The Pathways Programs

Their Use and Effectiveness
Two Years After Implementation

Fiscal Year 2016

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Merit System Accountability and Compliance

Special Study

The Pathways Programs
Their Use and Effectiveness Two Years after Implementation

August 2016

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Table of Contents

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.   Executive Summary

The Federal Government benefits from a diverse workforce that includes students and recent graduates who infuse the workplace with their enthusiasm, talents, and unique perspectives.[1] The need to promote employment opportunities for students and recent graduates, as part of an overall recruitment strategy, is paramount as an ever-growing number of Federal employees nears retirement age. The Pathways Programs, which consist of the Internship Program, the Recent Graduates Program, and the Presidential Management Fellows Program, were designed to meet this need by providing distinct paths to Federal internships and potential careers in Government for students and recent graduates.

As part of its statutory oversight responsibility,[2] the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) conducted a study of the Pathways Programs in FY15 to determine how they are being used and whether they are operating within the spirit and intent of the five core principles OPM identified in its implementing regulations: *transparency, limited scope, fairness to veterans, agency investment,* and *OPM oversight.* Additionally, OPM wanted to analyze agencies' usage, highlight notable practices, identify challenges and compliance concerns, and develop recommendations for improvement in the effective and efficient use of the Pathways Programs. OPM elected to conduct this study in FY15, after agencies had two full years in which to engage in recruitment and hiring activities, but while the programs were still relatively new.

Overall, OPM found agencies are using the Pathways Programs to strengthen the Federal workforce and doing so in accordance with the five core principles. Public notice has provided greater transparency than predecessor programs and has afforded applicants from all segments of society the opportunity to compete for Pathways positions. Demographic data on gender, race and national origin, and age indicate agencies' recruitment efforts are providing access to diverse applicant groups. Most agencies are using the Pathways Programs to supplement, rather than replace, competitive examining. Retention rates under the Programs have been high so far, and the hiring of veterans under them has increased nearly four-fold in comparison to predecessor programs. The majority of new Pathways appointees surveyed have been satisfied with the

---

[1] Executive Order 13562
[2] *See* section 1104 of title 5, United States Code.

training and development provided by their agencies. Moreover, many agencies have shown a true willingness to be accountable for their use of the Programs' authorities by reviewing Pathways appointment actions in their regular evaluation work, conducting stand-alone Pathways Programs assessments, and revising their procedures based on feedback OPM provided during the course of its study.

Still, there is room for improvement in the use of Pathways Programs in several respects. To maximize the Programs' effectiveness, agencies should educate hiring managers about the details of the Pathways Programs so they can work better as collaborators and subject matter experts in conjunction with their human resources (HR) offices. Agencies also must commit the necessary resources to engage their newly hired employees through dedicated mentors. Furthermore, agencies should consider strengthening their workforce planning efforts by using Pathways hiring authorities strategically as part of their succession planning efforts, in filling both Governmentwide and agency-specific mission-critical occupations. Another area needing improvement is the accuracy and completeness of data in the annual reports agencies submit to OPM, which should include overall hiring estimates and projected Pathways Programs appointments. As such data is vital to conducting effective workforce planning and appropriate use of the Pathways Programs, additional guidance from OPM will be provided to ensure agency officials fully understand the information being requested.

As part of its oversight role, OPM will continue its monitoring of agencies' adherence to the terms of their memoranda of understanding (MOUs) and the regulations governing the Pathways Programs; track usage rates by analyzing employment data and annual report submissions to ensure the Programs are used, as intended, to supplement and not replace competitive hiring; and provide additional guidance to agencies when needed.

2.   Background

Predecessors to the Pathways Programs

Historically, the Federal Government has sought to hire students and recent graduates using hiring procedures excepted from the competitive examining process to achieve a workforce drawn from all segments of society while upholding merit system principles. Prior to implementation of the Pathways Programs, agencies provided employment opportunities for students through the Student Educational Employment Program (SEEP). The establishment of SEEP in 1994 consolidated existing Federal student employment programs that had complex regulatory guidance and 13 different appointing authorities. The result was two streamlined programs that exposed students to public service, enhanced and supported their educational experience, and encouraged partnerships between Federal agencies and educational institutions:

> *The Student Temporary Employment Program (STEP)* provided flexible, temporary employment to high school, vocational or technical school, and college students at all levels. Employment ranged from summer jobs to positions that lasted as long as the individual was a student. These appointments did not lead to permanent employment.

> *The Student Career Experience Program (SCEP)* provided students at all levels with a structured work experience directly related to their academic field of study. It provided for formal periods of study and work for students while attending school, and successful completion of requirements could lead to permanent employment.

In addition to students, recent graduates with advanced degrees could be hired through the Presidential Management Intern Program. This program was established by E.O. 12008 in 1977 and later renamed the Presidential Management Fellows (PMF) Program. Four follow-on executive orders refined the program, and, since 2010, it has been included under the Pathways Programs umbrella.

The Federal Career Intern Program (FCIP), authorized by Executive Order 13162 in 2000, was intended to attract exceptional individuals with diverse professional experiences or academic

training to Federal careers involved in the analysis and implementation of public programs. FCIP was used extensively to fill entry-level positions. Although not a student or recent graduate program, many agencies used it as a vehicle to hire recent graduates.

On December 27, 2010, President Obama signed E.O. 13562, entitled, "Recruiting and Hiring Students and Recent Graduates." The principal purpose of the order was to establish a comprehensive structure to improve the competitiveness of Federal recruiting and hiring of talented individuals who are in school or who recently received degrees or valid post-secondary certificates. The order both eliminated FCIP as of March 1, 2011, and stipulated that STEP and SCEP would remain in place until the establishment of a new intern program under the larger structure, which would be known as the Pathways Programs.

> The Federal Government benefits from a diverse workforce that includes students and recent graduates who infuse the workplace with their enthusiasm, talents, and unique perspectives. The existing competitive hiring process for the Federal civil service, however, is structured in a manner that, even at the entry level, favors job applicants who have significant previous work experience. This structure, along with the complexity of the rules governing admission to the career civil service, creates a barrier to recruiting and hiring students and recent graduates. It places the Federal Government at a competitive disadvantage compared to private-sector employers when it comes to hiring qualified applicants for entry-level positions.
>
> *Executive Order 13562*

Purpose and Intent of the Pathways Programs

Pathways Programs positions, like positions in predecessor programs, are in the excepted service and not subject to some of the hiring procedures required for the competitive service. The excepted service provides for the possibility of a more flexible, streamlined approach to hiring. For example, applicants are not required to be rated and ranked based on an examination,

although the agency is required, with a few exceptions,[3] to provide veterans with as much preference as they otherwise would receive.[4] The President is authorized by statute to determine when "necessary exceptions of positions from the competitive service" are warranted by "conditions of good administration"[5] and to delegate to OPM the authority to except positions from the competitive service (which the President accomplished through the Executive Order establishing the Civil Service Rules).[6] It has been a longstanding practice under these authorities to permit positions that otherwise would be in the competitive service to be filled through excepted service appointments (e.g., people with disabilities, students) in order to accomplish the goals of particular excepted service authorities. With the goal in mind of ensuring a diverse workforce that includes students and recent graduates who infuse the workplace with their enthusiasm, talents, and unique perspectives, President Obama determined that the need to provide employment opportunities for students and recent graduates warranted the placement of Pathways Programs positions in the excepted service.

The Pathways Programs are designed to provide access for students and recent graduates to Federal internships and potential careers in the Federal Government. The Pathways Programs consist of three components:

> *The Internship Program* – exposes current high school, vocational, technical, undergraduate, and graduate students to the work of Government by providing paid opportunities to work in agencies and explore Federal careers while still in school.

> *The Recent Graduates Program* – provides opportunities for individuals who have received qualifying degrees or certificates within the previous two years (up to six years for qualifying veterans) to obtain entry-level developmental experience designed to lead to a career in the Federal Government after successfully completing one to two years under the Program.

---

[3] A few positions are exempt even from the procedures created for the excepted service. *See* section 302.101(c) of title 5, part 302, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR).
[4] Excepted service hiring procedures, including those applicable to the Pathways authority at 5 CFR § 213.3402, are addressed in title 5, part 302, CFR.
[5] *See* section 3302 of title 5, United States Code.
[6] *See* E.O. 10577, as amended, Civil Service Rules, now codified as parts 1 through 10 of the CFR.

The Presidential Management Fellows Program – promotes careers in the Federal Government by offering leadership development opportunities to individuals who have received advanced degrees within the preceding two years.

The Pathways Programs became effective on July 10, 2012. In the final implementing regulations, OPM identified five core principles shared by each of the programs to advance merit system principles and the policies established by the President in E.O. 13562:[7]

1) *Transparency* – In an effort to promote transparency, agencies must provide OPM with information about Internship Program and Recent Graduates Program opportunities and how interested members of the public can apply so that OPM can inform potential applicants. (The vacancy announcement itself may be posted on USAJOBS, the agency's website, or other another appropriate location.) OPM has chosen to use USAJOBS, a website used to announce Federal jobs in the competitive service, for the purpose of notifying the public of these opportunities and how to apply at each agency. (For the PMF Program, OPM itself publishes the vacancy announcement in USAJOBS, as in the past.) Under FCIP and previous student programs, public notice was not required, which created the appearance of restrictive, rather than open, recruitment practices.

2) *Limited Scope* – The extent to which agencies hire under the Pathways Programs should be limited. OPM intends for agencies to use the Pathways Programs as part of an overall workforce planning strategy to supplement competitive examining, rather than substitute for it. If agencies are not using the hiring authorities as intended, OPM may place caps on the number of individuals who may be initially appointed to or converted from Pathways positions to positions in the competitive service.

---

[7] Final regulations were issued on May 11, 2012, and are codified in various places in title 5 of CFR, mainly parts 213, 315, and 362. The five core principles are outlined in the supplemental information accompanying the final regulations for the Pathways Programs. *See* Excepted Service, Career and Career-Conditional Employment; and Pathways Programs, 77 Fed. Reg., 28,195 (2012).

3) *Fairness to Veterans* – The Pathways Programs honor and protect the rights of veterans in the Federal hiring process. Veterans' preference rules in the excepted service governed by sections 3308-3318, title 5, U.S.C. pursuant to section 3320, apply to Pathways positions through the application of part 302 of OPM's regulations in title 5 of the CFR. Veterans also have greater flexibility in meeting eligibility requirements for the Recent Graduates Program in that those unable to apply due to military service obligations have up to six years from the date they completed their educational programs to apply, whereas non-veterans must apply within two years of completion. This flexibility, along with providing public notice and safeguarding veterans' preference, helps ensure the hiring process is fair and veteran-friendly.

4) *Agency Investment* – To meet the training and developmental requirements for the Pathways Programs, especially for the Recent Graduates and PMF Programs, agencies must commit resources to foster a positive experience that will help prepare their Pathways hires for potential conversion to the competitive service and success in their careers as Federal employees.

5) *OPM Oversight* – To use the Pathways Programs, agencies must enter into MOUs with OPM and report to OPM annually on their use of the Pathways authorities. Agencies are also subject to any caps OPM may place on initial appointments or conversions to positions in the competitive service. In addition, the use of Pathways Programs is subject to evaluation by OPM or the agency as part of its independent audit program.

3.   Purpose of This Study

OPM conducted this study to determine whether agencies' use of the Pathways Programs meets the spirit and intent of the five core principles OPM identified to advance merit system principles and the policies established by the President in E.O. 13562. OPM wanted to analyze agencies' usage of the Pathways Programs, highlight notable practices, identify challenges and compliance concerns, and develop recommendations for improvement in the effective and efficient use of the

Pathways Programs. OPM elected to conduct this study in FY15, after agencies had the opportunity to engage in recruitment and hiring activities for two full years, but while the Pathways Programs were still relatively new.

4. Methodology

OPM analyzed Governmentwide data drawn from the Enterprise Human Resources Integration Statistical Data Mart (EHRI-SDM) on Pathways appointments made during FY13 and FY14, and appointments made during FY09 and FY10 under the predecessor PMF, FCIP, and student programs.[8] Upon review, OPM found no significant differences between FY09 and FY10 data, and no significant differences between FY13 and FY14 data. Therefore, OPM has presented only FY10 and FY14 data for comparison purposes in this report. OPM also analyzed appointments made under competitive examining procedures during the same timeframe to determine if agencies have been using Pathways as a supplemental hiring authority that is part of an overall workforce planning strategy and not as a substitute for competitive hiring. Data analysis also focused on the identification of hiring trends in relation to gender, age, race and national origin, and veterans' preference status.

---

[8] See Table 15 in the appendix for total number of Pathways appointments in FY14. OPM chose not to consider FY11 and FY12 as these were transition years from the predecessor programs to implementation of the Pathways Programs.

In addition to the data analysis, OPM sent Governmentwide surveys to the following stakeholders:

- *Pathways Programs Officers (PPOs)* – OPM sent surveys to every agency that has a current Pathways MOU. Of the 64 surveys sent, 49 responses were received, for a response rate of 77 percent.

- *PMF Coordinators* – OPM sent surveys to all agencies with identified PMF Coordinators. Of the 49 surveys sent, 24 responses were received, for a response rate of 49 percent.

To gain a better understanding of how effectively agencies are using the Pathways Programs, OPM performed a qualitative review of program implementation and appointments made during FY14 at 17 agencies. These agencies represent a cross-section of users, both in terms of agency size and the number of appointments made. Altogether, the 17 agencies listed in Table 1 *(right)* accounted for 87 percent of all appointments made under the Pathways Programs Governmentwide in FY14.

Table 1: The 17 Agencies Studied
Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Department of the Air Force (Air Force)
Department of the Army (Army)
Department of Commerce (DOC)
Department of Defense - 4th Estate (DoD-4th Est)
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)
Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)
Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
Department of the Interior (DOI)
Department of Justice (DOJ)
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)
National Archives and Records Administration (NARA)
Department of the Navy (Navy)
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC)
Office of Personnel Management (OPM)
Social Security Administration (SSA)
Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)

OPM's qualitative review included the following:

- *Surveys of Pathways appointees* – OPM sent surveys to a stratified random sample[9] of approximately 10 percent of Pathways appointees who were hired by the 17 agencies reviewed in FY14. Of the 1,284 surveys sent, 470 responses were received, for a response rate of 37 percent.

---

[9] To obtain a stratified random sample, the population was divided into subgroups (the agencies) before selecting a proportionate random sample of appointees from each subgroup relative to their percentage of the entire population.

- *Interviews* – To supplement the survey responses and gather additional information, OPM interviewed the following types and numbers of stakeholders: PPOs (17), Pathways appointees (148), and Pathways hiring managers (172).

- *Reviews of job announcements* – OPM reviewed a stratified random sample of FY14 Pathways job announcements to verify they (1) contained required information; (2) were written in plain language, free of Federal jargon; and (3) did not restrict improperly the area of consideration.

- *Reviews of hiring actions* – OPM reviewed a stratified random sample of FY14 Intern and Recent Graduate recruitment case files for overall compliance and to ensure they contained sufficient documentation for third-party reconstruction, e.g., position descriptions, properly coded candidate referral certificates, proof of eligibility, and properly signed and executed participant agreements. The review of case files for PMF appointments was somewhat more limited. In FY14, far fewer appointments were made under PMF than the Internship or Recent Graduates Programs; and because case files were identified randomly and not all agencies hired PMFs, the case file sample included PMF hires for only 6 of the 17 agencies.

5. Findings

OPM's findings, along with recommendations and notable practices, are discussed below and organized by the aforementioned five core principles of the Pathways Programs: *transparency, limited scope, fairness to veterans, agency investment,* and *OPM oversight*. In general, OPM found agencies are upholding these core principles as they implement their Pathways Programs and are using the authorities to recruit and hire students and recent graduates appropriately.

Transparency

> **In determining whether agencies are meeting the principle of transparency, OPM considered these questions:**
>
> • **How well are agencies meeting public notice requirements?**
> • **Are agencies recruiting in ways that promote fair and open competition?**
> • **Do demographic data reflect that agencies' public notice and recruiting efforts contribute to diversity in the workforce?**
>
> **As discussed in this section, agencies are being transparent in their recruitment and hiring efforts under Pathways authorities.**

Public Notice and Recruitment Efforts

Most agencies are meeting public notice requirements by posting clear, plain-language announcements to USAJOBS that contain all required information. Job announcements for Pathways Programs positions are open to all U.S. citizens and must include instructions on how to apply. OPM, which manages the recruitment process for the entire PMF Program, meets public notice requirements through its annual USAJOBS announcement opening the PMF application period for each year. With the elimination of the requirement for educational institutions to nominate PMF candidates, candidates now can apply directly to the PMF announcement in USAJOBS.

To determine whether hiring processes are fair, OPM reviewed a sample of hiring actions and found agencies assessed candidates objectively and consistently applied assessment criteria. When agencies conduct onsite recruitment (e.g., on-campus events), they may not require all applicants attend in-person but must provide an alternate means of applying. Any applications received at onsite events must be combined with those received from USAJOBS postings and other alternate means to create a single applicant pool. This provides fair and open competition to job seekers. It also ensures qualified candidates are referred in the proper order on candidate referral lists, after consideration of veterans' preference.

A few hiring managers stated they would like the option of limiting the area of consideration to applicants residing in the local commuting area because of last-minute declinations of job offers from candidates who do not live in the geographic areas in which the positions were located.

Since residency is a non-merit factor, limiting the area of consideration is inappropriate because it would violate the merit principles of open competition and job relatedness. Instead, agencies should focus on whether applicants can be in the location by the start date of the appointment rather than where they may be located at the time of application.

> **Recommendation:**
>
> State clearly in job announcements that applicants must be available to work in a particular location for a specific period of time or work hours, if applicable.

Multiple data sources indicate USAJOBS postings provide agencies with sufficient numbers of applicants. In particular, hiring managers confirmed in interviews that they often receive more than enough applications in response to Intern and Recent Graduate job announcements. In addition, close to half of the PPOs interviewed stated their agencies do not conduct recruitment and outreach activities due to the influx of applicants through USAJOBS postings. Hiring managers also cited budget constraints as a reason for not conducting such activities.

Table 2: **My agency participates in the following outreach activities for Pathways recruitment** *(survey respondents could select all activities that apply)*	
Activity	**Percentage**
Posting to USAJOBS	93.9%
Posting to agency website	59.2%
Career fairs	55.1%
College fairs	55.1%
Other (please specify) Responses included technical/trade school fairs; direct posting to college and universities; social media via LinkedIn	12.2%

Source: OPM Survey to Agency PPOs

However, effective recruitment goes well beyond the announcement itself, and relying solely on USAJOBS postings could leave the quality of agency referral lists to chance. For example, OPM conducts regular recruitment and outreach activities to educate post-secondary institutions' career counselors, graduate students, and academic faculty about the PMF Program. Engaging in outreach activities and conducting targeted recruitment increases the probability that the pool of highly qualified applicants will have unique skill-sets and high interest in specific agency

mission-related work. Moreover, with the right training, agency supervisors, managers and employees can, bolster their agencies' recruitment efforts by engaging in direct conversation with potential Pathways Programs applicants. This engagement is essential for Federal agencies to compete successfully for quality applicants.

> **Recommendations:**
>
> - Explore low-cost or cost-neutral outreach activities such as enhancing agency websites and social media presence, networking with professional organizations, establishing, and maintaining contact with community organizations and colleges.
>
> - Consider providing training to agency supervisors, managers, and employees to serve as effective recruiters for future vacancies.

Several agencies, including Army, DoD-4th Estate, DOI, and FDIC, collaborated closely with their hiring managers by involving them as subject matter experts in the development of assessment criteria. This integrated approach helps develop stronger applicant pools by more effectively screening candidates. It also promotes buy-in from hiring managers, as their involvement in the development of assessments creates a more transparent process.

> **Notable Practice:**
>
> Collaboration between hiring managers and HR offices in the development of assessment criteria resulted in stronger applicant pools.

Results: Gender

OPM analyzed data on women hired under the Pathways Programs in FY14, as well as under predecessor programs in FY10, to compare with data on women hired under competitive examining, also known as delegated examining (DE). While the percentage of women appointed decreased slightly from FY10 to FY14, women generally fared better under both the Pathways Programs and pre-Pathways programs than they did under DE. Most notable is the relatively high percentage (consistently over 50 percent) of women hired into the PMF Program, the Government's premier leadership development program for advanced degree candidates. In

FY14, the percentage of women hired under all Pathways Programs exceeded the percentage of women hired under DE.[10]

Table 3: Percentage of Females Hired by Program			
FY10		**FY14**	
Program	**Percentage**	**Program**	**Percentage**
STEP	51.6%	Intern NTE	51.5%
SCEP	45.1%	Intern	44.1%
FCIP	43.1%	Recent Graduates	43.5%
PMF	54.4%	PMF	53.0%
Overall for Predecessor Programs	*48.6%*	*Overall for Pathways Programs*	*48.3%*
DE	44.8%	DE	40.4%

Source: EHRI-SDM[11]

Results: Race & National Origin

OPM analyzed the race and national origin (RNO) composition of the Federal workforce in FY14 to compare with RNO data for Pathways Programs appointees. Overall, OPM found RNO statistics for Pathways Program participants are similar to the whole of the Federal workforce.[12]

Table 4: RNO Data for Governmentwide vs. Pathways – FY14		
Category	**Governmentwide**	**Pathways**
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.7%	0.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.0%	6.8%
Blakc	19.3%	21.8%
Hispanic	8.4%	6.9%
White	64.6%	63.7%

Tables 5a-d *(below)* show RNO data for temporary Interns, permanent Interns, Recent Graduates, and PMFs in FY14 in comparison to that of pre-Pathways programs in FY10.

---

[10] For a listing of statistics by agency, see Tables 18a and 18b in the appendix.

[11] Unless otherwise noted, the source of all data shown is EHRI-SDM.

[12] "Governmentwide" includes Federal civilian employees and excludes the following: Intelligence Agencies, Judicial Branch, White House Office, U.S. Postal Service, Postal Rate Commission, Office of the Vice President, Postal Rate Commission, Foreign Service Personnel at the State Department, Tennessee Valley Authority, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, Public Health Service's Commissioned Officer Corps, Government Printing Office, U.S. Tax Court, Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission, Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, Foreign Nationals Overseas, U.S. - China Economic and Security Review Commission, U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom.

Overall, representation was comparable between the two years, with some notable differences under the Recent Graduates and PMF Programs.

Table 5a: RNO Data for STEP vs. Temporary Interns		
Category	FY10	FY14
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.3%	0.8%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.2%	7.2%
Black	20.7%	22.2%
Hispanic	5.2%	5.9%
White	67.1%	63.9%
Unspecified	0.5%	0.0%

Table 5b: RNO Data for SCEP vs. Permanent Interns		
Category	FY10	FY14
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1.3%	0.9%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5.8%	5.2%
Black	16.1%	16.8%
Hispanic	5.1%	7.1%
White	71.3%	70.0%
Unspecified	0.4%	0.0%

Table 5c: RNO Data for FCIP vs. Recent Graduates		
Category	FY10	FY14
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.8%	0.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.7%	7.0%
Black	16.5%	26.7%
Hispanic	7.6%	9.7%
White	68.3%	55.9%
Unspecified	0.1%	0.0%

Table 5d: RNO Data for PMF		
Category	FY10	FY14
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.0%	0.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.4%	8.5%
Black	4.7%	17.2%
Hispanic	2.0%	4.4%
White	85.1%	69.3%
Unspecified	0.8%	0.0%

Results: Age

OPM compared data on the age of appointees in FY10 under pre-Pathways programs with those in FY14 under Pathways Programs, as well as appointments in those years made under DE. Overall, the age of appointees was comparable in both years.

Table 6: Average Age at Time of Appointment by Program			
FY10		**FY14**	
Program	**Average Age**	**Program**	**Average Age**
STEP	22.5	Intern NTE	24.9
SCEP	27.0	Intern	26.8
FCIP	31.1	Recent Graduates	32.3
PMF	28.5	PMF	30.7
Overall for Predecessor Programs	*25.4*	*Overall for Pathways Programs*	*27.1*
DE	39.9	DE	38.3

As shown above, overall, agencies have been transparent in providing public notice and in engaging in recruiting practices to promote fair and open competition. The demographic data on gender, race and national origin, and age indicate agencies' recruitment efforts are providing access to diverse applicant groups.

Limited Scope

> **In determining whether agencies are meeting the principle of limited scope, OPM considered these questions:**
>
> - **Are agencies using the Pathways Programs to supplement competitive hiring?**
> - **Are agencies using sound workforce planning strategies to ensure the principle of limited scope is met?**
>
> **As discussed in this section, most agencies are using Pathways Programs to supplement competitive examining, but additional workforce planning would increase strategic use of the hiring authorities.**

The Pathways Programs should be part of an overall data-driven agency recruitment strategy to supplement competitive examining, not replace it. Annual reports, which agencies are required to submit to OPM, must contain projections on the use of Pathways Programs based on workforce planning. Sound workforce planning ensures agencies identify the human capital

required to meet organizational performance goals and identify competency gaps existing in the current workforce. Using information generated from workforce planning, agencies may (1) develop sound strategies to address current or future workforce needs and (2) ensure competency gaps are ultimately closed. Due to the extensive use of FCIP to fill entry-level positions in the past, it is important for OPM and hiring agencies to monitor workforce planning efforts to ensure a balanced and strategic use of the Pathways Programs hiring authorities.

Although use of the Pathways Programs has increased steadily since their implementation, most agencies are using the authorities appropriately. OPM analyzed and compared usage rates of pre-Pathways and Pathways hiring authorities against usage rates of competitive examining, also referred to as the DE hiring authority. Table 7 *(next page)* reflects usage rates for four categories:

1. FY10 pre-Pathways total hires against FY10 DE total hires;
2. FY10 pre-Pathways permanent hires against FY10 DE permanent hires;
3. FY14 Pathways total hires against FY14 DE total hires; and
4. FY14 Pathways permanent hires against FY14 DE permanent hires.

Total Hires refers to all appointments, including those made on a temporary basis. *Permanent Only* refers to appointments with the potential for conversion to permanent employment. It does not include interns appointed on a temporary basis with no intended conversion to a permanent position. Analysis of this data indicates agencies are making Pathways appointments at significantly lower rates than they did under predecessor programs. The data also confirm agencies are using the Pathways Programs as intended, to supplement, not replace, competitive examining. For example, in considering the total number of permanent appointments made under DE and Pathways in FY14, the usage rate for Pathways was only 14.4 percent of the total, compared to 37.1 percent of the total in FY10.

Table 7: Usage Rate of Pre-Pathways/Pathways vs. DE			
Year	Appointment Type	Pre-Pathways/ Pathways Hires	DE Hires
FY10	Total Hires (Permanent & Temporary)	53.1%	46.9%
	Permanent Hires	37.1%	62.9%
FY14	Total Hires (Permanent & Temporary)	21.3%	78.7%
	Permanent Hires	14.4%	85.6%

A few agencies have used the Pathways Programs to a greater extent than competitive examining (see Table 16 in the appendix for detailed statistics by agency). OPM will be monitoring this closely to ensure the programs are used as intended and potential overuse of Pathways hiring authorities does not become commonplace. As previously mentioned, OPM emphasizes the value of workforce planning in the strategic management of human capital and recommends these agencies review their current strategies and recruitment results to ensure they are striking an appropriate balance between Pathways and competitive hiring.

Based on hiring data reviewed for FY14, it appears agencies are not relying on the Pathways Programs to fill Governmentwide mission-critical occupations (MCOs) to a significant degree. See Table 20 in the appendix.

Agencies may want to consider revising their workforce planning strategies to include greater use of Recent Graduates and PMF Programs to help build pipelines of potential candidates to augment succession planning efforts for Governmentwide MCO and leadership positions. This would be a more strategic use of the authority and ensure that the positive attributes of students and recent graduates are infused into positions directly linked to the mission of the agency.

> *Recommendation:*
>
> Strengthen workforce planning efforts to increase the strategic use of the Pathways Programs hiring authorities, help close competency gaps, fill MCO positions, and facilitate succession planning efforts.

Overall, Pathways Programs appointing authorities have been used to supplement competitive examining, as intended. OPM encourages agencies to consider strengthening their workforce planning efforts to ensure the Pathways Programs hiring authorities are used strategically as part

of succession planning efforts that include filling Governmentwide and agency-specific MCO and leadership positions.

Fairness to Veterans

> **In determining whether agencies are meeting the principle of fairness to veterans, OPM considered these questions:**
>
> • **Are agencies upholding veterans' preference laws in recruitment and selection?**
> • **How well are veterans represented under Pathways Programs?**
>
> **As discussed in this section, veteran hiring under Pathways Programs has increased significantly over predecessor programs, and agencies are upholding veterans' preference rights.**

At the time of FCIP, there was a perception, reflected in litigation, that the manner in which the program was being used resulted in veterans not receiving due consideration. Under the Pathways Programs, veterans' hiring has increased dramatically compared to hiring under predecessor programs. The percentage of veterans appointed nearly quadrupled between FY10 (4.7 percent) and FY14 (18.1 percent). In FY14, the Recent Graduates Program had the highest percentage of veteran appointments at 37.2 percent. Notably, veteran appointments for the PMF Program increased by 12.7 percentage points between FY10 and FY14.

Table 8: **Percentage of Veteran Hires by Program**			
FY10		**FY14**	
Program	**Percentage**	**Program**	**Percentage**
STEP	1.5%	Intern NTE	10.7%
SCEP	4.2%	Intern	17.3%
FCIP	12.1%	Recent Graduates	37.2%
PMF	7.7%	PMF	20.4%
Overall for Predecessor Programs	*4.7%*	*Overall for Pathways Programs*	*18.1%*
DE	25.8%	DE	32.4%

OPM's review of Pathways hiring case files shows, on the whole, agencies properly adjudicate veterans' preference and uphold the rights of veterans when making referrals and selections. However, OPM identified one area of potential vulnerability pertaining to the referral and selection process used in the PMF Program. OPM handles the front-end PMF processes,

including the posting of PMF Program opportunities, receipt and assessment of applications, and determination of finalists. Once OPM provides the list of PMF finalists, individual agencies are responsible for referring candidates to their hiring managers and managing selections. The process by which agencies then make selections from OPM's list of finalists is unclear. OPM has encouraged, but not required, agencies to use OPM's PMF talent management system, also referred to as the Talent Acquisition System (TAS), as a vehicle for posting their PMF vacancies in order to determine which of the finalists are interested and available for agency-specific positions. According to OPM's Governmentwide survey of PMF Coordinators, not all agencies use the system. Of the 49 percent who responded to the survey, just under half reported using it for every PMF vacancy. The lack of a standardized referral and selection process raises concerns about adherence to

Table 9: My agency posts PMF vacancies in OPM's Talent Acquisition System (TAS) for:	
Every position	47.8%
Select positions	34.8%
None of our positions	17.4%

Source: OPM Survey to PMF Coordinators

veterans' preference. To remedy this concern, OPM will soon be requiring all agency PMF vacancies be posted to OPM's talent management system. This will allow all preference eligible applicants to request consideration for a vacancy and the agency to appropriately apply veterans' preference. It also will facilitate third-party reconstruction of hiring actions and verification of adherence to veterans' preference rules

Given that agencies overall are adhering to veterans' preference laws and the hiring of veterans not only increased but nearly quadrupled between FY10 and FY14, OPM concludes agencies are upholding the principle of fairness to veterans when using Pathways Programs authorities.

Agency Investment

> **In determining whether agencies are meeting the principle of agency investment, OPM considered this question: Are agencies investing sufficient resources in their Pathways Programs from recruitment through conversion of successful candidates?**
>
> **As discussed in this section, agencies are devoting sufficient resources to the Pathways Programs, with the exception of assigning mentors and supporting mentoring programs.**

The Pathways Programs require agencies to invest sufficient time and resources to ensure their programs are effective—from the recruitment of talent and the on-boarding of new hires to the conversion of successful candidates to positions into the competitive service. Key to the Pathways Programs' success is the training and development provided to participants upon entry-on-duty and throughout their experience. Of the PPOs responding to the Governmentwide survey, 69 percent believe their agencies have effective new-hire orientation programs. Moreover, 78.8 percent of Intern and Recent Graduate appointees surveyed indicated they received sufficient information in their orientation experiences, either informally from their supervisors (18.5 percent) or during more formal orientation sessions provided by their agencies (60.3 percent). However, some respondents noted in the comments section of the survey that their offices were unprepared to answer their questions or to clarify or explain program requirements in sufficient detail.

Table 10: How would you describe any on-boarding and orientation received during your initial two weeks?	
Orientation session provided sufficient information regarding agency	60.3%
Supervisor provided with sufficient information informally	18.5%
Filled out paperwork but not provided any orientation	6.4%
No orientation but learned sufficient information about agency from peers	4.0%
No orientation and would have liked additional information about agency	3.8%
None of these	7.0%

Source: OPM Survey to Pathways Participants

DHS, DOJ, and FDIC use formal orientation programs for new hires. In addition, DHS, FDIC, and Navy have created cohorts to keep Pathways Programs hires engaged. These practices promote retention by providing structure to the on-boarding process, exposure to the culture of the agency, networking opportunities, and access to fellow participants going through the same training. These early engagement efforts help to establish a sense of belonging and encourage commitment from the new appointments to their agencies.

> **Notable Practice:**
>
> Formal orientation programs for new hires and the establishment of cohorts keep Pathways appointees engaged and promote employee retention by providing on-boarding structure, exposure to agency culture, and networking opportunities.

> **Recommendation:**
>
> Consider developing a structured on-boarding and orientation program to ensure Pathways Programs appointees consistently receive reliable information. Solicit feedback from Pathways appointees, as well as those who have been successfully converted, to develop strategies to improve current on-boarding and orientation processes, as well as Pathways training and development programs.

Pathways appointees and PPOs also were asked about the effectiveness of their agencies' Pathways training and development programs. Of the Pathways appointees who responded to OPM's survey, 79 percent are satisfied with the training provided by their agencies, and 67 percent of PPOs believe their agencies are doing a good job providing training and development to Pathways appointees.

Table 11: **Are you satisfied with the training you have been provided?**		
Interns	Recent Graduates	PMFs
80% [203/254] Yes	**78.2%** [151/193] Yes	**69.2%** [9/13] Yes
		79% - overall

Source: OPM Survey to Pathways Participants

An important component of an effective training program is the use of individual development plans (IDPs). Individual development planning benefits the organization by aligning employee

training and development efforts with its mission, goals, and objectives. When using IDPs, supervisors develop a better understanding of their employees' professional goals, strengths, and developmental needs, resulting in more realistic staff and development plans. Agencies are required to provide IDPs for their Recent Graduates and PMF appointees. OPM strongly recommends interns appointed with no time limitations have IDPs as well. Of the PPOs who responded to OPM's survey, 78.3 percent report their agencies already do so, which is commendable.

Strong mentoring programs have long been recognized as an essential strategy for attracting, developing, and retaining top talent. OPM has emphasized to agencies that, while mentors are valuable resources for guiding and maximizing any employee development through collaboration and knowledge sharing, they are especially important for Pathways Programs appointees, most of whom are just beginning their Federal careers. Since mentoring is a key component of an effective employee development program, agencies should review their current use of mentors for Pathways Programs appointees to ensure this aspect of the program is working as designed.

> **Recommendation:**
>
> Review existing mentorship programs to ensure the necessary resources are available to engage Pathways Programs participants through dedicated mentors.

Agencies are required to assign mentors to all Recent Graduate and PMF hires. While many agencies have robust mentoring programs in place, with some going beyond regulatory requirements by making mentors available to their interns, OPM findings indicate some agencies have fallen short in this area and should strengthen their commitment to provide mentors. When asked about mentors, 68 percent of Recent Graduate and 54 percent of PMF survey respondents indicated they had a mentor. Indeed, OPM's records review and interview results revealed assignment of mentors varies greatly among the agencies. Interview respondents had a range of responses, from describing hands-on working relationships with their mentors who ensure required training and development occur, to stating they were unaware of the mentoring requirement.

Table 12: Do you have an assigned mentor?			
Program	Yes	No	Not Sure
Internship	44% [113]	40% [104]	16% [41]
Recent Graduates	68% [136]	21% [41]	11% [22]
PMF	54% [7]	38% [5]	8% [1]

Source: OPM Survey of Pathways Participants

OPM also found differences in the amount of training agencies provided to hiring managers on the implementation of the Pathways Programs. During interviews with OPM, most hiring managers said they received some kind of basic training on the Pathways Programs; however, many expressed an interest in additional training to understand more fully the nuances of the Pathways Programs compared to the other hiring authorities their agencies typically use.

Recommendation:

Educate hiring managers about the details of the Pathways Programs to enable them to work as collaborators and subject matter experts in conjunction with HR offices and to foster a more integrative approach to hiring.

Since agencies dedicate significant resources to their Pathways Programs appointees, retention is a key indicator of a successful program. Of the employees given non-temporary Pathways Programs appointments between October 1, 2013, and September 30, 2014, OPM looked at the percentage of Pathways appointees who were still employed by the Federal Government as of August 2015. At that time, agencies were experiencing higher retention rates after two years among their Pathways hires (86.9 percent) than among those hired under DE (79.8 percent).

Table 13: Retention Rates of those hired between 10/1/13 and 9/30/14 – Pathways vs. DE[13]			
Authority	Total Permanent Appointees*	Total Separations within 2 years	% of appointees staying on board at least 2 years
Pathways	6,795	893	86.9%
DE	40,301	8,136	79.8%

In addition, 93 percent of Pathways Programs appointees surveyed plan to remain at their current agencies or continue to work in the Federal Government in the immediate future. Thus, agencies appear to be managing successfully the retention of their Pathways appointees.

Table 14: Do you plan to stay with your current agency and/or continue to work within the Federal Government in the immediate future?		
Interns	Recent Graduates	PMFs
90.6% [230/254] Yes	**96.4%** [186/193] Yes	**84.6%** [11/13] Yes
		93% - overall

Source: OPM Survey to Pathways Participants

Based on healthy retention rates and overall satisfaction with onboarding and training programs, agencies appear to be making sound investments in their Pathways Programs. However, some agencies may want to consider developing a more structured approach to their orientation programs and providing additional training to their hiring managers. In addition, as mentoring is critical to employee development, agencies should ensure they are dedicating sufficient resources to provide mentors to Pathways participants.

---

[13] For statistics by agency, see Table 19 in the appendix.

OPM Oversight

> **Regarding the principle of OPM oversight, OPM considered this question: How is OPM holding agencies accountable for the actions they take using the Pathways Programs' hiring authorities?**
>
> **As discussed in this section, OPM holds agencies accountable by (1) ensuring they are complying with Pathways Programs regulations and the key requirements contained in their MOUs with OPM and (2) providing agencies guidance and direction to enhance the effectiveness of their Pathways Programs.**

Agencies intending to use Pathways Programs authorities must agree to the terms prescribed in their respective MOUs with OPM, and they must report annually on their projected and actual use of the Pathways hiring authorities. As determined through workforce planning, agencies must project total hiring needs for each fiscal year. They also must project hiring opportunities under each of the individual Pathways Programs, indicating the overall percentage of hiring to be done through Pathways authorities. And finally, agencies must report on the previous year's usage, broken out by total hires under all hiring authorities, total hires under each of the Pathways Programs (with percentages for each), and the number (by program) of Pathways appointees who were converted.

In initial reports to OPM, some agencies did not provide all of the required information. Complete and accurate reporting is vital because OPM uses the annual report to help determine if agencies are conducting effective workforce planning and using the Pathways Programs as intended. Reporting overall estimates and actual numbers of appointments will help OPM determine whether the principle of limited scope is met or if it should consider placing caps on the number of Pathways appointments or conversions.

> *Recommendation:*
>
> Establish a quality review mechanism to ensure data reported to OPM are accurate and complete.

Agencies are encouraged to develop quality review mechanisms to ensure data reported to OPM are accurate and complete. One agency, the VA, has developed such a mechanism. It is a Pathways Programs tracker tool to assist with Pathways Programs reporting requirements and compliance monitoring. The tracker provides for centralized maintenance of all required

documentation and allows for the creation, signature, and storage of forms such as the participant agreement. Appointees under the Pathways Programs will use this tool to submit their participant agreements, IDPs, and training requests; update their training records; and track their progress towards completion of required training and development activities. Supervisors, managers, and mentors at the VA can access the tracker to review, approve, and sign documents. The tracker tool also provides the ability to monitor the assignment of mentors, training completion dates, and rates of conversion to the competitive service. This tracker tool affords VA a wealth of information to use in reporting annually to OPM, as well as streamlines and standardizes processes related to Pathways requirements.

> *Notable Practice:*
>
> Tracking tools can help agencies collect, maintain, and analyze data regarding their Pathways Programs participants.

> *Recommendation:*
>
> Develop tracking tools to aid in monitoring Pathways Programs milestones such as completion of training and development activities and conversions to the competitive service.

In addition, OPM holds monthly "office hours" calls with the PPOs to respond to agency inquiries and provide guidance. In 2015, OPM also established an Annual Pathways Day Program, a training event for career development, education, and network for Pathways participants, which includes workshops on leadership development, management skills, and competencies needed for future leadership roles in the Federal Government. A recently issued Pathways Toolkit will provide further clarity. Furthermore, through a collaborative effort with the Partnership for Public Service, PPO workgroups are developing several tools to provide additional guidance to HR staff and hiring managers on the use of Pathways Programs. Forthcoming tools include a desk guide and handbook. Agencies should become familiar with additional guidance as it is released and have standard operating procedures and policies in place to promote consistency.

Finally, OPM routinely includes reviews of Pathways Programs hiring actions in its evaluation work. Many agencies also are evaluating their use of the Pathways Programs authorities by reviewing appointment actions during their independent audits or conducting stand-alone Pathways Programs assessments. Historically, the use of previous student and entry-level recruitment programs has increased over time, and use of the Pathways Programs is expected to increase in the future. As such, agencies are encouraged to continue monitoring and evaluating their programs to ensure compliance with regulations and the effective and efficient use of the Pathways hiring authorities.

> *Recommendation:*
>
> Continually monitor Pathways Programs usage patterns and gauge program effectiveness through oversight activities.

The core principle of OPM oversight is being upheld for the Pathways Program. Most agencies are following the key requirements contained in their MOUs. As part of its oversight role, OPM assesses program effectiveness and ensures agencies are complying with Pathways Programs regulations through its evaluation program, including this study. OPM also provides guidance and direction to agency representatives through quarterly meetings with PPOs (and through the recently issued Pathways Toolkit). OPM will provide additional guidance to agencies on annual reporting requirements.

6.   Conclusion

Agencies have successfully implemented the Pathways Programs and, in general, are adhering to the five core principles that embody the policies established by the President in E.O. 13562. Implementation of the Pathways Programs has been transparent. The use of the Pathways Programs, for the most part, is limited in scope and is fair to veterans. Most agencies are complying with the regulations that govern the Pathways Programs, and some provide oversight through their independent audit programs. However, some agencies have fallen short in providing mentors to Recent Graduate and PMF appointees to help them adjust to their new work environments and achieve job success. Most agencies are using the Pathways Programs hiring authorities to the limited degree intended. Nevertheless, OPM will be reviewing hiring

patterns for agencies that have used the Pathways Programs hiring authorities to a greater extent than competitive hiring authorities to determine if the usage rates served a short-term, legitimate need or reflect a pattern of program abuse.

OPM offers the following recommendations for agencies to improve the effectiveness of their Pathways Programs and to maximize their value:

- To increase the likelihood that only persons with sincere interest in the locations advertised apply for Pathways opportunities, state clearly in job announcements that applicants must be available to work in a particular location for a specific period of time or work hours, if applicable.

- Explore low-cost or cost-neutral outreach activities such as enhancing agency websites and social media presence, networking with professional organizations, establishing, and maintaining contact with community organizations and educational institutions.

- Consider providing training to agency supervisors, managers, and employees to serve as effective recruiters for future vacancies.

- Strengthen workforce planning efforts to increase the strategic use of the Pathways Programs hiring authorities, help close competency gaps, fill MCO positions, and facilitate succession planning efforts.

- Consider developing a structured on-boarding and orientation program to ensure Pathways Programs appointees consistently receive reliable information. Solicit feedback from Pathways appointees, as well as those who have been successfully converted, to develop strategies to improve current on-boarding and orientation processes, as well as the Pathways Programs' training and development programs.

- Review existing mentorship programs to ensure the necessary resources are available to engage Pathways Programs participants through dedicated mentors.

- Educate hiring managers about the details of the Pathways Programs to enable them to work as collaborators and subject matter experts in conjunction with HR offices and to foster a more integrative approach to hiring.

- Establish a quality review mechanism to ensure data reported to OPM are accurate and complete.

- Develop tracking tools to aid in monitoring Pathways Programs milestones such as completion of training and development activities and conversions to the competitive service.

- Continually monitor Pathways Programs usage patterns and gauge program effectiveness through oversight activities.

Going forward, OPM will:

- As part of its oversight role, continually monitor agencies' usage of the Pathways Programs to guard against potential overuse, which may trigger the need for placing caps on the numbers of Pathways appointments or conversions.

- Continue developing guidance materials on the Pathways Programs for agencies, as needed.

- Clarify existing reporting instructions to improve accuracy of agency annual report submissions to OPM.

- Require all agency PMF vacancies be posted to OPM's PMF talent management system to facilitate third-party reconstruction of hiring actions and verification of adherence to veterans' preference rules.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

APPENDIX

The data in this appendix were drawn from EHRI-SDM. Information about pre-Pathways, Pathways, and DE appointments is provided on the 24 CHCO agencies, as well the four small agencies OPM included in this study. Tables 16-19 include the following summary data:

- *Subtotal* – includes the 24 CHCO agencies and four small agencies
- *Other* – all other agencies not included above
- *Governmentwide* – subtotal plus other

The tables in this appendix allow agencies to compare their agency-specific data to Governmentwide data at a glance.

The data depicted here include the number of initial appointments, as well as conversions to excepted appointments. This means the same individual may be reflected more than once in the data because the numbers may include multiple appointments and/or conversion actions for the same individual effected at different times in the same year.

Table 15: Pathways Appointments – FY14	
Type	**Number**
Intern NTE	8,179
Intern	3,103
Recent Graduates	3,203
PMF	494
Total	**14,979**

Table 16: **Usage Rate of Pre-Pathways/Pathways vs. Delegated Examining (DE)**

	Pre-Pathways						Pathways					
	FY10						**FY14**					
	All Hires (temp and perm)			Permanent Hires			All Hires (temp and perm)			Permanent Hires		
Agency	Pre-Pathways All Hires	DE All Hires	% Pre-Pathways All Hires	Pre-Pathways Perm Only	DE Perm Only	% Pre-Pathways Perm Only	Pathways All Hires	DE All Hires	% Pathways All Hires	Pathways Perm Only	DE Perm Only	% Pathways Perm Only
Agriculture	9357	2376	79.7%	1657	1856	47.2%	1193	1487	44.5%	429	984	30.4%
Commerce	966	3494	21.7%	346	1213	22.2%	261	1513	14.7%	36	1474	2.4%
DoD	29268	19071	60.5%	12962	16230	44.4%	5218	10853	22.4%	2597	14599	15.1%
Air Force	9163	5372	63.0%	2913	4757	38.0%	1015	1895	34.9%	471	1522	23.6%
Army	7921	5820	57.6%	3516	4535	43.7%	1700	6218	21.5%	562	3619	13.4%
4th Estate	4344	4213	50.8%	1696	3929	30.2%	814	3831	17.5%	387	3711	9.4%
Navy	7840	3666	68.1%	4837	3009	61.6%	1689	6109	21.7%	1177	5747	17.0%
Education	366	136	72.9%	147	134	52.3%	63	55	53.4%	13	55	19.1%
Energy	576	541	51.6%	250	502	33.2%	179	257	41.1%	86	242	26.2%
EPA	1157	223	83.8%	456	197	69.8%	100	50	66.7%	30	32	48.4%
FDIC	427	1159	26.9%	201	150	57.3%	259	174	59.8%	110	96	53.4%
GSA	570	303	65.3%	385	267	59.0%	47	51	48.0%	32	50	39.0%
HHS	2632	2635	50.0%	1041	2486	29.5%	637	1789	26.3%	195	1657	10.5%
Homeland Security	4303	2771	60.8%	2910	2539	53.4%	495	3475	12.5%	172	3119	5.2%
HUD	824	347	70.4%	230	327	41.3%	186	215	46.4%	118	208	36.2%
Interior	8798	7846	52.9%	1260	2191	36.5%	1317	6504	16.8%	395	1046	27.4%
Justice	3255	3775	46.3%	1099	3630	23.2%	574	3794	13.1%	83	3733	2.2%
Labor	972	797	54.9%	620	758	45.0%	220	433	33.7%	146	417	25.9%
NARA	751	246	75.3%	72	192	27.3%	361	119	75.2%	21	87	19.4%
NASA	441	405	52.1%	320	128	71.4%	278	113	71.1%	265	92	74.2%
NRC	2	0	100.0%	2	0	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
NSF	115	29	79.9%	16	26	38.1%	74	7	91.4%	17	7	70.8%
OMB	32	18	64.0%	10	18	35.7%	23	4	85.2%	23	0	100.0%
OPM	330	237	58.2%	255	216	54.1%	15	123	10.9%	9	121	6.9%
PBGC	106	37	74.1%	15	35	30.0%	65	32	67.0%	9	29	23.7%
SBA	144	684	17.4%	14	172	7.5%	8	733	1.1%	6	37	14.0%
SSA	5684	1808	75.9%	3319	1731	65.7%	1105	3568	23.6%	1078	3536	23.4%
State	1217	411	74.8%	301	379	44.3%	203	201	50.2%	131	195	40.2%
Transportation	503	430	53.9%	210	341	38.1%	175	286	38.0%	116	246	32.0%
Treasury	1667	13069	11.3%	751	10830	6.5%	116	7163	1.6%	80	4139	1.9%
USAID	38	133	22.2%	26	104	20.0%	52	16	76.5%	40	15	72.7%
VA	5626	7470	43.0%	2624	5940	30.6%	1277	4161	23.5%	478	3358	12.5%
Subtotal	80127	70451	53.2%	31499	52592	37.5%	14501	54376	21.1%	6715	39574	14.5%
Other	1289	1369	48.5%	216	1258	14.7%	478	816	36.9%	85	727	10.5%
Govt-wide	81416	71820	**53.1%**	31715	53850	**37.1%**	14979	55192	**21.3%**	6800	40301	**14.4%**

Data in this table reflects pre-Pathways appointments compared to hires from the public through DE authority. "All Hires" columns include temporary and term actions. To allow for easier comparison, "Permanent Hires" columns do not include such actions.

Table 17a: **FY10 Percentage of Veterans Hired Under Pre-Pathways**

Agency	STEP			SCEP			FCIP			PMF			FY10 TOTALS		
	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %
Agriculture	7694	38	0.5%	790	24	3.0%	832	22	2.6%	41	1	2.4%	9357	85	0.9%
Commerce	620	3	0.5%	164	3	1.8%	163	6	3.7%	19	1	5.3%	966	13	1.3%
DoD	16264	286	1.8%	5165	274	5.3%	7797	925	11.9%	42	7	16.7%	29268	1492	5.1%
Air Force	6212	138	2.2%	1785	113	6.3%	1148	174	15.2%	18	2	11.1%	9163	427	4.7%
Army	4403	66	1.5%	1222	43	3.5%	2293	234	10.2%	3	0	0.0%	7921	343	4.3%
4th Estate	2646	33	1.2%	466	12	2.6%	1213	213	17.6%	19	5	26.3%	4344	263	6.1%
Navy	3003	49	1.6%	1692	106	6.3%	3143	304	9.7%	2	0	0.0%	7840	459	5.9%
Education	219	1	0.5%	23	0	0.0%	104	5	4.8%	20	0	0.0%	366	6	1.6%
Energy	329	13	4.0%	99	4	4.0%	137	22	16.1%	11	0	0.0%	576	39	6.8%
EPA	706	11	1.6%	180	4	2.2%	261	20	7.7%	10	1	10.0%	1157	36	3.1%
FDIC	226	1	0.4%	80	1	1.3%	121	10	8.3%	0	0	0.0%	427	12	2.8%
GSA	159	2	1.3%	53	0	0.0%	331	22	6.6%	27	0	0.0%	570	24	4.2%
HHS	1594	11	0.7%	167	2	1.2%	796	52	6.5%	75	2	2.7%	2632	67	2.5%
Homeland Security	1388	17	1.2%	238	5	2.1%	2629	526	20.0%	48	6	12.5%	4303	554	12.9%
HUD	594	1	0.2%	62	0	0.0%	60	1	1.7%	108	8	7.4%	824	10	1.2%
Interior	7511	121	1.6%	1011	40	4.0%	249	27	10.8%	27	0	0.0%	8798	188	2.1%
Justice	2156	24	1.1%	119	3	2.5%	970	178	18.4%	10	1	10.0%	3255	206	6.3%
Labor	352	2	0.6%	111	2	1.8%	496	44	8.9%	13	0	0.0%	972	48	4.9%
NARA	646	17	2.6%	73	1	1.4%	32	3	9.4%	0	0	0.0%	751	21	2.8%
NASA	121	0	0.0%	238	4	1.7%	75	3	4.0%	7	1	14.3%	441	8	1.8%
NRC	0	0	0.0%	2	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	0	0.0%
NSF	99	0	0.0%	13	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	115	0	0.0%
OMB	22	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	7	0	0.0%	32	0	0.0%
OPM	75	0	0.0%	39	0	0.0%	208	25	12.0%	8	0	0.0%	330	25	7.6%
PBGC	91	1	1.1%	4	0	0.0%	11	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	106	1	0.9%
SBA	130	0	0.0%	6	1	16.7%	0	0	0.0%	8	0	0.0%	144	1	0.7%
SSA	2365	17	0.7%	60	2	3.3%	3244	144	4.4%	15	3	20.0%	5684	166	2.9%
State	947	10	1.1%	174	0	0.0%	25	5	20.0%	71	10	14.1%	1217	25	2.1%
Transportation	293	2	0.7%	102	2	2.0%	94	3	3.2%	14	0	0.0%	503	7	1.4%
Treasury	916	16	1.7%	247	6	2.4%	496	28	5.6%	8	0	0.0%	1667	50	3.0%
USAID	12	0	0.0%	10	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	16	1	6.3%	38	1	2.6%
VA	2611	129	4.9%	794	45	5.7%	2182	511	23.4%	39	8	20.5%	5626	693	12.3%
Subtotal	48140	723	1.5%	10027	423	4.2%	21316	2582	12.1%	644	50	7.8%	80127	3778	4.7%
Other	1072	7	0.7%	59	2	3.4%	142	7	4.9%	16	1	6.3%	1289	17	1.3%
Govt'wide	49212	730	**1.5%**	10086	425	**4.2%**	21458	2589	**12.1%**	660	51	**7.7%**	81416	3795	**4.7%**

Table 17b: **FY14 Percentage of Veterans Hired Under Pathways Programs**

Agency	INTERN NTE			INTERN			RECENT GRADUATE			PMF			FY14 TOTALS		
	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %	Hires	Vets	Vet %
Agriculture	764	39	5.1%	271	16	5.9%	119	22	18.5%	39	3	7.7%	1193	80	6.7%
Commerce	225	13	5.8%	8	1	12.5%	19	10	52.6%	9	0	0.0%	261	24	9.2%
DoD	2621	263	10.0%	1337	227	17.0%	1228	561	45.7%	32	16	50.0%	5218	1067	20.4%
Air Force	544	22	4.0%	320	68	21.3%	149	72	48.3%	2	0	0.0%	1015	162	16.0%
Army	1138	121	10.6%	214	50	23.4%	339	170	50.1%	9	7	77.8%	1700	348	20.5%
4th Estate	427	62	14.5%	159	21	13.2%	209	82	39.2%	19	8	42.1%	814	173	21.3%
Navy	512	58	11.3%	644	88	13.7%	531	237	44.6%	2	1	50.0%	1689	384	22.7%
Education	50	8	16.0%	3	1	33.3%	0	0	0.0%	10	1	10.0%	63	10	15.9%
Energy	93	11	11.8%	53	24	45.3%	26	6	23.1%	7	3	42.9%	179	44	24.6%
EPA	70	9	12.9%	12	1	8.3%	10	2	20.0%	8	0	0.0%	100	12	12.0%
FDIC	149	17	11.4%	66	9	13.6%	44	9	20.5%	0	0	0.0%	259	35	13.5%
GSA	15	0	0.0%	9	1	11.1%	22	18	81.8%	1	1	100.0%	47	20	42.6%
HHS	442	28	6.3%	86	7	8.1%	58	20	34.5%	51	7	13.7%	637	62	9.7%
Homeland Security	323	33	10.2%	123	16	13.0%	35	17	48.6%	14	6	42.9%	495	72	14.5%
HUD	68	11	16.2%	14	1	7.1%	4	0	0.0%	100	21	21.0%	186	33	17.7%
Interior	922	98	10.6%	294	43	14.6%	84	19	22.6%	17	1	5.9%	1317	161	12.2%
Justice	491	39	7.9%	80	11	13.8%	1	0	0.0%	2	1	50.0%	574	51	8.9%
Labor	74	6	8.1%	61	11	18.0%	69	17	24.6%	16	1	6.3%	220	35	15.9%
NARA	340	42	12.4%	21	1	4.8%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	361	43	11.9%
NASA	13	4	30.8%	229	46	20.1%	31	15	48.4%	5	3	60.0%	278	68	24.5%
NRC	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
NSF	57	0	0.0%	14	8	57.1%	0	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	74	8	10.8%
OMB	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	23	2	8.7%	23	2	8.7%
OPM	6	1	16.7%	1	1	100.0%	5	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	15	2	13.3%
PBGC	56	5	8.9%	9	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	65	5	7.7%
SBA	2	0	0.0%	2	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%	3	0	0.0%	8	1	12.5%
SSA	27	1	3.7%	0	0	0.0%	1065	250	23.5%	13	7	53.8%	1105	258	23.3%
State	72	2	2.8%	78	12	15.4%	21	9	42.9%	32	3	9.4%	203	26	12.8%
Transportation	59	6	10.2%	75	18	24.0%	32	13	40.6%	9	1	11.1%	175	38	21.7%
Treasury	36	4	11.1%	49	7	14.3%	15	9	60.0%	16	5	31.3%	116	25	21.6%
USAID	12	3	25.0%	1	0	0.0%	3	1	33.3%	36	3	8.3%	52	7	13.5%
VA	799	192	24.0%	174	64	36.8%	278	178	64.0%	26	12	46.2%	1277	446	34.9%
Subtotal	7786	835	10.7%	3070	526	17.1%	3170	1177	37.1%	475	97	20.4%	14501	2635	18.2%
Other	393	43	10.9%	33	11	33.3%	33	13	39.4%	19	4	21.1%	478	71	14.9%
Govt'wide	8179	878	**10.7%**	3103	537	**17.3%**	3203	1190	**37.2%**	494	101	**20.4%**	14979	2706	**18.1%**

Table 18a: **FY10 Percentage of Female Hires Under Pathways Programs**

Agency	STEP Hires	STEP Female	STEP % Female	SCEP Hires	SCEP Female	SCEP % Female	FCIP Hires	FCIP Female	FCIP % Female	PMF Hires	PMF Female	PMF % Female	FY10 TOTALS Hires	FY10 TOTALS Female	FY10 TOTALS % Female
Agriculture	7694	3432	44.6%	790	421	53.3%	832	383	46.0%	41	30	73.2%	9357	4266	45.6%
Commerce	620	293	47.3%	164	68	41.5%	163	49	30.1%	19	10	52.6%	966	420	43.5%
DoD	16264	7986	49.1%	5165	1865	36.1%	7797	2921	37.5%	42	20	47.6%	29268	12792	43.7%
Air Force	6212	3162	50.9%	1785	613	34.3%	1148	341	29.7%	18	11	61.1%	9163	4127	45.0%
Army	4403	2015	45.8%	1222	499	40.8%	2293	878	38.3%	3	1	33.3%	7921	3393	42.8%
4th Estate	2646	1425	53.9%	466	255	54.7%	1213	513	42.3%	19	6	31.6%	4344	2199	50.6%
Navy	3003	1384	46.1%	1692	498	29.4%	3143	1189	37.8%	2	2	100%	7840	3073	39.2%
Education	219	128	58.4%	23	14	60.9%	104	69	66.3%	20	13	65.0%	366	224	61.2%
Energy	329	162	49.2%	99	41	41.4%	137	57	41.6%	11	3	27.3%	576	263	45.7%
EPA	706	435	61.6%	180	94	52.2%	261	153	58.6%	10	6	60.0%	1157	688	59.5%
FDIC	226	142	62.8%	80	40	50.0%	121	35	28.9%	0	0	0.0%	427	217	50.8%
GSA	159	88	55.3%	53	28	52.8%	331	165	49.8%	27	14	51.9%	570	295	51.8%
HHS	1594	998	62.6%	167	122	73.1%	796	506	63.6%	75	58	77.3%	2632	1684	64.0%
Homeland Security	1388	795	57.3%	238	131	55.0%	2629	449	17.1%	48	21	43.8%	4303	1396	32.4%
HUD	594	394	66.3%	62	44	71.0%	60	28	46.7%	108	55	50.9%	824	521	63.2%
Interior	7511	3337	44.4%	1011	484	47.9%	249	93	37.3%	27	8	29.6%	8798	3922	44.6%
Justice	2156	1335	61.9%	119	51	42.9%	970	334	34.4%	10	7	70.0%	3255	1727	53.1%
Labor	352	216	61.4%	111	72	64.9%	496	237	47.8%	13	9	69.2%	972	534	54.9%
NARA	646	408	63.2%	73	49	67.1%	32	18	56.3%	0	0	0.0%	751	475	63.2%
NASA	121	72	59.5%	238	101	42.4%	75	29	38.7%	7	3	42.9%	441	205	46.5%
NRC	0	0	0.0%	2	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	0	0.0%
NSF	99	64	64.6%	13	11	84.6%	3	2	66.7%	0	0	0.0%	115	77	67.0%
OMB	22	12	54.5%	3	2	66.7%	0	0	0.0%	7	5	71.4%	32	19	59.4%
OPM	75	46	61.3%	39	27	69.2%	208	114	54.8%	8	1	12.5%	330	188	57.0%
PBGC	91	50	54.9%	4	3	75.0%	11	3	27.3%	0	0	0.0%	106	56	52.8%
SBA	130	73	56.2%	6	3	50.0%	0	0	0.0%	8	5	62.5%	144	81	56.3%
SSA	2365	1493	63.1%	60	36	60.0%	3244	2140	66.0%	15	7	46.7%	5684	3676	64.7%
State	947	592	62.5%	174	114	65.5%	25	14	56.0%	71	36	50.7%	1217	756	62.1%
Transportation	293	165	56.3%	102	53	52.0%	94	35	37.2%	14	4	28.6%	503	257	51.1%
Treasury	916	539	58.8%	247	133	53.8%	496	215	43.3%	8	5	62.5%	1667	892	53.5%
USAID	12	6	50.0%	10	7	70.0%	0	0	0.0%	16	9	56.3%	38	22	57.9%
VA	2611	1607	61.5%	794	496	62.5%	2182	1143	52.4%	39	20	51.3%	5626	3266	58.1%
Subtotal	48140	24868	51.7%	10027	4510	45.0%	21316	9192	43.1%	644	349	54.2%	80127	38919	48.6%
Other	1072	539	50.3%	59	43	72.9%	142	64	45.1%	16	10	62.5%	1289	656	50.9%
Govt'wide	49212	25407	**51.6%**	10086	4553	**45.1%**	21458	9256	**43.1%**	660	359	**54.4%**	81416	39575	**48.6%**

Table 18b: **FY14 Percentage of Female Hires Under Pathways Programs**

Agency	INTERN NTE Hires	INTERN NTE Female	INTERN NTE % Female	INTERN Hires	INTERN Female	INTERN % Female	RECENT GRADUATE Hires	RECENT GRADUATE Female	RECENT GRADUATE % Female	PMF Hires	PMF Female	PMF % Female	FY14 TOTALS Hires	FY14 TOTALS Female	FY14 TOTALS % Female
Agriculture	764	421	55.1%	271	157	57.9%	119	55	46.2%	39	21	53.8%	1193	654	54.8%
Commerce	225	95	42.2%	8	4	50.0%	19	7	36.8%	9	5	55.6%	261	111	42.5%
DoD	2621	1140	43.5%	1337	502	37.5%	1228	397	32.3%	32	13	40.6%	5218	2052	39.3%
Air Force	544	264	48.5%	320	106	33.1%	149	30	20.1%	2	1	50.0%	1015	401	39.5%
Army	1138	433	38.0%	214	89	41.6%	339	99	29.2%	9	3	33.3%	1700	624	36.7%
4th Estate	427	238	55.7%	159	80	50.3%	209	90	43.1%	19	9	47.4%	814	417	51.2%
Navy	512	205	40.0%	644	227	35.2%	531	178	33.5%	2	0	0.0%	1689	610	36.1%
Education	50	36	72.0%	3	2	66.7%	0	0	0.0%	10	5	50.0%	63	43	68.3%
Energy	93	42	45.2%	53	16	30.2%	26	10	38.5%	7	3	42.9%	179	71	39.7%
EPA	70	42	60.0%	12	9	75.0%	10	4	40.0%	8	7	87.5%	100	62	62.0%
FDIC	149	72	48.3%	66	37	56.1%	44	18	40.9%	0	0	0.0%	259	127	49.0%
GSA	15	7	46.7%	9	3	33.3%	22	6	27.3%	1	0	0.0%	47	16	34.0%
HHS	442	269	60.9%	86	61	70.9%	58	23	39.7%	51	33	64.7%	637	386	60.6%
Homeland Security	323	198	61.3%	123	70	56.9%	35	16	45.7%	14	2	14.3%	495	286	57.8%
HUD	68	44	64.7%	14	3	21.4%	4	1	25.0%	100	61	61.0%	186	109	58.6%
Interior	922	413	44.8%	294	112	38.1%	84	30	35.7%	17	10	58.8%	1317	565	42.9%
Justice	491	310	63.1%	80	44	55.0%	1	1	100%	2	2	100%	574	357	62.2%
Labor	74	42	56.8%	61	32	52.5%	69	29	42.0%	16	9	56.3%	220	112	50.9%
NARA	340	213	62.6%	21	10	47.6%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	361	223	61.8%
NASA	13	6	46.2%	229	79	34.5%	31	12	38.7%	5	0	0.0%	278	97	34.9%
NRC	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
NSF	57	45	78.9%	14	10	71.4%	0	0	0.0%	3	3	100%	74	58	78.4%
OMB	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	23	8	34.8%	23	8	34.8%
OPM	6	5	83.3%	1	0	0.0%	5	4	80.0%	3	3	100%	15	12	80.0%
PBGC	56	36	64.3%	9	7	77.8%	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	65	43	66.2%
SBA	2	1	50.0%	2	1	50.0%	1	1	100%	3	3	100%	8	6	75.0%
SSA	27	17	63.0%	0	0	0.0%	1065	639	60.0%	13	5	38.5%	1105	661	59.8%
State	72	50	69.4%	78	42	53.8%	21	9	42.9%	32	20	62.5%	203	121	59.6%
Transportation	59	27	45.8%	75	31	41.3%	32	10	31.3%	9	2	22.2%	175	70	40.0%
Treasury	36	17	47.2%	49	26	53.1%	15	4	26.7%	16	6	37.5%	116	53	45.7%
USAID	12	3	25.0%	1	0	0.0%	3	1	33.3%	36	23	63.9%	52	27	51.9%
VA	799	461	57.7%	174	100	57.5%	278	106	38.1%	26	13	50.0%	1277	680	53.2%
Subtotal	7786	4012	51.5%	3070	1358	44.2%	3170	1383	43.6%	475	257	54.1%	14501	7010	48.3%
Other	393	198	50.4%	33	10	30.3%	33	9	27.3%	19	5	26.3%	478	222	46.4%
Govt'wide	8179	4210	**51.5%**	3103	1368	**44.1%**	3203	1392	**43.5%**	494	262	**53.0%**	14979	7232	**48.3%**

Table 19: **FY14 Retention Rates for those hired between 10/1/13 and 9/30/14 Pathways vs. Delegated Examining**

Agency	Appointees excluding temp interns	Total # Pathways separations within two years	% non-temp Pathways appointees staying on board at least 2 years	DE excluding temp and term	Total # non-temp DE separations within two years	% non-temp DE appointees staying on board at least 2 years
Agriculture	429	39	90.9%	984	1	99.9%
Commerce	36	6	83.3%	1474	232	84.3%
DoD	2597	301	88.4%	14599	1937	86.7%
Air Force	471	41	91.3%	1522	161	89.4%
Army	562	75	86.6%	3619	348	90.4%
4th Estate	387	64	83.4%	3711	899	75.8%
Navy	1177	120	89.8%	5747	529	90.8%
Education	13	0	100.0%	55	0	100.0%
Energy	86	14	83.7%	242	24	90.1%
EPA	30	4	86.6%	32	0	100.0%
FDIC	110	22	80.0%	96	6	93.8%
GSA	32	3	90.6%	50	7	86.0%
HHS	195	26	86.7%	1657	123	92.6%
Homeland Security	172	32	81.4%	3119	329	89.5%
HUD	118	4	96.6%	208	17	91.8%
Interior	395	61	84.5%	1046	117	88.8%
Justice	83	12	85.5%	3733	457	87.8%
Labor	146	21	85.6%	417	45	89.2%
NARA	21	0	100.0%	87	25	71.3%
NASA	265	21	92.1%	92	1	98.9%
NRC	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
NSF	17	5	70.5%	7	0	100.0%
OMB	23	0	100.0%	0	0	0.0%
OPM	9	1	88.9%	121	7	94.2%
PBGC	9	1	88.9%	29	1	96.6%
SBA	6	0	100.0%	37	5	86.5%
SSA	1078	131	87.8%	3536	505	85.7%
State	131	19	85.5%	195	22	88.7%
Transportation	116	35	69.8%	246	24	90.2%
Treasury	80	19	76.3%	4139	1534	62.9%
USAID	40	1	97.5%	15	0	100.0%
VA	478	95	80.1%	3358	687	79.5%
Subtotal	6715	876	**86.9%**	39574	8043	**79.7%**
Other	85	17	**80.0%**	727	93	**87.2%**
Govt'wide	6795	893	**86.9%**	40301	8136	**79.8%**

Table 20: **Top 10 Series Filled by Pathways Programs in FY14**

Recent Graduates

Rank	# Hires	%**	Series	Title
1	395	12.3	0962	Contact Representative
2	353	11.0	0105	Social Insurance Administration
3	273	8.5	0901	General Legal and Kindred Administration
4	155	4.8	0996	Veteran Claims Examining
5	145	4.5	0511	Auditing*
6	126	3.9	1102	Contracting*
7	113	3.5	2210	Information Technology Management*
8	87	2.7	0501	Financial Administration and Program Management
9	84	2.6	0346	Logistics Management
10	75	2.3	0510	Accounting

PMFs

Rank	# Hires	%	Series	Title
1	207	41.9	0301	Miscellaneous Administration and Program Management
2	89	18.0	0343	Management and Program Analysis
3	35	7.1	0130	Foreign Affairs
4	14	2.8	0401	Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences
5	13	2.6	0671	Health System Specialist
6	13	2.6	0685	Public Health Program Specialist
7	9	1.8	0110	Economist*
8	8	1.6	0560	Budget Analysis
9	8	1.6	0601	General Health Science
10	7	1.4	0501	Financial Administration and Program Management

** Percentages in tables represent hires in a specific series from a population of all hires made within the individual program (Recent Graduates or PMF).
* Governmentwide MCO

U.S. Office of Personnel Management

Merit System Accountability & Compliance
1900 E Street, NW, Washington, DC 20415

OPM.GOV