

Summary and Analysis of Trump Administration “Day One” Executive Orders and Related Actions Impacting Education

President Trump issued over [two dozen Executive Orders](#) (EOs) and related administrative actions during his first days in office – several of which have significant implications for early childhood, K-12, and higher education. EOs have the force of law, but they cannot expand legal requirements or prohibitions beyond existing statutes or regulations, nor conflict with those laws. As such, several of the EOs and related actions are likely to be challenged in federal court even as they play out in further Administration actions. The table below provides a summary of the most relevant “Day One” EOs and related actions across the following topics: (1) equity and civil rights, (2) immigration, (3) repeal of actions undertaken during the prior Administration, and (4) management of the federal government and workforce. For each executive action, we have provided a [summary](#) of what is included, a brief [analysis](#) of its potential impact in education, and other [notes](#), including information about related Administration actions and legal challenges to these actions. We plan to update this summary of EOs in the coming days and weeks and/or provide a broader tracker that includes EOs and all Administration actions in the priority areas summarized here and others relevant to education.

Summary	Analysis	Notes
TOPIC 1: EQUITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS		
Trump EO: “Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs and Preferencing” (1/20/25) (link)		
<p><i>Eliminates diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) and diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) programs/initiatives in the federal government.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terminates all “illegal DEI” policies, programs, and activities “in the Federal Government, under whatever name they appear,” including but not only hiring, and calls for necessary revisions of employment practices, union contracts, or training policies. Requires each agency within 60 days (i.e., March 20) to: (1) terminate, “to the maximum extent allowed by law,” all DEI offices/positions; “equity action plans;” “equity-related” programs, grants, or contracts; and DEI performance requirements for employees, contractors, or grantees; (2) provide a list of all prior Administration agency activities or federal contractors who have provided trainings or materials to agencies; (3) provide a list of all federal grantees funded to provide or advance DEI programs, services, or activities; (4) assess the cost of prior Administration DEI actions; and (5) recommend further federal actions to align federal programs, activities, policies, regulations, guidance, employment, enforcement, contracts, grants, orders, and litigating positions with this anti-DEI EO. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This order does not define DEI while seemingly characterizing all <i>federal</i> “DEI” activities, including those within the U.S. Department of Education (USED) and other agencies, as “illegal and immoral discrimination.” The order contrasts “DEI” as a concept with approaches that “reward individual initiative, skills, performance, and hard work.” That said, the order does not expressly declare “DEI” initiatives as unlawful for the field under federal law, such as Title VI. Further, the EO should not have the authority to eliminate programs that Congress required to be created and funded. The order does, however, create an obligation on federal agencies and a mechanism within the White House to identify and advance other recommendations to eliminate “DEI” and terminate DEI-related grants and contracts, which could give rise to further field-facing actions. For example, the call for recommendations on new “litigating positions” aligned with the EO previews expected shifts in Administration postures in court cases seeking to end any consideration of race or ethnicity in education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following the issuance of this EO, the Trump Administration instructed federal agencies to place all federal DEI staff on leave and take down all DEI websites or media. Additionally, all federal agencies issued letters to their employees requiring them to report any information about DEI programs, including where language was changed with regard to those programs, and threatening them with adverse employment action if they fail to do so. USED summarized its early implementation efforts of this EO in this press release.

Summary	Analysis	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes monthly meetings led by the Domestic Policy Council to track progress and identify areas for additional action. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EO addresses federal “DEI” and “DEIA” programs, with the “A” standing for “accessibility,” which the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has defined as “[t]he design, construction, development, and maintenance of facilities, information and communication technology, programs, and services so that all people, including people with disabilities, can fully and independently use them.” Common usage in equity-advancing programs considers “A” to be access for those experiencing barriers, particularly people with disabilities. 	
<p>Trump EO: “Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity” (1/21/2025) (link)</p>		
<p><i>Reinforces the other anti-DEI order and further seeks to eliminate DEI programs/initiatives beyond the federal government.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that the “Federal Government, major corporations, ...the medical industry,...institutions of higher education” and other non-federal entities “have adopted...dangerous, demeaning, immoral race- and sex-based preferences under the guise of so-called ‘diversity, equity, and inclusion’ (DEI) or...DEIA that can violate civil rights laws....” Establishes a policy of “promot[ing] individual initiative, excellence, and hard work” and directs “all agencies to enforce our longstanding Federal civil-rights laws and...combat illegal private-sector DEI preferences, mandates, policies, programs, and activities.” It further instructs all federal agencies to “terminate all discriminatory and illegal preferences, mandates, policies, programs, activities, guidance, regulations, enforcement actions, consent orders, and requirements.” This includes termination of all “‘diversity,’ ‘equity,’ ‘equitable decision-making,’ ‘equitable deployment of financial and technical assistance,’ ‘advancing equity,’ and like mandates, requirements, programs, or activities, as appropriate.’” Directs the Attorney General and Secretary of Education to “jointly issue guidance to all State and local educational agencies that receive federal funds, as well as institutions of higher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Trump Administration here lays out plans to target and prioritize efforts to prevent actions that it might characterize as unlawful “DEI,” but it cannot use this EO to outlaw all “DEI” programs categorically. As implementation moves forward, the key questions are what the Trump Administration has the authority to say is illegal under federal law; how, when there is overreach, the field reacts to the potential chilling effect; and what the courts ultimately say about efforts to reinterpret antidiscrimination laws. The ambiguities of this EO’s requirements for federal action and its characterization of all DEI efforts as illegal raise First Amendment issues. The Supreme Court in <i>Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College</i>, for example, characterizes diversity interests as “commendable” and “worthy,” not illegal. The order rescinds seven longstanding equal opportunity EOs, including a 1965 order (EO 11246) from the Lyndon B. Johnson Administration that has been a hallmark of the civil rights era to ensure anti-discrimination protections for employees of federal contractors and subcontractors. 	

Summary	Analysis	Notes
<p>education that receive federal grants” and participate in the federal student loan program, “regarding the measures and practices required to comply with” <i>Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the head of each agency to include in all contracts or grant awards a term requiring the contracting or receiving party to “certify that it does not operate any programs promoting DEI that violate any applicable federal anti-discrimination laws.” • Directs the Attorney General within 120 days (i.e., May 21) to make recommendations for ending private sector “illegal DEI discrimination.” • Directs every agency to identify up to “nine potential civil compliance investigations of...large non-profit corporations or associations, foundations with assets of 500 million dollars or more...institutions of higher education with endowments of over 1 billion dollars.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The order calls on each federal agency to identify large non-profits, colleges and universities, and foundations for potential civil investigations relating to their advancement of DEI efforts. Whether the identification of these entities leads to enforcement of any kind is unknown. But, as with other actions, the chilling effect it may have on entities engaged in DEI efforts may prove significant. • The order’s requirement that every contract or grant award, which would include future contracts or grants, include a “term...that...compliance in all respects with Federal anti-discrimination laws is material to the government’s payment decisions for purposes of [the False Claims Act],” may give rise to False Claims Act liability for noncompliance. 	
<p>Trump EO: “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government” (1/20/25) (link)</p>		
<p><i>Establishes a federal policy that recognizes only two immutable biologically-determined sexes, and reverses the prior Administration’s position that Title IX protects against discrimination based on gender identity.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asserts that “ideologues who deny the biological reality of sex have increasingly used legal and other socially coercive means to permit men to self-identify as women and gain access to intimate single-sex spaces.” • Creates new definitions for the following terms: female, woman, girl, male, man, and boy, as well as gender ideology and gender identity. The binary definitions of “male” and “female” focus on a person’s sex “at conception.” Instructs federal agencies to enforce laws, regulations, and guidance governing sex-based rights and protections in a way that is consistent with these new definitions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The terms of art associated with gender included in the order may be considered by this Congress if the President presents it with the draft legislative text called for in the EO. Given the current make-up of Congress, it is possible legislation codifying the order’s definitions may pass and begin to affect a number of federal education laws and regulations. • The order particularly reverses efforts undertaken during the prior Administration to advance the interests and opportunities of transgender students and youth. • Several lower federal courts and the Biden Administration have held that other statutory prohibitions against sex-based discrimination (such as Title IX) included discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. Moving away from that interpretation has potentially far-reaching implications for policies designed to protect LGBTQI+ individuals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This EO directly conflicts with the Biden Administration’s Title IX regulations, which were finalized in April of last year and that sought to expand protections for transgender students, among other changes. Those regulations are also currently enjoined from taking effect, and they were vacated entirely by one district court.

Summary	Analysis	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires the White House Office of Legislative Affairs to present draft legislative text to the President within 30 days (i.e., February 20) that he can propose to Congress codifying these definitions in federal law, and requires the Department of Health and Human Services to provide guidance expanding on the definitions. Directs the Department of Justice to issue guidance that the Supreme Court’s holding in <i>Bostock v. Clayton County</i> – that Title VII prohibits discrimination based on gender identity in employment – does not apply to Title IX’s protections in education, and rescinds more than a dozen related guidance documents from the prior Administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It remains unclear what impact this EO will have for schools and districts that seek to provide students with access to facilities consistent with their gender identity. However, it removes the prior Administration’s recognition and enforcement of those rights, eliminates federal guidance that would support such actions, and previews potential enforcement against those actions where they are seen to interfere with others’ rights based on sex as defined in this EO. 	
<p>Trump EO: “Restoring Freedom of Speech and Ending Federal Censorship” (1/20/2025) (link)</p>		
<p><i>Prohibits federal employees – and agents of the government – from engaging in censorship of free speech.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asserts that the Biden Administration “trampled free speech rights by censoring Americans’ speech on online platforms, often by exerting substantial coercive pressure on third parties, such as social media companies.” Prohibits each “federal agency, entity, officer, employee, or agent [to] act or use any Federal resources in a manner” that would “abridge the free speech of any American citizen” or use “taxpayer resources [for such abridgement].” States that it is the policy of the United States to “identify and take appropriate action to correct past misconduct by the Federal Government related to censorship of protected speech.” Charges the Attorney General to consult with the heads of executive departments and agencies to “investigate the activities of the Federal Government over the last four years that are inconsistent with the [EO’s] purposes and policies” and to report to the President “with recommendations for appropriate remedial actions.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of “agents” of the federal government in the list of entities included in the order could include private contractors of the government, such as institutions of higher education and nonprofits <i>if</i> they are producing work contributing to federal policy or performing work that the government would otherwise perform. These concepts of agency are used in other contexts, for example to determine when the Freedom of Information Act applies to non-federal entities. However, the boundaries here are unclear and may develop as things unfold. The order states that it must be carried out consistent with applicable law. In this instance, it would require a review of activities relating to potential violation of free speech, protected by the First Amendment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complaints were raised during the Biden Administration that government officials worked to silence conservative viewpoints on social media on topics including the COVID-19 pandemic and election security. These complaints were advanced in cases brought by two states and five social media users. The Supreme Court sided with the Biden Administration in those cases.

TOPIC 2: IMMIGRATION

Trump EO: “Protecting the Meaning and Value of American Citizenship” (1/20/25) ([link](#))

Instructs the federal government not to recognize birthright citizenship.

- Reinterprets the 14th Amendment’s Citizenship Clause, which provides that: “All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.”
 - Seeks to exclude from automatic citizenship those born in the U.S. under two conditions: (1) when the mother was unlawfully present and the father was neither a U.S. citizen nor a lawful permanent resident at the time of birth; or (2) when the mother was lawfully but temporarily present (e.g., on a student, work, or tourist visa), and the father was neither a U.S. citizen nor a lawful permanent resident.
 - Applies only to those who are born thirty days after the issuance of the order (i.e., February 20).
- The order may be overturned as violating the 14th Amendment because the Citizenship Clause has been the subject to prior interpretation by federal courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court. These rulings, in addition to explicit legislative history during debates about the 14th Amendment, have consistently held over the past century that the 14th Amendment confers citizenship to nearly all children born in the United States, with very limited exceptions (e.g., the children of foreign diplomats because they are not subject to U.S. jurisdiction, unlike other nationals of other countries who are while present in the U.S.).
 - The order implicates the rights of not only individuals who are in the U.S. unlawfully, but also those who are lawfully present but on a temporary basis. For example, if a graduate student is attending an institution in the United States and has a child, citizenship may not confer to the child.
 - Certain early childhood settings are subject to the federal eligibility requirements in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWOA), which limits eligibility to federal public benefits to “qualified immigrants,” including only those children who are citizens or here lawfully. This includes benefits provided under the Child Care & Development Block Grant (CCDBG). If this EO remains in effect, CCDBG benefits could not be conferred to those who were lawfully present solely due to their birth on American soil. Head Start is not considered a federal public benefit subject to PRWOA’s eligibility requirements.
- As of January 21, [twenty-two states have sued](#) the Trump Administration in federal courts to block this order, including [eighteen states and two cities](#) that challenged the EO in Massachusetts and [four other states](#) that challenged the EO in Washington. Further, the [ACLU](#) filed suit in New Hampshire on behalf of several nonprofit organizations.
 - On January 23, the federal judge (appointed by President Reagan) hearing the challenge in Seattle, WA, [issued](#) a nationwide temporary restraining order, blocking implementation of the EO. The judge stated, “I’ve been on the bench for over four decades, I can’t remember another case where the question presented is as clear as this one is. This is a blatantly unconstitutional order.”

Trump EO: “Protecting the American People Against Invasion” (1/20/25) ([link](#))

Prompts immediate federal actions to vigorously enforce immigration laws.

- Rescinds four 2021 Biden Administration EOs related to immigration, including those aimed at addressing asylum seekers and family reunification, and instructs agencies to “promptly revoke all guidance and policies” based on these EOs.
- Establishes Homeland Security Task Forces to “end the presence of criminal cartels, foreign gangs, and transnational criminal organizations throughout the United States, dismantle cross-border human smuggling and trafficking networks, end the scourge of human smuggling and trafficking, with a particular focus on such offenses involving children,” among other actions.
- Enforces civil fines and penalties to undocumented immigrants and promotes the construction of detention facilities.
- Requires the Secretaries of Homeland Security and Treasury to report within 90 days (i.e., April 20) with progress on the actions in the EO and recommendations of additional actions.
- Instructs the Secretary of Homeland Security to use “her sole and unreviewable discretion” to carry out “efficient and expedited removal of aliens.”
- Directs the Attorney General and Secretary of Homeland Security to evaluate federal funding available to “sanctuary” jurisdictions and take “lawful” action against their practices.
- Instructs the Department of Homeland Security to significantly increase the number of agents and officers available to perform the duties of immigration officers.

- This is a sweeping order that requires Administration officials to carry out vast actions implementing immigration law enforcement.
- The discretion granted to the Secretary of Homeland Security by this order creates a wide range of potential impacts on K-12 schools and universities, especially with respect to ICE enforcement actions on students and their families/caregivers, as well as impacts on staff faced with enforcement taking place on their campuses. To the extent the order leads to significant increases in deportations and/or family separation, child care providers and K-12 schools may be confronted with extremely high levels of student instability and increased needs.

- The Administration paired this order with the [rescission](#) of guidance by the Department of Homeland Security that generally protected certain areas – including schools, universities, churches, and hospitals – from immigration enforcement. Click [here](#) for a summary of this sensitive areas policy, which dates back to 2011.
- The Department of Justice followed up by [ordering](#) its U.S. Attorneys around the nation to investigate state and local officials who refuse to help execute the Administration’s immigration policies. There will likely be legal challenges to any prosecutions along these lines, as the Supreme Court has held that the federal government cannot commandeer state/local law enforcement to implement federal laws, but the EO may impact data-sharing requirements, and the threat may have powerful chilling effects.

Trump EO: “Declaring a National Emergency at the Southern Border of the United States” (1/20/2025) (link)		
<p><i>Deploys federal resources to security enforcement at the U.S.-Mexico border.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declares a national emergency at the U.S.-Mexico border. • Asserts presidential authority to deploy emergency response via the Armed Services, more specifically, the Ready Reserve and National Guard. • Supports coordination between state governors and the Department of Defense to deploy additional physical infrastructure to improve operational security in obtaining “complete operational control of the southern border of the United States.” • Requires the Secretaries of Defense and Homeland Security to submit a report within 90 days (i.e., April 20) about the conditions at the border and any recommendations for additional actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This order primarily re-issues President Trump’s prior emergency at the U.S.-Mexico border and authorizes the deployment of Armed Services to prevent illegal entry into the United States. However, while the first declared emergency at the border was aimed at supporting the creation of a wall at the border, this EO seems oriented more toward enlisting the military in immigration enforcement. This would provide added capacity to the work typically undertaken by Homeland Security. • Presidents have broad authority to declare national emergencies, which immediately provide special authorities to the President to intervene and respond in ways that the executive deems appropriate to meet a crisis. Congress can suspend national emergencies, though it seems unlikely in this instance given the current make-up of Congress. • Depending on how the increased border enforcement is implemented, this order could result in more separation of children from their parents or guardians. 	
TOPIC 3: REPEAL OF PRIOR ADMINISTRATION ACTIONS		
Trump EO: “Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions” (1/20/25) (link)		
<p><i>Rescinds approximately eighty EOs and PMs issued during the Biden Administration that addressed wide-ranging topics.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reverses Biden Administration policies that the new Administration deems “deeply unpopular, inflationary, illegal, and radical” and aims to “restore common sense to the Federal Government and unleash the potential of the American citizen.” • Includes rescission of several EOs and PMs about education, including EOs that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advanced racial equity and supported underserved communities across the federal government, spurring federal agencies to create equity action plans to assess how 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The order reinforces this Administration’s preference for eliminating completely any prior measures to promote DEI in the federal workforce, apply an equity lens to federal policies and programs, or focus on the welfare of any particular group of people. • While the Trump EO rescinds prior EOs establishing White House Initiatives for certain students, it does not rescind the EO establishing a White House Initiative to strengthen Historically Black Colleges and Universities issued by President Obama. • Notably, certain other EOs from the Biden Administration were retained, including the EO on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During his term, President Biden released approximately 160 EOs. These initial rescissions effectively cut the number of effective EOs issued by President Biden in half. • As discussed in an earlier row above, President Trump also separately rescinded a 1965 executive order (EO 11246) from the Lyndon B. Johnson Administration that has been a hallmark of the civil rights era by

<p>policies perpetuate systemic barriers to opportunity, and how agencies would address those barriers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Established White House Initiatives dedicated to advancing equity of opportunity for particular populations of students and certain institutions, including initiatives dedicated to advancing educational equity, opportunity, and economic advancement for Hispanics, Native Americans, and Black Americans, and to strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities and Hispanic Serving Institutions; ○ Ensured the Census counted non-citizens; ○ Established the first-ever Gender Policy Council, dedicated to coordinating interagency efforts to promote equity of opportunity, particularly for women; and ○ Advanced DEI in the federal workforce. 	<p>Increasing Access to High-Quality Care and Supporting Caregivers. This EO drove actions across the federal government to support the care economy, including child care. While many directives from that EO have been achieved, some remain outstanding.</p>	<p>ensuring anti-discrimination protections for employees of federal contractors and subcontractors.</p>
--	---	--

TOPIC 4: MANAGEMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND WORKFORCE

Trump EO: “Restoring Accountability to Policy-Influencing Positions within the Federal Workforce” (1/20/25) ([link](#))

<p><i>Reinstates and amends the prior Trump EO establishing a new classification of federal employees involved in policy-influencing roles to make them at-will employees (previously “Schedule F”).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Moves civil servants in policy-influencing roles (i.e., those that are “confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating [in] character”) to the excepted services under the new schedule “Policy/Career.” This removes certain civil service protections and makes it easier to hire and remove individuals from these roles. ● States, as a basis for the order, that “there have been numerous and well-documented cases of career federal employees resisting and undermining the policies and directives of their executive leadership.” ● Instructs the heads of federal agencies to conduct a full review of all positions within 210 days (i.e., August 18) and determine which positions should be reclassified under this new schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The order could significantly affect employees at federal agencies, including USED, by altering the employment status of “policy-influencing” career employees. Conversion to this new schedule will subject them to at-will employment, which may lead to increased turnover that would impact the sustainability, efficacy, and operations of federal programs. ● Substantively, the career employees likely affected by this order often play a critical role in ensuring agencies implement laws consistent with how they are written, acting as impartial “referees.” Replacing them or making them more subject to political pressure could have significant implications for agency hiring, implementation, rulemaking, etc. ● The order gives each agency head broad authority to make determinations about which employees should be covered by this new schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The National Treasury Employees Union – representing federal workers at 37 federal agencies – filed a lawsuit seeking to reverse the order.
--	---	---

<p>Trump EO: “Restoring Accountability for Career Senior Executives” (1/20/25) (link)</p>		
<p><i>Creates more accountability for senior executive service officials.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seeks to provide greater oversight and transparency into the performance and conduct of Senior Executive Service (SES) officials through certain actions. Requires the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to create SES performance plans within 30 days (i.e. February 20) that agencies must adopt. Directs agency heads to “reassign agency SES members to ensure their knowledge, skills, abilities, and mission assignments are optimally aligned to implement my agenda.” Notes that those “who engage in unauthorized disclosure of Executive Branch deliberations, violate...constitutional rights..., refuse to implement policy priorities, or perform their duties inefficiently or negligently should be held accountable.” Underscores that agency heads should take action, including removal, against SES officials whose performance does not align with the principles outlined in the EO or their statutory duties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The order’s statement that SES employees should be reassigned to ensure alignment with the Administration’s agenda may mean that certain officials would be moved from their current position if there are perceived obstacles. It also may function to intimidate career officials, whose role in our nonpartisan civil service includes <i>not</i> acting in accordance with executive pressure when that contradicts federal law. 	
<p>Trump EO: “Reforming the Federal Hiring Process and Restoring Merit to Government Service” (1/20/25) (link)</p>		
<p><i>Overhauls federal hiring practices to purportedly prioritize merit.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criticizes procedures as “broken, insular, and outdated,” asserting they no longer emphasize “merit, practical skill, and dedication to the Constitution.” References specific factors in hiring that may indicate a “commitment to illegal racial discrimination under the guise of ‘equity’” and the “invented concept of ‘gender identity.’” Mandates the development of a Federal Hiring Plan by 120 days (i.e., May 20), crafted by several offices including the new United States DOGE Service (USDS). The Plan would reduce the government-wide time to hire to under 80 days, and “prevent the hiring of individuals based on their race, sex, or religion, and prevent the hiring of individuals who are unwilling to defend the Constitution or to faithfully serve the Executive Branch.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coupled with the actions to remove civil service protections from career federal employees and end all remote work, this order could create a roadmap for the streamlining of government operations and reducing the overall size of the federal workforce. This could, in turn, reduce the frequency and/or quality of services provided by federal agencies to learners in early childhood settings, K-12 schools, and institutions of higher education. It may also hinder agencies’ ability to conduct meaningful oversight of federal programs or to provide technical assistance to grantees. Reducing the time for hiring to 80 days could help quickly refill the ranks in government offices that experience attrition or high vacancies owing to eliminations carried out by the Administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> President Trump also issued an EO requiring agency heads to take all appropriate steps to have federal employees return to in-person work full time. This may drive staff attrition at some agencies. President Trump also issued an EO establishing a hiring freeze and requiring the head of the Office of Management and Budget to establish a plan to reduce the size of the federal government.

Trump EO: “Establishing and Implementing the President’s ‘Department of Government Efficiency’” (1/20/2025) ([link](#))

Establishes the United States DOGE Service (USDS) as a temporary organization within the Executive Office of the President, replacing the existing United States Digital Service.

- Establishes the role of a USDS Administrator who will begin an effort to “improve the quality and efficiency of government-wide software, network infrastructure, and information technology (IT) systems.”
- Charges the USDS Administrator to work with other federal agencies to promote interoperability between agency networks and systems, ensure data integrity, and facilitate responsible data collection and synchronization.

- While the focus of this order is on IT efficiency and data interoperability, it also references President Trump’s “DOGE agenda,” which likely maintains DOGE’s role – as widely reported prior to the Inauguration – in seeking to recommend substantial cuts to the federal budget. Although USED is a relatively small federal agency, this order could be part of a larger effort to shrink or even dismantle USED.