

Appendix A. Federal Program PART Score by Appointees from Campaign

<i>Appointment Authority</i>							
Appointee (0,1)	-5.72** (2.41)	-7.82** (2.46)	-5.59* (2.99)	-0.36** (0.17)	--	-4.38 (6.30)	-11.50** (4.10)
Appointee from campaign or national party (0,1)	-5.00 (3.17)	-4.22 (2.63)	-12.67** (4.73)	-0.57** (0.12)	-6.84 (14.77)	-4.97* (2.82)	-9.58** (4.66)
<i>Program Characteristics</i>							
Ln(Program Budget)	0.59 (0.53)	0.88** (0.40)	0.37 (0.61)	0.05** (0.02)	0.80* (0.45)	2.52** (0.72)	0.76 (0.74)
Block/Formula Grant (0,1)	-1.25 (4.62)	-4.73 (3.54)	-1.47 (5.44)	-0.31 (0.21)	-1.06 (4.97)	--	--
Capital Assets and Service Acquisition (0,1)	3.70 (5.68)	2.98 (4.09)	3.53 (6.32)	-0.01 (0.26)	7.96 (5.83)	--	--
Competitive Grant (0,1)	-3.17 (4.52)	-2.22 (3.47)	2.46 (5.65)	-0.19 (0.20)	-2.39 (6.30)	--	--
Credit (0,1)	-0.38 (5.63)	2.53 (4.15)	2.15 (6.02)	-0.07 (0.25)	3.35 (4.56)	--	--
Direct Federal (0,1)	1.70 (3.89)	3.32 (3.01)	5.63 (4.31)	0.17 (0.18)	5.87* (3.49)	--	--
Research and Development (0,1)	5.46 (5.54)	5.53 (3.75)	10.97* (6.43)	0.29 (0.23)	5.07 (4.62)	--	--
<i>Bureau Characteristics</i>							
Fixed Term (0,1)	6.55 (4.72)	-2.06 (5.77)	2.45 (5.21)	0.03 (0.32)	-0.83 (5.76)	--	--
Commission (0,1)	10.75* (5.79)	5.11 (4.31)	8.40* (4.34)	0.53 (0.27)	2.34 (6.02)	--	--
# Programs Evaluated	-2.96** (0.75)	0.31 (0.24)	-0.42 (0.73)	0.04** (0.01)	0.33 (0.38)	0.35 (0.31)	-2.24** (0.81)
Agency Ideology (Liberal-Conservative)	5.77** (1.22)	1.68 (1.53)	3.84** (1.27)	0.24** (0.06)	2.57** (0.91)	7.12 (7.27)	6.75** (3.20)
Constant	61.37** (5.19)	59.61** (4.89)	68.26** (5.23)	--	58.83** (4.71)	56.34** (11.49)	73.53** (4.52)
N	331	591	208	591	505	155	190
F (19, 311; 27, 563; 13,194)	9.12**	8.08**	3.42**	--	78.83**	8.30**	5.39**
R ²	0.32	0.27	0.13	--	0.15	0.11	0.16

Note: **significant at the $p < 0.05$ level; *significant at the $p < 0.10$ level in two-tailed test. Robust standard errors reported. Omitted category is a regulatory program run by a career member of the SES. Year assessed indicator estimates omitted. All models estimated with only most reliable PART scores. Model 1 excludes cases with no bureau listed on PART worksheet. Model 2 estimated with department fixed effects (fixed effect estimates omitted). Model 3 is estimated with managers as unit of analysis. Model 4 is an ordered probit model of program categorical grades (cut point estimates omitted). Model 5 includes 2SLS estimates on a model estimated only on appointees. We could not reject null that work for the campaign or party is exogenous ($p < 0.83$). Model 6 includes only liberal agencies and Model 7 includes only conservative agencies. Models 6 and 7 have sparse specifications because the limited number of cases makes cells for program type year and agency structure have only a few cases. Coefficient estimates in models with full specifications look similar for Model 6 but in Model 7 the coefficients are smaller and insignificant (Appointee (B (SE): -5.76 (4.09); Appointee from campaign or national party: -5.24 (4.14)).

Appendix B. Federal Program PART Score by Manager Background (IV Estimates)*Most Effective Part Scores Only**Manager Background Characteristics*

Bureau Experience (0,1)	-2.60 (1.96)
Months Serving as Bureau Chief (0 to 182)	0.74* (0.42)
Previous Public Management Experience (0,1)	-6.11 (4.13)
Masters (0, 1)	-3.22* (1.76)
Doctorate (0,1)	5.45** (2.46)
Worked in Another Department (0,1)	1.20 (1.76)
Private Management Experience (0,1)	-5.26** (2.00)
Worked in White House (0,1)	-7.87** (3.02)
Worked in Congress (0,1)	-3.15 (2.44)

Bureau Characteristics

Fixed Term (0,1)	-1.15 (4.37)
Commission (0,1)	2.58 (5.16)
# Programs Evaluated	0.21 (0.22)

Political and Program Characteristics

Agency Ideology (Liberal-Conservative)	3.47** (0.89)
Ln (Program Budget)	1.00** (0.41)
Constant	69.22** (4.89)

N (Observations, Managers)	500
F (25, 282; 25, 49)	142.39**
R ²	0.21

Note: **significant at the 0.05 level, *significant at the 0.10 level in two-tailed test. Robust standard errors adjusted for clustering on managers reported. Program type and year assessed indicator estimates omitted. We could not reject null that tenure is exogenous ($p < 0.14$).