United States General Accounting Office

GAO

Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service, Post Office and General Services, Committee on Governmental Affairs
United States Senate

July 1986

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

Agencies' Use of the Candidate Development Program

GAO

B-222957

July 14, 1986

The Honorable Ted Stevens
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service,
    Post Office and General Services
Committee on Governmental Affairs
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman

This report responds to your request that we examine the Senior Executive Service
Candidate Development Program (CDP)

Our letter to you of July 23, 1985, provided governmentwide data on the status of
candidates—how many had been selected, certified, and appointed to the Senior
Executive Service This report provides further analyses and details on these data.
It also discusses how agencies select candidates for CDP and utilize them after
certification and the results of our research into how the private sector prepares top
managers to be executives

As arranged with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we
plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days after its issuance. At that
time, we will send copies to the agencies that completed our questionnaire. Copies
will also be made available to other interested parties upon request.

Sincerely yours,

William J Anderson
Director

Executive Summary

In 1979, the Office of Personnel Management established the Candidate Development Program (CDP) to prepare top managers for the Senior Executive Service (SES). A 1984 GAO report on how five federal agencies operated CDP revealed that most of the candidates who participated in the program had not entered SES.

After the report was issued, the Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service, Post Office and General Services, Senate Governmental Affairs Committee, asked GAO to collect governmentwide information on the results of CDP.

Background

The basic purposes of CDP are to (1) identify highly competent individuals most likely to be appointed to SES and (2) further prepare them through individualized training and development activities.

Although agencies have a great deal of latitude in operating their programs, SES candidates in all agencies proceed through similar CDP stages After being competitively selected, candidates participate in executive development activities, including formal training and short-term developmental assignments. These activities are provided over a 1- to 3-year period. Candidates who successfully complete training and development are certified as being qualified to enter SES and stay in a certified pool until they are either appointed to SES or their certification expires Certification lasts from 3 to 5 years, depending on when the candidate entered the program After their certification expires, candidates must be recertified to receive an SES appointment (see pp 9 and 10)

Results in Brief

CDP has not served as the main source for filling the government's available SES positions During fiscal years 1982 to 1984, only 13 percent of the government's initial career SES appointments were granted to certified candidates. Despite this low utilization rate, however, most agencies favored continuing the program

Principal Findings and Analysis

During fiscal years 1982 to 1984, 87 percent of the individuals appointed into career positions had not participated in CDP (see p 12).

Agencies Have Not Fully Utilized CDP

GAO found that the number of candidates selected annually to participate in CDP has declined significantly since the early years of the program Moreover, only about 46 percent of the candidates who were certified to enter SES have been appointed to SES positions (see pp. 13 and 14)

About half of the certified candidates who had not received SES appointments were assigned to positions in their agencies with the same or less responsibility as the positions they held before entering CDP (see pp 14 and 15)

Most Agencies Favored CDP's Continuance

Although the large majority of SES appointments did not come from the CDP pool of certified candidates, most agencies favored continuing the program. Over half the agencies responding to a GAO questionnaire believed CDP should be continued. The remaining respondents were split between discontinuing CDP and having no opinion.

Nearly half the agencies believed that, in the aggregate, CDP's advantages were greater than its disadvantages, and an additional 25 percent believed that advantages and disadvantages balanced (see p. 16).

The Private Sector's Approach to Executive Development

Few private companies operate a formal program like CDP. Instead, the private sector emphasizes a long-term career development process to prepare those with high potential as replacements for incumbent executives. Such development begins with identifying these individuals early in their careers, often when they first become managers. Then, development is provided throughout the individuals' careers as they move up the management ladder Most development focuses on rotating to progressively challenging jobs every 1 to 3 years and on serving in collateral duties, such as membership on task forces (see p. 24).

Recommendations

Because GAO is further examining why so many SES appointments are not made from the certified candidate pool, GAO is making no recommendations.

Agency Comments

GAO did not request agency comments.

Contents

Tables

Abbreviations

ERB	Executive Resources Board
GAO	General Accounting Office
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
QRB	Qualifications Review Board

Introduction

The Senior Executive Service (SES) was created by Title IV of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-454, Oct. 13, 1978). It was established ". . .to ensure that the executive management of the government. .is responsive to the needs, policies, and goals of the Nation and otherwise is of the highest quality."

In creating SES, the act required the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to establish programs or require agencies to establish programs for the systematic development of SES candidates. To meet this mandate, OPM established the Candidate Development Program (CDP) in 1979 The purposes of this program, which individual agencies may operate under OPM guidance, were to (1) identify highly competent individuals most likely to be appointed to SES and (2) further prepare them through individualized training and development activities.

In mid-1984, we issued a report on executive development at the request of the Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service, Post Office and General Services, Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs.[1] Because we reported that some of the five agencies we reviewed had appointed less than half of the candidates who successfully completed the CDP program to SES positions, the Chairman asked us to follow up on that report and answer several questions regarding CDP.

- How many people are selected as SES candidates each year?
- How are they selected?
- How many complete the program and are certified by their agency and how many actually become SES members?
- If candidate programs are not used, how are SES members chosen and what happens to those not chosen?
- How do private sector programs compare to the public sector program in terms of the candidate acceptance percentages?

As agreed with the requester, we are further examining the reasons why so many initial SES appointments are not made from the certified candidate pool

In a letter dated July 23, 1985, we provided the Chairman with statistical data on the status of candidates, including the number selected for CDP, the number certified as managerially qualified after completing CDP, and the number appointed to SES (see app I) This report further

---

[1] Progress Report on Federal Executive Development Programs GAO/GGD-84-92, August 15, 1984

analyzes that data and addresses the remaining questions in the Chairman's request

The Structure of SES

SES is the first tier of government management below the President, Vice President, and the political appointees who require Senate confirmation SES covers executive branch employees who, before the formation of SES, were classified as General Schedule (GS) 16, 17, and 18 and Executive Level political appointees at levels IV and V who did not require Senate confirmation SES includes executives who fill managerially oriented positions, as well as executives in positions that require technical expertise

In making SES appointments, agencies fill two types of positions—career reserved and general The former refers to positions that only career civil servants may fill The latter refers to positions that career civil servants, noncareer individuals, or individuals who serve only a limited term (i.e., up to 36 months) may fill The act limits the number of noncareer employees who can occupy general positions to 10 percent of the total governmentwide allocation of SES positions. Career SES appointees are required to be certified as managerially qualified for an SES appointment [2]

CDP Exists to Prepare Future SES Members

The basic objective of CDP is to more fully develop future executives' managerial skills OPM has charged individual agencies with operating development programs under its criteria, guidance, and oversight However, OPM allows agencies to exercise discretion in operating their individual programs

OPM requires agencies to competitively select candidates for CDP on the basis of its merit staffing guidance In addition, OPM has suggested that agencies adopt other program features, such as.

- considering the key managerial and technical competencies required in agency's SES positions when reviewing applicants' qualifications for CDP,

---

[2]Certification is awarded by a Qualifications Review Board (QRB), which OPM convenes The QRB may certify candidates on the basis of any of three criteria demonstrated executive experience, special or unique qualities which indicate a likelihood of executive success, or successful participation in executive development programs, such as CDP The QRB certifies only candidates' managerial qualifications Technical qualifications required for any SES position must be assessed by the appointing agency

- selecting more candidates than projected SES vacancies to allow for attrition and inaccurate projections; and
- using CDP as the major source for SES, even though certified candidates should not be guaranteed an SES appointment

Despite the latitude OPM allows among agency programs, individuals in all agencies proceed through similar CDP stages. The first stage of CDP is the competitive selection of program candidates

Most agencies require applicants to submit paperwork that describes their experience (e.g , SF-171, Personal Qualifications Statement) and past and current performance (e.g., performance appraisals). Most also ask applicants to rate themselves against agency defined managerial competencies as well as any technical competencies they may possess, such as specialized knowledge and expertise in a technical subject.

Agency officials then rate and rank individual applicants to determine the best qualified and recommend finalists to the selecting official. For more detailed information about agency selection methods, see appendix II.

After selection to CDP, candidates participate in executive development activities, including formal training and short-term developmental assignments. These activities are scheduled over a 1- to 3-year period. Agencies may provide their own formal training for SES candidates, use training and development programs of other agencies, or use an OPM central training program. After training and development is completed and candidates are certified by the QRB, they enter the certified pool, where they stay until they are either appointed to SES or their certification expires

OPM initially stipulated that candidate certification would expire after 5 years. However, concern about the growing number of certified candidates who had not been appointed to SES prompted OPM to reduce this period to 3 years for candidates selected after July 1984. At the 3- or 5-year expiration, candidates must be recertified by the QRB to receive an SES appointment

Objectives, Scope, and Methodology

The objectives of our review were defined by the requester's specific questions described earlier. In answering these questions, we met with officials in OPM's Office of Training and Development to identify all agency Candidate Development Programs. We obtained OPM's guidance

on CDP and data on candidates' status and SES appointments. The information we gathered on appointments includes only initial appointment of career status individuals to SES, it does not include reassignments or transfers of SES members to other positions

Fifty federal executive agencies have operated a CDP that has been approved by OPM As a first step, we asked each agency to verify and update OPM data on the status of their candidates Agencies did so during March and April 1985 on the basis of candidates' status as of March 31, 1985

We also sent each of the 50 agencies a questionnaire that asked them to identify· (1) reasons why each of their unappointed certified candidates had not entered SES and how each was assigned, (2) methods for selecting candidates, and (3) perceptions of CDP's utility.

We sent the questionnaire to 65 officials who manage CDPs in 50 agencies[3] Of the 65 questionnaire recipients, 63 responded, accounting for 48 of the 50 agencies Appendix III lists the agencies and subunits that responded to our questionnaire as well as the agencies that did not.

To discuss private sector executive development and the availability of comparable data, we contacted about 50 individuals from private companies, academia, and associations who were familiar with executive development These people suggested that comparing federal and private sector executive development statistics would be difficult because comparable data do not exist After discussing this matter with the requester's representative, it was agreed that we would search current literature to create an overview of private sector executive development practices We researched 44 articles on this topic that had appeared in professional journals over the last 5 years

Our review, which was conducted between January 1985 and February 1986, was done in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards As requested by the Chairman's office, we did not obtain official agency comments

---

[3]Because the Departments of Treasury and Justice do not operate CDP at the departmental level, we sent the questionnaire to officials in the 17 subunits of these agencies which operated CDPs

Agencies Have Not Fully Utilized the Candidate Development Program

CDP has not served as the main source for filling the government's SES vacancies Our review showed that 87 percent of initial career SES appointments during fiscal years 1982 to 1984 were granted to individuals who had not participated in the program.

We found that the number of candidates selected annually to participate in CDP has declined significantly since the early years of the program (fiscal years 1980 and 1981). Moreover, as of March 31, 1985, about 46 percent of the candidates who were certified to enter SES had been appointed to SES positions About half of the certified candidates who had not received an SES appointment were assigned to positions in their agencies that had either the same or less responsibility as the positions they held prior to entering CDP.

Most SES Appointments Have Been Granted to Individuals Who Did Not Participate in CDP

During fiscal years 1982 to 1984, certified candidates from the CDP program received only 13 percent of the government's appointments into the SES. The remainder went to individuals who had not participated in the program

Table 2.1: Initial SES Appointments, Fiscal Years 1982-1984

Fiscal year	Total initial SES appointments	Candidates		Noncandidates	
		Number appointed	Percent	Number appointed	Percent
82	774	95	12 3	679	87 7
83	637	82	12 9	555	87 1
84	603	84	13 9	519	86 1
Total	**2,014**	**261**	**13.0**	**1,753**	**87.0**

The Number of Candidates Selected for CDP Has Been Declining

Since September 1979, when agencies first selected candidates, through March 1985, 1,119 candidates have entered CDP [4] However, the number of candidates being selected for the program has declined As shown in table 2 2, most of the candidates were selected for CDP during fiscal years 1980 and 1981

[4] This does not include 14 candidates selected by the Veterans Administration who subsequently entered non-SES executive positions Our July 23, 1985, letter included these 14 candidates in its calculations

Table 2.2: Number of Candidates Selected for CDP September 1979 Through March 1985

Fiscal year	Number selected
1979[a]	2
1980	362
1981	299
1982	134
1983	103
1984	148
1985[b]	55
Date unknown by agency	16
Total	**1,119**

[a]Includes only September 1979 when CDP started

[b]Includes first 6 months of fiscal year 1985, the most recent data available at the time of our review

The number of agencies selecting candidates for CDP has also declined. In fiscal year 1980, 28 agencies selected candidates; in fiscal year 1984, 13 agencies selected candidates

Table 2.3: Number of Agencies Selecting Candidates by Fiscal Year

Number of candidates selected	Fiscal years					
	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[a]
1-10	20	15	8	7	7	2
11-20	2	1	5	4	3	1
21-30	0	6	1	1	3	1
over 30	6	2	0	0	0	0
Total	**28**	**24**	**14**	**12**	**13**	**4**

[a]First 6 months

It must be recognized that the number of SES vacancies has also declined over the years By totalling the number of SES positions filled during each year and the unfilled positions remaining at year's end, we determined that the number of available SES positions declined from 1,882 in fiscal year 1982 to 1,322 in fiscal year 1984. However, in view of the low appointment rate of certified candidates to SES positions, it appears that the CDP selection decline is attributable more to agencies not using CDP as their primary source of appointments than to the declining number of SES positions

Agencies Have Not Extensively Used CDP Certified Candidates to Fill Vacant SES Positions

From September 1979 through March 1985, 739 candidates were certified as managerially qualified for SES Of these, 339, or 46 percent, were appointed to SES. Appendix IV is an agency-by-agency breakdown of these statistics.

We found that certified candidates who entered SES usually did so within 6 months after certification. Therefore, we calculated the period of time that the 400 unappointed certified candidates had remained in that status. As table 2.4 shows, about 88 percent of the unappointed certified candidates had been unappointed for 1 year or longer, and about 52 percent had been in that status for 2 years or longer.

Table 2.4: Unappointed Candidates' Time in Status Since Certification as of March 31, 1985

Time since certification	Number unappointed	Percent
Less than 1 year	50	12 5
1-2 years	141	35 3
2-3 years	118	29 5
Over 3 years	91	22 8
Total	**400**	**100.1**[a]

[a]Total equals 100 1 percent due to rounding

Our questionnaire asked agencies to identify, from among nine listed reasons, why these certified candidates had not been appointed to SES. Although "others being more technically qualified" was the most frequently cited reason why certified candidates were not appointed, agencies said this factor existed "to a great or very great extent" for only 22 percent of the unappointed certified candidates. (Additional information on the reasons that agencies identified for not appointing certified candidates is contained in app. V.)

Agencies' Use of Unappointed Candidates

OPM has not provided guidance on how agencies should use unappointed certified candidates. Because of the growing number of unappointed certified candidates, we asked agencies how they primarily assigned each of these candidates after certification. We asked if these primary assignments required more, less or similar responsibility than the assignments these candidates held prior to entering CDP We also asked if the candidates were assigned collateral or special duties.

We received responses for 352 of the 400 unappointed certified candidates. About half (172) of the responses showed that these candidates

were assigned exclusively to positions that required the same responsibility as or less responsibility than those positions they held before entering CDP Of these 172 respondents, eighty percent continued to hold the same position they held before entering CDP

The responses also indicated that about half of the unappointed certified candidates were assigned to some type of collateral or special duty, such as serving as a member of a task force or being assigned to a special project However, the extent of such usage varied significantly by agency Of the 40 agencies with unappointed certified candidates responding to this question, 21 assigned 50 percent or fewer of these candidates to such duties

Most Agencies Favor CDP's Continuance

Although 87 percent of SES appointments did not come from the CDP pool of certified candidates, most agencies favored continuing the program. In general, agencies with a larger SES expressed the most support for CDP.

Our questionnaire asked agencies to rate the effectiveness of various activities that we identified as part of CDP Agencies that conducted these CDP activities rated them more highly than those that did not Also, few agencies believed that adding activities to their programs would improve CDP.

Most Agencies Favor Continuing CDP

Over 50 percent of the agencies responding to our questionnaire believed that CDP should be continued. The remaining respondents were split between discontinuing CDP and having no opinion. Of the 39 agencies that had an opinion, 64 percent favored continuing CDP. Table 3.1 shows the agencies' responses

Table 3.1: Agencies' Views on Continuing CDP

	Number of responses	Percent
Continue CDP	25	52
Discontinue CDP	14	29
Do not know/Unsure	9	19
Total responses	**48[a]**	**100**

[a]We combined responses of 7 subunits of the Department of Justice and 10 subunits of the Department of the Treasury to create two agencywide responses, which we analyzed along with responses from the other 46 agencies

Nearly half of the agencies believed that in the aggregate, CDP's advantages were greater than its disadvantages. A quarter of the agencies believed that the advantages and disadvantages balanced, and 25 percent believed that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages. Table 3.2 shows these responses

Table 3.2: Agencies' Views on CDP Advantages and Disadvantages

	Number of responses	Percent
Advantages outweigh disadvantages	22	46
Advantages and disadvantages balance	12	25
Disadvantages outweigh advantages	12	25
No basis to judge	2	4
Total responses	**48**	**100**

In seeking more information on CDP, our questionnaire asked agencies to indicate the extent to which CDP provided potential benefits and disadvantages. Although almost twice as many agencies expressing an opinion favored continuing CDP and perceived that CDP had more advantages than disadvantages, they said CDP's benefits existed to a moderate extent. A partial explanation may be the extremely low rating agencies assigned CDP's potential disadvantages (most responses were "little or no extent"). Table 3.3 shows these average responses for the benefits and disadvantages on a five-point scale, which ranged from "a very great extent" (5) to "little or no extent" (1). It also lists the percentages of responses in the two highest points in this scale—great and very great extent, as well as the number of agencies that responded to each benefit and disadvantage.

Table 3.3: CDP's Benefits and Disadvantages

	Average response	Percent of responses— great/very great extent	Number of respondents
Benefits			
1 Breaks routines/challenges people	3 7	63	63
2 Better prepares candidates for SES	3 7	63	63
3 Broadens candidates' perspective of the agency	3 6	65	63
4 Increases access to networks (e g , communication) and other resources	3 6	56	63
5 Tests candidates' potential/readiness for SES	3 5	52	63
6 Improves candidates' performance even if they do not enter SES	3 4	49	63
7 Improves managerial competency	3 4	46	63
8 Enhances candidates' morale	3 3	52	62
9 Expedites SES appointments	3 3	52	63
10 Broadens candidates' perspective of other federal entities	3 2	38	63
11 Improves SES succession planning	2 9	38	63
12 Provides results from special projects that may not otherwise be conducted	2 4	24	63
13 Broadens perspective on state, local, and private sectors	2 2	10	62
Disadvantages			
1 Increases costs	2 5	23	62
2 Decreases candidates' morale if they do not enter SES	2 5	21	62
3 Takes top performers away from regular duties	2 1	11	63
4 Places unnecessary stress on candidates who have regular duties to perform	1 8	3	63
5 Starts too late to identify and develop potential executives	1 6	3	63
6 Attempts to create a managerial SESer in technically oriented agencies	1 5	3	63
7 Creates a bias against those not entering SES	1 4	3	62
8 Provides inadequate time for development	1 4	2	63
9 Creates a bias against those not selected for CDP	1 3	2	63

Agencies With a Larger SES Are Generally More Supportive of CDP

We analyzed agencies' views of CDP by the size of their SES.[5] We found that agencies with a larger SES were generally more supportive of the program, while agencies with a smaller SES were less supportive. Appendix VIII provides details on agencies' views of CDP by SES size.

We also analyzed agencies' views on CDP by appointment rate,[6] but we found no relationship between the two. Agencies with an average appointment rate were most supportive of CDP, but, as shown in table 3 4, these were primarily the agencies with a larger SES

Table 3.4: Success in Appointing Certified Candidates by Agency SES Size

| | Number of agencies by SES size | | |
Appointment rate	Larger	Smaller	Total
High	0	4	4
Above average	6	8	14
Average	8	2	10
Below average	6	6	12
None	1	7	8
Total	**21**	**27**	**48**

Agencies Consider Their CDP Activities to Be Effective

On the basis of information obtained during our previous review of CDP and input from OPM and other agencies, we identified 10 activities that could be included as a part of CDP We asked agencies whether they conducted these activities and how they would rate their effectiveness or potential effectiveness

Only three of the activities we identified were conducted by more than half of the respondents to our questionnaire The most common activity was selecting candidates on the basis of a desired mix of SES technical and managerial competencies; almost three-fourths of the respondents did this On the other hand, no respondent offered different development programs for generalists and specialists Table 3.5 summarizes the frequency with which the 63 respondents conducted the 10 activities.

---

[5]We used two categories of SES size large and small Appendix VI lists the agencies in each category We considered agencies with 75 or more members to be large and those with fewer than 75 to be small

[6]We developed five categories for rate of appointment to SES, ranging from high to none Appendix VII identifies agencies in these categories and the percentages which defined the ranges of the categories

Table 3.5: Frequency of Activities Conducted

Activity	Conducted Yes	No	Left blank	Percentage of respondents who conducted this activity
Select candidates based on a desired mix of SES technical-managerial competencies	47	16	0	74 6
Start formal development, before CDP, at lower managerial levels	42	21	0	66 7
Use certified candidates in ways that facilitate SES entry	40	23	0	63 5
Bypass CDP for individuals who are ready for SES	31	32	0	49 2
Give preference to certified candidates in SES appointments	30	33	0	47 6
Select candidates at a ratio below 1 5 candidates per projected SES vacancy	19	39	5	32 8
Target candidates to one or a group of SES positions	20	43	0	31 7
Require supervisors to nominate as candidates those most likely to enter SES	18	45	0	28 6
Allow candidates to participate full-time in CDP	13	50	0	20 6
Offer two different CDPs—one for generalists, and one for specialists	0	63	0	0

In analyzing the responses to this portion of our questionnaire, we noted that less than half of the agencies (47.6 percent) gave preference to certified candidates when making SES appointments, and only 28.6 percent required supervisors to nominate those individuals that were considered most likely to enter SES. Also, only about 60 percent of the agencies used candidates in ways that would facilitate their entry into SES. These low frequencies may partially explain why CDP participants received only 13 percent of career SES appointments.

We also asked agencies to rate these activities' effectiveness, and we analyzed these ratings by whether or not an agency conducted the activity We found that agencies rated activities that they conducted as more rather than less effective; over half of the respondents rated six of the nine activities they conducted in the most effective category However, when agencies did not conduct an activity, they did not consider it to be potentially effective or had no basis to judge its effectiveness. Tables 3 6 and 3 7 show these two findings, respectively

Table 3.6: Effectiveness Ratings by Agencies That Conducted Activities

Activity[a]	Number of agencies that conducted the activity	Percent				
		Little, no, or somewhat effective	Moderately effective	Very or very great effectiveness	No basis to judge	Did not rate
Require supervisors to nominate as candidates those most likely to enter SES	18	5 6	11 1	83 3	0	0
Select candidates based on a desired mix of SES technical-managerial competencies	47	8 5	6 4	83 0	2 1	0
Allow candidates to participate full-time in CDP	13	0	23 1	76 9	0	0
Start formal development, before CDP, at lower managerial levels	42	9 5	19 0	64 3	4 8	2 4
Target candidates to one or a group of SES positions	20	10	20	60 0	10 0	0
Use certified candidates in ways that facilitate SES entry	40	15 0	25 0	55 0	2 5	2 5
Give preference to certified candidates in SES appointments	30	20	33 3	43 3	3 4	0
Select candidates at a ratio below 1 5 candidates per projected SES vacancy	19	15 8	42 1	36 8	5 3	0
Bypass CDP for individuals who are ready for SES	31	19 4	38 7	35 4	6 5	0

[a]Excludes "offer two different CDPs-one managerial and one technical" because no agency conducted this activity

Table 3.7: Effectiveness Ratings by Agencies That Did Not Conduct Activities

Activity	Number of agencies that did not conduct the activity	Percent				
		Little, no, or somewhat effective	Moderately effective	Very or very great effectiveness	No basis to judge	Did not rate
Select candidates based on a desired mix of SES technical and managerial competencies	16	25 0	6 3	37 5	31 2	0
Start formal development, before CDP, at lower managerial levels	21	38 0	14 4	23 8	19 0	4 8
Require supervisors to nominate as candidates those most likely to enter SES	45	42 3	13 3	15 5	28 9	0
Bypass CDP for individuals who are ready for SES	32	37 5	15 6	9 4	31 3	6 2
Target candidates to one or a group of SES positions	43	46 5	16 3	7 0	27 9	2 3
Give preference to certified candidates in SES appointments	33	39 4	9 1	12 1	36 4	3 0
Allow candidates to participate full-time in CDP	50	50 0	8 0	6 0	32 0	4 0
Select candidates at a ratio below 1 5 candidates per projected SES vacancy	39	41 1	15 4	5 1	33 3	5 1
Use certified candidates in ways that facilitate SES entry	23	43 5	4 3	4 3	43 5	4 3
Offer two different CDPs—one to develop generalists, and one for specialists	63	55 5	7 9	0	33 3	3 3

Information on the Private Sector's Approach to Developing Potential Executives

Like the government, private companies view executive development as a way to enhance the competencies of their future executives. However, our literature search indicated that most private companies do not conduct formal programs like CDP and conceptually, there are major differences between CDP and private sector practices. Private companies usually identify potential executives early in their careers—often when these individuals initially become managers Companies base their decisions primarily on a long-term need for specific types of skills, and the executive identification process usually occurs informally. CDP, on the other hand, does not start until an individual reaches a position just below SES—usually GS-15 Agencies project their needs over about 2 years rather than on a long-term basis, and the process for selecting CDP candidates is based on a formal, competitive process.

A number of other differences exist between CDP and the private sector approach to executive development For example

- Private companies view executive development as a long-term process that can continue as long as an individual progresses within the organization. CDP lasts from 1 to 3 years, and successful candidates are certified as qualified for SES
- Private companies rely on developing executives through progressively challenging job rotations that may last from 1 to 3 years. Under CDP, job rotations usually last from 3 to 6 months.
- Some companies offer two-track development in that they separately develop general managers and technical experts. CDP focuses on developing managerial skills only

It should be noted that a reason why the two approaches seem on the surface to be significantly different is that CDP is a distinct program and private agency executive development is not However, some of the aspects of private sector development, such as the early identification of potential executives, could very well exist within the government even though they are not an integral part of the CDP structure

Letter to the Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service, Post Office & General Services, Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

GENERAL GOVERNMENT
DIVISION
GG5-15

JUL 2 3 1985

The Honorable Ted Stevens
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil
  Service, Post Office and
  General Services
Committee on Governmental Affairs
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Subject: Status of Candidates in the Senior Executive
          Service Candidate Development Program

In an October 19, 1984 letter, you asked us to study the Senior Executive Service (SES) candidate development program. The objective of this program, created by the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act, is to prepare federal managers for SES positions.

Your letter specifically requested that we collect government-wide information on:

--The number of persons (1) selected as SES candidates, (2) certified as managerially qualified after completing the developmental program, and (3) appointed to SES after certification;

--How agencies select SES candidates;

--How agencies appoint SES members and use candidates who are not appointed to the SES; and

--How the private sector compares in appointing executive development graduates to executive positions.

Our review is not complete, but we have developed statistical data you requested on the status of candidates. The data shows that from September 1979--when agencies first selected candidates--through March 1985, 1,133 employees have been selected as SES candidates and 753 have been certified as managerially qualified for the SES. From this group, 339 have been appointed to the SES. The enclosure to this letter provides a breakdown of these statistics by fiscal year.

In performing our work, we obtained government-wide data from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). We then asked all relevant federal agencies to verify and update that data. In instances where agencies' data differed from OPM data, we used the former--assuming it was more likely to be correct.

A copy of this letter is being sent to OPM because of its oversight responsibilities for the SES candidate development program.

Sincerely yours,

William J. Anderson
Director

Enclosure

2

ENCLOSURE   ENCLOSURE

CANDIDATES SELECTED, CERTIFIED, AND APPOINTED TO SES

Fiscal Year of Candidate Selection

	1979[a]	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985[b]	UNK[c]	Total
Number selected for the candidate development program	2	362	312	135	103	148	55	16	1,133
Number certified as managerially qualified during:									
1979	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	0
1980	1	17	—	—	—	—	—	1	19
1981	0	12	4	—	—	—	—	4	20
1982	0	187	115	7	—	—	—	10	319
1983	1	39	108	54	3	—	—	0	205
1984	0	9	30	42	31	3	—	1	116
1985	0	2	9	17	19	9	0	0	56
UNK[c]	0	10	5	0	3	0	0	0	18
Total certified	2	276	271	120	56	12	0	16	753
Number appointed to SES during:									
1979	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	0
1980	0	17	—	—	—	—	—	0	17
1981	0	17	3	—	—	—	—	0	20
1982	0	58	31	5	—	—	—	1	95
1983	0	35	30	14	3	—	—	0	82
1984	0	17	38	19	7	3	—	1	85
1985	0	7	10	7	9	7	0	0	40
Total appointed	0	151	112	45	19	10	0	2	339

[a]Agencies initially selected candidates in September 1979.

[b]Data as of March 31, 1985.

[c]"UNK" means that agencies did not know the year that a candidate was selected and/or certified.

ENCLOSURE   ENCLOSURE

     In reviewing the data, the following information needs to
be considered.

     --Because the candidate development program usually lasts
       from one to two years, candidates who were selected in
       late 1983 and afterwards probably are still participating
       in developmental activities.

     --Candidates selected before July 18, 1984, have 5 years to
       enter SES after certification before the certification
       lapses; candidates selected after July 18, 1984, have 3
       years to enter SES. As of March 31, 1985, no candidate's
       certification had lapsed.

Agency Methods for Selecting Candidates for CDP

Agencies' responses to our questionnaire addressed aspects of how they select candidates for CDP. The following information summarizes these responses.

Agencies use similar methods to select candidates for CDP. Almost all agencies (98 percent) required applicants to describe past experience in writing, and 70 percent also collected assessments of applicants' past performance. About 60 percent asked applicants to explain why they should be selected for CDP or ultimately appointed to SES and asked for recommendations from others

All agencies used the paperwork to rate and rank applicants. About half supplemented this information with structured interviews, another 14 percent used unstructured interviews. Only one-fourth used formal exercises (e.g , assessment centers, simulations) to assess applicants' SES potential

The candidate selection process commonly has four stages: rating, ranking, recommending, and selecting. For the 63 respondents, table II 1 lists the agency officials and/or groups who participate in each stage

Table II.1: Participants in CDP Selection Stages[a]

	Number participating in selection stages			
	Rate	Rank	Recommend	Select
Personnel/executive development staff	37	21	10	1
Ad hoc selection panel	28	31	20	0
Regional officials	4	6	7	0
Agency Executive Resource Board (ERB)[b]	14	14	31	20
Subunit (ERB)	10	17	23	4
Agency heads	1	2	3	40
Subunit heads	6	7	15	12
Others	0	2	3	2

[a]Agencies could indicate that multiple officials participated in each stage

[b]Executive Resource Boards are established by agencies to conduct merit staffing for career entry into SES, including recommendations on the selection of candidates

Most agencies stated that they gave equal consideration to managerial and technical competencies when selecting candidates. Information on this is in table II 2

Table II.2: Competency Focus in CDP Selection

Competency focus	Number of agencies	Percentage
Only managerial	4	6
Mainly managerial	13	21
Both equally	39	62
Mainly technical	7	11
Only technical	0	0
Total	**63**	**100**

Given CDP's goal of improving candidates' managerial competency, it is interesting that seven agencies focused mainly on technical competencies These included the Executive Office of the President, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Maritime Commission, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, State Department, and the tax and civil divisions in the Department of Justice

Most agencies informed us that when selecting candidates, they do not usually target them to specific SES positions. Only 15 (24 percent) stated that they targeted candidates. Of these 15, most stated that they targeted at least one-half of their candidates to specific SES positions. Further, the agencies stated they they seldom selected candidates from outside the agency. Only 13 of the agencies had done so, accounting for 31 of the 1,119 candidates selected through March 1985.

Different Factors Influence Agencies' Selection of Candidates

We asked agencies to rank the extent, on a five-point scale ranging from "essential" (5) to "little or no importance" (1), to which certain factors influenced their selection of candidates. We computed an overall average response for each of 14 factors, using the number of responses in each of the five categories of the scale.

Table II.3: Importance of Selection Factors[a]

1 Potential to enter SES	4 6[b]
2 Performance in regularly assigned duties	4 5
3 Willingness to complete CDP activities	4 4
4 Willingness to enter the agency's SES	4 2
5 Experience in your agency	4 1
6 Supervisory support to be in CDP	3 7
7 Performance in CDP selection exercises	3 5
8 Performance in duties other than regular ones	3 3
9 Willingness to stay with the agency after CDP	3 2
10 Experience outside of the agency	3 1
11 Need for CDP	3 1
12 Ability to perform regular duties during CDP	3 1
13 Willingness to geographically relocate	2 8
14 Contacts (e g , knowing key personnel)	2 2

[a]Respondents could add other factors to the list and rank them on the five-point scale Four agencies added a factor and ranked them "essential"—technical skills, legal experience, technical qualifications, and the agency head's recommendation Two agencies also added a factor, ranking each "very important"—specialized experience in agency functions and support from the subunit Executive Resource Board

[b]Although "potential to enter SES" ranks the highest as a selection factor, about three-fourths of the agencies also indicated that they did not require those most likely to enter SES to be nominated for CDP selection (see p 20)

Questionnaire Respondents[a] By Agency and Subunit

1 Agency for International Development
2. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
3. Commodity Futures Trading Commission
4. Consumer Product Safety Commission
5. Department of Agriculture
6 Department of Commerce
7. Department of Education
8. Department of Energy
9. Department of Health and Human Services
10. Department of Housing and Urban Development
11 Department of the Interior

12. Department of Justice
a Immigration and Naturalization Service
b. Bureau of Prisons
c Tax Division
d Criminal Division
e. Civil Division
f. Justice Management Division
g. Antitrust Division

13. Department of Labor
14. Department of State
15 Department of Transportation

16 Department of the Treasury
a. Office of Secretary
b Internal Revenue Service
c. Customs Service
d Bureau of Engraving and Printing
e Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms
f. Savings Bond Division
g Financial Management
h. Secret Service
i Office of the Comptroller of the Currency
j Office of Public Debt

17 Environmental Protection Agency
18 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

19. Executive Office of the President
20. Farm Credit Administration
21. Federal Communications Commission
22 Federal Emergency Management Agency
23. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
24 Federal Home Loan Bank Board
25. Federal Labor Relations Authority
26. Federal Maritime Commission
27. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
28. Federal Trade Commission
29. General Services Administration
30. International Trade Commission
31 Interstate Commerce Commission
32. Merit Systems Protection Board
33. National Aeronautics and Space Administration
34. National Capital Planning Commission
35 National Credit Union Administration
36. National Science Foundation
37 National Transportation Safety Board
38. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
39. Office of Personnel Management
40 Office of the Secretary of Defense
41. Railroad Retirement Board
42 Small Business Administration
43. Securities and Exchange Commission
44 United States Air Force
45. United States Army
46 United States Information Agency
47 United States Navy
48. Veterans Administration

ªACTION and the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board did not respond

Selected, Certified, and Appointed Candidates by Agency September 1979 to March 1985

Agency	Number of candidates		
	Selected	Certified	Appointed
Action	2	2	0
Agency for International Development	5	3	1
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board	1	0	0
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	5	5	2
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	1	1	1
Consumer Product Safety Commission	2	2	1
Department of Agriculture	93	89	37
Department of Commerce	11	9	6
Department of Education	4	4	0
Department of Energy	80	18	18
Department of Health and Human Services[a]	71	38	20
Department of Housing and Urban Development[b]	0	0	1
Department of the Interior	63	44	24
Department of Justice	122	72	34
Department of Labor	45	37	17
Department of State	13	8	2
Department of Transportation[c]	55	26	7
Department of the Treasury	163	94	38
Environmental Protection Agency	12	9	2
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	6	2	0
Executive Office of the President[d]	24	14	10
Farm Credit Administration	14	4	4
Federal Communications Commission	6	1	0
Federal Emergency Management Agency	6	5	3
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	4	4	1
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	2	0	0
Federal Labor Relations Authority	3	3	3
Federal Maritime Commission	2	2	2
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	2	2	0
Federal Trade Commission	11	7	1
General Services Administration	6	6	3
International Trade Commission	8	5	1
Interstate Commerce Commission	7	6	5
Metric Board[e]	1	1	0
Merit Systems Protection Board	7	4	3
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	32	25	7
National Capital Planning Commission	2	1	1
National Credit Union Administration	8	7	4

Agency	Number of candidates		
	Selected	Certified	Appointed
National Science Foundation	21	15	9
National Transportation Safety Board	1	1	0
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	42	30	20
Office of Personnel Management	5	5	1
Office of the Secretary of Defense	26	23	13
Railroad Retirement Board	6	6	1
Small Business Administration	7	6	4
Securities and Exchange Commission	3	3	2
United States Air Force	14	14	2
United States Army	23	22	8
United States Information Agency	3	3	0
United States Navy	10	10	4
Veterans Administration[f]	58	40	16
Water Resources Council[g]	1	1	0
Total	**1,119**	**739**	**339**

[a]The Department of Health and Human Services' statistics include a candidate from the Community Services Administration, which was abolished

[b]Although the Department of Housing and Urban Development has a CDP, it did not report that it selected or certified any candidates. The one certified candidate that it appointed was selected and certified by the Department of Labor

[c]The Department of Transportation's statistics include a candidate from the Civil Aeronautics Board, which was abolished

[d]The Executive Office of the President also includes the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of the Special Trade Representative

[e]Although the Metric Board has been abolished, it is included here because it had a candidate

[f]Excludes 14 candidates who were selected and certified but entered non-SES executive positions

[g]Although the Water Resources Council has been abolished, it is included here because it had a candidate

Reasons Certified Candidates Have Not Been Appointed to SES

We identified nine possible reasons for certified candidates not being appointed to SES and asked agencies to specify which of the reasons applied for each unappointed certified candidate. We asked agencies to gauge the extent to which each reason applied on a 5-point scale ranging from "little or none" to "a very great extent". If appropriate, the agencies could indicate more than one reason and add any other reasons for each candidate

Agency responses indicated no prevalent reasons why certified candidates had not been appointed to SES. As table V 1 shows, over three-fourths of the responses fell into the lower end of the extent scale; only about one-sixth fell into the upper end (i e , great extent) For example, the reason with the most responses in the upper end—others being more technically qualified—had less than one-fourth of its responses in the great and very great extent categories

As seen in the table, the only exceptions to this trend are the "other" reasons that agencies added Agencies ranked these reasons as major influences on not being appointed Of all "other" reasons, 90 percent contributed to candidates not being appointed to a great or very great extent. Of these, about half dealt with candidates' qualifications. For example, the two most frequent reasons were (1) a target position matching the candidate's qualifications was not yet available, and (2) the candidate was less qualified than the appointee

Table V.1: Reasons Certified Candidates Have Not Been Appointed to SES

Reasons	Total number of responses[a]	Percent of responses			Total
		Small extent[b]	Moderate extent	Great extent[c]	
Inadequate qualifications					
Others more technically qualified	270	60 4	17 4	22 2	100
Others more managerially qualified	247	87 4	6 9	5 7	100
Unsatisfactory performance since certification	198	97 5	2 5	•	100
Subtotal	**715**	**80.0**	**9.7**	**10.3**	**100**
Unavailable positions					
Number of SES positions decreased	250	76 8	16 0	7 2	100
Number of candidates exceeded vacancies	256	77 3	5 5	17 2	100
Subtotal	**506**	**77.1**	**10.7**	**12.2**	**100**
Unavailable candidates					
Did not apply for SES	242	78 9	2 1	19 0	100
Left agency or government	207	81 2	•	18 8	100
Retired	186	96 2	•	3 8	100
Demoted/removed/RIFFED	180	97 2	6	2 2	100
Subtotal	**815**	**87.5**	**.7**	**11 8**	**100**
Other reasons	101	7 9	2 0	90 1	100
No basis to judge	70	35 7	5 7	58 6	100
Total	**2,207**	**77.4**	**6.1**	**16.5**	**100**

[a]These responses apply to 400 unappointed certified candidates, agencies could and did cite more than one reason for each candidate

[b]Small extent combines the 'little or no extent' and "some extent" categories from our questionnaire

[c]Great extent combines the great extent ' and "very great extent" categories from our questionnaire

List of Agencies by SES Size

	Size of SES
Smaller Agencies (i e , fewer than 75 career SES incumbents)	
Agency for International Development	32
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	19
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	18
Consumer Product Safety Commission	7
Department of Education	44
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	33
Farm Credit Administration	9
Federal Communications Commission	34
Federal Emergency Management Agency	46
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	31
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	7
Federal Labor Relations Authority	19
Federal Maritime Commission	8
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	4
Federal Trade Commission	24
International Trade Commission	7
Interstate Commerce Commission	28
Merit Systems Protection Board	16
National Capital Planning Commission	5
National Credit Union Administration	10
National Transportation Safety Board	9
Office of Personnel Management	45
Railroad Retirement Board	8
Securities and Exchange Commission	44
Small Business Administration	34
United States Information Agency	23
Larger Agencies (i e , 75 or more career SES incumbents)	
Department of Agriculture	279
Department of Commerce	382
Department of Energy	389
Department of Health and Human Services	485
Department of Housing and Urban Development	80
Department of the Interior	227
Department of Justice	214
Department of Labor	147
Department of State	77
Department of Transportation	298
Department of the Treasury	496

	Size of SES
Environmental Protection Agency	201
Executive Office of the President	81
General Services Administration	106
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	434
National Science Foundation	93
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	202
Office of the Secretary of Defense	331
U S Air Force	191
U S Army	326
U S Navy	406
Veterans Administration	130

Source OPM data for period ending September 30, 1984

List of Agencies by Appointment Rate September 1, 1979, to March 31, 1985[a]

	Percent appointed[a] from those selected
High (75 percent or greater):[b]	
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	100 0
Federal Labor Relations Authority	100 0
Federal Maritime Commission	100 0
Merit Systems Protection Board	75 0
Above Average (43 to 74 percent):[b]	
Consumer Product Safety Commission	50 0
Department of Commerce	54 5
Department of the Interior	50 0
Executive Office of the President	66 7
Federal Emergency Management Agency	50 0
General Services Administration	50 0
Interstate Commerce Commission	71 4
National Capital Planning Commission	50 0
National Credit Union Administration	50 0
National Science Foundation	56 3
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	47 6
Office of the Secretary of Defense	50 0
Securities and Exchange Commission	66 7
Small Business Administration	57 1
Average (30 to 42 percent):[b]	
Agency for International Development	33 3
Arms Control and Disarmanent Agency	40 0
Department of Agriculture	39 8
Department of Energy	29 5
Department of Health and Human Services	40 0
Department of Labor	40 0
Department of the Treasury	36 5
U S Army	34 8
U S Navy	40 0
Veterans Administration	36 4
Below Average (1 to 29 percent):[b]	
Department of Justice	29 3
Department of State	15 4
Department of Transportation	25 9
Environmental Protection Agency	16 7
Farm Credit Administration	28 6
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	25 0
Federal Trade Commission	9 1

	Percent appointed[a] from those selected
International Trade Commission	16 7
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26 9
Office of Personnel Management	20 0
Railroad Retirement Board	16 7
U S Air Force	14 3
None (O percent):[b]	
Department of Education	0
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	0
Federal Communications Commission	0
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	0
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	0
National Transportation Safety Board	0
United States Information Agency	0
Other:	
Department of Housing and Urban Development[c]	•

[a]This table includes candidates selected during fiscal years 1984 and 1985 in the appointment rate calculations only if they had been appointed to SES Most newly selected candidates have not had time to complete CDP This analysis also does not include agencies that have been abolished since 1979

[b]We created these five categories on the basis of a governmentwide average—30 percent of those selected had been appointed to SES

[c]Despite the fact that the Department of Housing and Urban Development had not selected any candidates for its CDP, it appointed one candidate who had been through CDP at the Department of Labor

Agency Perceptions of CDP's Utility

Overall, most agencies' responses to our questionnaire indicated they support CDP and favor its continuance. Agencies with a larger SES support CDP more while those with a smaller SES support CDP, but to a lesser extent. Table VIII 1 shows these results on agency support for continuing CDP

Table VIII.1: Agencies' Views on CDP Continuance by SES Size

Viewpoints on continuance	Percentages of responses by SES size		
	Larger	Smaller	Total
Continue CDP	62	44	52
Discontinue CDP	24	33	29
Do not know/unsure	14	22	19
Total	**100**	**99ª**	**100**

ªTotal equals 99 due to rounding

Similar variance also occurred when agencies judged whether CDP had more overall advantages or disadvantages Most agencies with a larger SES believed CDP's advantages outweighed its disadvantages, as table VIII 2 shows.

Table VIII.2: Agencies' Views on Advantages and Disadvantages of CDP by SES Size

Balance of CDP advantages and disadvantages	Percentages of responses by SES size		
	Larger	Smaller	Total
Advantages outweigh disadvantages[a]	52	41	46
Advantages and disadvantages balance	24	26	25
Disadvantages outweigh advantages[a]	19	30	25
No basis to judge	5	3	4
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

[a]Our questionnaire included two advantage and two disadvantage categories (i e , outweigh and greatly outweigh) This table combines each into one category

In commenting on specific aspects of the program, over 50 percent of the large agencies rated 9 of the 13 items as being of benefit to a great to very great extent Smaller agencies rated CDP benefits much lower. Table VIII 3 shows this data

Table VIII.3: Agencies' Perceptions of CDP Benefits by SES Size

Benefits:	Percentages of responses by SES size[a]	
	Larger SES	Smaller SES
Broadens candidates' perspectives on agency/department	81 0	44 4
Better prepares candidates before they enter SES	81 0	40 7
Increases networks and access to other resources or knowledge	76 2	44 4
Improves candidates' performance even if they do not enter SES	71 4	29 6
Creates opportunities to break routines and challenge people	66 7	55 6
Gives opportunity to test candidates' potential/readiness for SES	61 9	44 4
Enhances candidates' morale	61 9	34 6
Expedites the SES appointment process	57 1	37 0
Improves management competency	57 1	33 3
Broadens candidates' perspectives on other federal entities	47 6	33 3
Improves succession planning for SES positions	28 6	29 6
Generates results from special projects that otherwise might not be conducted	23 8	14 8
Broadens candidates' perspectives on state/local or private sectors	9 5	11 5

[a]Lists the percentage of all responses in which agencies indicated the benefit existed to a great or very great extent based on a 5-point scale ranging from little or no to a very great extent

No disadvantages were strongly indicated by agencies with either a larger or smaller SES There was some agreement that lowered morale of unappointed candidates and increased costs were the primary disadvantages

Table VIII.4: Agencies' Views on CDP Disadvantages by SES Size

Disadvantages:	Percentages of responses[a] by SES size	
	Larger SES	Smaller SES
Causes candidates' morale to drop if they do not enter SES	33 3	23 1
Increases costs	19 0	26 9
Takes top performers from their regular duties	14 3	11 1
Creates a bias among management against candidates who do not enter SES	9 5	0 0
Starts too late in one's career to identify and develop potential executives	4 8	3 7
Attempts to create an SESer who is managerially oriented when the agency prefers technical skills	4 8	3 7
Provides inadequate time to fully develop candidates	0 0	3 7
Places unnecessary stress on candidates who also have to complete regular duties	0 0	3 7
Creates a bias among management against those not selected as candidates	0 0	3 7

[a]Lists the percentages of all responses in which agencies indicate the disadvantages existed to a great or very great extent based on a 5-point scale ranging from little or no to a very great extent

Requests for copies of GAO reports should be sent to.

U S. General Accounting Office
Post Office Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877

Telephone 202-275-6241

The first five copies of each report are free. Additional copies are
$2 00 each.

There is a 25% discount on orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a
single address.

Orders must be prepaid by cash or by check or money order made out to
the Superintendent of Documents.