

185. (3) As the Department does not appear to have made a consistently thorough study of FSO separations, nothing like a full record was available for examination by the project consultants. They were, however, able to see some documents which set forth reasons why certain FSOs had left the service and they found these documents illuminating.

186. (4) Several studies have been made in the past which have contained material that was relevant to this project. The Glassco Commission Report on the Department of External Affairs made some observations and recommendations on the subject of officer training which were examined. Mr. A. A. Day prepared two very useful memoranda in 1962 on new entry foreign service officer training. The Urwick, Currie Report of 1964 on Departmental administration also touched on the subject a number of times. Some briefer references to the requirements for training were also contained in the Eatock Report on Departmental organization rendered in 1966. Because of the extent of these previous studies many of the ideas and proposals contained in the current project are not new. The project officers gratefully acknowledge their extensive debt to these earlier studies.

187. (5) The rating forms regularly completed on foreign service officers up to the FSO 5 level did not turn out to be as useful a resource as we had hoped in terms of identifying training needs. As they are now designed, these forms tend to elicit a great deal more comment from supervisors on personal characteristics than they do upon work performance. Until the appraisal forms are keyed more closely to particular job requirements and until officers are rated more in the light of these requirements, the rating reports will not be as much use as they might be as a means of determining training