

18 May 1976

COMMENTS ON IG REPORT - R&P AREA

The IG report does not contain any specific recommendations requiring action by either Recruitment Division or Staff Personnel Division. R&P is quite pleased with the report and generally agrees with the substance. However, we feel several comments should be made. They follow.

1. Page 3, Chart. The box "Field Recruitment Branch" should bear the name

STAT

2. Page 18, Paragraph 33. The phrase "principal cause" may be a bit overstated. We would rather have seen the phrase "contributing cause."

3. Tab A, Paragraphs 1-14. Based on the review by the IG, the DDO has agreed that applicant files need no longer be sent to ISG. SPD is working with ISG to purge records not conforming with the two-year retention schedule under System 30. (Files and records over two years old will be destroyed as soon as the moratorium is lifted.) As of now, applicant files on candidates not accepted for employment are being retained in CARB for two months and sent directly to the Records Center for two years. At the end of two years, the files and all records pertaining to them will be destroyed.

4. Tab A, Paragraphs 15-20. We began to have an increase in the number of employees reviewing their files in July 1973, more than two years before  was published. From the number of questions and complaints we receive from employees reviewing their OPF's, it is obvious that OPF's are not in perfect condition. There are some relatively simple steps which can be made more emphatic during the file review by the employee. We can provide "misfiled" slips which the employee can use to identify material which should not be in his file. When an employee finishes his file review, we can specifically ask him whether he found any items of a questionable nature or if he believes there are documents not in his file that should be. In addition, and rather than taking a sampling of files, we could review from an accuracy standpoint those files we look at thoroughly. This would include all counseling cases and some of the QSI's, and would amount to about 200 files a year.

STAT

5. Tab C, Paragraphs 9 & 11. We appreciate the IG's recognition that there are limits on how much SPD can do in the reassignment of personnel, but we, like Avis, want to try harder. We think preparation of the new careers occupational handbook under the aegis of the Careers Committee, will facilitate our work. We have also drafted a new "Employees Available for Reassignment" publication. This is the opposite of the Vacancy Notice in that it will advertise the qualifications of those interested in a new assignment. Distributed to all offices, this publication will insure that the person's qualifications are not overlooked.

STAT 6. Tab E, Paragraph 2. We agree with the comment that new recruiters [redacted] possess somewhat more Agency experience than some of our current recruiters now do. It has been our plan for some time that new recruiters come from the inside unless peculiar circumstances dictate to the contrary. Certainly an externally picked up recruiter should be the exception, not the rule. As a matter of policy, new recruiters are now being accepted for rotational assignments of about five years duration. They will come from and go back to non-recruitment jobs within the Agency.

7. Tab E, Paragraph 2. The suggestion that some recruiters be brought into headquarters during their "slack season" and assigned to components for which they recruit does give us something of a problem. The idea sounds good. When we use the time/money/effectiveness criteria, we are not so sure. Under our present operating procedures there is no particular "slack season." Although the academic recruiting schedule is reduced during the summer, we have placed new emphasis on developing and utilizing non-academic sources, especially during the summer months. Also, field recruiters work against requirements for all elements of the Agency. Training/work assignments in this regard might well devolve into a familiarization experience rather than an in-depth learning one.

8. Tab E, Paragraphs 5-8. While we appreciate the IG's statement that SPD "is doing everything at Headquarters to get applicant cases into the hands of the customers as quickly as possible," we will continue to exert efforts to make the system work better. Many offices are doing a better job of making their recruitment guides more specific, but we need to get all offices to do this. Recruiters need to get tougher and reject applicants who are not exactly on target so that we don't have offices spending so much time reviewing files. (Having spent four years recruiting, C/SPD knows how difficult it is to turn down outstanding candidates. There is always the hope that someone will "buy" the applicant.) Preliminary statistics show that we are moving towards reducing the

decision-making time from 60 to 50 days. However, we will not meet this MBO objective unless we can somehow get the CT Program to review files faster. We would hope that the IG will assist this effort when they review OTR. We have recently established a new system for the review of Hispanic-American applicants. If successful, we might be able to adapt the system to the review of files of Black applicants -- the other area besides CTP which takes far too long. Our list of delinquent files remains too long. We have decided to be more aggressive in retrieving these files and will do so at higher levels. Delinquent files mean delinquent correspondence. In addition to retrieving files, we are tightening up on our procedures to see that applicants receive correspondence about every 30 days. We were delighted to see the IG comments concerning PATB Part I. As you know, we advocate the abolition of the Part I testing in the field. PATB Part I and II could better be taken in Headquarters by those applicants in whom operating components had a sincere interest. Since the IG report, the DDO has informed the Director of Personnel that PATB Part I will not be administered in the field for CT candidates. Finally, we have recommended that where an office is interested enough to put an applicant in process, that the PATB results be used as a final "go, no-go" decision, similar to the results obtained from the medical and security evaluations. Coming at the last of the processing, this would certainly speed up the processing.

9. Tab E, Paragraph 10. The history of the Agency shows that we never seem to have the proper number of clericals in process. We studied this for several months and believe that we now have fine-tuned our requirements. Recruiters now understand that clerical applicant input must be maintained on a steady, year-round basis and that we cannot rely on June high school graduates to meet our requirements on a year-round basis. In order to keep our clerical requirements filled, it may be necessary in the summer months to exceed our clerical ceiling, using the difference between our professional on-duty strength and ceiling to absorb clerical overages.

10. Tab E, Paragraph 9. We were also most interested in the IG comments concerning recruitment for the Career Training Program. We would be most interested in the conclusions drawn by the IG Inspection Team which is scheduled to do an OTR survey in the near future. In the meantime, we will continue to provide as precise guidelines as we can to our field recruiters on the profile of a prospective CT applicant. The closer we can get to the mark, the fewer applicant cases need be submitted.