

Peter F. Romero

Ambassador (retired), American Academy of Diplomacy and the podcast American Diplomat

House Committee on Foreign Affairs

Wednesday, June 17, 2020, "Diversity and Diplomacy: Why an inclusive State Department Would Strengthen US Foreign Policy"

I wish to thank Chairman Joaquin Castro and Ranking Member Lee Zeldin for the opportunity to speak to diversity in the State Department and why it matters. At the outset, I must take note of the dramatic events happening outside this hearing as America grapples with social justice and institutional violence towards our African American brothers and sisters. At the same time, the politics of resentment is complicating our ability to come together as we must, as one nation. Certainly, our luster as a beacon of freedom and justice has been tarnished, but it is foolhardy and irresponsible to rail at our adversaries for taking advantage of our current tumult and weakness. This is what adversaries do. At this crucial inflection point in our history we must look deeply into the soul of the country and commit to fixing institutional biases, whether they are on the streets of our cities and towns or in the offices of the State Department and our missions overseas.

So why does diversity matter within the ranks of our career Foreign Service practitioners? Our diplomats must represent the diverse composition of our nation. Our power to influence flows from who we are. America has led the way since 1941 not only because of our military might or our policy choices and actions (thank God), but because of who we are. We are a nation composed of pieces of every other country in the world. The rest of the globe has looked on with awe and envy at our diversity and commitment to freedom and equal opportunity for all Americans. It is the American model which not only inspires, but has provided me and others with the ability to walk into a foreign authoritarian's office and demand the release of unjustly imprisoned Americans or people tortured simply for exercising their rights. Even in the face of the current domestic turmoil our national commitment, "to form a more perfect union" shows our enemies and friends that the US is not done yet.

Morale at the State Department is at a low-ebb. One sees more slouch than swagger. Just as in the US writ large, bias, discrimination and a callousness to staff have plagued the department since its inception. It has worsened in the current administration. However, as is evident from the GAO report the Department has made considerable effort to diversify. Regrettably, the appointment of secretaries Albright, Powell, Rice and Clinton have not had the deep and sustained influence on diversity and inclusion that all had hoped. I was an Assistant Secretary in the Department when, with much fanfare, the Rangel, Paine and Pickering Fellowships were created. After almost 20 years, these programs have not succeeded in promoting diversity into the senior ranks. I will not repeat the data here since Mr. Bair has addressed himself to these dismal numbers.

In 1977 when I took the Oral Exam for the Foreign Service, one of my examiners told me, "you passed". Then thinking he was offering me a compliment added, "for an Hispanic, you write well". In conversations with diversity Fellows, some of whom have resigned, one gets the sense that while not said out loud, this kind of stereotypical bias persists in middle management. This is a failure of leadership among too many officers at the mid-ranks and a Department that does not demand greater accountability.

Without dwelling on these leadership shortcomings to diversity and inclusion, let me focus on some recommendations. The Department in word AND deed should:

--make mid-level officers accountable for developing ALL those supervised. Beyond leadership training, supervisors, in conjunction with their rating and reviewing officers, should be required to set specific diversity and inclusion goals for themselves and be evaluated yearly on how well they were achieved.

--create a diversity and inclusion "scorecard" that measures the success of supervisors in the recruitment, retention, promotion and professional development of those they manage. Bonus pay should be given to those with high-rankings on the scorecard.

--make it mandatory that Rating and Reviewing Officers of the supervisor reach out to all (or at least a good representative sampling) of her/his employees (360-degree assessments, employee satisfaction responses) in evaluating performance and counseling the supervisor as needed.

--raise inclusive and effective leadership to the highest level of core competency for supervising officers and make it an absolute requirement in the precepts for promotion (at FS-2 and above).

--more thoroughly utilize the representatives of the 14 Employee Affinity Groups (EAGs) in formulating promotion precepts, volunteering for the panels and as a sounding board for future initiatives on diversity and inclusion of minorities and women, particularly in and into the senior ranks.

--select out those officers who show an abusive pattern towards staff, regardless of any other personal qualities, influence or achievements.

--develop and implement an adequate system to determine why officers resign (exit surveys). Too many racial and, ethnic minorities and women have resigned in the early and mid-ranks. There has not been even a minimum of follow up to determine the reasons, let alone systemic patterns that must be addressed.

With respect to this last recommendation, a consistent complaint of our minority officers is that their suggestions for new policy initiatives, tweaking those that exist or reforms to procedures is often met with silence or demeaning response by supervisors... "You're an FS-3. You need to just listen". This dismissiveness is fairly common at State. It certainly was when I was going up through the ranks. Yes, Millennials are impatient and cite the private sector as more welcoming to new ideas. They want to make a difference...now. This spirit should be nurtured, not shot down. Every challenge that our country now faces begs for new approaches and novel ways of dealing with them. These will come from them, not from we grey hairs. Now, more than ever, the Department must cultivate and prize novelty.

The Civil Service accounts for almost half of the employees at State. Distinct from the Foreign Service, in the Civil Service your rank is tied to the grade designation of the job you occupy. A sharply narrowing pyramid as you rise in the Civil Service at State and opportunities based on retirement and lifespan actuarial tables, make opportunities for upward mobility infrequent at best, but somewhat better than winning the lottery. Diversity officers, as well as other civil service employees have chronically complained about the absence of opportunities as overseas postings go unfilled. The American Academy of Diplomacy has recommended an "Excepted Service" pilot program. Its participants would be given rank-in-person, not tied to a particular job, similar to the Foreign Service system. Promotion standards would be re-designed to reward high performers and select out chronic under performers. Those opting for the

Excepted Service would be expected to accept rotational assignments throughout the bureaus of the Department to include overseas postings. Promotion would be squarely based on the responsibilities undertaken by the officer and how well she/he performed. Leadership training and accountability standards would be given to GS-11 and above.

A passing note on the Pickering, Rangel and Payne Fellowship programs, designed to bring in more diversity at the intake level. These have worked. I know after having been part of the rigorous screening that goes into selecting these Fellows. We are bringing in just the right kinds and mix of people to represent our country in the 21st century. However, it may be the case that the Fellows accepted into the programs as undergraduates cannot compete effectively with their older, non-Fellow cohort. The Fellow comes into the Foreign Service after finishing graduate school at about the age of 24. This means that the State Department will be their only professional employment that they know. Conversely, the average age of the incoming class is 33 years old, even with the average weighted younger due to the presence of these Fellows in these incoming classes, the non-Fellow incoming officers routinely have 10-15 years of additional work experience, learning the culture of large organizations and better managing their careers within a large bureaucracy. Excursion tours in the private sector and more liberal use of Leave Without Pay might give these young officers the experience and seasoning to better compete with the older cohort to get to the senior ranks.

Beyond the moral imperative to better diversify State, there are several compelling comparative advantages to doing so now. It would give us greater cultural and linguistic competencies, arm us with critical empathy and understanding...all critical tools to influence friend and foe alike, provide us with more informed decision-making capabilities and gain the support of ALL Americans for our men and women that hazard political and physical threats to carry them out.

I would like to close by mentioning the passing last week of one of the stars of the Foreign Service. Ambassador Simon Henshaw was found in his residence, apparently the victim of a heart attack. This is a deep personal loss for all those that had the privilege of working with him. He was a true leader, mentor and friend. He will be truly missed.