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Executive Summary

Introduction

This document summarizes a half-day workshop exploring the challenges and opportunities involved in recruiting, hiring, and retaining science and engineering professionals. Nearly 50 key staff members from 18 Federal agencies and representatives from the Office of Science and Technology Policy and the U.S. Office of Personnel Management attended the workshop, which was held on February 10, 2012, in Washington, DC.

Pre-Workshop Survey

The Partnership for Public Service (PPS) surveyed Federal hiring managers and human resources specialists about their experiences in recruiting and retaining scientists and engineers. Survey respondents identified “pay in comparison to the private sector” as the chief deterrent for top science and engineering professionals accepting a position in the Federal Government. Nearly 60 percent of the respondents also identified “limited opportunities for professional advancement.” The majority of these respondents identified “recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives” as a highly successful strategy for the recruitment of science and engineering professionals and for their retention. Survey respondents also identified “special pay rates” and “direct hiring authority” as effective for increasing the recruitment of top science and engineering talent, but “special pay rates” were seen as effective for retaining the top talent by only about one-third of survey respondents.

A final question in the PPS survey probed possible roles and strategies for the White House in helping agencies successfully recruit top science and engineering talent. Respondents noted that the White House could:

- Give special hiring authority and remove spending/retention and recruitment bonus limitations.
- Relax limits on the use of the science and technology pay system and Schedule B appointments (i.e., appointments to jobs where competitive hiring procedures are impractical).
- Use recruiters, not USAJOBS, to locate and find candidates.
- Encourage agencies to create a technical ladder for those interested in science and engineering.
- Support legislation to provide direct-hire authority for science and engineering positions at the prevailing market pay rate.
- Support a Federal market pay study for all science and engineering positions to support the increased pay caps.

**Results for the Small Group Discussions**

Workshop participants adjourned into five discussion groups: Recruiting, Retention, Career Advancement and Development, Total Compensation, and Classification and Job Expectations. At the conclusion of the small group discussions, participants created a master list of recommendations. The recommendations were evaluated in terms of their impact on recruiting and retaining science and engineering professionals and feasibility of being implemented. Two recommendations were judged to have a high impact and a high feasibility:

- Work to identify hard-to-fill positions in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields that are critical to the mission (i.e., mission critical occupations) of each agency.
- Establish an action-oriented network of human capital and science and engineering professionals to share concerns and explore recruitment and retention solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Opening Remarks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Pre-Workshop Survey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Small Group Discussions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recruiting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Retention</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Career Advancement and Development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total Compensation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Classification and Job Expectations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Plenary Session</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Wrap-up and Next Steps</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix. Supporting Materials</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td>B-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Introduction

In December 2011, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) invited Federal Chief Human Capital Officers to encourage their agency staffs to attend a half-day workshop exploring the challenges and opportunities involved in the recruitment, hiring, and retention of science and engineering (S&E) professionals (see the appendix).

Nearly 50 key staff members from 18 Federal agencies joined representatives from OSTP and the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) at the Workshop on Attracting and Retaining S&E Talent in the Federal Government convened on February 10, 2012, in Washington, DC. This document provides a summary of the workshop, including the results of a pre-workshop survey and interviews exploring the experiences of Federal hiring managers and human resources (HR) specialists in recruiting and retaining scientists and engineers. An annotated bibliography is also provided.

B. Opening Remarks

In his welcoming statement, OSTP Deputy Director for Policy Thomas A. Kalil underscored the important role science and technology (S&T) play in President Obama’s plan for building a highly skilled workforce as part of continuing the Nation’s economic recovery. He urged workshop participants to explore new ideas for making the Federal Government a more competitive employer of world-class scientists and engineers as part of that strategy.

Sydney Smith-Heimbrock, Director of the OPM Leadership and Human Resource Development Solutions Center, described specific Federal efforts to close skill gaps in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) among government workers. For example, the Federal Service Ambassadors program launched in 2011 encourages Federal STEM employees to engage in volunteer activities within their fields. She also mentioned that OPM would soon announce the Student Pathways program as a mechanism available to Federal agencies to create employment pathways between educational institutions and the government—including STEM employment opportunities.

Bill Brykcynski, Deputy Director, IDA Science and Technology Policy Institute (STPI), set the stage for subsequent workshop discussion by identifying several challenges in the recruitment and retention of top-quality scientists and engineers (S&Es) in government employment—themes that have periodically appeared in reports and analyses dating from the early 1990s. These challenges include the lack of relevant data describing the scope and quality of the Federal S&E workforce (National Research Council [NRC] 1990; Jackson 2003; Seng and Flattau 2009), as well as the need for (1) a
broader set of management strategies to facilitate the flow of top S&E talent into the Federal workforce and foster these workers’ career advancement thereafter (National Academies 1997; Jackson 2003; Stine and Mathews 2009); (2) competitive employment and benefit incentives (NRC 1990; Stine and Brass 2009; Faulk 2012); and (3) coordination of government-wide and agency-specific statutory authorities that influence the growth and quality of the Federal S&E workforce (NRC 1990; Stine and Brass 2009).

C. Pre-Workshop Survey

At the request of OSTP, and under contract to STPI, the Partnership for Public Service (PPS) surveyed Federal hiring managers and HR specialists relative to their experiences in recruiting and retaining scientists and engineers. Table 1 presents the questions PPS posed.

At the workshop, PPS Vice President Tim McManus and his staff reported that a total of 76 individuals responded to the survey, chiefly representing various offices of the Department of Energy, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As Figure 1 illustrates, the majority of these respondents identified “recruitment, relocation, and retention incentives” as a highly successful strategy for the recruitment of S&Es (71% or 54 of the 76 respondents) and for their retention (56% or 43 of the 76 respondents). Survey respondents also identified “special pay rates” and “direct hiring authority” as effective for increasing the recruitment of top S&E talent (47% and 39%, respectively). However, “special pay rates” were seen as effective for retaining top S&E talent by only about one-third of survey respondents (26 of 76).

Survey respondents identified “pay in comparison to the private sector” as the chief deterrent for top S&Es accepting a position in the Federal Government (82% or 62 of the 76 respondents). Nearly 60% of the respondents also identified “limited opportunities for professional advancement” (45 of the 76 respondents). Figure 2 summarizes those results.

When S&Es leave Federal service, they largely take up employment in the private sector, according to the 76 survey respondents (Figure 3).
Table 1. Pre-workshop Survey Questions

What are the critical issues your agency/subcomponent faces in recruiting top S&E talent?

What are the effective strategies or practices that your agency/subcomponent uses to recruit scientists and engineers? Please briefly describe.

Based on your experience and insights, what do you believe are the greatest deterrents keeping top scientists and engineers from accepting a position in Federal Government?

What, if any, strategies or approaches have worked well for your agency to increase the recruitment of top S&E talent? [Check all that apply]

Can you share any insights about why these approaches have been successful?

Please select true or false for the statements below:

- Our agency/subcomponent attracts top science and engineering talent.
- Our agency/subcomponent hires top science and engineering talent.
- Our agency/subcomponent retains top science and engineering talent.

What are the critical issues your agency/subcomponent faces in retaining its S&E workforce today?

What are the effective strategies or practices that your agency/subcomponent uses to retain scientists and engineers? Please briefly describe.

What, if any, strategies or approaches have worked well for your agency to increase the retention of S&E talent? [Check all that apply]

Can you share any insights about why these approaches have been successful?

When S&E talent departs your agency/subcomponent, where does the departing talent go?

Besides recruitment and retention of S&E talent, what other personnel issues related to S&E hinder your ability to achieve your agency’s mission? Please describe below.

Based on your experience and insights, what can the White House do to help agencies successfully recruit and retain top S&E talent?
Note: IPAs = Personnel on temporary assignment through the Intergovernmental Personnel Act Mobility Program.

Figure 1. Successful Recruiting and Retention Approaches:
What, if any, strategies or approaches have worked well for your agency to increase the recruitment/retention of top S&E talent?
Figure 2. Deterrents for Recruiting Top S&E Talent:
Based on your experience and insights, what do you believe are the greatest deterrents keeping top scientists and engineers from accepting a position in Federal Government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deterrent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay in comparison to private sector</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunities for professional advancements</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthy hiring time</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear career ladders</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job responsibilities not aligned with desired career</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training opportunities for staff</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship requirement</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional educational/professional requirements for Federal employment</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A final question in the survey probed possible roles and strategies for the White House in helping agencies successfully recruit top S&E talent. Respondents noted that the White House could:

- Give special hiring authority and remove spending/retention and recruitment bonus limitations.
- Relax limits on the use of the S&T pay system and Schedule B appointments (i.e., appointments to jobs where competitive hiring procedures are impractical).
- Use recruiters, not USAJOBS, to locate and find candidates.
- Encourage agencies to create a technical ladder for those interested in S&E. Currently, the management ladder is the primary way for employees to be paid at the General Schedule (GS) GS-14 and GS-15 levels.
- Support legislation to provide direct-hire authority for S&E positions at the prevailing market pay rate.
- Support a Federal market pay study for all S&E positions to support the increased pay caps.

PPS also conducted a series of interviews with representatives of Federal research laboratories regarding their experiences in recruiting and retaining scientists and engineers.
D. Small Group Discussions

Workshop participants adjourned into five discussion groups and were asked to summarize the results of those discussions in a plenary session. Highlights of these discussions follow.

1. Recruiting

Workshop attendees participating in this discussion agreed that “direct hiring authority” has proved to be an effective hiring tool. Less effective are current government efforts to “brand” Federal S&T jobs for purposes of attracting talent. Furthermore, the “devolution” of human resource practices has led to the perception that recruitment is a “compliance” process rather than a workforce problem-solving one. Finally, attendees pointed out that world-class S&Es are often concerned about the professional restrictions imposed by government employment.

2. Retention

Participants in this discussion group identified inadequate standards for professional development and advancement as a significant barrier for retaining top-quality S&Es. The inability to continue to participate in professional activities within their communities is seen as a disincentive. Lower compensation and inadequate IT and technology resources compared to that of the private sector also emerged as issues behind the loss of S&E talent from the Federal workforce.

3. Career Advancement and Development

Discussants participating in this group identified the limited opportunities for professional development as a problem for retaining skilled S&E staff. However, they also pointed out that the absence of a clear path for advancement works against retaining these workers. The group identified the Development Career Map as an example of a report that laid out the path to a senior position. The potential role for a mentorship program was also discussed. It is important to recognize that some S&Es are interested in advancing along a management/administration career path, while others prefer to advance as professional research or technical staff.

4. Total Compensation

This discussion group emphasized the importance of standardizing hiring levels across fields of S&E, pointing out that some agencies recruit S&Es at lower GS levels than other agencies. Participants suggested a study on market pay would be useful, but with attention to differences across S&E fields—a topic of special importance in current efforts to recruit early career S&E talent. Participants noted that agency heads must be held accountable to avoid favoritism and other forms of compensation abuses.
5. **Classification and Job Expectations**

Workshop attendees participating in this discussion emphasized the need to convey clearly what the work of new hires will be, particularly the extent to which their work might involve administrative tasks to a greater degree than they might expect. Discussants agreed that greater attention is needed on S&E job classifications as job experience for the same S&E field will vary across the government. This group also discussed the need for more attention to S&T leadership training and development, especially with the goal in mind of creating better managers of talented S&Es.

**E. Plenary Session**

At the conclusion of the small group discussions, participants began the process of synthesizing the discussions by creating a master list of recommendations. The group identified 21 action-oriented recommendations (some of which are identified in the preceding paragraphs). Workshop attendees were then invited to “vote” on each recommendation relative to two criteria: *impact* and *feasibility*. Figure 4 lists the 21 recommendations ranked on the basis of probable impact, with the ranking of probable feasibility also arrayed.

For example, participants agreed that giving agencies “flexibility to moderate pay” would have high *impact*, but that the rule changes needed to implement the recommendation made it of low *feasibility*.

The top four high-*impact* recommendations emerging from the workshop, together with a parenthetical notation regarding their perceived *feasibility*, are as follows:

1. Work to identify hard-to-fill positions in STEM fields that are critical to the mission (i.e., mission critical occupations or MCOs) of each agency (high *feasibility*)
2. Provide agency directors/laboratory heads with the flexibility to moderate pay for S&Es, especially within a pay band (low *feasibility*)
3. Extend broad hiring and pay authorities currently used by some agencies to recruit physicians, lawyers, or cyber-security specialists to include STEM professionals (moderate *feasibility*)
4. Establish an action-oriented network of human capital and S&E professionals to share concerns and explore recruitment and retention solutions (high *feasibility*)
Figure 4. Recommendations Ranked According to Impact

Note: MCO = mission critical operation; ST/SL = Science or Technical/Senior Level positions in the Senior Executive Service.
Workshop participants considered the extension of direct-hiring authority across the Federal Government to be a moderately feasible recommendation having moderate impact on the recruitment and retention of S&Es in the Federal workforce.

Table 2 summarizes the main issues discussed in the small groups and the recommendations proposed to address them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Topic</th>
<th>Main themes and issues</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Limited direct hiring authority for STEM positions</td>
<td>Allow direct hiring authority for STEM positions across all government agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branding for S&amp;T jobs is not done well by the public sector, making them less competitive with the private sector</td>
<td>1. Create a competitive pay structure that is separate from any existing pay structure 2. Increase the supply of S&amp;Es by reaching students through scholarship programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-tier scientists worry about conflicts of interest terms when entering or leaving government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention</strong></td>
<td>Inadequate standards for technology, professional development, and continued education</td>
<td>Implement opportunities for scientific exchanges, professional development, and continued education using real support for these programs, rather than pulling from current budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowing for scientific exchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for promotion: the difference between scientists and managers</td>
<td>Give agencies local authority to promote people based on scientific ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advancement and Development</strong></td>
<td>Limited opportunity for development, innovation, and educational experiences</td>
<td>Creating an inter-agency rotational program for scientists to work on similar projects that allows them to focus on one big issue—a “One Stop Shopping Center”—where the best ideas float to the top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No clear advancement path</td>
<td>Develop a focused community of practice that includes mentorship, sharing and solving problems, innovation, and planning ahead. Using this inter-agency network, scientists can identify a problem and work on this problem with others in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define administrative management and technical management</td>
<td>Identify a specific career track (i.e., Science and Technology Career Maps) that keeps people in their field and out of administrative management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on the next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Topic</th>
<th>Main themes and issues</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Total Compensation     | Recognizing variation in S&T fields           | 1. In OPM’s annual survey, ask employees why they came to the Federal workforce, why they might consider leaving, and what their plans are for the future.  
2. Revise legislation to adjust base pay and relieve pay compression |
|                        | Study on market pay                           | 1. Conduct a market pay study that is field and skill specific and takes into account years of experience and education level  
2. Look at why people are leaving, how many and at what grade level, and what would provide incentive for them to stay |
|                        | Inherent inflexibility of offering compensation packages | Grant agency heads flexibility to modulate pay based on their needs |
| Classifications and Job Expectations | Clear expectations of S&E jobs | Avoid the mismatch of job expectations and job realities |
|                        | How to classify S&E jobs                      | Conduct a government-wide campaign on job structuring/classification to lure students in and retain them with various opportunities to make a difference with identifiable impact |
|                        | S&T leadership development                    | Look at career paths for people we want to stay in the government but who should not be managers |

During the plenary session, participants discussed solutions and recommendations and ranked them according to their potential impact and feasibility. Table 3 lists these solutions and recommendations, four of which were considered to be both highly feasible and high impact.

F. Wrap-up and Next Steps

Arun Seraphin, OSTP’s Assistant Director for Defense Programs, concluded the workshop by thanking participants for their contributions. He noted that the next steps would be to generate the evidence that would inform many of the issues and concerns raised and, working with the Office of Personnel Management and Office of Management and Budget, to identify solutions. He further noted that in the course of systematically exploring the dual topics of recruitment and retention, mechanisms not available today to Federal Human Capital Officers might emerge to enhance their important role in building and sustaining a vibrant and world-class Federal S&E workforce.
Table 3. List of Overall Plenary Solutions and Recommendations, in Order of Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify MCOs within STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to moderate pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide broad authorities for S&amp;T missions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Establish a network to share concerns/identify solutions/tackle problems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct hire authority for S&amp;T professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay/pay banding for S&amp;T professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data discussion to justify S&T gaps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive pay/separate S&amp;T pay schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen local authority/leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative fix to base pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/school for service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interagency pool of detail opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate S&amp;T excepted service pay system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden job classification standards to allow agency flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of total compensation package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear S&amp;T career paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit Science or Technical/Senior Level positions in Senior Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear career expectation for entry level talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore post-employment restrictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Bold text indicates solutions/recommendations ranked as both high impact and high feasibility.*
Appendix.
Supporting Materials

This appendix reproduces a memorandum from OSTP Deputy Director for Policy Tom Kalil inviting Chief Human Capital Officers to the workshop and an OSTP announcement that includes the workshop objective and agenda. Table A-1 provides a list of the attendees.
MEMORANDUM FOR CHIEF HUMAN CAPITAL OFFICERS

FROM:  TOM KALIL
       DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR POLICY

SUBJECT:  RECRUITING, HIRING & RETAINING FEDERAL SCIENCE &
          ENGINEERING TALENT

The White House Office of Science & Technology Policy (OSTP) recognizes that the Federal
government must become a more competitive employer for our Nation’s top scientists and
engineers. To make informed changes to policy and practice, the Administration must
understand which barriers prevent the Federal government from hiring and recruiting world-
class scientists and engineers.

You are invited to attend a half-day workshop we are hosting on the morning of February 10,
2012. The purpose of the workshop is to gain a better understanding of the challenges and
successes that agencies have in recruiting and retaining science and engineering (S&E)
professionals. We also expect that the workshop will help us identify potential policy changes
that will help you recruit and retain S&E talent.

I have asked the Science and Technology Policy Institute (STPI), OSTP’s Federally Funded
Research and Development Center, to help us identify and propose concrete programmatic and
policy solutions to the challenges the Federal government faces in recruiting, hiring and
retaining scientists and engineers. STPI has retained the Partnership for Public Service (the
Partnership) assist in this effort.

To do this, STPI and the Partnership will gather and confirm root causes to the problem
through interviews with Federal S&E subject matter experts (SMEs) and a survey of the S&E
community. Their findings will serve as the basis for the February workshop focused on
developing realistic next steps for OSTP and the Federal S&E community.

Please join our initial efforts by sharing this link http://tinyurl.com/73u2zzm to a brief survey
with both your organization’s leading S&E SMEs and also your own S&E recruiters or human
capital strategists. The survey will be open until January 17, 2012. Please also register for the
workshop at http://pps.convio.net/site/Calendar?id=1002448&view=Detail and encourage
appropriate staff within your agency to attend this important event. Contact Erin Creasy
(erceasy@ourpublicservice.org) with any questions about the survey or registration.

We all look forward to working with you on fresh and practical solutions to the challenges we
face in S&E talent management.
ATTRACTING AND RETAINING SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING TALENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

LOGISTICS
Date: Friday, February 10, 2012
Time: 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Location: Partnership for Public Service Conference Facilities
1100 New York Avenue NW, Suite 200E, Washington, DC 20005

OBJECTIVE
The objective of this workshop is to gain a better understanding of the challenges and successes that agencies have in attracting and retaining science and engineering (S&E) professionals. The workshop will help us identify potential policy changes that will help you attract and retain S&E talent.

AGENDA
8:30 a.m. Welcome & Introductions
Tim McManus  
Vice President  
Partnership for Public Service
Tom Kalil  
Deputy Director for Policy  
Office of Science and Technology Policy
Sydney Heimbrook  
Deputy Associate Director for Employee Services  
U.S. Office of Personnel Management

8:45 a.m. Summary of the Challenges
Bill Bryczynski  
Deputy Director  
Science and Technology Policy Institute

9:00 a.m. Small Group Discussions: Assumptions & Solutions
Tim McManus and Partnership facilitators

10:00 a.m. Break

10:10 a.m. Highlights and Reactions from Small Group Discussions
Tim McManus

11:15 a.m. Recommended Government-Wide Solutions
Tim McManus

11:45 a.m. Wrap Up and Next Steps
Arun Seraphin  
Assistant Director, Defense Programs  
Office of Science and Technology Policy

12:00 p.m. Adjourn

Last updated: February 7, 2012
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Using data from the Current Population Survey and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this report compares the total compensation and benefits of the Federal Government to the private sector. The comparison accounted for educational level and compared only those workers in the Federal and private sectors that had similar attributes. For instance, only data private sector workers in larger firms were used in this analysis because the work performed is similar to that performed by Federal employees.

- The analysis found that benefits for Federal workers were 48% higher than in the private sector. Federal workers receive more non-wage benefits such as paid leave, medical insurance, and defined-benefits pension plans, which are less available in the private sector. Benefit costs in the private sector are mostly from higher contributions to medical and dental insurance. Private sector workers receive fewer hours of paid leave, but provide additional benefit categories such as transportation and continuing education benefits, which were not accounted for in this study.

- Benefits for those with a high school degree or less were 70% higher for Federal workers as compared to similar workers in the private sector. Similarly, the differences in Bachelor’s level and Master’s level workers were 46% and 36%, respectively, compared to similar workers in the private sector. The costs of benefits for those with professional degrees and PhDs were comparable to those of workers with advanced degrees in the private sector.

- When comparing total compensation overall, Federal workers received 16% more compensation as compared to workers in the private sector. For Federal workers with a high school diploma or less, total compensation was 32% higher as compared to the private sector. For those with a bachelor’s degree and Master’s degree, compensation was 15% and 18% higher, respectively, than in the private sector. For those with a professional degree or PhD, compensation was 18% less than as compared to workers in the private sector.


This paper, presented to the Government-University-Industry Research Roundtable (GUIRR), focused on the current science and engineering workforce and what actions need to be taken to strengthening this specific workforce. Jackson notes that Federal and private sector science and engineering workforce are intertwined due to
the Government’s heavy reliance on private sector for much of its R&D and explores the role of the Federal Government in workforce planning around science and engineering talent.

Among the problems facing the science and engineering workforce, Jackson highlights the following as top risks to ensuring an adequate U.S. S&E workforce:

- The Federal S&E workforce is shrinking: Over 45% of all Federal scientists and engineers are 45 years of age or older. Federal agencies have not hired scientist and engineers in significant numbers in recent years. With this growing workforce, the nation risks losing essential technological expertise to retirement.
- The ability to recruit talent from abroad may be limited in the future: In the wake of September 11, there is legislative pressure to restrict immigration in the U.S.
- Comparable opportunities are luring foreign students home: Nations, such as South Korea and China, are providing more opportunities for their students and graduates at home.
- There is little room to increase “stay rates” of foreign scientists much further: The overall rate between 1994 and 1999 was 63%.
- The gaps between skill sets required for jobs do not match those gained through degree programs.
- There is a lack of reliable data to serve as a platform for public policy: Primarily, there is no reliable data on what happens to individuals with H-1B visas.

In addition to identifying problems and risks, Jackson also identifies priorities to address S&E workforce concerns. The list of priorities includes:

- Linking policy to need: Jackson suggests establishing a more targeted student aid program to address specific national needs, such as S&E, loan forgiveness, and S&E specific programs modeled after the Pell grants.
- Improve management practices, especially in government laboratories, to attract and retain S&E workers: To accomplish this, Jackson recommends designing and implementing systems that include practices such as competitive incentives, peer evaluations, and pay and promotions based on performance, not years of service.
  - Additionally, Jackson recommends flexibility in hiring, allowing directors to autonomously hire personnel, and flexibility in work schedules. Jackson also encourages agency scientists and engineers to design work to be interesting and challenging to compete with private sector pay.
- Gather better data to inform policy-making and provide information for more effective funding investment.
• Induce talented scientists to enter and remain in research by a campaign to renew interest in public service careers.

• Keep funding at appropriate levels: Federal agencies’ share of total R&D funds declined from 40% to below 30% during the 1990s.


This paper highlights restrictions on pay and professional advancement as barriers to the Federal Government recruiting and retaining highly qualified scientist and engineers. While the Federal Employee Pay Comparability Act of 1990 gave agencies the authority to ease these restrictions, the act has not been fully implemented. Possible solutions in the paper include affording agencies more flexibility in compensating employees and establishing a Senior Research and Development Service, modeled after the Senior Executive Service. Additionally, the paper also explores disincentives that prevent exceptional scientists and engineers from serving in top positions, such as unreasonable post-government employment restrictions and inappropriate conflict-of-interest prohibitions.


This report to the Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government documents the findings and recommendations of the Committee on Scientists and Engineers in the Federal Government (“the Committee”) on “what is known about the ability of federal agencies to recruit, retain and utilize scientists and engineers effectively.” It also includes five commissioned papers on specific aspects of the barriers or opportunities within Federal S&E workforce management, and shares the agenda, participants, and proceedings of a workshop held Feb. 23, 1990, on this topic.

The Committee’s key findings are grouped in three major areas:

1. Availability and Relevance of Data
2. Management Practices
3. Presidential Appointments
Availability and Relevance of Data:

- The quality and consistency of data on the S&E workforce by occupation classifications and also by individuals’ qualifications is a concern. Some agencies, including Naval Research Lab (NRL), Department of Defense (DOD) and Public Health Service (PHS) took data collection and analysis into their own hands in order to understand their organization’s workforce through individual agency data systems.

- S&E managers do not agree on “what constitutes accurate measures of the quality of that workforce.” Having proxies for that information is essential to getting a firm grasp on the state of the workforce. OPM and MSPB co-sponsored work on this issue in 1989 through the Conference on Workforce Quality Assessment and OPM began to survey S&E professionals in 1990.

Management Practices:

- The perceptions about the ineffectiveness, and limitations, of Federal hiring persist as a hindrance to agencies’ management of the recruiting process despite the centralized efforts of OPM and the individual work of various agencies.

- OPM’s initiatives included: (1) Delegation of Examining and Hiring Procedures, (2) Special Salary Rates, (3) Federal Pay Reform Act of 1990, and (4) Other recruitment initiatives to automate hiring and bring Federal Employment information to college populations.

- Agency’s initiatives included: (1) Cooperative programs, (2) increased on-campus recruiting and (3) restructuring entry-level job classifications.

- The Committee also acknowledged that S&E work “can be completed under a variety of scenarios, including the traditional setting within an agency, demonstration projects, Federal laboratories and managed-and-operated (M&O) facilities.” Demonstration projects show that dual career ladders for technical experts and broad pay bands can help agencies.

- Utilization of S&E talent also varies across agencies. While “the federal government clearly needs technically knowledgeable people who can interact with contractors and manage R&D contracts…several federal scientists and engineers felt that they were required to spend an inordinate amount of time on contract matters” (p. 25).

- Recruitment initiatives for underrepresented groups could allow the government to ward off future S&E shortages.

- “Government policies that limit the hiring of foreign nationals may have adverse effects on the ability of federal agencies to perform S&E work.” (p. 27)
Presidential Appointments:

- It is critical to the missions of government to have Presidential Appointee positions in S&E fields filled in a timely manner with knowledgeable and supportive leadership to carry out policy.

Three of the six lingering issues identified by the Committee for additional analysis have direct linkages to the goals of the current STPI project. They are explored on pages 29–32 of the report:

1. “What can be done to enhance federal recruitment of scientists and engineers, especially women and minorities at the entry level, and retention of all scientists and engineers at the midcareer level? What institutional decision-making processes should be altered and in what way? Should the relationship between OPM and the individual agencies be different for scientists and engineers than it is for other federal personnel?” (p. 29)

2. “What steps must be taken to heighten the awareness within agencies of the mechanisms established by OPM to alleviate many of the problems they encounter in recruiting and retaining scientists and engineers?” (p. 30)

3. “Are there too few scientists and engineers in the federal government? Or are there too few highly qualified federal scientists and engineers?” (p. 31)


This report to the Director of Defense Research and Engineering assessed the composition of the current Science and Engineering workforce at the Department of Defense Laboratories, including identification of workforce trends and projection of future workforce sizes, compositions, and trends. Using data from the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), trends were analyzed from 1988 to 2003 in 5-year time increments. The analysis was supplemented with lab director interviews to understand the role of “Lab Demo.”

The findings were grouped in three major areas:

workforce quality:

- The DOD labs civilian workforce is similar to the general U.S. S&E workforce with the exception that the DOD lab workforce is not flat, lacking in workers between the ages of 35–45 owing to a hiring freeze in the 1990s.

- Not much is known in terms of the quality of the S&E workforce, and to address this, IDA made the following recommendations.
  - Collect additional data to support a S&E workforce quality assessment
– Compile workforce metrics, such as number of patents, publications, citations, and invited talks and presentations.

**Workforce Projections:**

- The number of computer science, mathematics, and physics baccalaureates remains low, due to rising uncertainty in employment in the sciences and engineering as well as shifting student career preferences, and so DOD may have difficulty in seeking and hiring qualified workers from these fields.

- To address this, IDA recommended the following:
  - DOD should implement a workforce model to strengthen strategic planning.
  - DOD should revisit the adequacy of their workforce development strategies based upon three possible workforce scenarios:
    - Downsizing:
    - Maintaining current workforce
    - Increasing the S&E workforce

**Workforce Management:**

- A new wave of retirement in the DOD labs will begin in the next 5–10 years, and current and new hires will dominate the S&E workforce. Lab directors indicated in interviews that Lab Demo would allow the flexibility needed to make personnel decisions based on current market conditions and need.

- IDA recommended that Lab Demo be incorporated into the redesign of the DOD Personnel Management System.


This Congressional Research Service (CRS) report provides an overview of the current S&T workforce as well as policy discussions around this workforce. According to data from the National Science Foundation, the majority of scientists and engineers work in the business/industry sector (69.4%) with only 11.8% working in government. The report highlights three key issues that policy makers tend to focus on: demographics trends and the future of S&T talent pool, the current S&T workforce and changing workforce needs, and the influence of foreign S&T students and workers on the U.S. S&T workforce. In regard to foreign S&T students and workers, policy discussions focus on immigration policy, primarily increasing the ability for foreign STEM students to more easily obtain permanent admission and increasing the number of H-1B visas to recruit more talent from abroad. Views on immigration and the S&T workforce diverge, with some individuals citing the over-reliance on H-1B visa workers to fill high-tech positions has weakened opportunities for the U.S. workforce.

This report provides an illustrative overview of statutory authorities relating to the hiring and pay rates of Federal S&T personnel. Key factors that have contributed to S&T workforce concerns include:

- Demand for S&T workers in the broader labor market
- Competitive salaries
- The report cites that pay disparity may exist at higher degree levels (i.e., doctorate or professional degrees).
- U.S. citizenship requirement
- Aging of the Federal S&T workforce
  - Older individuals represent almost 60% of all Federal scientists and engineers
  - Between 2003 and 2005, the number of Federal scientists and engineers between 35–39 years of age decreased by 12.9% while those between 40–44 years of age increased by 5.4%.

The report also notes that the Federal civil service has become increasingly fragmented, leading to fragmentation of data for Federal S&T personnel. This fragmentation is due to increased complexities in the hiring and pay of the S&T workforce.

The Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 (CSRA) and other laws, including the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990 (FEPCA), provided statutory authorities related to the S&T workforce. While these authorities allow more agency flexibility, the government faces the challenge of finding the balance between flexibility and preventing abuse of the flexibility by holding agencies accountable. The report discusses executive branch–wide authorities and agency-specific statutory authorities.

Executive branch–wide authorities include:

- Appointment of high-level scientific and professional (ST) personnel
  - The Senior Professional Performance Act of 2008 established a new pay system for scientific or professional employees.
- Demonstration projects
  - These projects are a result of new statutory authority to pilot new management techniques. Only four of the 178 initiatives proposed were implemented. Demonstration projects are currently being implemented at the U.S. Navy, NIST, DOC, and DOD.
- Intergovernmental mobility
• Critical pay authority
• Recruitment, relocation and retention incentives
• Special pay rates
• Direct hire authority

Agency-specific statutory authorities that provided agencies with flexibility proliferate in the 1990s. The report highlights NASA’s critical pay authority and DARPA’s statutory authority, which provided flexibilities similar to critical pay and direct hire authorities and served as the foundation for similar authorities at DHS and HHS.
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In December 2011, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) invited Federal Chief Human Capital Officers to encourage their agency staffs to attend a half-day workshop exploring the challenges and opportunities involved in the recruitment, hiring, and retention of science and engineering (S&E) professionals. Nearly 50 key staff members from 18 Federal agencies joined representatives from OSTP and the U.S. Office of Personnel Management at the Workshop on Attracting and Retaining S&E Talent in the Federal Government convened on February 10, 2012, in Washington, DC. This document provides a summary of the workshop, including the results of a pre-workshop survey and interviews exploring the experiences of Federal hiring managers and human resource (HR) specialists in recruiting and retaining scientists and engineers. An annotated bibliography is also provided.
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