The Administrative Procedure Act (APA) requires that hearings conducted under its main adjudication provisions1 (sometimes known as “formal” hearings) be presided over by the agency itself, by “one or more members of the body which comprises the agency,” or by “one or more administrative law judges [(ALJs)] appointed under” 5 U.S.C. § 3105.2 Section 3105, in turn, authorizes “[e]ach agency” to “appoint as many [ALJs] as are necessary for proceedings required to be conducted in accordance” with those provisions.3

The process for appointing ALJs recently changed as a result of Executive Order (EO) 13,843.4 Until that order was issued, agencies could hire a new ALJ only from a certificate of qualified applicants (that is, a list of applicants eligible for hire) prepared by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM).5 Each certificate generally had three applicants selected from a much larger register of applicants OPM deemed “qualified.” The “list of three,” as it was known, consisted of the three highest-scoring applicants based upon, among other things, an OPM-

---

2 Id.
3 Id. § 3105.
5 This was the process for hiring new ALJs. Many agencies hired incumbent ALJs from other agencies under a process known as “interagency transfer.” This process no longer exists, but agencies are still free to hire ALJs from other agencies using their own process.
administered and developed examination and panel interview process, as well as veterans’ status.6

Under EO 13,843, newly appointed ALJs are no longer in the “competitive service,” but instead are in what is known as the “excepted service.”7 As a result, agencies now hire new ALJs directly—that is, without OPM’s involvement—generally using whatever selection criteria and procedures they deem appropriate. EO 13,843 was premised on two primary bases. The first was the need to “mitigate” the concern that, after the Supreme Court’s 2018 decision in Lucia v. Securities and Exchange Commission,8 the OPM-administered process might unduly circumscribe an agency head’s discretionary hiring authority under the Constitution’s Appointments Clause.9 Lucia held that the Securities and Exchange Commission’s (SEC) ALJs were officers under the Appointments Clause, with the result being that—assuming that the SEC’s ALJs are inferior rather than principal officers10—they must be appointed directly by the Commission itself as the head of a department rather than, as was being done, by SEC staff.11 The second basis was the need to give “agencies greater ability and discretion to assess critical qualities in ALJ candidates . . . and [such candidates’] ability to meet the particular needs of the agency.”12

EO 13,843 requires only that ALJs be licensed attorneys. In addition, it identifies desirable qualities for ALJs, such as appropriate temperament, legal acumen, impartiality, and

---

6 See Admin. Conf. of the U.S., Recommendation 1992-7, The Federal Administrative Judiciary 5, 57 Fed. Reg. 61,759, 61761 (Dec. 29, 1992). Qualified veterans received extra points that “had an extremely large impact, given the small range in unadjusted scores.” Id. As the Administrative Conference noted in 1992, “application of the veterans’ preference has almost always been determinative in the ALJ selection system.” Id.
7 “[T]he ‘excepted service’ consists of those civil service positions which are not in the competitive service or the Senior Executive Service.” 5 U.S.C. § 2103.
10 The Lucia majority expressly refrained from deciding whether the SEC’s ALJs are principal or inferior officers, but did note that “[t]he Government and Lucia view the SEC’s ALJs as inferior officers and acknowledge that the Commission, as a head of department, can constitutionally appoint them.” Lucia, 138 S. Ct. at 2051 n.3.
11 See id. This Recommendation takes no position on constitutional questions.
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the ability to communicate their decisions, explicitly leaving it, however, to each agency to
determine its own selection criteria. This Recommendation does not address the substantive
hiring criteria that agencies should employ in selecting among ALJ candidates, though it does
recommend that agencies publish the minimum qualifications and selection criteria for their ALJ
positions. The selection criteria that an agency adopts might include, for example, litigation
experience, experience as an adjudicator, experience in dispute resolution, experience with the
subject-matter that comprises the agency’s caseload, specialized technical skills, experience with
case management systems, demonstrated legal research and legal writing skills, a dedicated work
ethic, and strong leadership and communications skills.13

Each agency must decide not only which selection criteria will apply, but also which will
be mandatory and which are only desirable or preferred. Of course, agencies must also ensure
compliance with generally applicable legal requirements, including those relating to equal
employment opportunity and veterans’ preference.14

Because the EO allows each agency to design its own selection procedures, each agency
must now decide which of its officials will be involved in the selection process, how the process
will be structured, how vacancies will be announced and otherwise communicated to potential
applicants, and whether the agency will require writing samples or some other evaluation.

This Recommendation is built upon the view that there is no “one-size-fits-all” procedure
for appointing ALJs and is designed to assist agencies that are in the initial stages of thinking
through new procedures for appointing ALJs under the EO.15 Each agency will have to construct a

13 See generally Jack M. Beermann and Jennifer L. Mascott, Federal Agency ALJ Hiring After Lucia and Executive
Order 13843 (Mar. 28, 2019) (draft report to the Admin. Conf. of the U.S.), https://www.acus.gov/report/draft-
research-report-federal-agency-alj-hiring-after-lucia-and-executive-order-13843. This report is based in part upon
interviews with officials at a number of agencies, including those employing the vast majority of ALJs.
14 The Executive Order provides that “each agency shall follow the principle of veteran preference as far as
15 Some agencies have already publicly disseminated guidance. See, e.g., Secretary’s Order 07-2018, Procedures for
U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Serv.‘s, Administrative Law Judge Appointment Process Under the
system that is best suited to its particular needs. Doing so will require consideration of, among other things, the nature of its proceedings, the size of the agency’s caseload, and the substance of the relevant statutes and the procedural rules involved in an agency’s proceedings.

RECOMMENDATION

1. To ensure the widest possible awareness of their Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) vacancies and a broad pool of applicants, agencies should announce their ALJ vacancies on the Office of Personnel Management’s website USAJOBS, their own websites, and/or other websites that might reach potential ALJ applicants. Agencies that desire or require subject-matter, adjudicative, or litigation experience should also reach out to lawyers who practice in the field or those with prior experience as an adjudicator. Each agency should keep the application period open for a reasonable period of time to achieve an optimal pool of applicants.

2. Agencies should formulate and publish minimum qualifications and selection criteria for ALJ hiring. Those qualifications and criteria should include the factors specified in Executive Order 13,843 and the qualifications the agency deems important for service as an ALJ in the particular agency. The notice should distinguish between mandatory and desirable criteria. When constructing guidelines and processes for the hiring of ALJs, agencies should be mindful of the importance of the appearance of impartiality and the independence and neutrality of ALJs.

3. Agencies should develop policies to review and assess ALJ applications. These policies might include the development of screening panels to select which applicants to interview, interview panels to select which applicants to recommend for appointment, or both kinds of panels. Such panels could include internal reviewers only or both internal and external reviewers, and could include overlapping members among the two types of panels or could include entirely different members. These policies might include procedures to evaluate applicants’ writing samples. Such writing samples could be submitted with the applicants’ initial applications, as part of a second round of
submissions for applicants who meet the agencies’ qualifications expectations, or as part of a proctored writing assignment in connection with an interview.