



National Academy of Public Administration
Chartered by Congress

National Academy of Public Administration

The Intelligence Workforce for the 1990s:
A Review of Personnel and Compensation Systems
to Meet Current and Future Missions

VOLUME II

Panel Members

Philip A. Odeen, Chair

Julius W. Becton

James Colvard

Bobby R. Inman

Carol Laise

Fred Meuter, Jr.

William G. Miller

STAT

Officers of the National Academy

Joseph L. Fisher, Chairman of the Board

Astrid E. Merget, Vice Chairman

Ray Kline, President

Sheldon S. Cohen, Secretary

Anita Alpern, Treasurer

Academy Studies

Roger L. Sperry, Director

National Academy Panel on Intelligence Agency Personnel Systems

Philip A. Odeen, Chair

Honorable Julius W. Becton

James Colvard, Ph.D.

Admiral Bobby R. Inman

Honorable Carol Laise

Fred Meuter, Jr.

William G. Miller

Project Staff

Project Director
Frank A. Yeager, Deputy Project Director
Sammie Bear, Executive Assistant
John M. Clarke, Research Associate
Joseph W. Howe, Research Associate
Elaine L. Orr, Writer/Editor
Donald E. Smith, Research Associate
Winifred Steinbach, Secretary
John R. Wilson, Research Associate
James Y. Sweet, Research Associate

STAT

VOLUME TWO

Appendices

- A. Scope and Methodology
- B. Intelligence Agency Compensation Programs
- C. The Central Intelligence Agency Flexible Benefits Proposal
- D. Compensation Experiences of Some Other Organizations
- E. Agency Removal Authorities, Staff Reduction Policies and Outplacement Programs
- F. Agency Staffing Programs
- G. Impact of Personnel Security on Recruitment
- H. Agency Efforts to Create a Diverse Workforce
- I. Agency Training and Career Development Programs
- J. Summary of Employment-Related Restrictions on IC Personnel

List of Acronyms

ACTEDS	Army Civilian Training, Education and Development System
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CIARDS	CIA Retirement and Disability System
CIPMS	Civilian Intelligence Personnel Management System
CSRA	Civil Service Reform Act
CSRS	Civil Service Retirement System
CSS	Central Security Service
DCI	Director of Central Intelligence
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DIC	Defense Intelligence College
DISCAS	Defense Intelligence Special Career Automated System
DOD	Department of Defense
DOE	Department of Energy
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FCI	Foreign Counterintelligence
FEGLI	Federal Employees Group Life Insurance
FEHBP	Federal Employees Health Benefits Program
FERS	Federal Employees Retirement System
FES	Factor Evaluation System
FS	Foreign Service
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
GAO	General Accounting Office
GETA	Government Employees Training Act
GS	General Schedule
HPSCI	House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence
HRM	Human Resources Management
HUMINT	Human Intelligence
IC	Intelligence Community
ICDP	Individual Career Development Plan
ICS	Intelligence Community Staff
INR	Bureau of Intelligence and Research
MSPB	Merit Systems Protection Board
NCS	National Cryptologic School
NFIC	National Foreign Intelligence Committee
NFIP	National Foreign Intelligence Program
NSA	National Security Agency
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
OTE	Office of Training and Education (CIA)
PATCO	Professional/Administrative/Technical/Clerical/Other
RIF	Reduction in Force
SCI	Sensitive Compartmented Information
SSCI	Senate Select Committee on Intelligence
TPF&C	Towers, Perrin, Forster & Crosby
U.S.C.	United States Code

APPENDIX A

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

In the fiscal year 1988 Intelligence Authorization Act (Title VII, Section 701), the Congress directed that the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) perform a comprehensive review and comparative analysis of the civilian personnel management and compensation systems of the Intelligence Community (IC). The study, to be completed by January 20, 1989, was to include two interim reports, due May 1 and August 1, 1988. To meet this mandate, the IC Staff contracted with NAPA, using funds the Congress earmarked for this purpose.

The Congress directed the Academy panel to recommend changes, if warranted, in legislative, regulatory, or other areas in the personnel and/or compensation programs to improve the effectiveness of the personnel systems of the IC agencies and to ensure they are able to accomplish their missions in the years ahead.

To undertake this work, NAPA created a panel of experienced executives, drawing them from among its membership and the broader community of current and retired public and private sector individuals. Panel members, whose brief bio statements appear at the end of Volume I of this report, are:

Philip A. Odeen, Chair
Regional Managing Partner
Coopers and Lybrand

Hon. Julius W. Becton
Director
Federal Emergency Management Agency

Dr. James Colvard
Assistant Director for Tactical Systems
Applied Physics Lab, Johns Hopkins University

Admiral Bobby R. Inman
Chairman and CEO
Westmark Systems, Inc.

Hon. Carol Laise
Ambassador, Retired

Fred Meuter
Manager, Executive Compensation
Xerox Corporation

William G. Miller
President
American Committee on U.S.-Soviet Relations

Secret

SECRET

The panel was assisted by a staff whose experience included executive and legislative branch and intelligence agency positions. Project Director was [redacted] former Deputy Director for Administration of the Central Intelligence Agency and currently Director of Federal Programs at the National Academy. 25X1

To assist the panel, the IC established a Study Steering Group (SSG) to coordinate NAPA information requests and provide assistance in obtaining individual agency data or Community-wide responses. Composed of senior personnel staff from each intelligence agency, the members -- individually and as a group -- played a key role in facilitating the work of this study. The IC's Office of Planning and Policy was a focal point on these efforts.

In preparing its study design, the NAPA panel reviewed the requirements stated in the Authorization Act. These required that the panel:

- Examine the need for major change in the existing IC personnel systems given the strategic trends in the intelligence function and the economic, social, and demographic trends in U.S. society.
- Examine these personnel systems to ascertain if they will be adequate to attract and retain the highest quality personnel through the 1990s.
- Analyze personnel issues facing the IC that may differ greatly from those facing the federal government in general.
- Compare the personnel needs and requirements facing the individual IC agencies, with due regard for the differing missions, risks, job requirements and environments of the organizations in the Community.

After further refining the subjects it would address, the seven-member NAPA panel, assisted by its project staff, reviewed issues which encompass:

- How anticipated changes in the U.S. workforce will affect intelligence agencies.
- The impact of future intelligence requirements on human resource management systems, and how these systems might be organized to meet changing needs.

Secret

- Different levels of compensation within the intelligence agencies and how they compare to the rest of the federal government and the private sector.
- Recruitment and retention , especially as they relate to critical skill occupations, and whether personnel security requirements adversely affect agencies' ability to get quality staff.
- How well the agency career development and training programs support current and future mission accomplishment.
- Efforts the agencies have undertaken to make their workforces more representative of all groups within the U.S. population, and whether current levels of effort will enable the agencies to continue to diversify their workforces.

In addition, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence requested that NAPA review IC personnel costs and make appropriate recommendations on ways to constrain these costs without adversely affecting intelligence missions.

At the outset, the IC Staff, working with the SSG, developed the broad terms of reference for the study, which became part of the contract work statement. (See Attachment A to this Appendix.)

Early Data Gathering

NAPA requested background material from each agency on their:

- Organization, mission and structure.
- Personnel authorities and internal organization.
- Recent requests for statutory or regulatory change, whether obtained or not.
- Experience in recruiting and retaining people with critical skills.
- Personnel policies and practices.
- Anticipated future workforce issues.
- Competition among IC agencies in personnel programs.
- Other major issues/problems in personnel programs.
- Agency views on Terms of Reference issues.

Secret

After reviewing the data supplied by the intelligence agencies, NAPA staff met with the SSG, at their suggestion, for an intensive two-day series of briefings on these topics. The sessions provided extensive familiarization in a compressed period, and permitted the NAPA staff and the IC personnel to have a very useful give-and-take.

Structuring the Work Approach

Using this information as a base, the NAPA staff interviewed intelligence agency officials and prepared a summary of each agency's personnel authorities, practices and major issues. Acting on behalf of the panel, NAPA project staff also reviewed working papers of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, which had itself conducted a review of IC agency human resource policies. Because the Iran-Contra hearings arose just as the committee staff members were preparing the SSCI report, it was not finalized. The Committee decided to wait until it reviews the NAPA report before preparing a final report -- and it may not do so at all.

At its April 1 meeting, the panel reviewed all of this material and devised the workplan which served as the framework for most of the analysis. Also at its April 1 meeting, the panel met with the Senior Policy Management Group, which was established to provide top-level input, should the panel desire it. These senior representatives and staff of the House and Senate intelligence committees joined the panel in a policy-level discussion of major HRM issues facing the Intelligence Community.

The nine areas the panel selected for primary focus were:

- Intelligence Community uniqueness
- Future mission of IC agencies
- Workforce of the future
- Creating a more diverse workforce
- Staffing
- Training and career development
- Personnel security
- Compensation and benefits
- Organizational issues

Secret

The panel requested and the intelligence agencies supplied detailed information in each of these areas. The panel requested a great deal of trend data, particularly because the 1980s were a period of major staff growth for most agencies in the IC. Thus, much of the panel's analysis was based on intra- and inter-agency comparisons.

Having made its basic decisions as to scope of work and methodology for undertaking it, the panel reported this to the Congress in its first interim report, delivered through the DCI on May 1, 1988.

Preparing the Analysis

For each of the nine areas addressed, the staff developed for the panel a series of analyses of major issues within them. Each analysis addressed: current status, reason for the condition, impact of the situation, and draft conclusions/recommendations. The detailed papers which resulted from these analyses are included as Volume II of this report.

The panel met July 12 to review the analyses for future mission, workforce of the future, IC agency uniqueness, staffing, training and career development and personnel security. Based on the panel's decisions at that meeting, staff prepared for panel review the second interim report to Congress.

The panel carefully considered how to approach the complex area of compensation and benefits. At its July meeting, the panel approved dividing this work into three areas: comparative analysis of agency compensation policies and practices; review of private sector compensation systems; and study of specific NSA and CIA proposals. At its September 30 meeting, the panel reviewed the detailed analyses in these areas, and specifically recommended that the CIA be permitted to proceed with its proposal for a flexible benefits plan. The agency did not need statutory approval to pursue this, and the panel saw no reason for the CIA to delay implementation until the panel issued its final report.

Also at the September meeting, the panel reviewed material it had specifically asked be developed on agency separation and outplacement programs, and the ability of intelligence agencies to hire retired military personnel for work for which expertise could only be acquired through military service. The panel also determined its position on which of several organizational alternatives it believed would enable the Intelligence Community to better coordinate human resource change proposals.

Secret

Based on these issue analyses, the panel developed its recommendations, as reflected in Volume I of the final report.

Quality Assurance through Product Review

As it prepared all staff papers and report drafts, NAPA sought comments from the IC Study Steering Group. This input, never designed to persuade the panel to alter its judgment, ensured accurate interpretation of information and helped the panel frame its products in a manner that would make them more usable decision-making tools.

Each panel member also individually reviewed the interim and final reports. For the final report, the panel met October 31, 1988 to discuss members' reactions at length. Based on this feedback, the NAPA project staff refined the final report, which was again reviewed by all panel members.

The final report draft was also reviewed by NAPA's Director of Academy Studies, who performs a quality assurance review of all products.

Secret

- 6 -

Page Denied

Next 172 Page(s) In Document Denied