

The solution to such a problem should include:

- (a) The probationary period should be extended to five years.
- (b) The probationary period should be used, and those employees who do not show that they are suited to Foreign Service or whose competence does not otherwise prove up to standard should be forced to resign at the end of or during the understood probationary period.
- (c) Subsequently, if during the career of an employee, should it be shown that he or she is no longer producing efficiently, or proving unable to cope with living and working abroad, he or she should be asked to resign. (Such a "dismissal" for inefficiency clearly would have to include adequate warning and provide an appeal procedure.)

While these recommendations do not directly relate to preparation for retirement, indirectly they do. By weeding out conscientiously during the five year probationary period, and systematically from then on when efficiency falls below normal expectations, the number of times that an employee reaches retirement with an unsatisfactory record of service, and therefore almost certainly with a sense of grievance, will be sharply reduced.

If this breaking down of the traditional, almost iron-clad job security in the Department is somewhat radical, for that reason it should not be rejected. Already in the Armed Services, this principle is standard practice among officer ranks. Also, as reported in Section II, the State Department in Washington follows just such a system, which is not in force in other branches of the Civil Service. Surely, the benefits to be gained by the adoption of these principles would justify any temporary consternation.

R 25