

## PART Management Grades Dataset

This dataset includes data on all federal programs graded by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as part of their budget-performance integration initiative in the FY 2004-2006 federal budgets. OMB has graded 614 programs since the Bush Administration's initiative began in 2002 (for the FY 2004 budget). They have graded approximately 200 programs each year (234, 175, 206). Each program is one observation in the data. Although programs graded for the first time in 2002 and 2003 have been regraded in subsequent years, this dataset includes programs only for the first year they were graded. Programs are located in different bureaus across the federal government, some within a cabinet department and some located in independent agencies.

### Variable List

**Programid**—This is a unique numerical identifier for each program. Programs with identifiers from 0-1000 were graded in 2002. Programs with identifiers between 1000-2000 were graded in 2003. Programs with identifiers between 2000-3000 were graded in 2004.

**Department**—Each PART worksheet lists a space for the department and bureau that houses the federal program. This entry lists the department listed.

**DepartmentID**—This is a unique numerical identifier for each department. All cabinet departments have their own department ID (1-15). All independent agencies have the same ID (16). For the FY 2004 data, department IDs for the bureaus in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) correspond to the bureaus' old home departments rather than the new department. The DHS got its formal start in January, 2003 so these bureaus were not yet in the new department when graded. The one federal program in the new department that was graded but had no previous existence before the DHS started (Departmental Management—Program ID 136) was coded with the DHS identifier.

**DepartmentID2**—This is a unique numerical identifier for each department. All cabinet departments have their own department ID (1-15). All independent agencies with more than one subordinate bureaus also have a unique identifier (17-23). All agencies with no subordinate bureaus have the same ID (16). For the FY 2004 data, department IDs for the bureaus in the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) correspond to the bureaus' old home departments rather than the new department. The DHS got its formal start in January, 2003 so these bureaus were not yet in the new department when graded. The one federal program in the new department that was graded but had no previous existence before the DHS started (Departmental Management—ProgramID 136) was coded with the DHS identifier.

**Bureau**—Each PART worksheet lists a space for the department and bureau that houses the federal program. This entry lists the bureau listed. If the bureau entry is empty or the department and bureau entries are the same, this column is left blank. In cases where a bureau is listed along with a subordinate office, the subordinate office is considered the bureau. For example, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) is considered part of the State

Department. If the PART worksheet listed the Office of Transition Initiatives within USAID as the bureau, this was considered the relevant bureau for the dataset.

**Ompcode**--Unique 4 digit OPM agency identifier. First two digits normally identify the department and the last two normally identify the bureau within the department.

**Supman**—The number of supervisors or managers who work in the agency. Between 1988 and 2005 OPM used codes to indicate supervisory status. These codes vary from 2 to 8. If an employee is coded with a 2 this means:

Position requires the exercise of supervisory or managerial responsibilities that meet, at least, the minimum requirements for application of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide or similar standards of minimum supervisory responsibility specified by position classification standards or other directives of the applicable pay schedule or system.<sup>1</sup>

This is the highest managerial classification.

**Year**—Year program was first evaluated in the PART process. This variable takes on the values 2002-2004.

**Bureauid**—This is a unique numerical identifier for each bureau (as defined above under **Bureau**). Some bureaus administer several federal programs. There are 243 unique bureaus in the dataset.

**Nobureau (0,1)**—This is an indicator variable that is coded 1 if there is no unique bureau listed for the federal program. All other federal programs are coded with a 0.

**Program**—The name of the federal program.

### **Bureau Personnel Data**<sup>2</sup>

**Otherses**—A count of the total number of limited term or emergency members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) in the bureau that houses the program. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated.

**Careerses**—A count of the number of career members of the Senior Executive Service (SES) in the bureau that houses the program. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Office of Personnel Management. 2006. *The Guide to Personnel Data Standards*. Available at [www.opm.gov/feddata/guidance.htm](http://www.opm.gov/feddata/guidance.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Source: [www.fedscope.opm.gov](http://www.fedscope.opm.gov). The more appropriate data connecting personnel information to management performance may be information from May of the year the program was evaluated initially by OMB. The PART process for the fiscal year generally begins in earnest in May two years before the fiscal year. So, the PART process for the fiscal year 2007 budget begins in earnest in May of 2005.

**Noncareerses**—A count of the number of politically appointed members of the Senior Executive Service in the bureau that houses the program. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated. Service-wide 10% of SES members may be appointed. In any particular agency as many as 25% of the SES members can be appointed.

**Totalses**—A count of the total number of Senior Executive Service members employed in the bureau that houses the program. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated. Some agencies have no SES members, many because they have been given authority to create their own personnel systems outside of the traditional Title 5-defined merit system.

**Emp**—A count of the total number of federal civilian employees working in the bureau that houses the program. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated.

**PAS**—A count of the total number of Senate-confirmed appointees working in the bureau that houses the program. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated.

**Schedule A**—A count of the total number of Schedule A employees in the bureau. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated. Schedule A positions are filled outside the traditional merit system. Such positions were excluded from traditional merit system because it was impractical to hold competitive examinations for these positions. There are no examinations held for Schedule A positions and some positions historically included in the schedule include lawyers, military chaplains, or positions in isolated localities.

**Schedule B**— A count of the total number of Schedule B employees in the bureau. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated. Schedule B employees are hired outside the normal merit-system procedures again because of the impracticality of holding competitive examinations. Schedule B positions can have examinations attached to them but the examinations establish a threshold level of acceptability rather than comparisons across applicants. Historically Schedule B positions have included positions in new agencies or programs for which there are no established directions or guidelines yet established, federal work-study positions, and positions for certain types of disabilities.

**Schedule C**— A count of the total number of Schedule C employees in the bureau. Data are from September of the year the program was evaluated. Schedule C was created in 1953 by President Eisenhower and it is reserved for positions of a confidential or policy-determining nature. Schedule C originally included both management positions below the PAS level and the assorted staff assigned to appointees (confidential assistants, drivers, etc.). As such, the pay range for Schedule C appointees varied dramatically depending upon the position. Top management positions in the Schedule C were eventually converted to NEA positions in 1966 and SES positions in 1978. Lower pay Schedule C positions remain (GS 15 and below). Some positions currently included in the Schedule C are special or confidential assistants to PAS appointees, directors of communications, press, or outreach offices, and officials in legislative liaison offices. Part of the current Schedule C has its analog in the political ministerial staff that appears to be increasing in Western parliamentary democracies.

**Commission** (0,1)—An indicator coded 1 if the agency is a commission rather than an administration.<sup>3</sup>

**Term** (0,1)—An indicator coded 1 if the manager serves for a fixed term defined in law.

### **Program Data**

**Styear**—This is the year the program was created. There were several sources searched for this data including the PART worksheets, web research, the United States Government Manual, and other library resources.

#### *PART score data*

The PART management grading scheme is straightforward. It includes numerical grades from 0 to 100 in 4 categories and a final total weighted numerical management grade. The four categories with their purposes are:<sup>4</sup>

- Program Purpose & Design (weight= 20%): to assess whether the program design and purpose are clear and defensible
- Strategic Planning (weight= 10%): to assess whether the agency sets valid annual and long-term goals for the program
- Program Management (weight=20%): to rate agency management of the program, including financial oversight and program improvement efforts
- Program Results (weight=50%): to rate program performance on goals reviewed in the strategic planning section and through other evaluations

Grades were determined in each category based upon answers to a series of yes/no questions relevant to the section in question and adjusted for the type of program under consideration (block grant, regulatory, credit, etc.). For example, one question used to assess the quality of strategic planning asks, “Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?” Other questions used to evaluate management quality include:

- Are federal managers and program partners (grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, etc.) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?
- Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?
- Does the program have a limited number of specific, ambitious long-term performance goals that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?
- Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?

For these and other questions the OMB provided background information on the purpose of the question and elements of an affirmative response. Answers were determined jointly by the agency running the program and an OMB examiner. In cases of disagreement they were

---

<sup>3</sup> Source: U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. *Policy and Supporting Positions*. 106<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2d Sess.; U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. *Policy and Supporting Positions*. 108<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2d Sess.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Office of Management and Budget. *Instructions for the Program Assessment Ratings Tool*. Washington, DC, July 12, 2002. See also U.S. Office of Management and Budget. 2003. *Budget of the United States Government FY 2004: Performance Management and Assessments*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

resolved through arbitration by OMB hierarchy, namely the OMB branch chief and, if necessary, the division director and Program Associate Director.

**Programpurpose<sub>raw</sub>**—The raw program purpose and design score from the PART worksheet.

**Strategicplanning<sub>raw</sub>**—The raw strategic planning score from the PART worksheet.

**Programmanagement<sub>raw</sub>**—The raw program management score from the PART worksheet.

**Programresults<sub>raw</sub>**—The raw program results score from the PART worksheet.

**Totalweighted**—The total numerical management score for the program. It is a weighted combination of the raw scores described above. The weighting is described above.

**Programtype** (1-3)—This is a descriptor of what type of federal program it is. OMB has categorized all federal programs as one of 8 types. They are:

1. Block/Formula Grant
2. Capital Assets and Service Acquisition
3. Competitive Grant
4. Credit
5. Direct Federal
6. Regulatory Based
7. Research and Development
8. Mixed

Programtype<sub>2</sub> and Programtype<sub>3</sub> are additional columns included in case OMB listed more than one program type as they began to do in FY 2005. These columns are incomplete for the FY 2005 data but complete for the FY 2004 (empty) and FY 2006 data.

**Programgrade** (0-4)—All federal programs were given a categorical grade in addition to numerical grades—ineffective (0), results not demonstrated (1), adequate (2), moderately effective (3), effective (4).

**Actualbudine<sub>vyr</sub>**—Program budget size in millions of dollars. Program budget taken for year program was evaluated. So, for the FY 2004 programs, data listed is the actual budget in FY 2002.

### **Program Manager Data**

This dataset includes data on the bureau chiefs that administer federal programs. For every bureau (as defined above) a chief is listed.<sup>5</sup> In cases where no bureau was listed on PART

---

<sup>5</sup> The primary sources of this information are the *Federal Yellow Book* and *U.S. Government Policy and Supporting Positions*. *Federal Yellow Book: Who's Who in Federal Departments and Agencies*. New York, NY: Leadership Directories, Inc. (various years); U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Governmental Affairs. *Policy and Supporting Positions*. 106<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2d Sess.; U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Government Reform. *Policy and Supporting Positions*. 108<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2d Sess.

worksheets, the department head is listed and assumed to be responsible for the program. In cases where commissions were listed, the chairman of the commission is listed. In cases where there is turnover during the PART process, the bureau chief listed is the person serving in May of the year the program was evaluated. So, for the FY 2004 programs, the bureau chief is the person serving in May of 2002. There were some cases where new bureaus ran programs and people came on board after the PART process was well underway. These include the Electric Transmission and Distribution, the Office of Domestic Preparedness, and the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. In cases where a person is administering a bureau in an acting role, we include the acting person as the bureau chief. There is an indicator in the dataset for those serving in an acting capacity. If a new bureau chief is formally appointed during the PART process, they are listed even if it occurs after May. There is an indicator for this possibility below also.

**Position**—The title of the director of the bureau.

**Mgrid**—This is a unique numerical identifier for each manager in the dataset. There are 244 different managers in the dataset.

**Manager**—The name of the head of the bureau implementing the program.

**Apptype**—A description of how the position of bureau chief was filled. A politically appointed manager can be a Senate-confirmed appointee (PAS), a non-SES presidential appointee without confirmation (PA), a noncareer (appointed) member of the Senior Executive Service (NA), a schedule C appointee (schC). A career manager is identified with the code CA. They can either be career managers at the GS Level or careerists in the Senior Executive Service. There are also a handful of managers appointed through some statutorily defined process that is outside the traditional personnel system procedures (XS). Ninety-nine percent of managers in the dataset are either PAS, NA, or CA. There is 1 PA appointment (Chairman, Denali Commission) and 3 managers in positions excluded from the merit system by statute (XS—Armed Forces Retirement Home; Federal Student Aid; Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation).

Two managers were listed inconsistently in the Plum Book and the Federal Yellow Book. The head of the Minerals Management Service (R.M. Burton) was listed as a Schedule C appointee in the *Federal Yellow Book* but as a noncareer SES appointee in the *Plum Book*. The head of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (Carl Truscott) is listed as a Schedule C appointee in the *Plum Book* but the *Federal Yellow Book* suggests he is a careerist. His bio refers to his background in the Senior Executive Service. I called BATFE and they claim that the Homeland Security Act makes the head of this bureau an appointee of the Attorney General and so Schedule C is appropriate.

**Plumbook** (0,1)—This is an indicator variable coded 1 if there was no information in the *Federal Yellow Book* to help identify whether the manager was an appointee or a careerist or whether the *Policy and Supporting Positions* publication was necessary to identify the appointment status of the manager.

**Startdate**—The date the manager became the manager of the bureau administering the federal program in question. This data is incomplete and includes only dates for managers that were new in the FY 2006 grading. Other dates can be inferred by looking at tenure data and working backwards. All dates have a margin of error of +/- 1 month.

**Bio**—Selections of the managers' publicly available bios. Bios were obtained from agency websites, press releases, media reports, *Who's Who in America* (on-line version), and direct contacts with the bureaus or program managers themselves. This data was used to code for the personal information of all managers. (Not in Stata file)

**Appointment authority indicators** (YCA, YNA, YPAS--0,1)— These variables are mutually exclusive indicators identifying how the manager was selected.

**Tenure**—A count of the number of months the manager has been in charge of the bureau. This is calculated by subtracting the start date of the manager from May of the year when the PART evaluation takes place. If, for example, a manager becomes bureau director in May of 2001 and their program is evaluated for the FY 2004 budget, their tenure is 12 months since FY 2004 programs were evaluated beginning in May 2002.

If the manager was in charge of the bureau in an acting capacity before formal appointment or confirmation by the Senate, the start date for the manager is the date when they assumed their role in an acting capacity. In cases where bureaus were created after the PART process was started or a manager comes on board after the PART process was started, tenure is coded as 0 in months. Months are calculated with a margin of error of +/- one month.

**Congress** (0,1)—An indicator for whether the manager's bio indicates previous experience working in Congress as a legislator, staff member of a committee, or personal staff.

**Burexp** (0,1)— An indicator for whether the manager's bio indicates previous work experience in the bureau prior to becoming the director.

**Outburexp** (0,1)— An indicator for whether the manager's bio indicates previous experience working the federal government outside the bureau they manage.

**Depexp** (0,1)—An indicator for whether the manager's bio indicates previous work experience in the department prior to becoming director.

**Publicmgt** (0,1)— An indicator for whether the manager's bio indicates previous public management experience at the federal, state, or local level.

**PrivateNPMgt** (0,1)— An indicator for whether the manager's bio indicates previous management experience in the private or not for profit sector.

**Numed** (0-3)—This variable is coded according to the highest level of education received. The variable is coded 0 if the manager's bio indicates no education above a high school level, a 1 for Bachelors, a 2 for masters level, and a 3 for doctoral degree.

**Acting** (0,1)—An indicator variable coded 1 if the manager at the time of the PART evaluation was serving in an acting capacity. If a new manager replaces the acting manager during the PART process, the new manager is listed and this variable takes on a value of 0. If the acting manager becomes the permanent manager during the PART process, this variable still takes on a value of 1.

**Turnover** (0,1)—An indicator coded 1 if there was management turnover in the bureau during the PART process.

**Notitle5** (0,1)—An indicator variable coded 1 if the bureau has statutory authority to staff the agency outside the traditional Title 5-based personnel system. These agencies include USPS, TVA, FAA, Federal Reserve, NRC, OFHEO, Library of Congress, FDIC, Peace Corps, VHA, NSA, CIA, FBI, Sallie Mae, OTS, FAS, NIMA, FSA, and the FEC. It also includes all government sponsored enterprises like the Farm Credit Administration.

**Othdep** (0,1)—An indicator coded 1 if the manager’s bio indicates that the manager has worked in another department in the federal government prior to becoming manager of their current bureau.

**Degree**—Highest degree (s) obtained by the manager. This variable is followed by indicators for different types of degrees.

**Liberal** (0,1)—Agencies whose preference estimates were statistically distinguishable from moderate agencies using the preference measure described below.

**Conservative** (0,1)-- Agencies whose preference estimates were statistically distinguishable from moderate agencies using the preference measure described below.

**Aprefs**—This is an estimate of agency preferences on a liberal-conservative scale based upon an expert survey where estimates are adjusted for heterogeneity among raters.<sup>6</sup> Specifically, the estimate accounts for heterogeneity in discrimination among raters and different thresholds for what counts as liberal or conservative.

**Advice for using this data:**

Users of this dataset are encouraged to not the following:

1. There are multiple observations on different managers and different bureaus. This should be accounted for in analysis. Some managers or bureaus have as many as 13 programs in this data.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Clinton, Joshua D., and David E. Lewis. 2007. “Expert Opinion, Agency Characteristics, and Agency Preferences.” *Political Analysis*, Forthcoming.

2. To cut and paste this data from Excel to statistics packages such as STATA users may want to cut out the Bio variable since it has long, string-based entries that have no use in statistical analysis.
3. The extent to which what the dataset identifies as managers are truly managers depends upon the precision of the definition of the bureau. Some bureau chiefs are closer to actual program managers than others. For example, those programs that have no bureaus listed are often classified as being run by cabinet secretaries or administrators of large agencies. Any empirical analysis with this data should account for this fact and make sure that the results are robust to the inclusion and exclusion of programs with bureaus listed and programs without bureaus listed.
4. The coding of whether or not a manager is a careerist or an appointee is pretty reliable. The shakiest cases are those for which the variable **Plumbook** below is coded with a 1. Robustness checks should include the inclusion and exclusion of these cases as well.
5. A number of the programs are administered by commissions. In this data, the chairman of the commission is considered the manager. Users of this data may want to include or exclude programs administered by commissions if there is concern that chairpersons are in a fundamentally different position than other bureau chiefs.