

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD MEETING

DCI'S CONFERENCE ROOM

27 JULY 1953, 4:00 P.M.

Present

Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Chairman

[REDACTED]
Chief, PM

Mr. John Warner
Dep. Gen. Coun.

Mr. Paul E. Eckel
DD/TR (General)

[REDACTED]
DD/TR (Special)

[REDACTED]
Ch of Support Staff

Mr. James R. Hunt, Jr.
Deputy Chief, FI

Mr. John E. Baker
Deputy Chief, PP

Mr. Desmond Fitzgerald
Deputy Chief, FE

[REDACTED]
Deputy Chief, SE

Mr. Burton B. Lifschultz
Deputy Chief, EE

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

[Redacted]

Deputy Chief, WE

Mr. Thomas A. Parrott
Deputy Chief, SR

[Redacted]

Executive, OCD

[Redacted]

Chief, Econ, Res., ORR

Mr. George E. Aurell
Chief, FE

[Redacted]

Chief, WH

[Redacted]

Chief, TSS

Mr. Ralph L. Clark
DAD/SI

Mr. Joseph Larocque, Jr.
DAD/OO

Mr. Edwin M. Ashcraft
Chief, Contact, Div., OO

[Redacted]

Chief, FBID

Mr. John J. Bagnall
Chief, FDD

[Redacted]

Deputy Chief of Logistics

Mr. John A. Bross
Chief, EE

[Redacted]

Chief, Plans & Programs Coord Staff

08110100

~~SECRET~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

Mr. C. Tracy Barnes
Chief, PP

Mr. Rudyerd Boulton
Executive Secretary
CIA Career Service Board

Reporter

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SECURITY INFORMATION
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SECURITY INFORMATION
CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD MEETING

DCI'S CONFERENCE ROOM

27 JULY 1953, 4:00 P.M.

(After hearing from the Chairman of the CIA Career Service Board, Mr. Lyman Kirkpatrick, re the Executive Inventory, the following occurred:)

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you are nominating from outside the office an individual, if you don't know enough about his present job to fill it in, either indicate what his present job is and we can get the details, or else say, "On the basis of my knowledge of this individual, when he is performing such and such a job his capabilities . . ."

MR. LAROCQUE: You wouldn't indicate the qualifications you think he has to fill the job you are suggesting?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you know those qualifications firsthand, yes. I would assume that he would be exhibiting them in his present job or in the job that you are appointing from.

DR. GIBBONS: Do you wish to have them rated?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In order of priority?

[redacted]: My own job, suppose I have three -- just three -- names, or do you wish to have them rated?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would rate them. That would make the Inventory more valuable if they are rated.

MR. BAKER: And there is no distinction between PP, FI, or PM?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, this is across the board.

[redacted] At the Division level where you are only asked to supply one name, presumably that should go outside of anybody who is presently occupying an Executive Inventory position, correct?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I don't quite follow, Alan.

[redacted] I was just thinking if the three Divisions in OO did a round robin each nominating the other, it wouldn't serve any purpose.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, that wouldn't serve any purpose. You would have

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
SECURITY INFORMATION

to nominate somebody to succeed yourself.

Somebody who was outside of this present Inventory
or . . . ?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Oh, yes.

MR. BARNES: If the same fellow is nominated for two or three different jobs, does the outfit where he is presently working get the priority, or how do you decide that?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, you are not nominating for jobs and putting them on the Executive Inventory. You are just getting a name in the Executive Inventory, and he will not be nominated for a job until there is a job vacancy when the Director will say, "He looks like a good man," and he will say, "Tracy, do you want to yield him to take this other job?" and you may say, "Well, he is too important where he is," and he wouldn't push it then.

MR. BARNES: But the nomination is linked to the job at the time it is made?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Oh, yes.

MR. BARNES: On the other hand, if you had three people all nominate the same fellow and only one each, there are going to be two people short, and you come back and say . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It shouldn't be limited to just one nomination. If there are two, by all means nominate two, and if there are five, by all means nominate five, and, of course, there may be nobody. I hope that is not true. At the maximum we should have 350 names, and at the minimum we should end up with about 125. Now if you nominate the same man that is all right. From the point of view of the Inventory it would be even more appropriate, and then when the Director looks at the card he can see that here is X who is nominated by five or seven different individuals, and, therefore, he realizes he has a fairly broad reputation across the board as an individual in the executive capacity. You might nominate him. The FI side, PP side, and PM side might all nominate him, and the DD/P might

SECRET - 2 -

SECURITY INFORMATION

~~SECRET~~
SECTION

nominate him.

[] Somebody that is already listed on the Inventory, because he occupies one of these jobs, should he be listed for another job that you think he might be qualified for?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I see no reason why not.

[] This matter of "Don't go down too far." Obviously if there is a gap of three grades there . . . There are some individuals in the Agency who started at very low grades and are making their way up. They are quite competent, and yet because of the time element they have not reached a grade that would put them into a position to be considered here. Can exceptions be made? How much leeway can we have there?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is one of the reasons we put this six months item in here, Sid, so that if he can qualify in six months to succeed you, why, that is the factor involved. I think we should stick by the six months, and let's not confuse it anymore.

[] I would like to talk about grades. The new Clandestine Services Regulation says that one of the functions of the Career Service is to implement a just promotion plan. I presume that same wording appears elsewhere in the Agency. Where does the just promotion policy come from?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is a very good question, Hugh, because right at the moment we have got under consideration whether we shouldn't lay down an across the Agency promotion policy. On the one hand there is reluctance to go back to the present 1950 days when there was an absolutely standard policy for promotion . . . you will be in grade so long to go from such a grade to such a grade . . . and, on the other hand, we have the fact that probably every office has a slightly different promotion policy today from every other office, and that is one of the things which the Director is going to decide on before he takes his leave this summer. He wants to get that one hammered down because that question has been asked by darn near every Career Service Board.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
REGULATORY INFORMATION

MR. BAKER: I would like to say that I think that this Career Service system is finally really getting its teeth on to something. It has long needed to have some teeth into this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems we still have a long way to go. In the first place, I think you all recognize we can't exist with 23 Career Service Boards, and the personnel involved in servicing 23 Career Service Boards is out of the question.

I am just completing a survey of the Personnel Office, as I think most of you know. Everybody in the Personnel Office knows it, so it is not highly classified. That should be in the Director's hands within the matter of a few weeks, and there is a rather startling figure in that, which I am not at liberty to disclose, as to how many people we have doing personnel work, but we simply have got to draw our lines closer together to get this thing centralized and systematized and stop handling individuals on a mass production basis. I think we can do that. Now this is giving you a slight preview of what I think the things are we must do.

We have two other things rolling. We have a Legislative Task Force now at work to prepare the material to submit to the General Counsel's Office for the preparation of legislation to give CIA what it needs for a Career Service. The Director is following that fairly closely, and we think at the next session of Congress we will be ready to put it through. We have another Task Force at work preparing a statement of What a Career Service in the Central Intelligence Agency Means to You, which will come right down to the brass tacks and talk about tenure, dependent benefits, illness, and all of the factors which are not clear issues today, indicating where we don't have what we want and how we are going after other things we need.

And then another factor is at the Director's request I am convening a panel of women to talk about careers for women in the Agency because those of you who sat in at the last Orientation Course know the Director got about five questions on the subject of whether there is professional discrimination against women in the Agency. Can a woman get ahead just as fast?

CONFIDENTIAL - 4 -

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
REGULATORY INFORMATION

SECRET

Are fewer women hired than men? All that sort of thing. Now those are the things we have got rolling, and I hope by the time snow flies we can really get this thing shaken down and moving the way it should. I think it is particularly important for foreign Division Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs that we get it straightened down so we can give the people in the field a real statement about what is going on before too long because Frank tells me everybody asks about it, and all they have gotten is one rather dry bureaucratic regulation on the subject, with due apologies to those who wrote it.

... The meeting then adjourned at 1635 ...

8241-50100
SECRET

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD MEETING

DCI Conference Room

4:00 p.m.

23 July 1953

Reported by: I Peterson

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD MEETING

DCI Conference Room

4:00 p.m.

23 July 1953

In Attendance:

X Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Chairman

Mr. James M. Andrews

X Mr. Matthew Baird

[Redacted]

Mr. Rudyerd Boulton

[Redacted]

Mr. George C. Carey

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Mr. Dana B. Durand

[Redacted]

Colonel Sheffield Edwards

Mr. James A. Garrison

Mr. Otto E. Guthe

Mr. Lawrence R. Houston

[Redacted]

Mr. Sherman Kent

Mr. George E. Meloon

[Redacted]

Colonel Jean W. Moreau

Mr. James Q. Reber

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

Mr. Edward R. Saunders

Mr. Winston M. Scott

Mr. Lyle T. Shannon

X Mr. Huntington Sheldon

Dr. John R. Tietjen

Mr. Eric W. Timm

28

- 2 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

SECRET

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

. . . A special meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 4:00 p.m., 23 July 1953, in the DCI Conference Room, with Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's go ahead and start the meeting.

Gentlemen, we asked you to come today to one of two special meetings that will be held by the Career Service Board to discuss with you the so-called Executive Inventory. Now this Executive Inventory idea obviously has bugs in it. The obvious bugs, to point them out, are: No. 1, what constitutes an Executive Inventory and what are the executive positions in the Agency? This particular subject was debated on at some considerable length, and we finally reached the rather arbitrary decision that we would consider the executive positions in the Agency--for the purpose of this meeting--those in which the Director himself would probably--and I use that word advisedly--would "probably" be concerned in the filling of. Consequently you will see the list which is on page 3, I think it is, of your attachment, that here are the major executive positions: the deputies, the Director of Training, the Assistant Director of Communications; and then on the DD/P side you will note that it includes the chiefs of all the major staffs and the chiefs and the deputy chiefs of the Divisions; and on the DD/I side it includes, with one or two exceptions, the AD's and the deputy assistant directors; on the DD/A side it includes the AD's, the chiefs of the offices and their deputies.

The immediate question may arise, why didn't we include the divisions on the DD/I side or the other sides? Well, there we were getting into the practical aspect that the divisions under DD/P are just about the same size as some of the major offices in other parts of the Agency--in some instances much larger--so that obviously size

- 1 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

was one criteria. And the other factor goes back once again to the fact that the Director himself is personally concerned in the selection of individuals to be the chiefs of the major operating divisions, as well as in the selection of their deputies.

Now the second factor was: How do you handle an Executive Inventory? You obviously get into matters of personal concern there. Individuals will say, "Well, gosh, I missed the boat. I didn't get tapped. My job isn't in the Executive Inventory list." Consequently that is one of the reasons why we are handling this on practically an individual basis. Each of you will be handed this and be asked to make your selections and return them, and the material will be handled on a very exclusive basis up here. It will be reviewed, as it should be, by the Deputy Directors for their particular offices only, and then will be put in a card file and turned over to the Director for his use.

Why do we need an Executive Inventory? One of the reasons--the fairly obvious one--is that we have gotten so large. There are so many people concerned--the Director has a limited amount of time and it would be impossible for him to know intimately the details of every single individual in the organization--plus the fact that whether we like it or not there is a constant rotation of positions in these executive jobs. I could probably cite to you the exact number of times these jobs have changed hands in the last few years, but I don't think it is necessary to do that. Up until General Smith took over we had had 35 changes on the top level of the Agency, and that didn't include assistant directors. I think in the past few years that has even expanded. The point being, there is a constant rotation in these jobs.

We have left out of this list one obvious group of executives

- 2 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

in the Agency, so that some of those in Washington whose feelings may be hurt by not being included on that list can also recognize there are others left out. We have left out the chiefs of the overseas stations, and some of our overseas missions are almost as large as some of the offices in Washington, and a great number of them are as large as some of the divisions in Washington. But they have been left out for two reasons: one, so that we could get this moving; and secondly, because of the very difficult selection problem there of which chiefs of overseas stations should be included in the Executive Inventory. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Rather than get into that complex and difficult problem of deciding we agreed to start out with just simply what could be called an Executive Inventory, and then add to it as we gain experience, and particularly as we see whether it is made use of.

The question has always arisen: What is an executive inventory. Those of you who were present at the last AD's meeting know that I have some fairly strong feelings on the subject. To my mind we have in this Agency three different types of individuals who, shall we say, get up into the high grade or super-grade field. They are, namely, your intelligence officer who is an expert on analytical and research types of intelligence processing who can describe to you fairly expertly a situation in any given country or in a particular country, a man who knows how to handle information in the simplest terms. Then we have the operator. When I was in the position of running SO I used to feel that we had two types of individuals, the fellow you would send abroad as an operator and you would put him in a given spot to do a job and you would give him just as few administrative responsibilities as you could. He might nominally

- 3 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

carry the title of Chief of Station but his deputy or assistant deputy might do all the work, [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Then you had the

executive type, and that is the type we are talking about here. Quite frankly, gentlemen, I think this Agency has all too few executives. In certain instances we have intelligence officers and operators in executive positions, and I think that is unfortunate from both angles. I think it is unfortunate because it dissipates the true value of the individual. If he were smart enough to recognize it he would exert considerable effort to get out of that position. And secondly, it doesn't give the Agency a fair chance, and we have a lot of executive positions which must be filled by executives.

Now in discussing this the CIA Career Service Board has developed certain thoughts. I am going to read a portion of them to you so that you can carry these back with you when you are deliberating on this problem.

(Reading)

"PROBLEM. To establish an Executive Inventory of personnel with executive ability or potential which will:

- a. Provide the Director with an Executive Inventory of persons possessing executive ability who are suitable for assignment to Executive Positions.
- b. Identify the Executive Positions of Agency-wide significance, the incumbents of which are appointed by, or with the concurrence of, the Director.
- c. Provide a uniform method of establishing Executive Inventories and identify Executive Positions at the Office level.
- d. Establish an Executive Development Program to discover and develop the persons in, or for, the Inventories above listed."

MR. KIRKPATRICK (Continuing): As you see, there we are thinking beyond this principal CIA Inventory. As I see it--and this will be

to a large degree left up to the individual Career Service Boards-- each office should, in effect, develop its own Executive Inventory to take care of the development of individuals from the branch chief up through the division chief level; and, also, to move them as they mature and develop into the CIA Executive Inventory. In other words, the processes for development of our own personnel for promotion from within, following the theory that anybody coming in here out of college or graduate school and going through the various phases of training in the organization and getting a good cross section, eventually, on a career basis, can aspire to the hope of becoming the Director of the Agency.

Now the assumptions.

(Reading)

"ASSUMPTIONS.

a. It is incumbent on any supervisor to ensure that adequate replacement is available for him in the event of his reassignment or disability. This responsibility stems from two requirements: (1) That he ensure that the job will be well done in his absence; (2) That he develop subordinates to accept greater responsibilities."

MR. KIRKPATRICK (Continuing): I know in my criteria the best executive is the fellow who doesn't have to be at his desk, a fellow that has his work so well delegated that he can make sure his office or unit is running perfectly well in his absence and he knows everything will be taken care of and handled expeditiously. Obviously, if he wants to keep his job he should show up occasionally. (Laughter) As a corollary, when his deputy is absent the office should run just as well; in other words, he shouldn't make the executive type in his deputy and make him do all the work, but be able to shift off and on with his deputy so that he can be out in the field looking at the work of his organization, or if it's here in Washington be down in the branches or divisions dealing with the men and knowing the work is being done.

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

(Reading)

"Executive ability is not a function of technical proficiency in any one field and is, therefore, not limited to utilization in any particular area of activity."

MR. KIRKPATRICK (Continuing): There you get what I mean by the intelligence officer and the operator.

(Reading)

"Executive ability is an attribute that can be described in terms of leadership, of ability to organize, to delegate responsibility and to achieve results and of facility in promoting teamwork. It does not necessarily result from education, work experience, area knowledge, etc. Once identified, it may be enhanced by appropriate developmental programs and techniques."

MR. KIRKPATRICK (Continuing): That, I think, is the most pertinent part of this analysis that was done for the CIA Board, and that was passed up to the Board.

What we would like you to do now, in a period of approximately a month--I believe our deadline is 19 August, so you have three to four weeks--is to prepare for us on these forms a list of the individuals who you think have the potential for moving into your job.

Now obviously this isn't to be taken as any indication that any moves are going to be made in anybody's direction. But it does give the Director, for a first time, a look see at what he has in the Agency. I think it is particularly important that you do something which this Agency has always been weak on and for which we have suffered, and for which I would say 90% of the cases reaching the Inspector General are responsible, and that is to be perfectly frank in making these assessments. If a person has weaknesses let's point out those weaknesses; and if he has strengths let's point those out. The very simple factor in nominating anybody to a job is to put him where his weaknesses will not hamper him and where his strengths will contribute to a better job. I feel very strongly on that particular point, and I can quote you book, chapter and verse as to

- 6 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

where this Agency has been hard hit by lack of critical personnel evaluations. It is very, very important that particularly a group that will be working on these Executive Inventory positions be perfectly frank and clear in putting it up.

Now the question arises: Do I nominate only individuals from my own office or do I nominate individuals from other offices as well? In answering that question I think I would put it this way, if you have ever worked with an individual or had an individual as a subordinate who today does not happen to be in your own office but about whom you can speak with authority--in other words, from personal experience and from close experience--then I think it is perfectly legitimate for you to nominate somebody from another office or another part of the Agency. But if you are doing it because you have lunch with him occasionally or see him in meetings occasionally then I don't think it is so legitimate because you aren't in a position to immediately judge his efficiency in his particular job, and his ability to do work. You might be able to say, "Well, I think so and so is a pretty good man." But what we need here is something on which the Director can rely, and I don't think he can rely on distant observation or lack of close and immediate personal observation on your part.

Finally, what is the future of the Executive Inventory and how is it going to work out? Frankly, I can't answer that in any great detail because this is the first time we have tried it and it will depend on exactly whether the Director finds it of immediate use and value and utility to him. I have discussed it with him and he thinks it will. The cards, when we finally put them in, are going to have to be a fairly good biographical breakdown of the individual, and an analysis from probably two or three different individuals who have worked with this individual. In other words, an AD may put in

- 7 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

the name of an individual and the DD// or the Deputy Director over him may say, "Well, I think he is over-estimating him. I don't quite have the same opinion." And the Deputy Director may put in a modifying clause, both of which are obviously for the consideration of the Director in making these decisions.

Now you will note that in this presentation to you we state that the Director will use the Executive Inventory for nominations upon consultation and advice with the Career Service Board. Perhaps the Director will use it that way, and perhaps he will use it without consultation with the Career Service Board. I think all of you know how appointments are made and how they are considered. The odds are probably pretty good that he will consult with the Deputy concerned as to the vacancy concerned, and the Deputy may wish to bring it before the Career Service Board or it may be handled on a closer level. At any rate, the CIA Board is available and ready to assist the Director. Only experience will enable us to see how it is going to work out.

We have stated in here that it will be kept on a current basis by resoliciting on six month intervals. It is not meant by that that you are going to get called to a meeting every six months and refreshed as to the inventory, or anything like that. I think it can be kept up on a fairly informal basis by the various assistant directors and chiefs of organizations advising the Career Service Board that so and so is developing the qualities that should nominate him to the Executive Inventory. Obviously we are not going to circulate any more material on this than we have to.

Now I would strongly recommend that you keep your counsel on this to yourselves. I think it will be a good test case to see

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

how closely items can be held. I think it might create among the middle echelons, so to speak, a morale problem if they thought there was an Executive Inventory and that they were passed over. I consider it extremely important, once this Inventory is created and the names are on it, that there be no discussion or loose talk about whose name is or isn't on the Executive Inventory. And I think that will be a very important factor in its future, in whether it succeeds or fails in accomplishing its job.

I think all of you will agree that an organization that has reached the size of this one, which is very large and, obviously, spread world-wide, to try and handle nominations to senior jobs without a systematic file of two or three hundred names, would be most foolish.

One final item I might add is that on this CIA executive positions list, at the last meeting of the Career Service Board two or three of the deputies had added names and after discussion and analyzing the situation a little more thoroughly some of the names were removed and others were added. But the deputies concerned have had a look at this and this is the present picture as we see it. I don't think anybody should regard it as inflexible from that point of view.

I will now try to answer any questions you have about the Executive Inventory, and then if you want to take this opportunity to raise any other questions about the Career Service Program-- since the opportunities to discuss it are so limited--why I would be glad to expose myself to fire on that.

Q. MR. ANDREWS: In filling out this form where it says "additional duties" do you describe there the duties he is now performing or do you describe the duties and evaluate his probable

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

performance?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would describe the duties he is now performing and evaluate him on that.

Q. MR. REBER: What about suggesting names from outside of the Agency? Are you interested in that?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, I don't think so, Jim. There are too many "ifs" "ands" and "buts." There is the security clearance, the medical clearance, and all the other factors. We might some day have a roster of names available, but I think the best way to handle that is to shoot them up to Personnel, because they have that regular file up there that you run whenever you are looking for positions.

Q. MR. MOREAU: This thought occurred to me a long time ago and I am very happy to see it being put into effect, that is, the Executive Inventory. At the time it was first thought of we wondered how you would draw the line, the point being that the grades and the degree of responsibility in different offices varies so much that we wondered if perhaps a grade criteria couldn't be set up. Rud, as you recall, we at one time thought perhaps all GS-15's should be put into an inventory system and then you weigh them as to what job they might do in FI or Training, etc. across the board. This sort of limits it to those people that you think should have your own job, am I right?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, from the point of view of nominations, but not from the point of view of the inventory itself.

Q. MR. MOREAU: In other words, should we think of a GS-12 who has great potential yet who isn't about to take a job to replace Mat Baird or anybody else?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would put it this way, that that particular

- 10 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

individual would go in your office inventory and eventually as we expand this--as I think we will do--he would graduate into that. But obviously today he wouldn't be in a position to come up there. We started out thinking that we would put everybody above GS-14 in that, and if we had done that the initial paper work would have been so great that we wouldn't have gotten it off dead center. So, admitting this is an arbitrary basis for doing it, and going back to the very logical system that here are the jobs that the Director himself is interested in, knowing who is sitting in them, and wants also to know about those individuals, why that is the way we have done it.

Q. MR. KENT: Do you want more than one nomination?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would say anywhere from one to five. Some of you may nominate three, four or five. But I would limit it to five from each of you. But if you could nominate five then we should be proud of the fact that you have five executives somewhere in your organization because that is, to my mind, a very laudable factor.

MR. BOULTON: Some persons are also being asked to nominate for other positions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Rud points out that DD/P has, I think, 14 possible positions to nominate for. I don't know how I can persuade Frank to get down to doing that, but that is the way it works.

Q. MR. BAIRD: Isn't it fair to say this is an attempt not to identify positions but to identify individuals, and that the positions listed are merely a guide or a help? The main thing is to find out who the people are that have executive potential as well as executive ability to demonstrate.

A. MR. BOULTON: The list of positions is for the purpose of

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

Security Information

demonstrating that the Executive Inventory is to fill those positions. In other words, those are the positions in which the Director is personally interested, but the people don't necessarily have to be the deputies or second-in-line to those positions. The individual can come from anywhere in the Agency if qualified and recommended and so on.

Q. [] Then am I correct, Mr. Chairman, in understanding that if we select an individual, even though he may be a lower grade than those immediately susceptible to promotion, that he will be favorably considered for additional training?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: That, of course, is another very important factor in this. I think, particularly on the levels from branch chief up, that where we feel an individual has executive qualities and needs training or maturing, that by all means we should do that, whether the training is a formal type of training by going to one of Mat's courses or going to the Harvard School of Business Administration, or transferring to another part of the Agency and getting a spell in something different, that is where I think the true career service program starts to operate.

Q. [] Is that the kind of nomination you want?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: The nomination has to be for the individual that could reasonably be considered as your successor.

Q. []: In other words, if I am gone tomorrow somebody to put in my job?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

MR. BOULTON: An arbitrary rule of roughly six months of intensive development to qualify; in other words, somebody who is not quite ready but within six months you could get him there. That is just a rule of thumb.

- 12 -

~~SECRET~~

Security Information

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

Q. MR. GARRISON: Are the military personnel considered at all?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not if military career people. If they are military coming over to us like one individual in your office that I know, he probably would be qualified. In other words, if he has indicated an intent to leave the military service and make a career of CIA then he is qualified, but if he is regular service and plans to stay in the regular service then I don't think so.

Q. MR. JOHNSON: In view of your remarks about the division chiefs can we nominate people who are in responsible positions overseas at this time but who could be brought back?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: Very definitely. They would normally be some of those on the list of executive positions. But as I explained it, it just complicated it too much to get it started.

Q. MR. CAREY: If you list three or four do you list them in the order of their priority?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would certainly help the Inventory to list them in the order of their priority, George, from that point of view.

I don't know whether I made this particular point clear--Mr. Boulton points it out--that the CIA Board will examine the nominations and if in the opinion of the Board there are additional persons that should be added to the Executive Inventory, that will be done by mutual consent. If a nomination is challenged that, again, will be a Board action. But prior to that the individual deputy directors will get another shot at the names nominated from their own particular part of the Agency, that is, the DD/I, DD/A, DD/P, and Colonel Baird on Training, and General McClelland on Commo.

- 13 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

Q. MR. BAIRD: Even if we should disagree you would forward the recommendation?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: With a notation to that effect.

MR. BAIRD: But I would not like to feel that even if my deputy and I disagreed on it that I would stop the recommendation of my deputy because I disagreed with him. I would feel honor bound to forward that recommendation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In that case the Board would have to examine it.

Q. MR. DURAND: Doesn't the deputy forward his own?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes, indeed, the deputy forwards his own.

Q. MR. DURAND: Without discussion with his chief?

A. MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is right. You should not discuss it with the deputies because they are coming to the next meeting. We will get two nominations, we presume, and it will also make an interesting cross section to see how many people agree. I'll wager that we will get a better than 90% correlation of agreement. It just happens to work out that way. That's a factor in it.

Are there any other questions? Are there any questions about the career service that you would like to ask while you are here?
(No response).

That's fine. I'm glad to see it is going so well.

Thank you so much, gentlemen.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. . . .

- 14 -

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~