



6. Mrs. Thompson also requested promotion to GS-16, retroactive to August 1, 1977. The Committee chose not to recommend her promotion to GS-16, being concerned that such an adjustment would be contrary to established procedures for supergrade promotions.

The Recommendation of the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity

7. I concur in the Committee's finding of disparate treatment. (U)

8. I do not wholly concur in the Committee's recommended adjustment which is intended to make Mrs. Thompson whole. The Committee's concern regarding procedural barriers to the promotion of Mrs. Thompson to the grade of GS-16 is not warranted. The adjustment of an EEO complaint, after a finding of discriminatory treatment, provides one of the two legal justifications for "out of cycle" promotion to rectify an employee's career. The other justification is the correction of administrative error. Further, in my judgement, neither the information in the investigative file nor the rationale of the Operations Directorate provides adequate reason to believe that the Agency could substantiate a defense against a "But For" challenge should this case be pursued in the judicial arena. In other words, there is little indication that the Agency could prove with confidence that the Complainant would not have been promoted even if the course of her career had not been adversely affected by her sex.

9. I recommend therefore, that you also consider the promotion of Mrs. Thompson to GS-16. It is my opinion that such a promotion, if granted, should be retroactive to 17 October 1977, the date the formal complaint was filed. An earlier date of retroactivity, while perhaps justified, is difficult to establish due to the more subjective and competitive nature of supergrade promotions.

10. Please select and initial the alternative of your choice from the following. I will prepare the Final Agency Decision for your signature.

- | <u>Alternative</u>   | <u>Initial</u> |
|--|----------------|
| a. The Proposed Disposition of the Operations Directorate  |                |
| b. The Recommendation of the ACDDC: Promotion of Complainant to GS-15 retroactive to October 1975. |                |

18 APR 1979

c. Promotion of Complainant to grade  
GS-16, retroactive to 17 October 1977

d. Promotion to GS-15 retroactive to  
October 1975 and promotion to GS-16  
retroactive to 17 October 1977.

11. You may choose an adjustment other than those here  
presented. I am, of course, available to assist you in the  
deliberation and preparation of any adjustment you determine  
to be an equitable means of resolving the case. (U)

Omega J. re, Jr.

Attachments,  
as stated

Report of Investigation  
Equal Employment Opportunity Complaint  
of Harritte T. Thompson

I. Description of Complaint

Position: Chief, Review Branch,  
Comptroller Group  
Staff. GS-16. Incumbent GS-14  
Complaint: Failure to Promote because of sex  
Date: 7 July 1977  
Kind of Discrimination Alleged: Sex  
Identity of Alleged  
Discriminatory Official: None specified, the system

II. Description of Investigation

Investigator:  
Date Case Received by  
Investigator: 4 November 1977  
Date Report Submitted: 10 June 1978  
Places of Investigation: Langley, Virginia  
Dates of Investigation: 4 November 1977 - 10 March 1978

III. Issues in Complaint

Failure to promote. Failure to reward equal work with equal pay. Until Mrs. Thompson achieved GS-12, she progressed in a manner similar to her male colleagues. At GS-12 her promotions became much slower than her male colleagues performing similar work. Her fitness reports were strong or better. She was assigned increasing responsibility. Her supervisors, and later the Chief, East Asia Division, repeatedly requested promotions which did not materialize. Male colleagues have been assigned training courses and varied assignments to enhance their careers while she advanced in responsibility within EA Division to chief of the Section GS-15 and then to Deputy Chief Operations Staff. Her responsibilities grew until the

D-1



resources she helped manage were approximately half that of the present target strength of the DDO, yet despite head room in her slot and the recommendation of the Chief, East Asia, she was not ranked high enough by the 1976 Panel to be promoted. She remained a GS-14 in a GS-15 position. Finally, she was assigned out of the Division to a GS-16 slot under the DDO/Comptroller. Her Fitness Reports remained Outstanding, she was recommended for promotion by her supervisor and the Assistant Deputy Director for Operations, she was performing the work of a GS-16, yet the 1977 Ranking Panel ranked her ninth on the Category C list for possible promotion when available headroom allowed only two or three promotions. Again no promotion resulted. The panel would not recognize her performance as worthy of promotion. By this time the DDO's prerogative of adjusting the Panel's rank order for promotion had been cancelled by the DCI. The possibility of appealing her case to the Director was apparently considered by the DDO and ADDO but rejected. In the Directorate of Operations, the identity of the Ranking Panel members is not published; hence, it was impossible for the complainant to challenge their specific attitudes or objectivity. ; There is no specific Alleged Discriminatory Official, rather an Alleged Discriminatory Unit, the Directorate of Operations itself. She requests remedial action by promoting her to GS-15 retroactive to May 1972 and to GS-16 retroactive to 1 August 1977.

#### IV. Attachments

- a. Statistics
- b. Extracts from "DDO Career Service Personnel Evaluation System Handbook"
- c. Complainant's Training Record
- d. Blank Ranking Form, Form No. 3362
- e. Awards: Commendation by Chairman of Task Force on Paperwork  
Nomination for Federal Woman's Award with Related documents  
Memo on approval of Incentive Award

g. QSI Requests and Actions

h. Promotion Requests

i. Promotion Actions (dated: 24 Feb 57, 21 May 67, 2 Apr 72)

j. Two Memoranda regarding Complainant's designation for executive development

k. Memo dated 17 December 1975 Requesting the position of Chief, EA be upgraded to GS-15 with attachments A & B Letter of Instruction as DC.

l. Memorandum dated 15 February 1977 appointing Mrs. Thompson Chief, Branch, Comptroller Group.

Memorandum dated 14 December 1976, to the DDO requesting Mrs. Thompson be appointed to the Comptroller group with a simultaneous promotion to GS-15

Memorandum to DDO from Chief, CMS recommending against promotion on transfer

Position Description for Chief, Branch, Comptroller's Group, GS-16, Mrs. Thompson's present position  
Memorandum to DDO from Comptroller,

Staff, recommending promotion of the

Complainant after the 1977 Panel failed to designate

Complainant for promotion.

V. Description of Exhibits

Affidavits :

1. Complainant

2. Panel Chairman GS-16

3. Panel Member GS-16

4. Panel Member GS-16

5. Witness GS-17

6. Witness GS-16

7. Witness GS-15 (retired)

8. Witness GS-11

9. Witness GS-17

10. Witness GS-18

11. Witness EP-5

## Background Material

1. Biographic Profile
2. Notice of Receipt of Discrimination Complaint
3. Counselor's Report
4. Privacy Act Notice
5. Memorandum appointing investigator
- V. Summary of Investigation

My first actions were to determine whether there was available evidence of unequal treatment based on sex within the DDO. A statistical analysis of the sexual composition of each grade level from 12 through 18 was performed.

In the DDO women do not have proportional representation in the senior grades. The decrease in female representation is particularly severe at GS-15 -- the specific grade transition of this complainant. Attachment A to this report is a graph and statistical summary of male/female employment in the DDO grades 12 - 18. For each year it reports the total on board in both June and December. The cumulative is merely an aid to calculate an accurate percentage for the entire year, i.e., to average the entire year rather than to use a six month period. At least three apparently significant observations may be made from these figures:

A. For all of the years from 1972 through 1977, women comprise between 18 percent and 19 percent of the DDO GS-12 working force. Using 1977 as a typical year, there is a male plateau for grades 12, 13 and 14; there are actually about 6 percent more GS-13's and -14's than GS-12's. For females the change is vastly different; there are 34 percent fewer GS-13 females than there are GS-12 females, and 66 percent fewer female GS-14's than GS-13's. Thus while the male population increases about 6 percent from GS-12 to GS-14, the female population for those same grades decreases over 77 percent. Whereas females make up 19 percent of the DDO professionals regardless of grade and 18.6 percent of the GS-12 officers, they make up only 4.7 percent of the GS-14 officers. Were no sex discriminating factors involved in the progression to the higher grades, the percentage of females could be expected to

remain nearly constant at 13 percent through those grades. Judging from the approximately equal numbers of males in these three grades, grades 12 - 14 must be considered the junior through senior journeyman level for case officers.

B. The GS-14 to GS-15 transition apparently represents a transition from senior journeyman specialist to manager. Section XIV "Qualifications to be Promoted to GS-15" page 71 of the Personnel Evaluations Handbook (Attachment B) makes this point clear but it also qualifies this concept in paragraph 5 stating "there is a need for the GS-15 case officer, staff officer, specialist, or specialized manager." However, at the GS-15 level the number of functional categories is reduced to three: Category OB - Operational, Category D - a specialized category for specialized operational personnel, and Category W - Staff Specialists which replaces all categories other than B and D. Although combining the many diverse specialties into one category is a practical measure, to allow better comparison of the small numbers of officers involved, it is further evidence of the transition from specialist to manager. It is this transition from GS-14 to GS-15 which statistically women find most difficult to achieve. An analysis of the statistics of that GS-14 to GS-15 transition further highlights the trend of a decreasing female percentage with increasing grade. The male population drops 48 percent from GS-14 to GS-15 whereas the female population drops 92 percent for that same transition. Thus, the GS-14 to GS-15 barrier the journeyman to manager transition for females is almost impenetrable. Within the DDO, since 1972, the percentage of GS-15's who are female has not risen above 1 percent.

C. Grades GS-15 and above. Since 1972 the total number of D D women in these grades has not changed; in 1972:

in 1977:

These figures result in the interesting anomaly that with the exception



of the years with a supergrade level had no female representation, the percentage of females in each grade, since 1972, is lowest at GS-15.

Having demonstrated disparate sexual representation with increasing grade level the investigation attempted to determine roots and causes of this difference and in each instance attempted to determine whether such causes were relevant to the Complainant.

#### Career Development

Mrs. Thompson complains of disparate treatment in terms of career development and projection. Affidavits of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ are pertinent.

#### A. Training

Summary. Statistically women in general below GS-15 are not proportionally represented in the prestige career enhancing courses. The Complainant has received very little CIA training, much less in both quality and quantity than the average of her male colleagues. Moreover, she has not received a single broadening, executive development course such as the Midcareer Course.

Details. Office of Training records indicate Mrs. Thompson has had a total of six courses, two of which were part time and the longest of which was 80 hours. At the request of the Investigator, Mrs. Thompson made a list of seven male contemporaries, i.e., males of similar age and similar positions of responsibility, each of whom happens to be GS-15 or higher. The training records of these seven individuals reveals their recorded hours\* of training varied from 16 to 2550 with the average of 774 hours. Prior to about 1962 the training hours were not recorded and the individual with 16 recorded hours actually received 14 courses -- the 16 hours represented only the last course taken. The number of courses per individual varied from 5 to 20 and averaged 13.

\*The hours of training were used only where recorded. No effort was made to calculate the actual hours involved where not recorded. Although this introduces an error, the error is a constant and does not materially affect the conclusion.

Thus while a CIA employee, in a period covering more than 25 years, Mrs. Thompson received six courses for a total of 120 recorded hours. The average of her seven male colleagues is 13 courses for a total of 774 hours. She received seven courses and approximately 650 hours less training than the average of seven of her male colleagues.\* Of the courses considered as career-enhancing, one of this group of males received none, but the others received from one to three such courses. The Complainant has received none of these courses.\*\*

#### DDO Training Statistics for Relevant Courses

Course	Grade Range to Qualify	Students % Female	Work Force in grade range % female
Midcareer	GS-12 - 13	4.4	15.5
Management Seminar	GS-13 - 15	3.2	7.1
Advanced Intel Sem.	GS 14 - 18	2.5	2.6
Senior Seminar	GS 15 - 18	2.6	1.1

Note: 1975 Training records were used with 1977 work force data because of the availability of material.

When viewed in terms of the female percentage of work force in a grade level eligible for the course, it can be seen that the lower the grade of eligibility for the course, the less likely females are to be represented in numbers equivalent to their percentage of the workforce. Specifically:

Midcareer, women represented by 28 percent of parity

Management Seminar, women represented by 45 percent of parity

Advanced Intel Seminar, women represented by 100 percent of parity

Senior Seminar, women represented by 236 percent of parity. Since there are only 10 females in the entire DDO eligible for the Senior Seminar, i.e., 1.1% of that grade group, each female registered will make this figure fluctuate wildly. For example, in a class of 30, 1 female would represent 300 percent of parity.

\*The names and training records of the individuals used for the comparison have not been attached to this report for reasons of privacy. They are available in the Investigator's background data file.

\*\*In this comparison, these courses are limited to any course at Harvard, any war college, the Senior Seminar, Advanced Intelligence Seminar, and the Midcareer Course.

B. Career Enhancement Through Job Assignments.

Mrs. Thompson served in the \_\_\_\_\_ group from 1964 through 1976. During that period she progressed to Deputy Chief of Operations \_\_\_\_\_ Staff. The \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ affidavits attest that she became virtually indispensable to the Division. Throughout that period the EA Division was in crisis. Virtually everyone I talked with referred to Mrs. Thompson's "encyclopedic" knowledge of operations. She knew individual operations and their performance. While I was interviewing \_\_\_\_\_ he received a phone call, which was for Mrs. Thompson and was referred to her at her new location. \_\_\_\_\_ said to me, "See what I mean, one year after she has left the Division and they still go to her for information." In the midst of the Vietnam conflict, the career development of an "Outstanding" performer in a key position took second place to the immediate requirements of the Division.

Elements of disparate treatment of females were uncovered here also. See especially \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ affidavits, but references were also made to the problem by \_\_\_\_\_ Chief of EA \_\_\_\_\_

Staff (now known as Staff C) from whom I did not take an affidavit. The substance of their remarks is that within the DDO emphasis is given to career projection for officers in the B/OG Category, over the Specialist Category. The discriminatory effects of this will be discussed in a subsequent paragraph. In any event, Mrs. Thompson remained in one EA Staff, with a performance rated as Outstanding, described as indispensable, hence cancelled even from training courses, while competent males less glowingly described were rotated to the DDO Comptroller Staff, then to the CIA Office of the Comptroller for broadening experience which resulted in promotions. Iden A on page 12 is one case in point.

Evaluation of Fitness Report Ratings.

Mrs. Thompson has received consistently Outstanding ratings on her Fitness Reports. Are these ratings valid? It is recognized that

the Fitness Report as much a reflection on the rater as on the ratee. Some raters have a reputation for rating high. To learn if Mrs. Thompson's Outstanding ratings were possibly due to serving under a supervisor who routinely gives high ratings, the raters were examined. Had only one or two individuals been responsible for these ratings, an attempt would have been made to examine the FR's they had submitted on other individuals during the same time frame. However, such comparison proved unnecessary as during the period from 1 January 1970 to January 1977, ten different individuals participated in rating or reviewing Mrs. Thompson's FR's. Of these ten only two felt that although portions of her performance deserved the Outstanding rating, she was not fully enough involved in all activities to merit an overall "Outstanding" and suggested "Strong" instead. Thus eight out of ten, over a seven year period, agree on the "Outstanding" rating and the other two agree that individual duties deserve an "O" but prefer an overall "Strong." Such unanimity on one individual's performance, from a cross section of the DDD, confirms the validity of the rating. The narrative of the 74/75 Fitness Report, reviewed by DC/EA, praised Mrs. Thompson's performance highly and stated "Subject is already performing at the GS-15 level in her present job." The individuals who participated in the above ratings are:

#### Attitudes in the Operations Directorate Regarding Females As Operations Officers

Faced with statistics which demonstrate the percentages of women decrease with advancing grade, an effort was made to explain this phenomenon. The DDO is considered by most of those senior officers interviewed, as an organization of Operations Generalists. Almost without exception the affidavits which addressed the subject of women in operations, presented the opinion that generally women could not

They attributed the problem not to DDO policy nor to prejudice in our own culture but to the prejudice in the cultures in which we must operate. The affiants point out that especially in Latin America, Africa

The Near East, and Asia, women are second class citizens. Women in these countries seldom have access to information of value; hence they are not likely to be selected.

These same people point out that in such cultures our women would not have the freedom of movement enjoyed by males.

The opinion that women could generally not handle was freely and forcefully expressed to the investigator by one GS-16 member of the 1977 Ranking Panel which ranked the Complainant. He stated that the relationship usually developed into a very close relationship, that male officers could control the emotional aspects of such relationships far better than women and therefore could better exploit the relationship. He opined that with women officers the relationship would be more emotional and would likely lead to a sexual relationship detrimental to the operation. He did not allow this opinion to be included in his affidavit, although he affirmed it as representing his view. The attitude of this senior officer may well indicate why, at least until recent years, women have not been welcomed as operations officers and if they have happened to become Operations Generalists, they were unlikely to get much experience.

Attitudes toward women in the Directorate are apparently changing. pointed out to me that women are getting operational assignments and some of them have done very well. A woman is now the Deputy Chief, East Asia Division. Although these developments may affect some future investigations they have little relevance to this one.

#### Operational Experience as a Factor in Promotions

Experience at along with evidence of skills and activities which go along with seem to be the most influential criteria in promoting. See and affidavits. The evidence strongly suggests that women are not allowed to engage directly in Operational activities nearly as freely as are men. It also suggests that participation in operational activities

is virtually a requirement for timely promotion, the same can not be  
promotion as expressed in affidavit. Therefore, the likely  
result is that promotions for women are likely to be fewer with more time  
in grade. These attitudes shed light on the rapid decrease in numbers  
of women in grades above GS-12, previously presented. Agency average  
time in grade of those promoted from GS-12 (1974) was about three years,  
Complainant spent ten years as a GS-12, despite the fourth Fitness Report, in  
January 1963, and all succeeding FR's as a GS-12 highly recommending  
her for promotion. The Reviewing Officers' (Deputy Chief, Far East  
Division) comments on the January 1963, January 1964, July 1964 and  
January 1965 Fitness Reports, all stress the need for mobility (i.e.,  
overseas experience) in order to be promoted. By 1965, the Rating  
Officer had apparently become convinced that sex discrimination was  
playing a role in the failure to achieve promotion for Mrs. Thompson. A  
copy of the narrative portions of that FR follow:

"...I unhesitatingly recommended Subject for promotion to GS-13  
the last time Grade 12's were considered. Inasmuch as Subject was  
not promoted at that time, I urge that the next Panel consider  
Subject's promotion favorably; judging her on the basis of the

thoroughly qualified person that she is rather than on the basis of  
what she might be if she were a man or a case officer in the field."

Even with that plea, two years followed before promotion to GS-13  
became a reality. Despite Strong Fitness Reports and repeated supervisor  
requests for promotion, Mrs. Thompson spent ten years as a GS-12 when  
CIA's average is between three and four years. Does the absence of  
mobility similarly handicap males? A promotion progression for four  
male officers in similar circumstances is diagrammed below. The intent  
of this presentation is only to demonstrate that what served as an absolute  
for Mrs. Thompson, lack of mobility, was not a similar absolute for  
these four male officers. In order to respect the privacy of these  
four individuals their identities are not given; they are contained  
in the Investigator's raw data file.

Individuals	Time in Grade as GS-12	Time in Grade as GS-13	Time in Grade as GS-14	Time in Grade as GS-15	Time in Grade as GS-16	Time in Grade as GS-17	Time in Grade as GS-18
Complainant	2/57-5/67 (10+)	5/67-4/72 (5)	4/72-present				
Iden A Male GS-16	9/58-11/63 (5)	11/63-6/66 (2+)	6/66-9/70 (4+)	9/70-12/74(4+)*	12/74-present		
Iden B Male GS-15	10/62-10-68 (6)	10/68-3/74 (5+)	3/74-7/77 (3+)	7/77-present			
Iden C Male GS-17				1/66-3/67 (1)	3/67-11/70 (3+)	11/70-present	
Iden D Male GS-18	6/54-2/58 (3+)	2/58-1/61 (3)	1/61-8/65 (4+)	4/65-5/70 (5)	5/70-8/73 (3)	8/73-7/77 (4)	7/77-present

Iden A was last overseas in 1963. His FR's are Strong. There are no comments regarding his "mobility" or lack of field assignment since 1963.

Iden B was assigned in 64-67 to a domestic operational activity. He has no foreign field experience.

Iden C has had no overseas or operational experience.

Iden D has had no field experience since 1958.

D-12

Is the foregoing discussion regarding participation in operational activity relevant to the progression of a Category C Specialist?

Relevant excerpts from the Personnel Evaluation System Handbook are attached. Briefly, Category C was established to allow specialists within the DDO to be evaluated among themselves and to progress independently of operational experience. A proportional quota of headroom for each promotion is allocated to this group. The C Category was established to allow promotion through needed specialization without the handicap of the specialist being compared to and competing with the Operations Generalist for promotions. But does it work that way?

The Category C Ranking Panel consisted of three dedicated men, who although they were of diverse backgrounds (one came up through the security officer route) all describe themselves as operations officers. The Ranking Form\* (Form 3862) Attachment D, is clearly designed to evaluate Operations Officers and clearly emphasizes the importance of operational experience, activity, and operationally desirable attributes.

About one third of the blanks<sup>spaces</sup> are relevant only to the ranking of operations officers but irrelevant to the Headquarters-placed Specialist. When evaluated with these forms, a good operations officer with a little experience should have positive entries in nearly all blanks. However, even an Outstanding, experienced Specialist is likely to have approximately half of the blanks empty, or if entries, the entries are likely to be negative, e.g., in the case of Complainant and the 1977 Ranking Forms, "none". There are no blanks on the form intended to reveal outstanding managerial accomplishments or other achievements which are the *raison d'etre* for Category C. The Complainant made a highly significant managerial suggestion regarding paper flow which went unnoted in the Ranking Forms except that one of the three noted a \$1000 Incentive Award had been received and two noted that

\*This form is used in ranking all categories of personnel. It would also put other categories not involved in operational activity at a disadvantage, for example, Category A, Reports Officers, etc; a category which contains a large percentage of women.



Mrs. Thompson had been nominated for the 1976 Federal Womens' Award. Nowhere on the form is there any evidence that the nature or the quality of the suggestion was considered by the Panel. Subsequent to the Panel's Ranking, the Chairman of the "Paperwork and Bureaucracy Task Force" in a commendation for Mrs. Thompson, Attachment E, regarding her contribution stated, "It is considered by many to be the most beneficial and far reaching improvement in field reporting in the history of the Clandestine Service." Had the form been properly designed to evaluate Category C Specialists rather than Operations Generalists, the nature of this important contribution might have been brought out during the ranking process. Rather than reflecting a positive image, of a person who has had overall Outstanding Fitness Reports since 1968, and who had made substantive, creative contributions, the form when filled out on the Complainant appears negative or at least unimpressive.

It is also believed significant that the three 1977 Panel members, all Operations Generalists, Affidavits numbered 2, 3, and 4 found the Ranking Form neither constraining nor inhibiting. In their eyes, the form was well designed to recognize those activities which they are convinced are the life blood of the DDO. Conversations with the Panelists were laced with comments such as "Humint is our main bag" and "What happened to the concept of the complete man?" Also the disdain for the type of work being done by the Complainant was made apparent by a comment suggesting that she possibly got such good Fitness Reports because no one else wanted her job; i.e., keep her happy and keep her there. In discussing the Complainant's managerial contribution to reduce paper flow, the comment of one Panel member was yes, "but did it?". It was clear that he felt that no Headquarters Specialist, without field experience, was either interested in or capable of reducing paper flow. A note written on one rating form by one Panelist is both interesting and relevant: "My first review of her file led me to place her very high. Panel discussion however changed my mind....does a great job in one field of endeavor. Although Category C is for specialists others being ranked did have in their backgrounds varied jobs and experiences. It

they should be promoted but when compared to others who have had a variety of jobs one must conclude that others are more worthy of promotion..." This Panel member started out understanding the purpose of Category C but in the presence of two other Operations Generalists caved in and did not reward the specialized performance which in his own words, "should be promoted." Copies of the three ranking sheets used in the evaluation of the Complainant are in the Investigator's raw data file. It seems clear that Category C, functioning in the manner outlined above, is not rewarding specialization, no matter how outstanding the performance, nearly as much as Operational performance. The affidavit from one Panel member in commenting on the persons ranked above Complainant, "These are all good officers with broad operational experience." The above happened with a very dedicated panel which in this investigator's opinion diligently worked to be objective and "agonized" over their decisions.

Category C is therefore not functioning as a separate Category of specialists but as a separate compartment of Category B/Operations. Category C has failed in its purpose. Both the form used in ranking and the selection of the Panelists to do the ranking were biased in favor of the Operations Officer over the specialist.

The Chief, DDO Career Management Staff was requested to identify the persons ranked above Mrs. Thompson by both the 1976 and 1977 Panels, in order for this Investigator to check the influence of operational experience in ranking. These names were not made available, so we must rely on the statements of the Panel members on this point.

Does a bias in favor of the Operations Officer over the Specialist constitute a bias against women? Within the DDO it has been virtually universally held that with few exceptions, women cannot be used as

Generally this attitude is explained as due to a bias in the foreign culture within which we must operate. One affiant went so far as to indicate that women generally could not handle the psychological pressures

This Investigator was not tasked to investigate the complaint of a female Category B Operations Generalist. Whether the arguments suggesting that women generally cannot be used as Operations Officers is factual or spurious has not been addressed as it is only marginally relevant to this complaint. That this belief exists is relevant and it is thought adequately documented in this report Experience in Category B, in which women have not been accorded free

access, is used as an influential attribute, affecting promotions where in Category C it should have no relevance. This is also believed to have been well documented, especially in the comments of Reviewing [redacted] the long string of Fitness Reports Complainant received as a GS-12, and in the affidavits of the 1977 Panel members, numbers 2, 3, and 4. In summary, experience in an environment from which women have been considered handicapped, is rewarded in another environment, Category C, where such experience is not supposed to be relevant. A quote from the Evaluation Handbook is appropriate, "The C Officer rarely, if ever serves in a B/OG or B/OS type assignment." Therefore the practice outlined constitutes discrimination against women in the promotion process, and in the case of the Complainant, it clearly was an important factor in preventing her promotion at the 1977 Panel ranking.

#### Blatant Discrimination as a Factor in the Complaint.

It seems apparent that the Complainant has been damaged primarily by unwitting, subliminal, unconscious discriminatory procedures which have become institutionalized by practice. Thus, there is no discriminatory official. Most of those involved in the ranking procedure, etc., which most affected Mrs. Thompson's pay status and future did what they are sincerely convinced was the right thing to do. Mrs. Thompson did, however, serve under one supervisor, the Chief, EA who, according to testimony, was blatantly biased against women being assigned to responsible positions. See the Complaint of Discrimination, Page 6 and also see the affidavit of [redacted] allegedly stated that he could not recommend the Complainant to be Chief, EA because she was a woman. According to [redacted] whose affidavit is attached, he made a number of other statements derisive of women. The actions of [redacted] have not been further investigated because his actions are not believed to be as significant in the complaint as those investigated. However, the attitudes he vocalized may be more widespread and germane than we realize, as [redacted] after his EA

position, was appointed the Agency Director of Equal Employment Opportunity, then a position on the Inspector General's Staff.

#### Reasonableness of the Complaint

Fitness Reports and Promotion Requests have repeatedly indicated that Mrs. Thompson has been performing above her grade level, examples include:

1975 Fitness Report, REviewing Officer, DC/EA,

"...is performing beyond her grade level..."

1975-1977 Fitness Reports, Same outstanding performance...little

to be gained in searching for new laudatory synonyms....

Mrs. Thompson is the Division authority on program matters...

she is unique." Assisted in supervision of 21 employees

including a GS-15. Many diverse functions. "performed

at a steady sustained level of excellence." Reviewing

Officer, DC/EA,

"She is underpaid for the

work she does. Her performance during the period under

review (note in a GS-15 position) warrants an Outstanding

rating."

Feb-Aug 1977: First Fitness Report in GS-16 position, Rater,

Outstanding, Reviewer Strong. "She should have no trouble

in maintaining her record of achievements to date."

Feb 1976: Recommendation for Promotion to GS-15,

C/EA: "Ms. Thompson has been performing above

her grade level for some time."

This Investigator encountered no one who had ever dealt with Mrs. Thompson, as a supervisor, as a coworker, or as a subordinate/consumer who did not hold her performance in high esteem. The Complainant requests promotion to GS-15 retroactive to May 1972, the date she had been in a GS-15 position for one year. Her Fitness Report for that year was Outstanding. At that date she would only have been in grade one month; however, since she had been a GS-12 for over ten years, and her supervisor indicated in her 1965 FR that sex had been a factor in the failure to promote,

she feels this is not an unreasonable request. She also feels that she should be promoted to GS-16 retroactive to 1 August 1977, the date that a panel could have promoted her had she received her GS-15 in May 1972. Mrs. Thompson has been in a GS-16 position since February 1977 and her 1977 Fitness Report for that position is Outstanding. Her most recent Fitness Report, January 1978, is Strong, with a "clarification" memo added by Complainant. In April 1977 CSI-230-4 was issued based on the work and recommendations of Complainant. The only affidavit which addresses the reasonableness of the remedy, although inadvertently, is that of GS-17.

Investigator

D-18