What's On the Minds *of* FEDERAL HUMAN CAPITAL STAKEHOLDERS?

What's On the Minds of FEDERAL HUMAN CAPITAL STAKEHOLDERS?

Director
Steve Nelson

Deputy Director
John Crum

Project Managers
Maria Rost Rublee
Ligaya Fernandez

Table of CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

F rom specific practices such as broadbanding and pay for performance, to sweeping systemic changes such as those embedded in the new Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense's proposed National Security Personnel System, the array of new and experimental flexibilities is dizzying—and matched only by agencies' calls for more of the same. At such a time, assessing the health of the Federal merit systems—the official charge of the Office of Policy and Evaluation (OPE) within the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB)—is more critical than ever. How is merit preserved outside of traditional Title 5 civil service employment? Which of the new and proposed policy and procedural changes will ensure the government provides top-notch service to and for the American people? How do managers and employees function effectively and efficiently under such conditions?

With the sea change of reform taking place, OPE embarked on devising a new research agenda. To make certain we consider a full range of potential topics, we asked stakeholders what issues they believe most needed our attention and examination. Understanding the concerns of the Federal community enriched our efforts to identify topics we should explore in our pursuit of improving practice, influencing policy, and ensuring merit. We originally intended to use stakeholders' comments only in the creation of our research agenda. However, the volume and quality of the comments was such that we believed a summary of our stakeholders' concerns would be useful to others in the Federal human capital field.

This report captures the major research questions raised by our stakeholders. Unlike traditional MSPB studies, this report does not analyze or attempt to answer those research questions. Instead, we simply share with you the issues that inspired over 800 stakeholders from across the country to complete our surveys and participate in our focus groups.

Facts About Comment Collection

To maximize the range and scope of comments, we sought input between November 2002 and January 2003 from our stakeholders in a number of ways. First, we developed a web survey and invited members of the MSPB Studies e-mail list to participate, as well as members of the Federal Communicators' Network. We also invited select constituents to participate in the web survey: Federal human resource (HR) directors, Congressional representatives and their staffs, academics, labor union officials, and associations such as the Federal Managers Association, the Senior Executive Association, and Blacks In Government. The survey resulted in more than 2000 comments from over 800 participants inside and outside the Federal Government. For additional insight, we conducted interviews with six Federal HR directors. Finally, we held focus groups with members of Federal Executive Boards across the country.

Research Issues Raised

Comments we received ranged extensively in type and scope, from specific complaints about narrowly defined topics to wide-ranging discussion about broad human resources management. What they all shared, however, was that in one fashion or another, they suggested research questions related to Federal human capital issues. Comments were related to the following topics:

- ❑ Competitive sourcing and contracting out
- ❑ Workforce planning
- ❑ Recruitment, assessment and selection
- ❑ Position classification and compensation
- ❑ Performance management
- ❑ Leadership and management
- ❑ Work-life balance
- ❑ Labor relations
- ❑ Employee protections and due process

Report Structure and Format

To give readers a sense of the types of research issues suggested by our participants, we have structured the report around major topical areas. The topical areas are organized with intended logic around their interrelationship and the work life cycle rather than any rank order. Issues are presented as major research questions, each with sub-questions also raised by participants that represent areas for in-depth investigation. To give readers a sense of the energy and emotion surrounding these issues, we begin each section with a selection of quotes from our participants. Please note that the quotes are only meant to represent the larger body of comments we received for each topic. The quotes do not reflect MSPB's opinion on any of the topics. We believe informing you of our participants' suggested research topics, without also conveying the passion behind those suggestions, would give you less than a full picture of what's on the minds of Federal human capital stakeholders. In addition, the Appendix lists major research papers already completed by MSPB and other human capital research organizations on the relevant topics.

Suggested Research Questions

Competitive Sourcing and CONTRACTING OUT

"Job security issues are especially important with the increased emphasis on outsourcing. People aren't going to be happy productive employees when they know their positions are being considered for outsourcing."

"With the emphasis on contracting Federal jobs to the private sector, ensure that only the appropriate jobs are contracted out. There are many public safety and security occupations that should not be trusted with the private sector. The profit motivation or other conflict of interest could compromise the welfare of the citizens."

"Although [a greater] quantity of work can be completed with a greater monetary savings from contracting out work, what are some of the other savings and costs associated with contracting out?"

Competitive sourcing and contracting out sparked anxiety and doubts on behalf of many of our participants, pointing to the following research questions:

How do competitive sourcing and contracting out influence the effectiveness and efficiency of the Federal workforce?

❑ Are decisions about competitive sourcing strategically made around core agenc   s and workforce strengths?

❑ Are competitive sourcing and workforce planning decisions integrally intertwined in a strategic sense?

❑ What is the impact of competitive sourcing and contracting out on merit principles?

❑ Do studies that measure the savings of competitive sourcing quantify all relevant
as government preparation to contract out, government oversight of contracting,   .u
potential government costs when work quality concerns arise?

❑ To what extent do fears of competitive sourcing affect the morale of the government work-force, or the ability of the Federal government to recruit and retain the best employees?

Workforce PLANNING

"Are agencies planning far enough ahead in their programmatic areas to be able to effectively determine what kind of workforce will be needed in the future? Will the government simply be replacing retirees, or will the government be developing new positions to ensure that the new people hired will be meeting strategic needs? What impact does the current classification system have on an agency being able to create new positions (and potentially new series) quickly? How are current staff (not near retirement age) being developed to fill new roles?"

"Workforce planning is nearly non-existent. Everyday on the job is like being in a crisis situation, with nothing to do but just try and get through the day!"

"A sudden push to hire staff before the end of the fiscal year resulted in over-hiring. This hiring was done without plan or thought as to what were the most critical positions needed by the agency. Now we are faced with critical vacancies that may have to go unfilled."

Downsizing of the 1990s, impending retirements in the next decade, and increasing government responsibilities have combined to create a considerable need for workforce planning. Our participants raised a number of relevant research questions:

What resources—people, funding, and most of all, expertise—are needed to perform large-scale workforce planning, and do Federal agencies have what it takes?

❑ What workforce planning models are available, and which are most relevant to the Federal government?

❑ Are any Federal agencies doing a particularly good job with workforce planning?

❑ To what extent does the pressure of day-to-day priorities keep agencies from performing workforce planning? How can this be fixed?

❑ How can workforce planning needs be reconciled with the yearly budget process?

Do the government's employment systems—such as hiring, classification, reduction-in-force, and retirement—hinder proper workforce planning?

❑ Could greater flexibilities help agencies plan and execute workforce planning more ___ ly? For example, how can qualification requirements be changed to allow hiring f__ potential - instead of the usual requirement of direct experience?

❑ Could greater flexibilities in retirement rules—such as permitting part-time work before retirement—enable better knowledge transfer?

Recruitment, Assessment, and SELECTION

"There is a drastic need to re-frame the way we recruit and advertise jobs in the Federal government. Announcements are definitely boring, intimidating, and full of red tape. I've always wondered why we require so much of our applicants when private sector companies only ask for a 1-page resume ... shouldn't that be enough?"

"[Due to KSA requirements], many applicants get frustrated at the time they have to spend to apply for one job in the Federal government ... and then they're also required to come up with entirely new responses to new KSAs when they want to apply for a job with a different agency even though the duties are the same."

"[Consider] simplifying and expediting processes, to enable government to be responsive in a highly competitive environment. Our processes do not allow us to compete with private industry at career fairs, where private industry can make job offers on-the-spot. As a result, we lose good candidates."

Our participants asked for a spotlight on many aspects of the government hiring and staffing processes. The research questions raised by their comments include the following:

Does the Federal government have greater difficulties than private industry in hiring and retaining the best people?

- ❑ How can the Federal government improve its ability to compete with the private sector? Would increased pay or faster hiring decisions help?
- ❑ Would simplifying and streamlining the Federal hiring process improve our ability to attract the best candidates?
- ❑ Would consolidating the variety of hiring offices and procedures make a difference?
- ❑ Would improving recruitment tools, such as vacancy announcements, give the Federal government greater advantage?

Would the expanded use of pay flexibilities improve the Federal government's competitive position for candidates?

- ❑ How often are pay flexibilities used?
- ❑ To what extent does a lack of funding for pay flexibilities limit their use?

- To what extent does the use of pay flexibilities actually improve the Federal government's ability to hire the best people?

- Does the difference in funding levels among agencies result in discrepancies among agencies? That is, do well-funded agencies have greater ability to use pay flexibilities and thus attract better talent?

Is the Federal government's assessment process of job applicants weak?

- Are qualification standards and qualification requirements out of date? If so, how should they be revised?

- How effective is the current use of KSAs (knowledge, skills and abilities) in selecting the best-qualified candidates? Can we improve our usage of KSAs or should another type of assessment be formulated?

- Does automation strengthen (or weaken) the assessment process?

How widespread is the perception and practice of pre-selection?

- How often do vacancy announcements actually represent attempts by supervisors to promote a current staff member?

- To what extent does the perception of pre-selection discourage talented people from applying for job openings?

How does the Federal government balance the goals of merit (hiring the best qualified person) and diversity (hiring a representative workforce)?

- How are merit principles preserved when targeted recruitment takes place?

- Are less qualified candidates selected because they belong to underrepresented groups?

Position Classification and
COMPENSATION

"Classification—the system is outdated, abused, spindled and mutilated. Because of the pressure on pay, the classification system has been ignored and we are seeing great disparity across the Federal sector. This creates confusion and anger in employees who see the system as unfair. Either we enforce the standards and require pay to be set by surveys, or we eliminate the process and let local management determine pay within broad categories."

"What recommendations do you have for improving position classification? It's practically never audited, so there are all kinds of abuses of the system. Grades have increased without any correlation to classification. Definitions are outdated in many areas. There are too many series and level definitions. How can all this be simplified? Is the "competencies" approach in classification and qualifications good or bad?"

"Federal classification ... it goes hand in hand with the GS pay system in that the pay system/grade usually drives the classification (rather than the reverse, which is how it is intended). Managers are wise to the whole classification game so that they end up word- smithing position descriptions (PDs) to get them to a grade level that they feel will attract quality candidates .... PDs have become more complicated and wordy than necessary. Compared to many private sector companies, our PDs are 5-6 pages vs. 1-2. Is all the extra language really necessary? If the GS pay system was updated or changed, perhaps managers wouldn't feel as compelled to play the classification game as grade wouldn't necessarily be an issue any more."

In the Federal government, position classification and compensation are closely linked. Position classification is the process in which Federal positions are categorized according to the kind of work performed, the level of difficulty, the level of responsibility, and required qualifications. Through classification, positions are classified into occupational groups, series, pay plans and grade levels. Grade level, in turn, determines pay. (The Office of Personnel Management has official responsibility for maintaining Federal classification standards.) Both classification and compensation, as well as the linkage between them, generated a number of comments from our participants, suggesting the following research questions:

Are classification standards outdated, and if so, to what extent does that affect our ability to manage the Federal workforce?

❑   To what extent has downsizing affected the nature of work assignments, without corresponding change in classification and compensation?

- ❏ Would greater flexibility in classification and compensation help agencies ensure a better match between classification and actual work performed?

- ❏ To what extent would delegating classification standards responsibilities to agencies resolve the problems?

Does inconsistency exist in classification determinations, and if so, what impact does it have?

- ❏ Do different personnel offices classify the same job descriptions differently? If so, how often - is this a widespread issue?

- ❏ Why do different personnel offices classify the same job descriptions differently?

- ❏ How does this perceived problem affect employee morale?

- ❏ To what extent does variability in classification determinations contribute to managerial frustrations?

- ❏ Does variability in classification determinations indicate a disconnect between HR roles and the needs of the agency?

Are classification decisions manipulated to increase employee pay?

- ❏ How widespread is the phenomenon of "word-smithing" position descriptions to ensure a certain GS level, potentially resulting in "grade inflation"?

- ❏ What effect does this issue have on the Federal government's ability to carry out its missions?

Will pay for performance and pay banding resolve Federal pay issues, or will these flexibilities create more problems than they solve?

- ❏ To what extent would pay for performance and pay banding give managers greater flexibility in rewarding strong performers and providing incentives for better results from poor performers? To what extent would they take advantage of it?

- ❏ How would merit be protected in pay for performance and pay banding systems?

- ❏ What impact will pay for performance have on the majority of employees in the middle? Will productivity be affected?

- ❏ Will performance appraisal systems be sufficiently sophisticated to make these fine distinctions?

- ❏ Will managers be adept enough to make the system work?

- ❏ Will there be enough trust in the system to gain employee buy-in?

Performance MANAGEMENT

"It can't be impossible to figure out how to manage poor performers. It's just emotionally difficult and takes time. Our managers must be held responsible for doing something, so a sense of fair play is returned to the workplace."

"If any employee's conduct and/or performance is unacceptable, make it easier to terminate them. The time and effort needed to terminate an unacceptable non-probationary employee is tremendous, and invariably the employee will file an EEO complaint. Then, to save money, the organization buys the employee off, regardless of the legitimacy of the termination. Supervisors quickly learn that it's not worth the hassle. Thus, mediocre employees are allowed to scrape by, and the good performers get dumped on."

"As a manager, I believe there needs to be more training specific to dealing with serious personnel issues, such as conduct and performance issues, and more specifically, the PIP [Performance Improvement Plan] process and termination. I recently went through the process of terminating an employee, and it was basically learn as you go. Although I did get some guidance from human resources, having training specific to this would have made the process more manageable."

The issue of performance management—how to fairly reward outstanding employees and effectively handle poor performers—generated a great deal of comments from our participants, suggesting the following research questions:

Do Federal supervisors handle performance issues properly, particularly the issue of poor performers?

❑ Do supervisors and managers have enough training or direction to handle difficult performance issues?

❑ What are the disincentives to dealing with poor performers, and how can they be realistically overcome?

What are the limitations of our current performance appraisal systems, and what options for improvement exist?

❑ How effective are current performance appraisal systems, in the view of employees and supervisors?

❑ Do we need entirely new performance appraisal systems, or better training in the ones we have?

❑ Are performance standards applied objectively, and if not, what can be done to improve their application?

Do awards really motivate employees and reward outstanding performance?

❑ How does the use and effectiveness of awards differ under different performance appraisal systems (such as 5-tiered ranking versus pass/fail)?

❑ What type of awards do employees find the most meaningful, and how can agencies provide them?

❑ How can issues of perceived favoritism in awards be addressed?

Leadership and
MANAGEMENT

"Developing good leadership and effective working relationships at all levels is key to a successful organization. And while so critical, it is probably the most challenging of all of the issues facing government today. Good leaders are good recruiters, they handle performance well, they develop their employees, and they plan and prepare for their future workforce needs. I believe this is really the heart of the matter."

"I see a real lack of good supervisory and leadership training. Most employees who become supervisors get there because of their technical competence. We then throw them to the wolves. They receive a couple of basic supervision classes and then are told to go out and conquer. Supervisors need to be developed over their entire career."

"If human capital is going to remain a top concern (as I think it should), then we need to look closely at the skills of our managers and supervisors. We won't be able to keep people in the government until we get to a point where our supervisors are top-rate - to a point where they can do the job of being supervisors (looking out for, coaching, teaching & managing their employees) instead of being front-line, technical workers who only do 'supervisory' tasks when absolutely necessary (i.e., managers who only review & respond to an employee's performance at the obligatory end-of-year performance appraisal meeting)."

"Managers must be held accountable for employee development and training and good management practices. Employees have almost no recourse to bad managers except to grieve, so grievances are increasing in number."

The topics of management and leadership have fueled countless academic and practitioner texts, articles, and courses; they also inspired volumes of comments from our participants, prompting the following research questions:

Do managers have the talents and skills needed to both lead and manage?

- ❑ Do agencies hire or promote technical experts into supervisory positions, without giving them the necessary training? If so, why and what can be done about it?
- ❑ Are supervisory competencies, such as good communication skills and ability to lead, actually trainable?
- ❑ Do supervisors receive the types of training they believe they need?

Do managers treat all employees in an equal and fair manner?

❑ Do managers give superior treatment to favored employees?

❑ Are managers charged with misconduct treated more leniently than non-managerial employees?

How are managers held accountable, and for what?

❑ Do managerial performance ratings encourage or give weight to good supervisor-staff relationships and other morale-related issues?

❑ To what extent do agencies provide 360-degree feedback for managers?

Is training a priority for agencies, and how can its effective use be improved?

❑ Should agencies train solely to improve expertise in current positions, or develop employees for future jobs or advancement?

❑ Why are training opportunities limited, and why is training sometimes the first ite[m] budget crises? Are employees discouraged from attending training because of wo[rk]load issues?

❑ What types of training do employees believe they need, and do their expectations match those of their supervisors?

Work-Life BALANCE

"Agencies are not making the best use of telework or alternate work schedules. There is still a perception among managers that if you are not physically in the office, you are not working. My agency, in particular, does not offer any kind of alternate work schedule because we are a new agency and they are worried that Congress will think we are not being productive if employees are allowed to work at home or work schedules that do not require them to be in the office 8 hours a day."

"The whole area of telework needs to be researched: its feasibility; how to expand it; results of those who have teleworked; supervisory opinions of telework; benefits received to the organization; drawbacks of teleworking; big picture benefits such as enhanced air quality, stress reduction, quality of family life, etc.; telework as a retention incentive; telework as a recruitment incentive; telework as a way to keep the government business flowing in times of national crises."

Workplace flexibilities have long been touted as a way to improve morale, increase retention, and serve societal goals (such as reduce traffic congestion and help the environment). However, many in the Federal government claim that we are behind the curve on implementing such flexibilities (mainly telework). Research questions raised by participant comments include the following:

Are agencies fully implementing workplace flexibilities, and if not, why not?

❑   If agencies are not fully implementing workplace flexibilities, to what extent does managerial resistance play a role?

❑   Do employees abuse workplace flexibilities, and to what extent?

❑   What are the quantifiable benefits to workplace flexibilities, and how can that information be shared to encourage full implementation?

❑   Do managers know how to manage a flexible workplace? If not, what types of training or knowledge sharing would help?

❑   Does lack of funding affect implementation of workplace flexibilities (such as funding for home offices)?

Labor RELATIONS

"We definitely need unions to keep administrations honest and the employee protected from retaliation from administration officials and managers. We are in more need today for this type of labor relations than ever before."

"Many years ago the unions were needed and established to protect employees. But my experience today is all they try to do is flex their muscles and put up barriers for management."

"There are a lot of misconceptions about what labor unions are and what role they play in the workplace. We need to have more education about this topic."

The role of labor unions and labor relations in the Federal government elicited compliments, complaints, and calls for better education, as shown by the following research questions participants suggested:

What functions and for whom do labor unions perform?

❑　To what extent can labor unions assist agencies in change management?

❑　What role does the Federal Labor Relations Authority play?

❑　How accessible is information on unfair labor practice charges, as well as the types of resolution of these filings?

Employee Protections and
DUE PROCESS

"The appeal process is very time-consuming and costly for agencies (and appellants). It is a deterrent to employees who have legitimate and non-frivolous complaints to realize the length of time and money they must invest to get their complaint heard."

"I have held three of my staff accountable for poor performance (documented over a course of time) and those employees have each conducted their own reprisal through EEO complaints, etc. Those complaints are highly stressful, time consuming, and place on me personal financial liability."

If the supervisor-employee relationship breaks down and a grievance is filed, both sides agree that the current process leaves much to be desired. Specific research topics raised by our participants include the following:

Is the grievance process as time-consuming, costly, and stressful as many claim?

❑ Do employees fail to file legitimate grievances because they believe the process is too drawn-out and draining?

❑ Do managers and agencies settle unnecessarily for fear of the stigma of having grievances filed, or because in economic terms, it costs less to settle than tend to a time-consuming and costly review process?

❑ What models might the Federal government emulate to make the appeal process less stressful but still fair?

❑ Is Alternative Dispute Resolution widely used in resolving grievances or other workplace disputes?

Do numerous avenues of seeking relief expose the grievance and appeal systems to abuse?

❑ How many employees use more than one avenue of recourse (e.g., agency grievance process, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Office of Special Counsel, Merit Systems Protection Board) for the same issue?

❑ To what extent does use of multiple avenues of recourse constitute abuse of the stem? To what extent could it be construed as harassment of supervisors?

❑ Does the potential for employee use of multiple avenues of recourse deter managers from taking what they believe is needed action?

CONCLUSION

W ith far-reaching changes planned and proposed for Federal civil service, we believe it is critical to study how these changes may influence the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal work force. How should government best manage the tension between managerial flexibilities on one hand, and protection of merit principles on the other? Hearing from stakeholders—most of whom are in the Federal workplace daily—sheds light on the issues that promote and inhibit the best management of Federal personnel. The research questions raised in these comments, as well as suggestions for more in-depth study, gives our office insight as we prepare our research agenda. Over the next several years, we will tackle a number of the topics proposed by our stakeholders. The range of topics is so great that our office—indeed, any one institution—is unlikely to be able to investigate them all. For this reason, we invite others interested in the study of Federal human capital issues to consider examining these research questions. This report highlights the topics important to our stakeholders. We in the Federal human capital community should consider these topics carefully as we develop our agendas for research. We thank all of the contributors who provided us their opinions and insight.

APPENDIX

Selected Resources on Related Federal Human Capital Issues

Competitive Sourcing and Contracting Out

❑ *Fact Sheet on the New True Size of Government.* Center for Public Service, Brookings Institution (September 2003)

❑ *Competitive Sourcing: Reasoned and Responsible Public-Private Competition, Agency Activities.* U.S. Office of Management and Budget (September 2003)

❑ *Competitive Sourcing: Conducting Public-Private Competition in a Reasoned and Responsible Manner.* U.S. Office of Management and Budget (July 2003)

❑ *Competitive Sourcing: Implementation Will Be Challenging for Federal Agencies,* GAO-03-1022T. U.S. Government Accounting Office (July 2003)

❑ *Competitive Sourcing: Implementation Will Be Key to Success of New Circular* A-76, GAO-03-943T. U.S. Government Accounting Office (June 2003)

Workforce Planning

❑ *Human Capital: Insights for U.S. Agencies from Other Countries' Succession Planning and Management Initiatives,* GAO-03-914. U.S. Government Accounting Office (September 2003)

❑ *Human Capital: A Guide for Assessing Strategic Training and Development Efforts in the Federal Government,* GAO-03-893G. U.S. Government Accounting Office (July 2003)

❑ *Workforce Planning Resource Guide for Public Sector Human Resource Professionals.* International Personnel Management Association (2002).

❑ *Strategic Human Resources Management: Aligning with the Mission.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (September 1999)

❑ *Building the Workforce of the Future to Achieve Organizational Success.* National Academy of Public Administration (1999)

❑ *Federal Supervisors and Strategic Human Resources Management.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (June 1998)

Recruitment, Assessment and Selection

❑ *Human Capital: Opportunities to Improve Executive Agencies' Hiring Processes,* GAO-03-450. U.S. Government Accounting Office (May 2003).

❑ *Help Wanted: A Review of Federal Vacancy Announcements.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (April 2003)

❑ *Delegated Examining Operations Handbook 2003: A Guide for Federal Agency Examining Offices.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (April 2003)

❑ *The Federal Selection Interview: Unrealized Potential.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (February 2003)

- *Tapping America's Potential: Expanding Student Employment and Internship Opportunities in the Federal Government.* The Partnership for Public Service (July 2002)

- *Assessing Federal Job Seekers in a Delegated Examining Environment.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (February 2002)

- *The Federal Merit Promotion Program: Process vs. Outcome.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (February 2002)

- *Mid-Career Hiring in the Federal Government: A Strategy for Change.* The Partnership for Public Service (February 2002)

- *Insights on the Federal Government Human Capital Crisis: Reflections of Generation X.* The Partnership for Public Service (2002)

- *A Work In Progress: Openness in the Employment Process II.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (July 2001)

- *Competing for Federal Jobs: Job Experiences of New Hires.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (February 2000)

- *Restoring Merit to Federal Hiring: Why Two Special Hiring Programs Should Be Ended.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (January 2000)

- *Testing and Assessment: An Employer's Guide to Good Practices.* U.S. Department of Labor (2000).

- *The Three Rs: Lessons Learned from Recruitment, Retention, and Relocation Incentives.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (December1999)

- *The Role of Delegating Examining Units: Hiring New Employees in a Decentralized Civil Service.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (August 1999)

- *Opportunity Lost: Openness in the Employment Process.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (April 1999)

- *The Rule of Three in Federal Hiring: Boon or Bane?* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (December 1995)

Position Classification and Compensation

- *Human Capital: OPM Can Better Assist Agencies in Using Personnel Flexibilities,* GAO-03-428. U.S. Government Accounting Office (April 2003)

- *A Fresh Start for Federal Pay: The Case for Modernization.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (2002)

- *Demonstration Projects and Alternative Personnel Systems: HR Flexibilities and Lessons Learned.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (September 2001)

- *New Options, New Talent: The Government Guide to the Flexible Workforce.* National Academy of Public Administration (1998).

Performance Management

- *Results-Oriented Cultures: Modern Performance Management Systems Are Needed to Effectively Support Pay for Performance,* GAO-03-612T. U.S. Government Accounting Office (April 2003)

- *Results-Oriented Cultures: Creating a Clear Linkage between Individual Performance and Organizational Success,* GAO-03-488. U.S. Government Accounting Office (March 2003)

- *Performance Management: A "Start Where You Are, Use What You Have" Guide.* National Academy of Public Administration (October 2002).

- *Results-Oriented Cultures: Using Balanced Expectations to Manage Senior Executive Performance,* GAO-02-966. U.S. Government Accounting Office (September 2002)

- *A Handbook for Measuring Employee Performance: Aligning Employee Performance Plans with Organizational Goals.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (September 2001)

- *Federal Supervisors and Poor Performers.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (July 1999)

- *Poor Performers in Government: A Quest for the True Story.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (January 1999)

- *Incentive Awards.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (August 1998)

- *Removing Poor Performers in the Federal Service: An Issue Paper.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (September 1995)

Leadership and Management

- *First-Line Supervisors in the Federal Service: Their Selection, Development and Management.* National Academy of Public Administration (July 2003).

- *Results-Oriented Cultures: Creating a Clear Linkage between Individual Performance and Organizational Success,* GAO-03-488 (March 2003).

- *High Risk Series: Strategic Human Capital Management,* GAO-03-120. U.S. Government Accounting Office (January 2003).

- *Human Capital: Effective Use of Flexibilities Can Assist Agencies in Managing Their Workforces,* GAO-03-2. U.S. Government Accounting Office (December 2002).

- *Strengthening Senior Leadership in the U.S. Government.* National Academy of Public Administration (December 2002).

- *Making the Public Service Work—Recommendations for Change.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (September 2002)

- *The 21st Century Federal Manager: A Study of Changing Roles and Competencies.* National Academy of Public Administration (July 2002).

- *The U.S. Office of Personnel Management in Retrospect—Achievements and Challenges After Two Decades.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (January 2001)

- *Growing Leaders: The Presidential Management Intern Program.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (August 2001)

- *Supervisors in the Federal Government: A Wake-Up Call.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (January 2001)

- *Civil Service Evaluation: The Evolving Role of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (July 1998)

- *Leadership for Change: Human Resource Development in the Federal Government.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (July 1995)

Work-Life Balance

❑ *Human Capital: Further Guidance, Assistance, and Coordination Can Improve Federal Telework Efforts,* GAO-03-679. U.S. Government Accounting Office (July 2003)

❑ *Telework Works: A Compendium of Success Stories.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (May 2001)

❑ *Achieving a Balance: Meeting Work and Family Obligations.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (July 2000)

Labor Relations

❑ *Directory of Unions and Associations with Exclusive Recognition in the Federal Service.* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (June 2002)

❑ *FLRA 20 Years: 1979-99.* U.S. Federal Labor Relations Authority (May 1999)

❑ *A Guide to Dispute Resolution Procedures.* U.S. Federal Labor Relations Authority (July 2003)

Employee Protections and Due Process

❑ *Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Organizing for the Future.* National Academy of Public Administration (February 2003).

❑ *Veterans: Getting Their Preference?* U.S. Office of Personnel Management (December 2000)

❑ *Achieving a Representative Federal Workforce: Addressing the Barriers to Hispanic Participation.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (September 1997)

❑ *Fair and Equitable Treatment: A Progress Report on Minority Employment in the Federal Government.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (August 1996)

❑ *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Trends, Progress, Continuing Challenges.* U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (October 1995)