

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Deaver, Michael
Folder Title: Wick, Charles Z. (correspondence)
(2)
Box: 60

To see more digitized collections
visit: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name DEAVER, MICHAEL: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 8/30/2011

File Folder WICK, CHARLES Z. (CORRESPONDENCE) (2)

FOIA

F97-0066/19

Box Number 62

COHEN, D

186

DOC NO	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
1	LETTER	WICK TO DEAVER (PP. 5-6 CLOSED IN WHOLE, PAGE 7 IN PART)	3	2/23/1984	B6
2	LIST	RE MEETINGS AND REVIEW SESSIONS ATTENDED	3	ND	B6 B7(C) B7(D)

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]



file

February 23, 1984

Dear Mike:

The question of an Agency maintained "blacklist" has been very much an issue in the press in recent days. I am enclosing my response to a number of the most frequently raised questions regarding this, which I hope will prove helpful to you. I would only reiterate that I knew nothing about this list, that I was appalled to learn that such a list was being maintained, and that the practice has been stopped. I am particularly concerned about any possibility that this may have damaged our American Participants (AmParts) Program.

With your indulgence, I would like to initially provide some background on the USIA management-directed inspection of the AmParts program which caused the "blacklisting" practice to be disclosed before the press awareness.

Last summer, in response to a draft GAO report on USIA's Office of Inspections and Audits, I took a number of steps to strengthen those functions. The most significant of these were (1) the appointment of an INSPECTOR GENERAL and (2) the formation of the AGENCY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE.

The AGENCY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE was established to bring top management attention to issues raised by the inspection and audit functions. Its members are the General Counsel, the Associate Director for Management, and the Director for European Affairs. It is chaired by Mark Everson of my office. He is a CPA and had over six years of audit experience with Arthur Andersen & Co. before joining the Agency in 1982. Mr. Everson serves as USIA Assistant Director for Management Policy and Coordination.

After establishing procedures for overseas inspections, last fall the AGENCY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE asked the Office of Inspections to develop a list of domestic program elements for possible inspection. This was based on my request that our inspections, historically limited generally to overseas operations, be expanded in scope to include programmatic examinations of domestic Agency elements.

The Honorable
Michael K. Deaver
Assistant to the President
and Deputy Chief of Staff
The White House

The AGENCY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, after consultation with Deputy Director Designate Leslie Lenkowsky in the fall of 1983, requested that the first domestic inspection for fiscal year 1984 be the AmParts Program. This reflected his judgment, based on discussions with me, that we wished to review and strengthen the AmParts Program.

As its ninth meeting since formation, on November 22, 1983 the AGENCY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE formally authorized the inspection of the AmParts Program. See item 3 of the attached minutes of the November 22 meeting authorizing the inspection at (TAB C). In accordance with procedures established by the AGENCY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, the Office of Inspections conducted a pre-inspection study in December in order to identify precise precepts for the inspection. The prospectus for the inspection was submitted to the AGENCY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE on January 6, 1984 (See TAB D). The selection process for AmParts was specifically included within the parameters of the inspection.

The inspection of the Office of Program Coordination and Development began as scheduled on January 17, 1984. The "blacklist" came to the Inspector's attention during the first week of the inspection. The inspectors have stated, "we did not report the problem to the Director because we were persuaded at the time that program management was in the process of solving it" (See Tab E).

The inspection is not yet completed, but I have attached an interim status report covering the work to date (See TAB F). The Chief Inspector has been recalled from an inspection in Brazil to accelerate the AmParts inspection.

I will of course keep you fully informed of the status and results of the inspection, which is expected to be completed in March.

One of the unfortunate aspects of the press accounts surrounding this incident is that they have failed to disclose that the inspection, set in motion by my office, caused the disclosure of the "blacklists" practice.

As you may know, the American Participants Program (AmParts) exists to send U.S. speakers abroad to discuss a variety of topics with foreign audiences. Primarily, speakers are sent in response to requests from USIA posts overseas. The names of potential AmParts come from a variety of sources: posts may make specific requests, especially for spokespersons to explain the policies of the current Administration; individuals who plan private travel abroad may advise the Agency of their availability and qualifications; the names of potential speakers are recommended to the Agency by third parties, other experts in given fields, etc. I have from time to time myself suggested the names of potential speakers.

Starting in August 1981, a weekly list of potential AmParts was compiled within the Office of Program Coordination and Development. At the suggestion of the then Deputy Director of the Agency, the list of potential AmPart nominees was then reviewed by the management of the Bureau of Programs and sent to the Deputy Director, Counselor and four Associate Directors of the Agency. Any of these individuals had an opportunity to comment to the Associate Director for Programs on prospective AmParts. This review process did not extend to my office.

The total number approved through this process as potential AmParts was 4,896; since August 1981, 84 AmPart nominees were suggested for deletion from the weekly selection lists. Individuals rejected as potential AmParts usually were rejected without any reason being stated to the Office of Program Coordination and Development. Some may have been rejected for political reasons; others were dropped for such reasons as they were likely to be unavailable (such as journalists prohibited by their news organizations from speaking for the government, see page 6, point e), were thought to be poor speakers, or were deemed inexpert in their proposed fields. Sometime after the process of circulating the review list of AmParts began, officials in the Office of Program Coordination and Development began keeping a separate, unsanctioned list of those who had been rejected for whatever reason in order to avoid renominating such individuals automatically. This list was regarded as a working tool and it has since become called a "blacklist."

With regard to the specific questions raised recently:

1. WHY WAS THE LIST DEVELOPED?

Officials within the Office of Program Coordination and Development believed that individuals whose names had been eliminated from consideration at a specific time were not to be submitted in the future. I have been told by the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination that, in fact, when officials in the office challenged candidates previously rejected, generally the challenge was sustained and the individuals were then approved.

2. WHO COMPILED THE LIST?

A compilation of such names was made at the office director or deputy director level within the Office of Program Coordination and Development. The names listed were those rejected by the USIA Deputy Director, the four Associate Directors and the Counselor during the review process mentioned above. The list was closely held by the four program managers, the two Deputy Directors and the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination.

3. WHAT CRITERIA WERE USED TO PLACE INDIVIDUALS ON THE LIST?

Individuals rejected as potential AmParts by the USIA Deputy Director, Associate Directors or Counselor during the review process usually were rejected without any reason being stated to the Office of Coordination and Development. Some may have been rejected for political reasons; others were dropped for such reasons as they were likely to be unavailable, were thought to be poor speakers, or were deemed inexpert in their proposed fields.

4. HOW MANY USIA EMPLOYEES HAD ACCESS TO THE LIST?

Eight had access to the so-called "blacklist". The Director of the Office of Coordination and Development, two Deputy Directors, the four program managers, and a secretary.

5. WHO CONTROLLED DISTRIBUTION OF THE LIST THROUGHOUT USIA OFFICES AND DIVISIONS?

To my knowledge, the so-called "blacklist" was not distributed. It was held closely within the Office of Coordination and Development.

6. DID YOU TAKE PART IN ANY WAY IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND/OR UTILIZATION OF THE LIST?

No. I did not receive the weekly lists of potential AmParts and was unaware of the fact that a so-called "blacklist" of rejected names had been developed and maintained.

7. AT WHAT POINT IN YOUR TENURE AS USIA'S DIRECTOR DID YOU BECOME AWARE OF THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH A LIST?

I heard a report that such a "blacklist" might exist on Friday, January 27, 1984 just prior to my long-planned departure on January 29 for official business to Europe concerning NATO and Worldnet, USIA's new global television network. I told my Executive Assistant, Robert Earle, that if such a practice existed it should be discontinued immediately.

8. ONCE YOU BECAME AWARE OF THE LIST, WHAT DID YOU DO ABOUT IT?

I directed that the maintenance of the so-called "blacklist" be terminated as soon as the practice was confirmed to me the week of January 30, 1984. In discussions with Mark W. Everson, USIA Assistant Director for Management Policy and Coordination, I asked that a full accounting be made for the entire practice.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

DEAVER, MICHAEL: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 8/30/2011

File Folder

WICK, CHARLES Z. (CORRESPONDENCE) (2)

FOIA

F97-0066/19

COHEN, D

Box Number

62

186

DOC Document Type

NO Document Description

No of

pages

Doc Date

Restric-

tions

1 LETTER

3 2/23/1984 B6

WICK TO DEAVER (PP. 5-6 CLOSED IN WHOLE,
PAGE 7 IN PART)

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

b(6)



I, and members of my staff, of course stand ready to answer any and all further questions you may have.

In closing, I would like to repeat my own belief that the practice of "blacklisting" is repugnant, poor public policy and inconsistent with our democratic form of government.

Sincerely,

Charles Z. Wick
Director

<u>CANDIDATE</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>DATE</u>
Abramovitz, Morton	DF	8/25/82
Agee, Philip	DC	10/14/81
Albright, Madeline	DF	12/5/83
Baldwin, James	DC	1/29/82
Bender, Jerry	DF	REB 10/27/82
Blaier, Seweryn	DF	REK 9/19/83
Blacker, Coit Dennis	DF	
Bosworth, Barry	DE	3/30/83
Bradlee, Ben	DP	8/31/81
Bremont Mrs. (Pamela Sanders)	DC	11/20/81
Brinkley, David	DP	10/14/81
Brooks, Jack (D-Texas)	DF	10/7/81
Bundy, McGeorge	DF	8/4/83
Burger, Clair (R-Cal)	DF	10/7/81
Burton, Phil (D-Cal.)	DF	10/7/81
Calleo, David P.	DF	12/1/83
Cerrell, Joseph	DP	5/6/83
Chisholm, Shirley	DP	8/31/81
Chutkow, Paul	DP	11/4/81
Coffey, Joseph	DF	
Cooper, Richard	DE	6/24/83
Cronkite, Walter	DP	10/14/81
Cummings, Robert J.	DF	HOLD
Davis, James	DF	6/24/83
de Borchgrave, Arnaud	DP	8/25/81
Diamond, Sigmund	DP	6/24
Dillon, Dorothy	DF	HOLD
Dinerstein, Herbert S.	DF	12/1/83
Dominquez, Jorge	DF	12/10/82
Downey, Thomas	DF	12/23/82
Drew, Elizabeth	DP	11/4/81
Eldersveld, Samuel J.	DP	WST Call 8/12/82
Etzione, Amatai	DP	REB Verbal
Fagen, Richard R.	DP	1/6/83
Fallows, James	DP	10/14/81
Feinberg, Richard	DF	12/10/82
Feith, Douglas	DF	3/3/83
Fitzgerald, Frances	DC	9/22/82 REB
Friedan, Betty	DP	9/22/81
Gailbraith, John K.	DE	2/24/83
Garcia, Robert (D-New York)	DF	10/7/81
Gelpi, Alexander	DC	6/24/83
Gelpi, Barbara	DC	6/24/83
Ginsberg, Allen	DC	11/29/82
Glazer, Joseph	DP	1/20/82 GM
Gosho, John	DP	9/22/81
Grey, Robert R., Jr.	DF	FK 2/3/83
Harris, Fred	DF	12/16/82
Harris, Patricia	DP	1/12/83
Hart, Gary (D-Col)	DP	10/7/81
Haviland, H. Field	DF	FK 2/3/83
Hermann, Charles	DF	HOLD
Jaramillo, Mari-Luci	DP	12/15/81
Johnson, Peter	DF	HOLD
Kaplan, Stephen	DF	3/9/82

<u>CANDIDATE</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>DATE</u>
King, Coretta	DP	REB
Kutler, Stanley I.	DP	6/24
Lacayo, Hank	DP	5/6/83
Lindblom, Charles E.	DE	11/4/81
Lofstrom, William	DF	6/24 OK 7/18/83
Lowenthal, Abe	DF	4/8/82
MacDonald, Bruce	DF	9/25/81
Mason, Bruce	DP	11/23/83
Mastny, Vocjeh	DF	8/31/81
Miller, William	DP	WST Memo 7/7/82
Mohammed, Imam Wardith	DP	6/24 OK 7/18/83
Momaday, Scott	DC	3/11/82
Nader, Ralph	DP	2/5/82
Neal, Fred	DP	9/22/81
Needler, Martin	DF	
Norman, Joy Y.	DE	6/24/83
Norman, Mark A.	DE	6/24/83
Nosenzo, Louis	DF	8/25/82
Prager, Karsten	DP	9/11/81
Ravenel, Earl	DF	12/5/83
Reedy, George	DP	10/14/81
Remick, H.	DP	11/23/83
Samueison, Paul	DE	8/31/81
Schlesinger, James R.	DE	11/13/81
Scranton, William	DP	HOLD Counselor
Seymour, Jennifer	DF	HOLD
Stiehm, Judith Hicks	DP	10/28/81
Thornton, Thomas Perry	DF	8/16/83
Thurow, Lester	DE	REB to HH 10/6/8
Turner, Stansfield	DF	10/22/81
Ullman, Al	DE	10/14/81
Valdez, Abelardo	DE	9/11/81
Weitz, Margaret Collins	DF	10/7/81
Whitaker, Ms.	DF	HOLD
Wicker, Tom	DP	8/31/81
Wilson, Ernie	DF	HOLD
Wolins, Sheldon	DP	5/18/83
Wolpert, Stanley	DP	WST Memo 7/13/82
Wzrinsky, Greg	DF	10/7/81



February 16, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Associate Directors
Area Directors
General Counsel
Director - Public Liaison
Director - Television

FROM:

D - Charles Z. Wick *CZW*

Last summer, in response to a draft GAO report on USIA's Office of Inspections and Audits, I took a number of steps to strengthen those functions. The most significant of these were the appointment of an Inspector General and the formation of the Agency Oversight Committee.

As you all know, the Agency Oversight Committee was established to bring more top management attention to issues raised by the inspections and audit functions. Its members include the General Counsel, the Associate Director for Management, and the Director for European Affairs. It is chaired by Mark Everson of my office, Assistant Director for Management Policy and Coordination.

After establishing procedures for overseas inspections, last fall the Agency Oversight Committee asked the Office of Inspections to develop a list of domestic program elements for possible inspection. This was based on my request that our inspections, historically limited generally to overseas operations, be expanded in scope to include domestic elements of the Agency.

The Agency Oversight Committee, after consultation with Deputy Director Designate Leslie Lenkowsky, requested that the first domestic inspection for fiscal year 1984 include the AmParts Program. This reflected his judgment, based on discussions with me, that we wished to review and strengthen the AmParts Program. This was also prior to the discovery of the unsanctioned so-called "blacklist" in the Office of Program Development and Coordination, in January, 1984.

On November 22, 1983, the Agency Oversight Committee formally authorized the inspection. In accordance with procedures established by the Agency Oversight Committee, the Office of Inspections conducted a pre-inspection study in December in

order to identify precise precepts for the inspection. The prospectus for the inspection was submitted to the Agency Oversight Committee on January 6, 1984. The selection process for AmParts as it serves the needs of the field was specifically included within the parameters of the inspection.

The inspection of the Office of Program Development and Coordination began as scheduled on January 17, 1984. The unsanctioned so-called "blacklist" was discovered by this inspection during the first week of the inspection. As you know, I have directed that the maintenance of that list be stopped. It is also my instruction that no such list should be maintained anywhere in the Agency.

Members of Congress have inquired as to whether the Agency does or did in fact keep any other "blacklists" (beyond the one in the Office of Program Development and Coordination) which it uses or used to prevent Americans from participating in other agency-sponsored programs.

I have responded that to my knowledge, no other "blacklists" are being kept.

Please let me know right away if you are aware of anything within your official purview or otherwise pointing to any other "blacklist" now or in the past. I would appreciate your reviewing this issue with your managerial staffs as well.

All of us have a public trust to report questionable practices or activities whenever they arise. My office will review any issue of concern, and of course the Inspector General's role is to address such issues in depth. This is a major feature of our commitment to a well-managed Agency.

I am sure we all agree that a "blacklist" is repugnant to the very foundation of our democracy.



November 29, 1983

Minutes of the Agency Oversight Committee Meeting
November 22, 1983

1. AOC membership and procedures: Mark Everson is to chair future meetings of the AOC and Mr. Lenkowsky will be represented by Mark Dillen, who will act as the secretary for the Committee. If questions arise that cannot be resolved through consensus, dissenting views will be noted along with the recommendation of the body to the Deputy Director and the Director.

2. Office of Inspections:

Proposed change of procedures in inspection reports: Mr. Everson recommended an amendment to the procedures approved on September 28 to include post/element comments in the actual inspection reports. The procedure, as Mr. Everson outlined, would be for the draft summary of the inspection report to be sent or given to the post/element with a provision that the post/element has fifteen days to register a reply or to comment to the inspection summary draft. The comments shall be recorded in the final report unless, by mutual agreement, the summary references are changed to make the post comments or replies unnecessary. If there is a personnel issue involved in the inspectors draft summary, M/P will receive a copy of the summary. In the case of a field post inspection, the appropriate geographical area may also comment on the findings of the inspection. The intent of this procedural change is to give the post or element the opportunity to give a reaction on paper to the findings of the inspection report.

3. Domestic Inspections in FY 84: The approved list of domestic offices for inspection in FY 84 was reconsidered, with the suggestion that P/D* and M/PT be the first domestic units to be inspected. It was agreed that precepts for each inspection need to be developed at least two weeks before the inspection is undertaken. Mr. Winkler and Mr. Werbel are to work on domestic inspection precepts and will consult with Mr. Bridges also on this question.

* P/D is the Agency symbol for the Office of
Program Development and Coordinate

mwr 2/15/84

4. Inspector General: The AOC reviewed the proposed delegation of authority for the Inspector General and approved it. Once this delegation has been approved by the Director and announced, Mr. Bridges will move forward in implementing its various provisions, in particular Mr. Bridges will look at the staffing pattern required for the Office of the Inspector General and arrange for the hiring of professional auditors as specified in the FY 84 authorization bill. Mr. Bridges described the steps that need to be taken to put his office into action and said that he would like to post a description of the office by December 12. He said that he needs to establish a type of information system with Agency elements and one of the first announcements that he intends to circulate relates to "whistle blowing." Finally, it was agreed that there should be no dotted line on the Agency organizational chart connecting the IG and Office of Inspections to Management.

Distribution:

DD - Mr. Lenkowsky
C - Mr. Hedges
D - Mr. Everson
M - Mr. Kingman
M - Mr. Werbel
M/I - Mr. Winkler
IG - Mr. Bridges

Approved 

January 6, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR Agency Oversight Committee
D - Mr. Everson ✓
M - Mr. Kingman
GC - Mr. Harvey
EU - Mr. Courtney
D - Mr. Dillon

FROM: IO - Gordon Winkler *GW*

SUBJECT: Precepts for Domestic Inspections

Attached is a revised draft of the precepts for domestic inspections. This has been worked out with Mr. Kingman and Mr. Werbel. Also attached are precepts for the inspection of P/D.* Preliminary meetings are now being completed for this inspection. The inspection will begin January 17.

* P/D is the Agency symbol for the Office of
Program Development and Coordination

MLP 2/16/84

PRECEPTS FOR USIA DOMESTIC INSPECTIONS

The following precepts serve several purposes. They provide a common framework of analysis for domestic inspections. They establish uniform benchmarks, for both inspectors and Agency managers, for reviewing the performance of Washington units. They also serve as a point of departure for the more specific questions and issues to be raised in inspecting a given domestic unit or program.

These precepts define the basic focus for inspectors in reporting to the Agency Director on domestic operations: effectiveness in support of Agency objectives and field needs. Inspectors will evaluate management and operational questions from this perspective, with particular attention to issues that have emerged from field inspections.

Inspectors will not normally evaluate options for future action, pending decision by Agency management, unless expressly asked to do so by the Agency Director, nor will they prescribe specific organizational solutions to the problems they find. Instead, they will report their findings and recommendations for further action to the appropriate Agency unit.

Because of the wide variety of domestic operations, the process of domestic inspections will begin with two to three weeks of preliminary interviews. Based on this, the inspectors will produce a prospectus of inspection issues and methods for the specific unit or program to be inspected. Such precepts will normally fall within the general framework described below. If specialized skills or other resources are needed for a given inspection (e.g. consultants or information from the field), they will be identified at this point.

The inspectors will seek to determine:

1) How effectively the unit is achieving desired results in support of the Agency's mission.

Inspectors will accept unit objectives as defined by Agency management as a given and measure performance primarily against those objectives. Inspectors will evaluate domestic units' achievement of such objectives with particular emphasis on issues identified in field inspections. At the same time, inspectors will be free to comment on the substance of these objectives when it appears that modification should be considered. In this connection, inspectors will review:

- Whether unit leadership has a realistic strategy for implementing objectives, including specific goals and timetables;
- Whether the strategy is clearly understood by subordinate managers and staff members, as well as by senior officers outside the element, both in Washington and at field posts, as appropriate;
- Whether the unit has a workable method for evaluating progress towards objectives and for making changes in direction, when necessary;
- Whether the results actually achieved are adequate in terms of stated objectives and whether the work actually performed justifies the investment of Agency resources;
- Whether, in the case of units engaged directly in the communication process or in support of it, the products or services provided by that unit support Agency regional and global objectives and play an appropriate role in an international communications mix.

2) How well the unit is managed to accomplish its objectives and maintain or improve its effectiveness over time.

Inspectors will review the internal allocation and use of a unit's personnel, funds and other resources to determine whether the unit is managed effectively and efficiently to accomplish its stated objectives. Recognizing the constraints imposed on domestic managers, this review will focus on:

- Whether managers have established clear priorities for allocating their resources, including their own time and effort, and have developed realistic plans for implementing those priorities;
- Whether the unit's complement is appropriate to its objectives and its staff has the knowledge and experience to accomplish its objectives;
- Whether allotted funds are utilized to achieve desired results at least reasonable cost;
- Whether managers have thoughtfully evaluated alternative means of accomplishing objectives and made changes in operations when appropriate.
- Whether the unit successfully coordinates activities with other units in the Agency and with other organizations, including appropriate private-sector organizations.

Inspectors will ascertain the quality of internal communications and policy guidance as well as communications with and guidance to outside contractors and grantees. Unit management's leadership qualities will be reviewed to determine whether they result in maximum return on personnel capabilities.

3) The quality of unit personnel.

While inspectors will not normally comment in detail on the performance of individual staff members, they will note especially good performance of an individual employee or group of employees as well as significant weaknesses. Positive comments on performance may be included in the inspection report itself or in a separate memorandum to the Director; adverse comments on performance will be documented outside the inspection report per se.

4) The quality of direction given to the unit by senior managers and the quality of support provided by other Agency offices.

PROSPECTUS
INSPECTION OF THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATION (P/D)

The Office of Inspections met during the past several weeks with a number of officers interested in the Amparts program, including the Deputy Director and the Deputy Associate Director of P. Based on these meetings and discussions of the Amparts program at field posts during the past several years, we have identified a number of basic issues and concerns about P/D operations that are shared by officers throughout the Agency.

These issues, listed below in the framework described in the inspection precepts, provide the basic direction for the P/D inspection. While it may not be possible to answer all such questions in the course of the inspection, they focus attention on the fundamental issue of the inspection: the effectiveness of P/D and the value of the Ampart program to the Agency's mission.

We anticipate the need to contact a sample of USIS posts to assess the quality of the Amparts program in the context of its implementation and the success of present methods in meeting field objectives. Inspection teams visiting eight posts (in EA, NEA and AR) concurrently with the P/D review will be asked to prepare papers for the P/D inspection team.

In light of prior domestic inspections, we also anticipate the possible need to include selected desk audits in the P/D inspection. For this purpose, we would request the services of a personnel specialist from M/P to work with the inspection team. We believe we may also need assistance from a systems specialist and, possibly, a management analyst to help evaluate present use of technology and organizational structure in P/D. We will make those requests if and when the need arises or recommend the attention of these special capabilities in our report.

issues

- 1) Effectiveness of P/D in achieving desired results:
 - What is the mandate and the function of the Office of Program Coordination and Development (P/D)? What are the office's goals (quantitative, qualitative)? Are those goals relevant to Agency and post objectives?
 - Are P/D objectives clearly understood by subordinate managers, area offices and field posts, as well as by other Agency offices with an interest in the Ampart program?
 - Do P/D procedures for identifying and responding to post needs produce results that adequately support Agency and post objectives (country plan proposals, themes and concerns, selection of speakers, etc):
 - * Do field posts provide adequate information on program strategy, audiences, goals and standards for P/D to identify and recruit effective Amparts?
 - * Do P/D standards for selecting Amparts assure that content and quality support agency and post goals?
 - * Are P/D and post procedures for briefing and other orientation for Amparts effective?

- How does P/D define the success of its efforts? How does it evaluate results against goals? Are field reports on Amparts sufficiently substantive to assist in this?
- Are the results of the Amparts program worth the investment of Agency resources in the program? Are there workable mechanisms for reviewing program results and reprogramming resources if needed (RMS; etc)?

2) Quality of P/D management:

- Does P/D have adequate resources (employment ceiling, funds and qualified staff) to successfully accomplish its objectives? Does it make effective use of consultants and contract employees?
- Does P/D have clear and reasonable priorities for accomplishing its objectives? Does it allocate staff time and funds accordingly? Are resources allocated sensibly in terms of subject, area, country and program method (Amparts, electronic dialogues, etc)?
- Is the P/D staff well motivated and is it using available time and skills effectively? Are procedures for managing the flow of information within P/D and between P/D and the field (including communications and paperwork) efficient and effective?

3) Quality of personnel:

- Does the P/D staff have the knowledge and experience required to accomplish all program objectives at an acceptable level of quality? Are the goals of P/D best served by the present balance of foreign service employees and domestic specialists in supervisory and subordinate positions? Does P/D have need of expertise now lacking on staff?
- Does the Agency's Office of Personnel adequately support P/D in recruiting, selecting and training staff members?

4) Coordination with other offices:

- What is the quality of P/D coordination with USIA area offices, other agencies that have an interest in the formulation and execution of foreign policy (State, AID, etc), and private-sector organizations that can make significant contributions to identifying Amparts and helping arrange their programs overseas?
- Is coordination between P/D and TV on video dialogues working well?

5) Quality of direction by senior managers/Quality of support by other Agency offices:

- Does P/D receive adequate guidance from P on policy and operations, including methods of operation?
- Does P/D coordinate its activities effectively with other offices in USIA that may deal with the same Americans in their programs or with the same audiences?

February 17, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: D - Mr. Everson
FROM: IO - James L. Culpepper *JK*
SUBJECT: Inspection of the Office of Program Development and
Coordination

The question has been raised why the inspectors did not inform the Director of the existence of a "black list" in the Office of Program Development and Coordination as soon as it came to our attention during the first week of the inspection.

When we initially discussed the list with the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination, we were assured that he and the Acting Director of Programs were deeply concerned about the list, and were considering corrective action. Shortly thereafter the list was abolished, and revisions made in the review process. We did not report the problem to the Director because we were persuaded at the time that program management was in the process of solving it. If we had not been so persuaded, we would have met with the Deputy Director, who has shown interest in the speaker program, and reported our findings to him. We did not anticipate the existence of the list being leaked to the media after the list was abolished.

February 17, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: D - Mr. Mark Everson
Chairman, Agency Oversight Committee

FROM: IO - James L. Culpepper *JL*

SUBJECT: Interim Inspection Report on Use of Review Lists in the
Office of Program Development and Coordination (P/D)

The inspection of the Office of Program Development and Coordination was begun on January 17, 1984. Included in the precepts or issues identified as basic to the direction of the inspection was the question of whether "Office of Program Development and Coordination standards for selecting Amparts assure that content and quality support agency and post goals?".

In the first week of the inspection, it came to our attention that it had been a long standing practice in the Office of Program Development and Coordination to prepare review lists of speakers being considered for USIS programs, which were forwarded to the Director of Programs, who then reviewed them and circulated them to other senior agency officers for any comments they might wish to make. If found wanting in one or another respect, either in terms of expertise, authority to speak on policy issues, or speaking ability, the candidate was rejected.

This practice has been in effect since shortly after the new Administration took office in 1981. It replaced a more ad hoc, informal review of the qualifications of proposed speakers by the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination and Acting Director of Programs, who were concerned that potential speakers contacted before the new administration took office were still appropriate to explicate its policies, and would satisfy criticism of posts that had complained about the quality of speakers sent them.

The system remained in force with slight modifications until the end of last year, when the new director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination began discussions with the Program Director on how it could be made less cumbersome and reduce delays in obtaining approval for program development officers to use speakers. These discussions also were stimulated by the new Deputy Director's interest in the Ampart program, and his expressed concern whether the agency was recruiting the best possible qualified speakers in their respective fields of expertise. In a meeting with the inspectors on February 3, the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination

said he was in the process of developing a new procedure that would eliminate circulation of the review list outside the Office of the Director of Programs. The new procedure was confirmed to posts by telegram on February 9, but not before the story of the "black list" had been published in the Atlanta Constitution on February 8.

The "black list" is a list of rejected speakers compiled by the management of the Office of Program Development and Coordination from the weekly review lists to make it easier to keep track of speakers judged unsuitable for programs. This practice, too, dates back almost as long as the review lists. The list was compiled and updated about every six months, and distributed to program managers for reference. Use of the "black list" was terminated by the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination and the Acting Director of Programs on January 30, as the result of their growing concern that the list might receive critical attention in the media and Congress, and reinforce suspicions that agency programs were being politicized. This action corrected a major deficiency in the management of the office initially noted by the inspectors.

A negative aftermath of this action has been a lingering discontent and resentment by the staff in the Office of Program Development and Coordination, who feel unjustly blamed in the media for developing the "black list", which they view as a result of the review system imposed on them. The inspector believes that a major cause for misunderstanding, suspicion of politicization, and lack of trust or being trusted among the staff has been the almost total lack of communication with them by higher agency management on the selection process. No reason has been given to program development officers for disapproval of names submitted for review, no discussion has taken place of the abilities of a proposed speaker related to the program in which he was to participate and the topics he was supposed to address, no clarification has been given whether a speaker was disqualified only for one program, or for all programs indefinitely. The common assumption has been that rejection was permanent. It is clear that staff morale will continue to be adversely affected unless management improves its dialogue with the people charged with carrying out the program.

The inspector has discussed the problem with the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination and the Acting Director of Programs, who recognize it as serious. The Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination is considering a weekly meeting with his program managers that will be devoted to discussing the pros and cons of speakers under consideration or already recruited for programming. Other means of communication with staff members also should be considered.

The Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination, the Acting Director of Programs, and the Deputy Director have agreed that another

area where action is required is creation of a computerized speaker data base that will assist both managers and staff in quickly identifying qualified speakers in various fields of expertise for possible recruitment. No such data bank or master speaker file now exists. The final inspection report will recommend that budget and personnel resources be allocated to remedy this deficiency. Both the Director of the Office of Program Development and Coordination and Acting Program Director have told the inspector that development of such data may make it possible to do away completely with the present review system by incorporating input from all agency elements that can contribute useful information for the selection process. It is the consensus of all agency directors and members of the Office of Program Development and Coordination interviewed by the inspector that a review system should have a positive, rather than negative objective, and should permit as much responsibility as possible to be placed where programs can be most effectively implemented, at the program development officer-program manager level.

It therefore is the tentative conclusion of the inspector that the management of the Office of Program Development and Coordination is taking positive steps to correct existing deficiencies, to amend the selection process so that a wider selection of qualified speakers will be considered, and to improve communication with staff members. It is expected that the inspection of all aspects of the Ampart program will be completed by the end of March, 1984.

Attached is a chronology of the conduct of the inspection and the discussions preceeding it. In addition to selection of Amparts, other issues covered by the inspection have been the effectiveness of the Office of Program Development and Coordination in achieving desired results, particularly it's support of post communication strategies; the quality of the program's management and the adequacy of its resources; the quality of the staff and its utilization; coordination with the area offices, TV, the library, and the international visitors program; and the quality of direction by senior agency managers. Meetings with managers and staff have been held on almost a daily basis. Speaker files, review lists, program support materials and pertinent agency memoranda also have been reviewed.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

DEAVER, MICHAEL: FILES

Withdrawer

KDB 8/30/2011

File Folder

WICK, CHARLES Z. (CORRESPONDENCE) (2)

FOIA

F97-0066/19

COHEN, D

Box Number

62

186

DOC Document Type

NO Document Description

No of Doc Date Restriction
pages

2	LIST	3	ND	B6
	RE MEETINGS AND REVIEW SESSIONS			B7(C)
	ATTENDED			B7(D)

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

**United States
Information
Agency**

Washington, D.C. 20547



February 16, 1984

MEMORANDUM TO: D - Mark Everson, Chairman
Agency Oversight Committee

FROM : IG - Jerry G. Bridges, Inspector General *JGB*

SUBJECT : Request for IG Investigation of the AMPARTs Program

At your request, I have explored whether my office should perform an investigation of the AMPARTs program and more specifically the so called 'blacklist'.

As you know, the Office of Inspection is now engaged in an inspection to independently evaluate the AMPARTs program. The Office of Inspection inspection, which started the week of January 17, and will be completed in March, is addressing the issues and circumstances surrounding the 'blacklist'. It is my view that, given its organizational independence and responsibility for reporting to the Director, Office of Inspections should have the sole responsibility for investigating the AMPARTs matters. Direct involvement of my office at this time would only distract and confuse the investigation in process as a part of the Office of Inspection's inspection.

The Office of Inspection staff has informed me that corrective actions are being implemented by the Bureau of Programs. The attached cable (USIA 07691) is the first step in that direction. Also, I am informed that a computerized master list of potential speakers is planned that will be indexed by subject matter and will be used as the source for selecting speakers in the future. This would be a positive step since the Agency would then have ready access to a larger pool of speakers in any given field. I am sure that the Office of Inspections interim report to the Director as well as their final report will include other actions taken or to be taken.

Under the circumstances, I do not plan to pursue an investigation. However, I will continue to monitor the progress of the ongoing inspection to satisfy myself that an independent and objective job is done.

Attachment

UNCLASSIFIED
UNITED STATES
INFORMATION AGENCY

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

550

PAGE 01

036310 NIA116

036310 NIA

09/22792

ORIGIN OFFICE D-03

INFO ACO-01 AF-05 AR-03 EA-03 NEA-03 EU-03 GC-02 /023 A1 16

DRAFTED BY D RLEARLE
APPROVED BY D LLENKOWSKY
AF JRCLINGERMAN
EU CECOURTNEY
EA RLMNEVITT
AR SFDACHI
NEA JTHURBER
GC THARVEY

O 092225Z FEB 84 ZFF-4

FM USIA WASHDC

TO ALL PRINCIPAL POSTS IMMEDIATE
RUEHNR/AMEMBASSY GABORONE IMMEDIATE
RUEHNB/AMEMBASSY NASSAU IMMEDIATE
RUEHPO/AMEMBASSY PARAMARIBO IMMEDIATE
RUEHVI/AMEMBASSY VIENNA/RPO IMMEDIATE
RUEHVI/AMEMBASSY VIENNA/REX IMMEDIATE
RUFNDU/AMCONSUL DUSSELDORF IMMEDIATE
RUFNOM/AMCONSUL FLORENCE IMMEDIATE
RUFNAM/AMCONSUL HAMBURG IMMEDIATE
RUDKRW/AMCONSUL KRAKOW IMMEDIATE
RUFNOML/AMCONSUL MILAN IMMEDIATE
RUFRRSH/AMCONSUL NAPLES IMMEDIATE
RUFNOM/AMCONSUL PALERMO IMMEDIATE
RUDKRW/AMCONSUL POZNAN IMMEDIATE
RUEHNU/AMCONSUL THESSALONIKI IMMEDIATE
RUEHON/AMCONSUL TORONTO IMMEDIATE
RUFNOM/AMCONSUL TRIESTE IMMEDIATE
RUEHVC/AMCONSUL VANCOUVER IMMEDIATE
RUDPRB/AMCONSUL ZAGREB IMMEDIATE
RUEHVA/AMEMBASSY SUVA IMMEDIATE
RUFNOM/AMCONSUL GENOA IMMEDIATE
RUEHNG/AMCONSUL JOHANNESBURG IMMEDIATE
RUEHNDU/AMCONSUL DURBAN IMMEDIATE
RUEHBE/AMEMBASSY BELIZE IMMEDIATE
RUHQHQA/USCINCPAC HONOLULU HI IMMEDIATE

BT

UNCLAS USIA #7691

USIA

FOR PAOS FROM ACTING DIRECTOR LENKOWSKY

EO 12356 N/A

1. THE WASHINGTON POST AND THE INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE CARRIED A STORY TODAY WHICH IN THE POST WAS HEADLINED "USIA BLACKLISTED LIBERALS FROM SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS ABROAD." YESTERDAY THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION CARRIED A STORY HEADLINED "NUMBER OF WELL-KNOWN AMERICANS REJECTED BY USIA FOR TALKS ABROAD."

2. FOR YOUR GUIDANCE ON AN IF-ASKED BASIS, THERE WAS AN UNSANCTIONED SO-CALLED BLACKLIST MAINTAINED IN THE AMPARTS PROGRAM FROM APPROXIMATELY AUGUST 1981 TO JANUARY 1984 CONTAINING 84 NAMES. WHEN THE EXISTENCE OF THIS UNSANCTIONED LIST WAS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE DIRECTOR AND THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR AT THE END OF LAST MONTH, THE DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR INSTRUCTED THAT MAINTENANCE OF THE LIST BE STOPPED IMMEDIATELY.

3. THE AMPARTS SELECTION PROCESS HAS BEEN CLARIFIED AS OUTLINED IN THE FOLLOWING MEMO FROM GIFFORD D. MALONE, ACTING ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR PROGRAMS TO DEPUTY DIRECTOR LENKOWSKY. (BEGIN TEXT) "FEBRUARY 1, 1984

IN THE PAST SEVERAL WEEKS, WITH YOUR HELP, WE HAVE BEEN REVIEWING THE AMPARTS PROGRAM TO ASSURE THAT THE INDIVIDUALS

SUGGESTED TO PARTICIPATE AS AMPARTS ARE OF THE HIGHEST QUALITY AND REPRESENT THE BROADEST POSSIBLE DIVERSITY, CONSISTENT WITH FULFILLING THE AGENCY'S MISSION TO PRESENT THE FACE OF AMERICA ABROAD. TO THAT END, I PROPOSE THAT HENCEFORTH THE AMPART SELECTION PROCESS BE AS FOLLOWS:

AMPART NOMINEES WILL BE SUBMITTED BY THE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS THROUGH THE PROGRAM MANAGERS, WHO MAY ADD NOMINEES SUBMITTED FROM OTHER SOURCES. THE PROGRAM MANAGERS WILL SUBMIT THESE TO THE DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT. THE DIRECTOR OF P/D WILL FORWARD THEM TO THE ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR PROGRAMS, WHO WILL, AS APPROPRIATE, CONSULT WITH OTHER MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. THE FACT THAT A PARTICULAR NOMINEE IS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR A GIVEN PROJECT DOES NOT MEAN THAT THIS INDIVIDUAL WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED FOR OTHER FUTURE PROGRAMS. THE CRITERIA FOR SELECTION WILL BE QUALITY, DIVERSITY, AND RESPONSIVENESS TO THE NEEDS OF THE FIELD." (END OF TEXT)

4. THE QUALITY OF THE AMPARTS PROGRAM HAS BEEN A SOURCE OF SOME CONCERN TO THE DIRECTOR AND THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR BEGINNING SEVERAL MONTHS AGO AND BASED IN PART ON COMPLAINTS ABOUT IT FROM THE FIELD. IN AN EFFORT TO INSURE THE QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF THE PROGRAM AND ENRICH ITS OFFERINGS TO THE FIELD, THE DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR INSTRUCTED THAT THE OFFICE OF INSPECTIONS CONDUCT AN INSPECTION OF THE AMPARTS PROGRAM. THIS INSPECTION HAS BEEN UNDERWAY FOR APPROXIMATELY ONE MONTH AND IS EXPECTED TO CONCLUDE LATER NEXT MONTH.

5. ANY QUERIES FROM THE PRESS WHICH CANNOT BE HANDLED WITH THE ABOVE GUIDANCE SHOULD BE REFERRED TO THE AGENCY IN A CABLE SLOGGED FOR YOUR AREA OFFICE, PL AND D. LENKOWSKY, ACTING

BT

07691