. EEO Considerations:
Do quotas exist? Is the establishment of quotas official policy? Are quotas legal?

"Suspicions of racial bias in the PAT-B" have not been verbalized to PSS. The NAPA team did not talk to anyone in PSS, and therefore such a statement is both irresponsible and unprofessional. Current test validation research (the results of which are available in PSS to those qualified to interpret them) supports the validity of the PAT-B across racial lines. Agency EEO officers have not expressed any interest in the nearly two dozen studies held by PSS. The general view in PSS is that we are in compliance with Federal laws and guidelines promulgated by EEOC.

Re: membership of D/EEO on PERB and ARP: members of boards and panels are there because of special qualification and special authority to make decisions. D/EEO has no credentials or organizational authority to function in such a capacity.

7. Roles: Offices should not be asked to play a staff role. OTR should not be given generalized staff responsibility as it would be too easy for them to become enmeshed in personnel actions across the board.

8. Management Staff: I am against what appears to be a tendency toward the proliferation of staffs.

Administrative - Internal Use Only
Approved For Release 2005/12/23 : CIA-RDP83-00156R000600020034-3