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Minority Underrepresentation in Senior Executive Service
Institutional Theory: An analysis of mimetic influence on federal agencies’ diversity and equity initiatives and how contextually irrelevant solutions influence outcomes

Abstract

The federal government acknowledges minority underrepresentation in the Senior Executive Service (SES) level position is a persistent problem. Why do policymakers adopt certain solutions and initiatives to address this problem? Federal agencies copy the private sector’s best practices to legitimize the solutions and initiatives such as mentoring, succession planning, and diversity initiatives, further legitimizing themselves amongst their constituents who have vested interests in this problem. The federal government use common justifications for copying these best practices such as representative bureaucracy and performance effort. Rather than studying the problem within context and coming to an analytical solution, policymakers scan the environment looking for ways to address the problem with solutions that have legitimacy even if they don’t really address the problem. This results in an organization structure that reinforces institutional isomorphism instead of change. I argue that rather than diagnosing the problem specific to the particular concerns of SES, policymakers consistently avoid contextually relevant solutions to address this problem, mimetic influences result in the use of best practices from business and government agencies without desired outcome. Justifications for these solutions has tracked changing justifications in some private sector environments rather than being tied to the particulars of public service as it relates to this highly politicized position. Although minorities have advanced in positions below the SES, federal agencies have been unsuccessful in achieving similar results for minorities in SES positions. Initially, Affirmative Action initiatives were used as
solutions to address this problem until 1993 when deliberate inclusion was eliminated with by removing these initiatives and requirements. Using content analysis, my primary data were 14 documents from a 17-year period, 1994 – 2011. I assessed how often solutions or initiatives were selected by policymakers to determine prevalence. I suggest, in search of legitimacy, initiatives are selected outside their initial context and these solutions and initiatives have shifting justifications with convergence across time. Findings in this study indicate the most prevalent solution or initiative is workforce and succession planning strategies. The justification most often used was not best practices as I suggested but Representative Bureaucracy, which was contextually relevant in addressing SES. There was pattern of shifting justifications when selecting solutions and initiatives but no pattern of convergence across time. One interesting finding in this study was the prevalence of seven out of 16 solutions and initiatives were recommended by a cross-section of policymakers over a 17-year period, which may suggests mimetic influences are without contextually relevant solutions.

Introduction

Why do policymakers select certain initiatives or solutions? Whether the problem is identified as failing math scores for students in public schools, environmental problems, or underrepresentation of minorities in Senior Executive Service positions, policymakers select initiatives and solutions to address the problem. Analysts assume that policymakers have the necessary expertise during the decision making process to select initiatives and solutions that will address the problem. Why are some initiatives and solutions selected repeatedly regardless of their effectiveness? It appears
policymakers champion programs for legitimacy not effectiveness, managers research information from studies about minority underrepresentation in SES, but fail to analyze it, and lastly, consultants outside of the federal government are hired as experts, not for advice but to signal legitimacy. This research not only addresses initiatives and solutions selected but also policymakers’ search for legitimacy when addressing the underrepresentation of minorities in SES with shifting justifications when selecting initiatives. Justification, in this research, refers to the justification given by the government for adopting initiatives. Although justifications such as best practices, representative bureaucracy, social equity, and increased performance are attached to which initiative is selected, initiatives are still selected outside their context. Outside of context means policymakers, without consideration for the uniqueness of the SES position, adopt best practices from private and public sector organizations. These organizations were considered successful in diversity but not specifically in the context of diversity for senior level positions that are similar to SES positions. The push to use best practices from business to improve the effectiveness federal government originated partly from the National Partnership for Reinventing Government. I will explain the National Partnership for Reinventing Government initiative later in this article (Clinton, 1997) (Schneider, Ingram, 1988) (Schneider, Ingram, 1990) (Best Practices, 1999) (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983) (Considine, 2012).

Policymaking is often done through a process of borrowing, where tools and frameworks are used outside their initial context simply because they are available rather than because they have been diagnosed as a suitable solution to a particular problem at hand. Policymakers, through a process of borrowing, identified solutions such as target
recruiting, mentoring, and succession planning. Although the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) has the oversight of the SES program, they recommended initiatives that have not been diagnosed as a suitable solution to address minority underrepresentation in SES (Schneider, Ingram, 1988) (Schneider, Ingram, 1990) (Considine, 2012).

This article will analyze the federal government’s efforts to maintain legitimacy while addressing the underrepresentation of minorities in SES. I argue that rather than diagnosing a problem specific to the particular concerns of the SES, the federal government advocate for initiatives and solutions that rely on the same strategies across public employment sectors. The justifications for these initiatives has tracked the changing justifications in some private sector environments rather than being tied to the particulars of public service as it relates to this highly politicized position of SES. For clarity, the first part of this paper will provide a snapshot of minority underrepresentation in SES. Next, I will discuss how transitions within the federal government led to replacing Affirmative Action and affirmative employment programs with weaker initiatives and solutions. As part of the theoretical framework, I provide a discussion addressing initiatives and solutions being used outside their context, shifting justifications, and selecting initiatives and solutions for legitimacy. Finally, I will explain the findings from this study. In this paper I make references to the government rather than agencies selecting best practices, diversity and equity initiatives, or solutions. Of the documents analyzed in this research, the federal government selected the best practices, diversity and equity initiatives, or solutions and either mandated or suggested federal agencies adopt the practices to address the problem. Following this introduction, all
references to diversity and equity initiatives and solutions will be referred to as initiatives (Clinton, 1997) (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983) (Schneider, Ingram, 1990) (Salamon, 2002).

Minority Representation in SES

The SES position was created in 1979 after the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 went into effect. This position is the senior level of the federal government’s civil service ranking positions. Some SES positions are politically appointed while the majority are not. The SES position includes managerial, supervisory, and policy positions above the General Schedule (GS) – 15 level. As of Sep 2013, there were nearly 7,910 (7,190 career, 720 non-career, limited term/emergency) SES positions of which, 80.12% are white 19.84 are minorities and .04% unspecified. Minorities, for this research, are defined as Asian American and Alaskan Native, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander (Comm Rpt, 2008) (Fair and Equitable, 2009) (EEOC, 2011)

Below the SES position are GS 14 and 15, professional and administrative category, known as the feeder group because they are considered the pipeline for promotion to SES. The percentage of minority representation in lower levels, GS 1 through GS 13, increases until it reaches the feeder group. Once they reach the feeder group, minority representation percentages continue to decrease into SES positions. Unlike minority representation, the percentage of white representation shows a continuous increase through the feeder group and into SES positions. Over a 12 years period from1996 through 2008, minorities increased in SES without achieving parity and this issue still exists today (Comm Rpt, 2008) (Fair and Equitable, 2009).
The Evolution of Affirmative Action

While working in the federal government as a member of the military in the area of diversity and equity from 1998 through 2010, I found that underrepresentation of minorities in civilian jobs at the senior level was a commonly discussed issue. Quite often, the federal government would recommend agencies implement the same or similar strategies as a solution to address this issue. Often, military and civilian colleagues would observe and comment on initiatives selected as a déjà vu moment with no expectation of change. Following the elimination of Affirmative Action and affirmative employment initiatives, gaps were left and still remain in the ability of the government to address underrepresented minorities in SES (Affirm Action, 1995).

In 1969, President Nixon issued an executive order requiring federal agencies establish Federal Affirmative Employment Programs to address underrepresentation of women and minorities. Affirmative employment programs included developing and submitting equal employment plans identifying underrepresented groups in various employment categories and develop goals for these groups where vacancies were expected. In 1978, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) had advisory authority for the affirmative employment functions without enforcement authority. EEOC was responsible for review and approval of annual equal opportunity plans submitted by each federal agency (duRivage, 1985) (Affirm Action, 1995).

In 1981 and 1982, Affirmative Action began to weaken under President Reagan’s deregulation policies for the private sector, giving employers the responsibility for their own discrimination policing. The EEOC under Justice Clarence Thomas’s leadership disapproved the use of goals and timetables for increasing the number of people who
were members of underrepresented groups. Although these changes were applicable to the private sector, the changes also affected the federal agencies. EEOC used Management Directives (MD) to implement federal affirmative employment initiatives. First, MD 707 was issued in 1981 directing agencies to determine underrepresentation of women and minorities in various employment categories and set goals to address this issue. In 1987 under President Reagan, EEOC issued MD 714 which eliminated the requirement for agencies to set goals to address underrepresentation. Agencies were instructed to develop flexible approaches to addressing the underrepresentation of women and minorities in the workforce (duRivage, 1985) (Affirm Action, 1995).

Finally, in 1993 and 1994 under President Clinton, MD 715 replaced MD 714, requiring leaders of federal agencies to hold senior and program managers accountable to accomplish agency objectives without sanctions or penalty, which further weakened the requirement for affirmative employment initiatives. During these changes, Affirmative Action initiatives lost their impact, transitioning from submitting plans and setting goals to allowing managers to maintain their own programs to address underrepresented women and minorities in agencies (Clinton, 1997) (Best Practices, 1999) (Anand, Winters, 2008).

**Transitions in the Federal Government**

Following Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush administration, there was an effort, albeit weak, by the government to identify and address the underrepresentation of minorities in SES. Diversity and Inclusion programs became a focus within the federal government following the significant attention given to these programs within the private sector. The private sector implemented various initiatives to
address underrepresented minorities and women throughout all levels of the organization. Initiatives included standing up diversity offices separate from human resource offices, developing strategic plans, mentoring programs, and targeted recruiting efforts. Since deliberate inclusion was done away with when removing Affirmative Action and affirmative employment requirements for quotas, goals, and timelines, policymakers in favor of Affirmative Action began seeking new initiatives from the private sector to address this problem within the federal government at all levels, to include SES (Gore, 1997) (Best Practices, 1999) (ACT-IAC, 2011).

In 1993, President Clinton implemented the National Partnership for Reinventing (NPR) Government with the intention of making government more efficient. This initiative often used the private sector as a model when determining changes to implement in the government. An extension of this initiative was Vice President Al Gore’s benchmarking study on Best Practices in Achieving Workforce Diversity. The NPR initiative continued the momentum in the federal government to benchmark the private sector when looking for solutions to make the government more efficient as well as increasing workplace diversity. The federal government adopted initiatives from the private and public sector that included workforce succession planning, mentoring programs, and increased leadership oversight of diversity initiatives. These initiatives were adopted, not because they were proven to effectively address minority underrepresentation in SES, but because they were available and considered best practices (Clinton, 1995) (Gore, 1997) (Schneider, Ingram, 1988) (Schneider, Ingram, 1990) (Salamon, 2002).
Without Consideration for Context

The SES consists of two different status, political appointee and career. Not only is the political appointee a politicized position but also the career SES. The career status SES is selected by Employee Resource Board, which consists of non-career members. Career status also receives bonuses for performance that may influence what good performance looks like. These processes have the potential to influence the behavior of career SES members to be more responsive than responsible. Because the SES position is a politicized position in comparison to organizations where some, but not all, positions are politicized, policymakers may overlook context when modeling successful private and public sector initiatives. Given the importance of context, care must be taken not to copy designs without carefully considering differences in contexts and values that may impinge upon policy effects. The government did not carefully explore how the context of various initiatives used by successful organizations would apply to the underrepresentation of minorities in SES (Gore, 1997) (Schneider, Ingram, 1988) (Schneider, Ingram, 1990) (Salamon, 2002) (Peters, Pierre, 2004).

The initiatives used in the private sector were created to address underrepresented groups throughout all levels of their organizations, not underrepresented groups specifically at the senior level. The government remained biased and even stuck regarding the success of organizations in the private sector, preventing them from considering contexts, specifically in the area of addressing minority underrepresentation in senior level positions, when selecting initiatives. This is partly due to the timeframe the federal government initially adopted these initiatives from the private sector, there was a focus on minority representation at all levels in the federal government. Once
initiatives were identified to address minority underrepresentation in levels below the SES position, the same or similar initiatives were used to address underrepresentation at the SES level. Thus the use of initiatives without context continues (Gore, 1997) (Schneider, Ingram, 1988) (Schneider, Ingram, 1990).

**Policymakers Seek Legitimacy**

During 110th Congress in 2007, policymakers introduced the Senior Executive Service Diversity Assurance Act (H.R. 3774) to address the underrepresentation of minorities in SES, suggested agencies adopt initiatives to address minority recruiting, minority media, and outreach to minority communities. These initiatives are similar to ones used to address underrepresentation of minorities at levels below SES (GS 1 – GS 15). During committee hearings, the Department of Justice (DOJ) often challenged suggestions that resembled affirmative employment initiatives such as agencies cannot take into consideration race when hiring, stating it would be unconstitutional on equal protection grounds. Policymakers in favor of stronger affirmative employment initiatives acquiesced to the suggested revisions and eventually this bill was passed by the House in 2008 but was not passed by Senate. According to Zucker, in order to survive, organizations conform to what is societally defined as appropriate and efficient, largely disregarding the actual impact on organizational performance. Although minorities are underrepresented and decrease during career advancement to SES, policymakers cannot arbitrarily decide to reinstate Affirmative employment initiatives such as goals and timelines, but must work within constrained options (Meyer and Rowan, 1977: 353; Zucker, 1982) (Fair and Equitable, 2009) (CR, 2009) (111th Congress, 2009-2010).
Organizations are competing for resources, political power, and social and economic fitness. Instead of selecting initiatives within context of the SES position and for effectiveness, initiatives are selected to legitimize the federal government’s effort to address this issue. It is unlikely the federal government will cease to exist if an Affirmative Action initiative is reinstated. The federal government will survive, but if initiatives are introduced that threaten the majority representation (white males) in SES changes. The internal pressures from politicians who endorse funding or support various federal agencies and the voice of the majority of those in SES positions, which happen to be white male, may be sufficient enough to keep SES representation the same (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983) (Salamon, 2002).

This resistance was evident during this research in various documents over the 17 years studied. The resistance was across party lines where, during committee hearings, the Democrats were constantly met with resistance from Republicans to enact a law to address this issue. The closest the Democrats came to enacting a law was the establishment of Executive Orders. Executive Orders may or may not be enforced but will provide symbolism. These initiatives are safe and current beliefs, values, and political influence that will prevent policymakers from returning to Affirmative Action or any initiative that would resemble its requirements (Peters, Pierre, 2004).

Response to this issue is a great example of mimetic isomorphic where federal government appear to take action through selection of initiatives, copy best practices of successful organizations for legitimacy, while maintaining its position for survival by appeasing political interest. In 1994, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the agency responsible for addressing issues of underrepresentation, stated it
found no single answer to the challenge of overcoming barriers to underrepresented groups in the federal government because the barriers vary from one agency to another. Over 20 years later, this statement is still true for the SES. Whether mandated or copied initiatives, agencies are still trying to figure out how to address this issue (HRM, 1994) (Clinton, 1997).

In this study, I observed both coercive and mimetic isomorphic pressures as agencies select initiatives to address this problem. Coercive pressures are evident when agencies are mandated to establish diversity and inclusion programs. This prevents the appearance of doing nothing about underrepresented minorities. Both minorities looking for SES opportunities and special interest minority groups are watching the government’s response to this issue. Not only has the government mandated through Executive Order 13583 that all federal agencies establish a diversity and inclusion office but one of their justifications for this initiative is representative bureaucracy. Neither justifications of modeling best practices nor representative bureaucracy has resulted in an increased minority representation in SES, but according to the documents used in this study, minority interest groups often advocate for the federal government to look like America. Modeling best practices may not be as popular with minority interest groups because the overall goals aren’t always clear (E.O. 13583, 2011) (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983).

Diversity goals of Executive Order 13583 are ambiguous. Because there are no longer goals set under affirmative employment initiatives, some policymakers define successful diversity initiatives as representation within SES positions that mirrors our nation. The question, “What is considered appropriate or sufficient representation for minorities in SES” has not been answered. Thus the federal government models itself
after organizations with successful diversity programs, resulting in mimetic isomorphism. Mimetic isomorphism is the standard responses to uncertainty – let’s copy someone who has done it successfully (E.O. 13583, 2011) (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983).

Using existing practices from other organizations is not only an economical way to find initiatives that may address this issue but it also legitimizes the federal government’s efforts to make an attempt to address this problem and avoid appearing negligent to organizations who advocate for equity: African American Federal Executives Association (AAFEA), the National Association of Hispanic Federal Executives (NAHFE), the Asian American Government Executives Network (AAGEN), Federally Employed Women (FEW), and Blacks in Government (BIG). It appears initiatives are selected symbolically without the intent of producing change but keeping things the same. I am not saying the efforts of the government will never produce change in the representation of minorities in SES because external and internal pressures may result in change following a long period of resistance. At one time minorities were underrepresented in the levels under SES, but today that is no longer considered an issue. What I am saying is efforts of the government may be more symbolic with the intention of legitimacy rather than effectiveness (DiMaggio, Powell, 1983) (111th Congress, 2009-2010).

Methodology and Findings

Rather than analyzing the problem within the context of underrepresented minorities at the executive level, the government, in search of legitimacy, selects initiatives because they are best practices. Also, I suggest initiatives have shifting justifications with convergence across time. Using content analysis, I assessed the
frequency of initiatives selected in an effort to determine if there was an initiative of choice that directly addressed this problem. Content analysis is defined as any data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings. A particular advantage to this approach is having the ability to examine trends over time in the government’s selection of initiatives as well as general patterns of initiatives selected. My primary data are documents from a seventeen year period (Appendix 1), 1994 - 2011 which includes 2 studies conducted for the federal government, 4 GAO reports, 4 Executive Orders, Senate and House Reports and Committee Hearings, and 4 documents categorized as “other” for a total of 14 documents (see Appendix 1). This was a collection of data from the Library of Congress, Federal Government websites for Office or Personnel Management, Government Accounting Office, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and Studies found online. Using thematic analysis, every initiative referenced was identified with corresponding justification for use of that initiative (Yanow, 1996) (Berg, 2001) (Patton, 2002).

I analyzed the data for patterns of isomorphism by identifying justifications provided for each initiative, to include private or public sector best practices, Representative Bureaucracy, social responsibility/justice, performance, and/or better problem solving. During this analysis, I evaluated the convergence of frameworks across time for addressing the underrepresentation of minorities in SES. Convergence of frameworks across time was critical in this study because there were initiatives discussed in one time frame that were not discussed in other timeframes. For example, establishing a diversity and inclusion office was not in the conversation prior to the implementation of
Executive Order 13583 in 2011. This EO reflected an unparalleled commitment to diversity from the current Administration (Yanow, 1996) (Berg, 2001) (Patton, 2002).

**Coding Process**

The coding scheme was designed to capture references to selection of initiatives to address the underrepresentation of minorities in SES positions. The following coding scheme was used (Appendix 2): 1-Plan, 2-Targeted Recruitment & Hiring Efforts, 3-D&I office, 4-Task Force/Committee, 5-Legislation/Executive Order, 6-Conduct new study (e.g., survey) about the problem, 7-Workforce and Succession Planning Strategies, 8-Monitor Applicant/Promotion Hiring Ratio, 9-Performance Management Measurement/Accountability System (targeted to managers for working to promote a diverse and inclusive workforce), 10-Mentoring/development, 11-Organizational time/resources, 12-Put on social gatherings, 13-Strengthen HR/employment practices in general (no specific reference made to recruitment, selection, development, etc.), 14-Leadership commitment, 15-Increased Oversight/Advisement, 16-Onboarding.

First, as stated earlier, 14 documents met the criteria for inclusion and were targeted for coding by myself and another researcher, Stephen Young, an outside expert with a Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. The unit of analysis is paragraph, which we coded thematically. The issue was addressed that certain documents (e.g., Senate reports) could cause higher word counts for certain initiatives due to oratory convention and speaker verbosity rather than true prevalence. Often, within the same Senate or House Report, there were references to the same initiatives repeatedly by the same policymaker; these were counted once. If this were not done, the word count would not accurately represent a particular initiative’s widespread selection in such cases. A
code was used (see Appendix 2) each time an initiative was referenced and a requisite justification (if applicable) was given in a document. Additionally, this rule allowed for the same initiative to be referenced multiple times in a document. However, an initiative would only be counted a second time if either a different justification was given for the initiative or if the initiative represented a sub-category of the primary initiative. If an initiative was not referenced, we did not count based on implied or personal interpretation (Berg, 2001).

Second, I created a preliminary coding structure based on the documents under study using the constant comparative method. The constant comparative method is an inductive approach that involves reviewing the study’s documents in detail, resulting in the formation of provisional categories or first order categories of initiatives. This set of categories was then reviewed by Young and I and refined to reflect a mutually exclusive set of categories of initiatives. To ensure the consistency of coding among raters, a coding manual was created consisting of category names, definitions, and examples (Weber, 1990) (Berg, 2001).

Third, Young and I independently coded approximately one-third of the 14 documents under review using the following variables: Initiative, year, person/agency referenced within document, and initiative justification. I included these categories to ensure I captured specific information. To determine prevalence of selection of initiative, I identified how often initiatives were selected. The year of each document (or year referenced within the document) was identified to determine if there was convergence over time for certain initiatives. In this study, I suggest the government select initiatives using the justification of best practices, without consideration for context. To track this, I
identified the link between selection of initiative and justification used when selecting the initiatives. Young and I agreed on 12 of 44 total codes put forth between both individually for an inter-rater agreement index of 27% (Berg, 2001).

There were a couple of reasons our inter-rater agreement was 27%. First, the documents often reference initiatives without specific references to SES. I clarified to Young, the focus of my content analysis is coding initiatives selected or recommended in reference to SES minority underrepresentation. Second, we had not initially agreed upon a rule for determining how particular units were coded, discrepancies were discussed and changed to reflect 100% agreement based on clarification of the coding rules. The coding manual was slightly adjusted to reflect one change to the policy type variable such that two categories “Targeted Recruitment Efforts” and “Hire More Minorities” were combined to reflect one category “Targeted Recruitment and Hiring Efforts” (Berg, 2001).

Young and I proceeded to code remaining documents individually to minimize but not eliminate researcher subjectivity in interpreting content. The remaining documents resulted in 100% inter-rater agreement. During this process, one additional category was added and cited as “Onboarding” since it became apparent that instances of this category could not be absorbed into the original set of codes. As a last step, I looked for ways to make sense of the themes identified. This involved exploring the dimensions of the categories and identifying relationships between categories and/or variables (Bradley, 1993) (Berg, 2001).

Following the above coding, I developed another coding document that included five justifications (Representative Bureaucracy, best practice, social responsibility,
performance, and better problem solving) referenced for each initiative. Using interpretive analysis, I identified the type of justifications given for the selection of each initiative, analyzing for shifting justifications. Some justifications were clearly stated and other justifications were stated in the purpose of the document or throughout the document (Yanow, 1996) (Berg, 2001).

**Findings**

Of the 128 references to initiatives selected by the government, the most prevalent initiative of choice was workforce and succession planning strategies. This initiative was the most prevalent but not in a significant way. Workforce and succession planning strategies was selected 16% of the time while mentoring/development 12%, selection of plans 11%, and target recruitment and hiring efforts selected 11% of the time. The justification most often used was not best practices as I previously suggested but representative bureaucracy. This finding is surprising since the emphasis in the federal government since 1994 and earlier has been to reinvent government through the use of best practices from business. Throughout the documents, initiatives identified with the justification of Representative Bureaucracy were contextually relevant, consistently addressing the issue of SES underrepresentation. Of the 128 initiatives identified, 59% of the initiatives had one justification (per initiative) while 41% of the initiatives had two or more justifications (per initiative). Within the group with one justification (per initiative), 92% of the justifications were representative bureaucracy and 7% of the justifications for selecting the initiative were best practices. Additionally, there was a pattern of shifting justification where 41% of the initiatives had 2 or more justifications. There was no pattern of convergence across time. Initiative selection over the 17 years of
content did not show an increase, decrease, or concentrated use during any time period. An interesting finding was the prevalence of seven out of 16 initiatives identified in this study were recommended by a cross-section of policymakers over a 17 years period. By cross-section, I mean politicians, heads of agencies, agencies (e.g. OPM, EEOC), etc. This may also indicate a pattern of institutional isomorphism without contextually relevant solutions. This research is still being further developed (Gore, 1997) (Best Practices, 1999) (Berg, 2001).
## Appendix 1

### Documents by Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action Review, Report to the President</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO 13171</td>
<td>10/12/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO-03-34</td>
<td>1/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO 04-123t Enhance Diversity in SES 2003</td>
<td>10/15/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO-08-609T</td>
<td>4/3/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 3774</td>
<td>6/4/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Report 110-517</td>
<td>10/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR 2721</td>
<td>6/4/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity SES Excel Conference-GAO 09-110-HR2721 2009(Senate 1180)</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB OPM SES Memo</td>
<td>2/18/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing on Strengthening the Senior Executive Service-</td>
<td>3/29/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommittee Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Better, More Diverse SES 2050 Study</td>
<td>9/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM Strategic Plan</td>
<td>11/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Coding Scheme

1-Plan
2-Targeted Recruitment & Hiring Efforts
3-D&I office, 4-Task Force/Committee
5-Legislation/Executive Orders
6-Conduct new study (e.g., survey) about the problem
7-Workforce and Succession Planning Strategies
8-Monitor Applicant/Promotion Hiring Ratio
9-Performance Management Measurement/Accountability System (targeted to managers for working to promote a diverse and inclusive workforce)
10-Mentoring/development
11-Organizational time/resources
12-Put on social gatherings
13-Strengthen HR/employment practices in general (no specific reference made to recruitment, selection, development, etc.)
14-Leadership commitment
15-Increased Oversight/Advisement
16-Onboarding
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