

# FEDERAL ACQUISITION INSTITUTE



GS-1102 Workforce Mobility Study

February 7, 2017

## Table of Contents

I. Purpose .....	3
II. Introduction .....	3
III. Data Sources .....	3
IV. Transferability of the FAC-C .....	4
V. GS-1102 Transfers .....	7
VI. GS-1102 Transfer Trends .....	9
VII. Transfer Characteristics .....	11
VIII. Factors for Transferring .....	12
IX. Conclusion .....	14
Table 1: FAC-C Agency Specific Requirements.....	4
Table 2: Agency Unique FAC-C Requirements .....	6
Table 3: Government-wide GS-1102 Transfer Outs.....	7
Table 4: Government-wide GS-1102 Transfer Ins.....	8
Table 5: Agency GS-1102 Transfers: Largest Net Gains and Losses.....	8
Table 6: Agency GS-1102 Transfers as a Percentage of 1102 Workforce Size.....	9
Table 7: GS-1102 Transfer Key Characteristics .....	12
Table 8: Factors in Transferring .....	13
Table 9: Most Important Factor Attracting to New Agency .....	14

## I. Purpose

There is a higher rate of transition among GS-1102s compared to other government-wide workforce occupational series. Through this study, FAI sought to investigate potential root causes and to provide insight into the trends and potential drivers of GS-1102 transfers.

## II. Introduction

Through the GS-1102 Workforce Mobility Study, the Federal Acquisition Institute (FAI) investigated the trends and drivers of GS-1102 transfers across the civilian Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Act agencies. While not synonymous, the “FAC-C” and “GS-1102” workforces are closely linked, with approximately 95% of FAC-C holders being GS-1102s (i.e., contract specialists).<sup>1</sup> As the FAC-C workforce is one of three primary Federal Acquisition Certifications (FACs), FAI sought to provide insight into the trends and drivers of GS-1102 transfers.

Additionally, this study explored the potential benefits and challenges to having a transferable, and highly mobile government-wide GS-1102 workforce. In conjunction with additional research, the findings of this study could help agency and government-wide leaders more effectively manage a highly skilled and qualified acquisition workforce. The GS-1102 Workforce Mobility Study primarily sought to:

- Determine the transferability of the Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (FAC-C) workforce members across civilian agencies
- Quantify and benchmark the number of GS-1102 transfers, at both a government-wide and agency level
- Analyze Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey Data, FAI Agency Change survey data and OPM Fedscope Data and determine if relationships exist between GS-1102 transfers and environmental factors, such as employee engagement, employee satisfaction, and workload
- Understand the characteristics of those GS-1102 workforce members who have transferred agencies
- Evaluate the factors that caused workforce members to leave one agency to transfer to another

This report outlines the findings and conclusions from the analysis of available data across the five primary areas noted above.

## III. Data Sources

Data from the following sources was evaluated in conducting the GS-1102 Workforce Mobility Study (in order of analysis):

- FAI Agency-specific FAC Requirements Survey (Data current as of August 2016)
- Office of Personnel Management’s (OPM) FedScope system (<https://www.fedscope.opm.gov>)

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on FAI FAITAS-EHRI mapping data as of October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2016, 95% of FAC-C holders within FAITAS fall into the GS-1102 occupational series as coded in OPM’s EHRI.

- Office of Personnel Management’s (OPM) 2015 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) (<https://www.fedview.opm.gov/>)
- General Services Administration’s (GSA) Federal Procurement Data System - Next Generation (FPDS-NG) ([https://www.fpds.gov/fpdsng\\_cms/index.php/en/](https://www.fpds.gov/fpdsng_cms/index.php/en/))
- FAI’s Training Application System (FAITAS) (<https://faitas.army.mil/faitas/>)
- FAI’s Agency Change Survey (Administered between Q1 FY14 and Q2 FY15)

#### IV. Transferability of the FAC-C

Since the Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (FAC-C) creation in January of 2006, it has served as the government-wide standard for contracting professionals in non-Department of Defense (DoD) agencies. The importance of the government-wide standard has remained constant, as noted in the May 7, 2014 [Memo on Revisions to the Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting \(FAC-C\)](#) from OFPP, which stated: “The FAC-C is founded on core competencies that are considered essential for successful contracting, education and experience requirements, continuous learning to maintain skills currency, and developmental activities.”

To better identify and understand what, if any, agency-specific FAC-C requirements exist in the civilian agencies, FAI conducted the Agency-specific FAC Requirements Survey in August of 2016. The survey asked respondents to report any agency-specific requirements in the areas of education, training, experience, and continuous learning that must be met in addition to the standard FAC-C requirements.

FAI received feedback from 20 of the 23 civilian Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Act agencies. Of those agencies, five cited agency-specific FAC-C requirements that are in addition to the government-wide standards. Of the four agencies that cited additional training requirements, most consisted of agency-specific training offerings or ethics-related courses. The two agencies that cited additional experiential requirements differed in their guidelines, with one agency requiring a set period of time at each certification level before a workforce member could apply for the next level of FAC-C. The second agency required workforce members to have a certain number of years of experience to apply for the FAC-C level II or level III. Only one agency cited having an additional continuous learning requirement, which was that all workforce members take an ethics-related course. Table 2: Agency Unique FAC-C Requirements on page 5 contains a complete breakout of the additional, agency-specific FAC-C requirements.

Table 1: FAC-C Agency Specific Requirements

Requirement Category	Number of Responding Agencies
Education	0
Training	4
Experience	2
Continuous Learning	1

While five civilian CFO Act agencies do have additional agency-specific certification requirements to obtain or maintain the FAC-C, none of the requirements present a significant barrier to an individual seeking to transfer agencies. Additionally, the minority of agencies

indicating even one additional requirement suggests that an individual looking to transfer agencies would have little trouble or additional training burden in maintaining their FAC-C at a new agency. When

looking at the flow of GS-1102 transfers from one agency to another (Section IV. GS-1102 Transfers), there does not appear to be a relationship between additional FAC-C requirements within an agency and the net increase or decrease of GS-1102s to that agency.



Table 2: Agency Unique FAC-C Requirements

Agency	FAC Level	Experience	Training	Continuous Learning
DHS	Level I, II, III		FAC 043 (Procurement Ethics)	FAC 043 (Procurement Ethics)
DOJ	Level I, II, III		FAC 018, FAC 031, FAC 043	
NASA	Level I	2 months of experience between Level I courses	CON 100, CON 090	
	Level II	6 months of experience required after Level I is achieved prior to enrolling in Level II courses; 2 months of experience between Level II courses	ACQ 101	
	Level III	1 year of experience after completion of Level II prior to enrolling in Level III courses; Level III courses limited to GS 13 and above	ACQ 202, CON 370	
SSA	Level II	3 years of cumulative experience		
	Level III	7 years of cumulative experience		
VA	Level I, II, III		Welcome to the VA an Orientation for New 1102s; ECMS New User Training; FPDS Computer Based Training Certification - IDV; FPDS Computer Based Training Certification - Awards; CPARS Overview; CPARS Quality and Narrative Writing	

Note: No agency reported unique FAC-C education requirements.

## V. GS-1102 Transfers

To better understand the magnitude of GS-1102 transfers between agencies, this study examined data from the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) FedScope system.<sup>2</sup> The data was examined to benchmark the number of transfers (both in and out of agencies) in the GS-1102 workforce against the Federal Government as a whole. Additional analyses were performed to benchmark the civilian CFO Act agencies against one another.

Fedscope defines a transfer out as the "movement of a single employee, or group of employees, to another agency with a break in service of 3 days or less."<sup>3</sup> In order to better understand the magnitude of GS-1102s leaving one agency to transfer to another, the transfer out rate for the GS-1102 population was calculated across five fiscal years. As demonstrated in table 3, the GS-1102 occupation series had a transfer out rate of between 4% and 5% between FY 2011 and FY 2015. In comparison, the government-wide transfer out rate (exclusive of GS-1102s) was approximately 1% for each year. During this period, the population size of the civilian GS-1102s remained consistent between 12,400 and 13,000 members.

Table 3: Government-wide GS-1102 Transfer Outs

Occupation	FY11 Rate	FY12 Rate	FY13 Rate	FY14 Rate	FY15 Rate
GS-1102 Transfer Outs	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%
Government-wide (excluding 1102s)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Difference	+3%	+3%	+3%	+3%	+4%

Similar to examining the transfer out rate of the GS-1102 workforce, table 4 demonstrates the transfer in rate of the GS-1102 workforce.

The transfer in rate for GS-1102s ranged from 3% to 4% between FY 2011 and FY 2015. Similar to the transfer out rate, the GS-1102 workforce transferred in to agencies at a rate higher than the government-wide rate, which was consistently 1% across the five years.

The difference between the transfer out and transfer in rates is due to a variety of factors, including a workforce member changing their occupational series during the transfer. For example, a workforce member may transfer out of one agency as a GS-1102 (counted as a GS-1102 transfer out) and into another agency as a non-GS-1102 employee (not counted as a GS-1102 transfer in).

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.fedscope.opm.gov/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.fedscope.opm.gov/datadefn/index.asp#separations>

Table 4: Government-wide GS-1102 Transfer Ins

Occupation	FY11 Rate	FY12 Rate	FY13 Rate	FY14 Rate	FY15 Rate
GS-1102 Transfer Ins	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%
Government-wide (excluding 1102s)	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Difference	+2%	+2%	+2%	+2%	+3%

As demonstrated in the government-wide transfer data, the GS-1102 workforce transfers between agencies at a higher rate than the government-wide workforce. The higher transfer rate among GS-1102s could be due to a variety of factors, including the similarity of job requirements across the agencies or the relative transferability of the FAC-C as reviewed in Section III of this study, which enables easier transitions from one agency to another.

In addition to examining the government-wide GS-1102 transfer data, OPM FedScope data also provide insight into the GS-1102 transfers within individual agencies. The net gain or net loss for each civilian CFO Act agency was calculated over six fiscal years by subtracting the number of transfer outs from the number of transfer ins within a given agency (Net Gain/Loss = (Agency A Transfer In FY10 + FY11 + FY12 + FY13 + FY14 + FY15) – (Agency A Transfer Out FY10 + FY11 + FY12 + FY13 + FY14 + FY15)). Table 5 demonstrates the five agencies with the largest net gain and the five agencies with the largest net loss of GS-1102s due to transfers over the six year span.

Across the 23 civilian CFO Act agencies, the average agency ended the six year period with a net gain of 23 GS-1102s. The agencies presented in table 5 comprise a mix of larger and smaller agencies, both in the net gain and the net loss columns.

Table 5: Agency GS-1102 Transfers: Largest Net Gains and Losses

Agencies with the Largest Net Gain (FY10 – FY15)		Agencies with the Largest Net Loss (FY10 – FY15)	
Agency	Net Gain	Agency	Net Loss
GSA	516	DHS	-253
VA	255	HHS	-145
USAID	191	DOT	-68
NASA	112	DOJ	-63
EPA	46	DOI	-44

To better control for size variations between the civilian CFO Act agencies, table 6 illustrates the average net gain or loss of agencies as a percentage of their GS-1102 population (Average Percent Change = ((Agency A FY10 Net Gain or loss ÷ Agency A FY10 GS-1102 Population) + ... + (Agency A FY15 Net Gain or loss ÷ Agency A FY15 GS-1102 Population)) ÷ 6). More specifically, table 6 lists the five agencies with the

largest net gain and net loss of GS-1102s as a percentage of each agencies total GS-1102 workforce. This revised calculation shifts the top 5 agencies with the largest net gain and net loss.

The 23 civilian CFO Act agencies averaged a yearly net increase of GS-1102s of 1.2% due to transfers. In addition to controlling for the size variation between agencies, the analysis presented in table 6 also helps to better understand the magnitude of the GS-1102 transfers for a given agency. While we can identify which agencies experienced a net gain or net loss of GS-1102s over the six-year period, further analyses is needed to better understand what drives GS-1102s to leave one agency for a position in another agency. Further sections of this study will evaluate the trends and characteristics of the transferring GS-1102s in an attempt to be understand key drivers.

**Table 6: Agency GS-1102 Transfers as a Percentage of 1102 Workforce Size**

Agencies with the Highest Average Yearly Increase (FY10 – FY15)		Agencies with the Highest Average Yearly Decrease (FY10 – FY15)	
Agency	Avg. Percent Change	Agency	Avg. Percent Change
USAID	12.9%	Education	-3.8%
SBA	6.4%	DHS	-3.0%
NSF	5.8%	DOT	-2.5%
OPM	5.5%	DOL	-2.5%
GSA	5.4%	HHS	-2.3%

## VI. GS-1102 Transfer Trends

In addition to examining the government-wide and agency-specific transfer data of the GS-1102 workforce, this study also analyzed the transfer data in relation to other benchmark data to determine if trends exist. Data from OPM’s Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) and GSA’s Federal Procurement Data System - Next Generation (FPDS-NG) was used to evaluate whether correlations exist between the transfers of GS-1102s to or from a given agency and the characteristics of that agency. To better understand what sort of relationship exists between GS-1102 transfers and the various benchmarks, this study analyzed the correlation coefficients between the two data sets.<sup>4</sup> OPM FEVS data was used to examine if a relationship exists between GS-1102 transfers and employee engagement and satisfaction. GSA FPDS-NG data was used to determine if a relationship exists between GS-1102 transfers and employee workload.

### Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS)

To examine the relationship between GS-1102 transfers and employee engagement, this study first compared the average net gain or loss of agencies as a percentage of their GS-1102 population to the scores on the Employee Engagement Index. The Employee Engagement Index is an OPM developed index comprising a subset of questions from the FEVS. Per OPM, the “index provides an assessment of the engagement potential of a work environment and is comprised of three subfactors: Leaders Lead,

<sup>4</sup> The correlation coefficient was used to determine to what extent the two variables were associated with one another. The range for potential correlation coefficients is -1.0 (perfect negative correlation) to 1.0 (perfect positive correlation), with 0.0 indicating that there is no relationship between the variables.

Supervisors, and Intrinsic Work Experience. Each sub-factor reflects a different aspect of an engaging work environment and each is assessed through questions on the FEVS.”<sup>5</sup>

In comparing average net gain or loss of the 23 civilian CFO Act agencies as a percentage of their GS-1102 population to the scores on the Employee Engagement Index, a small to moderate positive correlation was found (.22). While correlation does not equal causation, it is worth noting that as an agency’s Employee Engagement Index score increases, so does the likelihood of having a positive net transfer rate, meaning the agency would have more 1102’s transfer in than 1102’s that transfer out.

In addition to comparing the average net gain or loss of the 23 civilian CFO Act agencies as a percentage of their GS-1102 population to the agencies scores on the Employee Engagement Index, the average net gain or loss of the agencies was also compared the FEVS item number 69: “Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job?” This comparison found a slightly stronger, but still moderate, positive correlation between the two factors (.40).

Taken together, the relationships between employee transfers and employee engagement and satisfaction indicators offer a potential rationale as to why employees transfer agencies. While not definitive, there does seem to be a relationship between higher employee engagement and satisfaction indicators and an increased likelihood of a positive net transfer rate for workforce members move to an agency with those higher scores.

In addition to the Employee Engagement Index, the relationship between three additional OPM FEVS indices and the average net gain or loss of the 23 civilian CFO Act agencies as a percentage of their GS-1102 population was examined. The Human Capital Assessment and Accountability Framework (HCAAF) Index looks across four key areas including Leadership and Knowledge Management, Results Oriented Performance Culture, Talent Management, and Job Satisfaction. Comparing the HCAAF Index to the average net gain or loss of the agencies demonstrated a small, negative correlation (-.02).

The OPM New IQ Index measures “behaviors that help create an inclusive environment and is built on the concept that repetition of inclusive behaviors will create positive habits among team members and managers.”<sup>6</sup> When looking at the New IQ Index and the average net gain or loss of the agencies, a small, negative correlation (-.03) was also found.

OPM has also developed a Global Satisfaction Index to measure “employee satisfaction about four aspects related to their work: their job, their pay, their organization, and whether they would recommend their organization as a good place to work.”<sup>7</sup> In comparing the Global Satisfaction Index to the average net gain or loss of the agencies, a small, positive correlation (.10) was found.

The three additional OPM indices reviewed in this study, including the HCAAF Index, the New IQ Index, and the Global Satisfaction Index, demonstrated small correlations with the average net gain or loss of

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2016FILES/Engagement\\_Drivers\\_Background\\_and\\_Summary.pdf](https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2016FILES/Engagement_Drivers_Background_and_Summary.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2015FILES/2015\\_FEVS\\_Gwide\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2015FILES/2015_FEVS_Gwide_Final_Report.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> [https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2015FILES/2015\\_FEVS\\_Gwide\\_Final\\_Report.pdf](https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2015FILES/2015_FEVS_Gwide_Final_Report.pdf)

the civilian CFO Act agencies. Two of the indices (HCAAF Index, New IQ Index) demonstrated a small, negative correlation and the Global Satisfaction Index demonstrated a small, positive correlation.

Agencies that want to increase their net gains can begin by action planning to improve engagement in key indicator areas. Transferring provides an avenue to pursue professional development and career advancement for many GS-1102s. Agencies can use this knowledge to evaluate, plan, and publish meaningful contract specialist career paths with aligned developmental opportunities. This will show employees that the agency is committed to their long-term growth and success and that there are opportunities for internal advancement that they may not have considered.

### **Federal Procurement Data System - Next Generation (FPDS-NG)**

In addition to examining data related to employee engagement and satisfaction, data related to the workload of GS-1102s was also evaluated. Three data points were collected via FPDS-NG as proxies for GS-1102 workload, including contract actions, open contracts, and dollar obligations. To right size each of the measures, the data was then divided by the number of GS-1102s within each agency to establish the final benchmarks (e.g., contract actions per GS-1102s).

When comparing the percent net gain or loss due to transfers of the 23 civilian CFO Act agencies to each agency's contract actions per GS-1102, open contracts per GS-1102, and dollar obligations per GS-1102, almost no relationship was found between any of the indicators. Both the contract actions and open contracts per GS-1102 demonstrated a small negative correlation with agency transfers (-.01 and -.06, respectively). Additionally, dollar obligations per GS-1102 exhibit a small positive relationship with agency transfers (.06). Unlike the relationship between agency transfers and the employee engagement and satisfaction indicators, there does not appear to be a relationship between agency transfers and the selected workload indicators.

## **VII. Transfer Characteristics**

The FAI Training Application System (FAITAS) provides insight into the certification-related data of GS-1102s that have recently transferred agencies. The FAITAS data was analyzed to determine if any trends exist that may lead to a better understanding of the characteristics of GS-1102s at the time of transfer. For the purposes of analyses described in this section of the study, an agency transfer is defined as a registrant in FAITAS that changed their agency in the FAITAS profile between July 2015 and June 2016.<sup>8</sup>

Table 7: GS-1102 Transfer Key Characteristics below provides a snapshot of key characteristics, including the grade, certification level, and number of certifications of GS-1102s. The table includes data for both GS-1102s that transferred and the GS-1102 population as a whole.

---

<sup>8</sup> The definition of "transfer" when reviewing the FAITAS data differs from the same term as defined by OPM when reviewing OPM Fedscope data.

Table 7: GS-1102 Transfer Key Characteristics

GS-1102 Transfers	GS-1102 Population
<b>FAC-C Level</b>	
Level I: <b>12%</b>	Level I: <b>18%</b>
Level II: <b>21%</b>	Level II: <b>22%</b>
Level III: <b>67%</b>	Level III: <b>60%</b>
<b>Number of FACs Held</b>	
One: <b>76%</b>	One: <b>92%</b>
Two/Three: <b>24%</b>	Two/Three: <b>7%</b>
<b>Grade Level</b>	
GS 13-15: <b>52%</b>	GS 13-15: <b>45%</b>
GS 11-12: <b>38%</b>	GS 11-12: <b>32%</b>
GS 10 or lower: <b>10%</b>	GS 10 or lower: <b>22%</b>

As demonstrated in table 7, GS-1102s who transfer agencies are more likely to hold a higher level of FAC-C than the GS-1102 population as whole. Approximately 67% of GS-1102 transfers hold a Level III FAC-C, compared to approximately 60% of the whole GS-1102 population. Additionally, the GS-1102s that hold a FAC-C Level I are less likely to transfer than the GS-1102 population as a whole.

Table 7 also highlights the difference between the two groups in the number of Federal Acquisition Certifications (FACs) held. In addition to a FAC-C, an acquisition workforce member may also hold a FAC for Program and Project Management (FAC-P/PM) or a FAC for Contracting Officer’s Representative (FAC-COR). GS-1102s that transferred agencies were more than 3 times as likely to hold multiple FACs compared to GS-1102s that did not transfer agencies.

Those GS-1102s that transferred agencies were on average more highly graded than their counterparts that did not transfer. For example, 52% of GS-1102s that transferred agencies were GS 13-15 compared to 45% of the entire GS-1102 population. Additionally, 38% of GS-1102s that transferred were GS 11-12, compared to 32% of the overall GS-1102 population.

Overall, data shows that on average GS-1102s who choose to transfer agencies hold a higher level of certification, are more likely to hold multiple FACs, and are more highly graded than the GS-1102 population as a whole. The characteristics of the GS-1102s transfers support the notion that more senior, more certified workforce members have more mobility than the GS-1102 population as a whole.

## VIII. Factors for Transferring

To evaluate why GS-1102s transfer agencies, this study looked at data collected in the Agency Change Survey. The Agency Change Survey was administered by FAI within FAITAS on a quarterly basis to workforce members who indicated a change of agency within their profile field between Q1 FY14 and Q2 FY15. The data analyzed included respondents from 22 agencies and roughly 60 GS-1102s, which offers a broad snapshot into the factors influencing a workforce member’s decision to transfer agencies.

The Agency Change Survey first collected data on the most important factor for an individual deciding to transfer to a different agency. Table 8: Factors in Transferring provides a comprehensive list of the factors, including the percentage of respondents who selected the factor as the most important to them. By 8 percentage points, the most commonly cited factor by GS-1102s for transferring agencies was Professional Development/Career Advancement Opportunities. The second most important factor was Agency Leadership. The third and fourth most common factors included Compensation and Benefits and Work/Life Balance, two often cited reasons as to why workforce members change jobs. The least cited factor for transferring agencies among GS-1102s was their immediate supervisor.

In the Agency Change Survey, GS-1102s were also given the opportunity to select the second most important factor in their decision to change agencies. The results for GS-1102s are also shown in Table 8: Factors in Transferring. When looking at the second most important factor for transferring agencies, Organizational Culture and Compensation and Benefits jump to the top of the list. Also close to the top of the list is Immediate Supervisory/Team Lead, which was at the bottom of the primary factor list.

**Table 8: Factors in Transferring**

Most Important Factor	Percent of Respondents	Second Most Important Factor	Percent of Respondents
Professional Development/Career Advancement Opportunities	27%	Organizational Culture	15%
Agency Leadership (not including Immediate Supervisor)	19%	Compensation and Benefits	14%
Compensation and Benefits	11%	Immediate Supervisor/Team Lead	12%
Work/Life Balance	10%	Agency Leadership (not including Immediate Supervisor)	10%
Organizational Culture	8%	Personal Circumstances	10%
Nature of the Work	7%	Professional Development/Career Advancement Opportunities	8%
Personal Circumstances	7%	Work/Life Balance	8%
Immediate Supervisor/Team Lead	5%	Workspace and Resources	5%
Other	5%	Nature of the Work	4%

The information in the table above can help to better understand why GS-1102s are deciding to transfer agencies. For example, over one-third of those who transfer reported that their primary or secondary reason was to seek new professional development or career advancement opportunities.

The Agency Change Survey also collected data on what factors attracted the individual to the new agency. The results of that analysis are shown in table 10. Similar to the factors influence GS-1102s to leave their current agency, the most important factor attracting workforce members to the new agency is Opportunities for Career Advancement. Interestingly, Work/Life Balance was not cited as a top three reason for leaving their current role, but was the second most cited factor that attracted workforce members to their new agency.

**Table 9: Most Important Factor Attracting to New Agency**

Most Important Factor Attracting to New Agency	Percent of Respondents
Opportunities for Career Advancement	13%
Work/Life Balance	13%
Nature of the Work	12%
Salary	11%
Opportunities for Training and Development	11%
Work Environment	10%
Opportunities for Telework	10%
Commute	7%
Opportunities for flexible, part-time, or alternative work schedules	7%

Taken together, the information presented in tables 8-10 help to illustrate the variety of factors that influence an individual’s decision to transfer agencies. The data also highlight the wide dispersion of responses across multiple factors, demonstrating that there is not one or two primary factors influencing the decision-making process.

## IX. Conclusion

The members of the GS-1102 workforce are uniquely positioned to transfer across civilian agencies, and are doing so at a rate higher than the government-wide population. The GS-1102 Workforce Mobility Study helps

government-wide and agency leaders better understand the movement of GS-1102s across the civilian CFO Act agencies. The study looked at five potential areas related to GS-1102 movement, including (1) the transferability of the Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (FAC-C), (2) the scope of GS-1102 transfers, (3) the relationship between GS-1102s and employee engagement, employee satisfaction, and workload, (4) the characteristics of the GS-1102s that have recently transferred, and (5) the factors causing workforce members to leave one agency for another. Looking across all five potential areas for GS-1102 movement mentioned above, there was only a small positive correlation between an agency’s employee engagement scores and their net gains through GS-1102 transfers.

The analyses in this study can help government-wide and agency leaders determine if GS-1102 mobility across agencies is a challenge or an opportunity. One result of this mobility is a relatively low level of attrition out of government service. That, in conjunction with the higher than average transfer rates demonstrated by GS-1102s, may suggest that the workforce values the ability to move between agencies.