Using Performance Measurement in Human Resource Management

A Survey of U.S. Counties

EVAN M. BERMAN, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
JONATHAN P. WEST, UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
XIAOHU WANG, UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

This article examines the use of performance measurement in human resource management. Based on a survey of counties with populations over 50,000, it finds that performance measurement is widely used. Many measures reflect traditional concerns with compliance, but measures are also used to assess human resource management reforms in recruitment and compensation. This study also finds that mission-orientation and broad support affect the use of performance measurement in human resource management, as well as technical ability to gather such data. Many efforts are relatively recent, and thus it is too early to tell whether these measures will find enduring use.

In recent years, performance measurement has received much attention in public administration (Ammons, 1995, 1996; Behn, 1996; Center for Accountability and Performance, 1998; Gianakis & McCue, 1997; Fisher, 1994). Performance measurement is defined as measuring levels of achievement through a range of indicators. Traditionally, performance measurement has been used in human resource management to monitor compliance such as meeting affirmative action requirements (Mushkin & Sandifer, 1980; Stutz & Massengale, 1997), but it is also used increasingly to assess organizational effectiveness and the human resource efforts that contribute to it (such as recruitment, compensation and training) (Hornestay, 1999; Fitzenz, 1995; Fitzenz & Phillips, 1998; Phillips, 1996). Although no prescribed or even recommended measurement matrix exists for public personnel activities, organizations have long used a broad range of human resource measures (many of which are examined in this study), and organizations are continuously developing new ones as they seek to improve their accountability and performance (Mushkin & Sandifer, 1980; Stutz & Massengale, 1997; Tigue & Strachota, 1994).

Recent systematic studies show that performance measurement is widely used in many cities and agencies, but these studies do not discuss specific uses in public personnel management (Berman & West, 1998; Brudney, Hebert & Wright, 1999). This national study examines the use of performance measurement in personnel functions in counties with populations over 50,000. It focuses on the different kinds of measures that are used, as well as conditions that influence use.

FRAMEWORK

Definitions of performance measurement frequently distinguish among activities (or workloads), outputs, outcomes, and efficiency measures. Outputs are the immediate results of activities (e.g., the number of completed personnel transactions), whereas outcomes (or effectiveness) measure the extent to which an activity has achieved its goals or objectives, including measures of quality and client satisfaction. Efficiency is a measure of the cost per outcome or output.

The number of employees who participate, for example, in training is an activity measure, whereas the percentage of employees with certain skills, the proportion of clients satisfied with human resource services, or the ability to attract and retain employees might be viewed as human resource management outcome measures.[1] The cost per recruited employee is an efficiency measure. Although, in theory, a broad range of measures might be constructed for all human resource activities, concerns about data availability and the need to focus on the purpose of performance measurement (e.g., increased accountability) make overly comprehensive efforts impractical. Rather, measures are constructed which are practical, based on existing data, and that reflect the priorities of managers. As the saying goes, "what gets measured gets done."

In this regard, considerable interest exists in developing performance measures that reflect new human resource reforms such as better and faster recruitment (Barzelay & Armajani, 1997; Human Resources, 1999; ICMA, 1999). Another area of interest involves monitoring the competitiveness of compensation and benefits (City of Virginia Beach, 1998), including continuing education and child care benefits (National Academy of Public Administration, 1998). Workforce development is an increasing concern, and some HR departments now monitor participation in job skill courses or skill development over time (Epstein, 1992, Ludeman, 1991; Paddock, 1997). For example, performance measurement is used to monitor the number of employees participating in productivity improvement and customer service efforts, two strategic issues which have been raised in many jurisdictions (Hatry, Gerhart & Marshall, 1996; Leithe, 1996).

It might be noted that a certain skepticism exists about the use of performance measurement in government. Concern exists that performance measurement, like other productivity improvement efforts, is a fleeting fad to which many organizations only give lip service (Halachmi, 1999). The concern is not limited to human resource management (Loffler, 1999). It is difficult to assess this claim, as many productivity improvement efforts begin in small ways, with most managers sitting on the sidelines, waiting for new efforts to prove themselves. When such efforts are shown to be successful they are promptly replicated and diffused.[2] When they fail to live up to their promise, they lose momentum. Performance measurement has now entered the phase in which ineffective applications are being identified and weeded out (Theurer, 1998).

Three research questions guide this study. First, what kinds of performance measures are used in county personnel functions? No prescribed or best metric for performance measurement exists, but most jurisdictions have comparable human resource management activities. For example, all jurisdictions recruit personnel, and thus may be concerned with the outcome of their advertising efforts or test scores of new employees. The number of new employees promoted within 12 months is often used as a measure to attract quality employees. To determine the range (or "breadth") of performance measures, this study includes human resource management measures that have been repeatedly suggested in the literature, and focuses on the areas of recruitment, compensation, skill development and employee relations, all of which have received much attention lately. To determine the nature (or "depth") of human resource management performance measures, we ask counties to characterize the extent that, overall, their measures reflect workload,

effectiveness, quality and client satisfaction. This provides an indication of the relative emphasis that counties put on developing their human resource performance measures.

Second, who assumes leadership for development of human resource performance measures? The development of performance measurement in human resource management does not occur in isolation from other organizational initiatives (Few & Vogt, 1997; Jones, 1997; Leithe, 1996; Nyhan & Marlowe, 1995; West, 1995). In recent years, many performance measurement efforts were led by either county administrators or budget directors who required all departments, including human resource management, to develop performance measures. The presence of jurisdiction-wide performance measurement efforts may spur the use of performance measurement in human resource management. In some instances human resource managers lead jurisdiction-wide efforts, or they are otherwise pro-active in developing modern human resource performance measures. We examine whether human resources-led efforts lead to different emphases in the depth of human resource performance measurement. Specifically, we surmise that human resources-led efforts are more likely to emphasize quality measures which help the HR director provide accountability to their internal customers (such as budget and other offices).

Third, which county conditions, if any, affect the use of performance measurement? Performance measurement requires technical abilities that often transcend the ability of individual departments (Berman, 1998; Holzer, 1992). Many performance measurement efforts require employee and client surveys; yet, few managers are trained in gathering and analyzing such data in scientifically valid ways. Performance measurement also requires the ability to conceptualize outcome and output measures that are relevant and feasible. This study examines whether mission-orientation also increases the use of performance measurement. Such efforts are associated with increased customer-orientation and use of client-feedback to assess services (Griefel, 1994; Wray & Hauer, 1996).

In addition to technical abilities, performance measurement also requires broad support among users of performance measurement data. As an accountability strategy, performance measurement presumes interest among users of these data. These users include elected officials, citizen advisory boards, county administrators and even department heads and supervisors who benefit from accountability. Some concern exists that, thus far, elected officials have not been much interested in performance measurement (Tigue, 1994), even though a few chief executives have championed the use of such measures (Leithe, 1996; Loffler, 1999). Nonetheless, elected officials often prefer traditional forms of accountability based on testimony and citizen complaints. Yet, the use of performance measurement is contingent on the willingness of county managers and elected officials to be persuaded by information that includes performance measurement data.

METHODS

A survey was administered in 1998 regarding the use of performance measurement in counties. The survey was pre-tested on a group of fifty managers and, following minor changes, mailed to all 856 counties with populations over 50,000, identified through *Counties USA*, 1997. After three waves of mailing, 209 responses were received from counties which use performance measure-

ment. Of these, 162 respondents provided in-depth information about the use of specific performance measures in human resource management. Most of the remaining respondents (43 of 47) indicated that they use performance measures in their human resource management and they, like the other 162 respondents, also provided broad characterizations about this use. To determine the extent that the 162 respondents represent all counties that use performance measurement,[3]a telephone survey was conducted among a random sample of counties that did not respond. Of the 106 non-responding counties that were contacted, only 13 counties indicated that they use performance measurement in some way. Thus, it follows that (856-209)*13/106=79 counties did not respond to the survey and use performance measurement. Consequently, the survey *response rate* of counties using performance measurement in human resource management is (162/162+43+79=) 57.0%. One caveat is that this study does not examine counties which do not use performance measurement.

To ensure valid survey data, we also conducted follow-up telephone calls with respondents who indicated the use of a wide range of measures. Respondents were asked for specific examples, and their survey responses were verified. Very few changes were made as a result of these telephone interviews. The telephone survey also included some randomly selected survey items. Comparison of these responses with those of the mail survey respondents does not indicate problems of nonresponse bias. To determine the extent that performance measurement is used, this study uses a broad range of indicators, reflecting both breadth (different aspects of human resource management that are measured) as well as depth (the nature of performance measures, that is, whether they measure workload as well quality, effectiveness and client satisfaction). Organizations that report a broader and deeper use of performance measurement in human resource management are said to have a greater commitment to it, and organizations that report a high use are re-contacted by interviews to ensure the validity of their responses. These measures are discussed in the text and tables below.

FINDINGS

Performance measurement is common in human resource management. Table 1 shows the use (breadth) of performance measurement in employee relations, career and skills development, recruitment, and compensation and benefit functions. Among the most frequent measures are comparisons of salary (81.8%), fringe benefits (69.5%) and sick leave practices (61.9%), as well as job turnover rates (75.3%), accident rates (71.9%) and absenteeism (66.3%). In addition, many organizations also measure the use of educational benefit programs (54.9%), employees who participate in skill courses (51.7%), vacancies (49.7%) and test scores of new employees (49.7%).

Other measures are less often used, such as comparing child and elder care practices in other jurisdictions (17.8%), new employees who are promoted within 12 months (20.1%), employees who exceed minimum job qualifications (29.5%), the number of internships (30.6%), complaints about career progression (30.4%), employees who are eligible for training programs (32.6%), comparing continuing education benefits (34.9%), the number of employees who fail probation (34.9%), and workplace violence (37.1%). Many of these measures concern training and the development of employees, both of which reflect matters of workforce effectiveness.

TABLE 1. Type of HR Performance Measures in County Governments

HR Performance Measures	All Counties
Employee Relations	
Job turnover rates	75.3 %
Accident rates	71.9
Absenteeism	66.3
Job satisfaction	41.8
Substance abuse	49.4
Workplace violence	37.1
Aggregate Measure (alpha=.75)	45.5
Career and Skill Development	
Use of educational benefit programs	54.9
Employees taking job skill courses	51.7
Number of promotions	48.4
Career progression by job class	43.0
Employees eligible for training programs	32.6
Complaints about career progression	30.4
Aggregate Measure (alpha=.82)	45.1
Recruitment	
Test scores of new employees	49.7
Percentage of vacancies	49.7
Outcome of advertising and recruitment efforts	43.5
Employees who fail probation	34.9
Number of internships	30.6
Employees who exceed minimum job qualifications	29.5
New employees promoted within 12 months	20.1
Aggregate Measure (alpha=.79)	25.9
Compensation and Benefits	
Comparing salaries for technical jobs	81.8
Comparing salaries for managerial jobs	81.8
Comparison of fringe benefits	69.5
Comparing sick leave practices	61.9
Comparing performance incentives	42.0
Comparing continuing education benefits	34.9
Comparing child/elder care practices	17.8
Aggregate Measure (alpha=.85)	25.1
All Measures (alpha=.86)	37.2
N=162	

TABLE 2. Nature of HR Performance Measurements by Responsibility

HR PERFORMANCE MEASURES	% USED	RESPONSIBILITY[1] OMB	HRM
Workload	66.5	.167**	
Effectiveness	47.2	.189**	
Service Quality	40.8	.134*	.191**
Client Satisfaction	28.4		.138**

[1]Relationship with implementation responsibility.
Measures are tau-c. **1% significance *5% significance $N=205$

Table 2 characterizes the nature (depth) of human resource management performance measures that are used. About two-thirds of respondents characterized their measures as emphasizing workload (66.5%), about half as effectiveness (47.2%), and fewer as including quality (40.8%) and client satisfaction measures (28.4%). Although these characterizations are not exclusive, very few organizations that do *not* use workload measures use quality (15.3%) or client satisfaction measures (9.7%), reflecting that the latter are more challenging to develop.

A composite measure was constructed to assess commitment to performance measurement in the human resource management function. This measure is based on the breadth and depth of human resource performance measurement, as reported in Tables 1 and 2. Defining strong commitment as using performance measurement in at least half of each area of the human resource management areas shown in Table 1, and using workload as well as effectiveness or quality or client satisfaction measures, shows that 16.0% of respondents can be said to have strong commitment to using performance measurement in human resource. If low commitment is defined as using less than six performance measures shown in Table 1 (that is, less than one-quarter shown), then 30.4% of respondents fall in this category. About 53.6% of respondents can be said to have moderate commitment to using performance measurement in human resources.[3]

Commitment to using performance measurement in human resource management does not vary by county size or form of government. More counties in the West have a high commitment to using performance measurement in human resource management than other counties: 39.1% versus 10.9% ($t=2.59, p < .01$). The disparity is, in part, caused by the near absence of counties in the South (3.8%) with a high commitment: these counties are more likely to have only moderate commitment (64.4% versus 43.8%). There are no statistically significant regional differences concerning low commitment. Commitment increases over time, too: 20.4% of counties that have used performance measurement longer than four years have a high commitment to using it in human resource management, as compared to only 11.1% of counties that have used performance measurement less than four years.

Many of the interviewees noted the use of performance measurement in recruitment. In Lewis County, Washington, performance measurement is used to document the number of recruitment efforts and the steps that

are involved in each. This involves tracking the number of applications, the type of service provided such as basic screening, testing, designing and grading testing instruments, and the development of interview questions. Performance measurement is also used to track the speed at which new openings are posted. These measures are used for both productivity improvement and accountability: the human resource department evaluates the cost per recruitment, and these data are provided to the county commissioners on a monthly basis.

Table 2 also shows how the nature of human resource performance measurement is affected by the office which takes the lead responsibility for developing it. When the County Office of Management and Budget leads in developing performance measurement throughout the county, human resource departments are more likely to emphasize workloads and effectiveness measures. For example, 81.8% of counties in which the Office of Management and Budget leads in developing performance measurement county-wide use workload measures in human resource management, compared to 62.5% of counties in which the Office of Management and Budget does not lead (tau-c=.167, $p < .01$). By contrast, when human resource departments have a lead responsibility, human resource measures will more strongly emphasize service quality and client satisfaction; twice the number of human resource performance measurement efforts involve client satisfaction when human resource has a lead role (51.5% versus 25.4%, tau-c=.138, $p < .01$). These differences reflect different purposes; budget offices are often interested in workloads for purposes of budget preparation, whereas human resource departments are necessarily interested in measures of their clients' satisfaction with human resource services.

Table 3 examines various conditions, mentioned above, that may affect the use of performance measurement in human resource management. About sixty percent of counties have staff (63.4%) and information systems (55.3%) to gather data that are necessary for performance measurement. In many instances, this involves capacity to develop and implement client feedback questionnaires; this capacity often is jurisdiction-wide, as few departments, including human resource management, have adequate resources to develop and maintain such expertise by themselves. Computerization also facilitates the collection of some traditional measures, such as those involving vacancies and absenteeism. Table 3 shows that having adequate infrastructure and resources is positively associated with breadth (more human resource performance measures) as well as depth (use in workload, effectiveness, quality, client satisfaction). For example, whereas 44.0% of counties that have adequate management information systems for performance measurement use effectiveness, service quality and client satisfaction measures, only 18.0% of those who report not having such capacity do so (tau-c=.297, $p < .01$). Having staff capable of analyzing performance data also increases the use of such measures by a ratio of 40.2% versus 25.0% (tau-c=.189, $p < .05$).

Support for human resource performance measurement can come from many different sources. Most common is support from the county administrator (79.8%). Interviewees frequently noted that the administrator strongly supports performance measurement county-wide, and that this support bolsters the use of human resource performance measures. Often, elected officials are said to be supportive of performance measurement efforts, though they

TABLE 3. General County Conditions and HR Performance Measurement

General Conditions	% Present	HR Performance Measures: Type (breadth)	HR Performance Measures: Nature (depth)
Mission-orientation			
We have written customer comments	65.5	.172*	.228**
Performance measures are used to evaluate goals and missions	64.5	.208**	.432**
Goals and missions are frequently discussed	62.5	.271**	.406**
We survey the satisfaction of program clients	58.6	.260**	.441**
Aggregate (alpha=.78)	62.7	.241**	.407**
Technical Ability			
Can develop outcome measures	73.3	.150*	.229**
Have staff capable of analyzing performance measurement data	63.4	.191*	.227**
Have management information systems to collect performance measurement data	55.3	.249**	.272**
Can determine the validity of performance measures	54.7	.309**	.207**
Aggregate (alpha=.83)	61.7	.188*	.327**
Support for Performance Measurement			
County manager supports performance measurement	79.8	.003	.153**
Most department heads support performance measurement	40.8	.076	.287**
Elected officials support performance measurement	34.6	.079	.330**
Most supervisors support performance measurement	21.2	.091	.218**
Citizen advisory boards support performance measurement	19.9	.101	.173**
Aggregate (alpha=.78)	39.2	.072	.305**
Entrepreneurship			
Increased privatization	58.0	.092	.128
Private contracting has increased	53.8	.195*	.107
Entrepreneurial activities have increased	53.3	.116	.223**
Franchises are awarded to private organizations	39.9	.184*	.087
Aggregate (alpha=.69)	50.2	.233**	.221**

Measures are tau-c; **1% significance; *5% significance. $N=191$. $N=196$ (except for column "breadth," $N=131$)

TABLE 4. Determinants of HR Performance Measurement

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: Nature of HR Performance Measurement ("Depth of Use")		
	Regression Coefficient	*Beta Coefficient*	*Standard Error*
Constant	-.138		.164
Mission-Orientation	.241	.234	.081**
Technical Ability	.114	.105	.084
Support	.066	.155	.033*
Entrepreneurship	.036	.035	.072
Size	.051	.103	.037
Northeast	-.084	-.071	.094
South	-.052	-.066	.072
West	.004	.004	.086
OMB[1]	.094	.113	.062
HRM[1]	.085	.079	.073

R=.482; R^2 adj=.189
[1]Implementation responsibility
**1 % significance; *5 % significance; N=185

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: Type of HR Performance Measurement ("Breadth of Use")		
	Regression Coefficient	*Beta Coefficient*	*Standard Error*
Constant	.226		.145
Mission-Orientation	.230	.289	.080**
Technical Ability	.212	.270	.080**
Support	-.020	-.068	.029
Entrepreneurship	.096	.132	.068
Size	-.028	-.079	.034
Northeast	.035	.048	.076
South	.025	.045	.065
West	.167	.222	.079*
OMB[1]	-.019	-.032	.055
HRM[1]	.012	.018	.060

R=.529; R^2 adj=.210
[1]Implementation responsibility
**1 % significance; *5 % significance; N=114

seldom act as instigators or catalysts. Broad support for performance measurement does not affect the breadth of performance measurement, but it does affect the type of measures that are used. Many of the listed actors are internal customers of human resource management, and thus it is not surprising that when they advocate performance measurement for their own units they also indicate expectations for measuring the effectiveness of human resource management. Indeed, when department heads are perceived as advocates for performance measurement, 51.3 % of human resource departments have a broad range of quality and satisfaction measures compared to 29.3% when advocacy is lacking (tau-c=.185, $p < .01$).

Mission-orientation and entrepreneurship are associated with the use of performance measurement in human resource management. Both may increase awareness about the quality of human resources and their effectiveness. The items in Table 3 include many that have been advocated in recent years. Overall, it is found that mission-orientation and, to a lesser extent entrepreneurship, increase the breadth and depth of human resource performance measurement. These orientations show especially strong associations with career development and recruitment human resource activities; quality-oriented organizations require talented employees and managers who often are impatient with prolonged recruitment efforts which, too often, fail to attract top candidates. Among organizations with mission-orientation, 65.2% measure recruitment outcomes and 76.0% track the number of employees who take job skill courses. By contrast, the respective percentages of organizations that have a weak mission orientation are 32.8% and 39.8% (resp. $t=3.52$ and $t=4.17$, both $p < .01$). Interestingly, mission orientation is not associated with tracking promotion rates, perhaps, reflecting the fact that many mission-oriented organizations have become increasingly flat structures with fewer promotion opportunities.

Table 4 examines the effect of the conditions mentioned in Table 3 on the index variable of the breadth and depth of human resource performance measurement.[4] The model shows that mission-orientation is associated with both the depth and breadth of using performance measurement in human resource management. This suggests that such efforts as customer-orientation have broad effects in the organization, including the use of performance measurement in human resource management.[5] In addition, technical abilities such as information technology and capable staff result in using performance measurement in a broader range of areas, whereas broad support (such as from elected officials and senior managers) causes performance measures to focus more on outcomes, which may be consistent with these stakeholders' interests. The results also show that the locus of responsibility (the personnel department or Office of Management and Budget) does not affect the depth or breadth of human resource performance measurement when the above county conditions are controlled for. One interpretation may be that these four conditions are themselves affected by leadership. For example, in the Office of Management and Budget leadership may result in counties investing in performance measurement training and information technology.

Interviews were also conducted to determine the outcome or impact of using performance measurement in human resource management. In many instances respondents report that performance measurement is useful to monitor trends and to

control costs and improve productivity. Several respondents indicated the importance of recruitment measures. Rather than only collecting data about the number of recruitment efforts (which indicate human resource management activity), survey interviewees also recorded data about the way they do business, such as the number of job applications they obtain at job fairs, the time to post job advertisements or fill positions, and the cost of filling positions. Such information has strategic importance for decisions about improving human resource management operations.

However, in many settings, performance measurement is seen as a recent development. One respondent noted that performance measurement is itself useful to help justify doing it, but also that "I would like to have ammunition to persuade more of us here to do more in this area (of performance measurement)." The data suggest that human resource performance measurement is associated with some improved outcomes. According to respondents, performance measurement helps organizations to better determine their long-term budget needs: 95.0% of respondents whose jurisdiction has a high level of commitment to using performance measurement in human resource management agree with this aspect, compared to 46.0% of jurisdiction with a low or medium commitment (tau-c-.284, $p < .01$). Similarly, human resource management performance measurement is associated with improving the effective use of resources (85.0% versus 58.4%, tau-c=.187, $p < .05$).

CONCLUSION

A national survey of all U.S. counties with populations over 50,000 finds that performance measurement is widely used. Many measures reflect traditional concerns with compliance rather than recent interest in performance improvement. However, measures are also used to assess human resource management reforms in such areas as recruitment and compensation. This study also finds that mission-orientation and stakeholder support increase the use of performance measurement in human resource management. Support and mission-orientation are also associated with having adequate technical ability for gathering performance measurement data. Many efforts are relatively recent, and thus it is too early to tell whether these measures will find enduring use.

Human resource managers have been under pressure for some time to justify their operations. A recent report by the General Accounting Office (1998) notes the reduction of human resource management staff at federal agencies, as personnel operations such as hiring and benefits management are streamlined and automated. In many local governments, human resource departments face similar pressures. Line managers look for new ways to increase value and productivity from human resources. As a competitive resource, training is used for improving worker effectiveness and furthering productivity improvement efforts, not merely to compensate for skill deficiencies. Performance measurement, then, is not only used for documenting performance improvement in traditional activities, but also for demonstrating accountability that new human resource approaches are working.

As with all new productivity improvement efforts, in time the good is separated from the bad. As many human resource managers are trying new ways to increase their performance and provide accountability, new performance measures must be proposed, implemented and evaluated. Processes for designing performance measures include input from stakeholders and feed-

back from those using pre-existing measures. Future studies should track the way in which performance measures evolve over time. They should also examine whether these measures add value to the human resource function: do they adequately inform managers? Do stakeholders believe that they provide human resource accountability? Are they used for determining the cost-effectiveness of services? Are measures comparable across organizations? In short, how effective is the use of performance measurement in human resource management?

Notes

[1]These different purposes affect how performance measurement is used: for example, educational benefits are sometimes reported to show that a jurisdiction is comparable to others. However, when the purpose is workforce effectiveness, these measures are often accompanied by employee surveys and focus groups to identify factors that affect the willingness of employees to increase skills.

[2]In this study, we examine counties that use performance measurement; thus, our purpose here is to examine the extent to which our sample represents all counties that use performance measurement. We do not claim that our sample represents all counties, hence, there is no 'creaming' involved in this methodology.

[3]These results vary, of course, according to the standards that are used: if low commitment is defined as using fewer than one-third of measures shown in Table 1, then the percentage of counties with a low commitment to HR performance measurement increases to 40.8%.

[4]This measure also includes a measure of reporting performance measurement to the county manager's office.

[5]The four conditions add considerable explanation to the models. The increase in the adjusted-R^2 as a result of adding these four conditions (given the control variables and leadership variables) is, respectively, .101 for the "breadth" model and .126 for the "depth" model.

References

Ammons, D. (1996). *Municipal benchmarks: Assessing local performance and establishing community standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ammons, D. (1995). *Accountability for performance measuring and monitoring in local government*. Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association.

Barzelay, M. & Armajani, B. (1997). Innovation in the concept of government operations: A new paradigm for staff agencies. In A. Altshuler & R. Behn (Eds.), *Innovation in American government* (pp. 119-145). Washington, D.C.: Brookings.

Behn, R. (1996, July 8). Performance measures: To punish, or to motivate? *Governing*.

Berman, E. (1998). *Productivity in public and nonprofit organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Berman, E. & West, J. (1998). Productivity enhancement efforts in public and nonprofit organizations. *Public Productivity & Management Review 22* (2), 207-219.

Brudney, J., Hebert, T. & Wright, D. (1999). Reinventing government in the American states: Measuring and explaining administrative reform. *Public Administration Review* 59 (1), 19-30.

Center for Accountability and Performance (1998). *Performance measurement: Concepts and techniques*. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration.

City of Virginia Beach, Virginia. (1998). *Public Personnel Administration* 27 (3), 415-422.

Epstein, P. (1992). Managing and analyzing the productivity of professionals and managers. In M. Holzer (Ed.), *Public productivity handbook* (pp. 335-368). NY: Marcel Dekker.

Few, P. & Vogt, A. (1997). Measuring the performance of local government in North Carolina. *Government Finance Review 13* (4), 29-34.

Fisher, R. (1994). An overview of performance measurement. *Public Management 76* (9), S2-S8.

Fitzenz, J. (1995). *How to measure human resource management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fitzenz, J. & Phillips, J. (1998). *A new vision for human resources*. Crisp Publishing.

General Accounting Office. (1998). *Management reform: Agencies' initial efforts to restructure personnel operations*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gianakis, G. & McCue, C. (1997). Local government capacity building through performance measurement. In J. Gargan (Ed.), *Handbook of local government administration* (pp. 239-261). NY: Marcel Dekker.

Grifel, S. (1994). Organizational culture: Its importance in performance measurement. *Public Management 76* (9), S19-S21.

Halachmi, A. (1999). *Performance and quality measurement in government*. Burke, VT: Chatelaine Press

Hatry, H., Gerhart, C. & Marshall, M. (1996). Eleven ways to make performance measurement more useful to public managers. *Public Management 76* (9), S15-S20.

Holzer, M. (1992). *Public Productivity Handbook*. NY: Marcel Dekker.

Hornestay, D. (1999). The human factor. *Government Executive* (February). (http://www.govexec.com/gpp/0299hr.htm)

Human Resources (1999, February). *Governing*, 23-25.

International City Managers Association (1999). Performance indicators/support services/human resources. ICMA *Comparative Performance Measurement Program*. http://www.icma.org/performance/PI-support.cfm

Jones, A. (1997). Winston-Salem's participation in the North Carolina performance measurement project. *Government Finance Review 13* (4), 35-36.

Leithe, J. (1996). Managing for results. *Government Finance Review 12* (3), 40-42.

Loffler, E. (1999). Service quality measurement of innovative public organizations. In A. Halachmi (Ed.). *Performance and quality measurement in government* (pp. 129-144). Burke, VT: Chatelaine Press.

Ludeman, K. (1991). Measuring skills and behavior. *Training and Development* 45 (11), 61-66.

Mushkin, S. & Sandifer, F. (1980). Personnel management. In G. Washnis (Ed.), *Productivity improvement handbook for state & local government* (pp. 530-584). NY: J Wiley & Sons.

NAPA. (1998). *Work/life programs: Helping managers, helping employees*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Public Administration.

Nyhan, R. & Marlowe, H. (1995). Performance measurement in the public sector: Challenges and opportunities. *Public Productivity and Management Review 18* (4), 333-348.

Paddock, S. (1997). Benchmarks in management training. *Public Personnel Management 26* (4), 441-460.

Phillips, J. (1996). *Accountability in human resource management*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Stutz, J. & Massengale, R. (1997). Measuring diversity initiatives. *HR Magazine 42* (12), 85-88.

Theurer, J. (1998). Seven pitfalls to avoid when establishing performance measures. *Public Management*, 80 (7), 21-24.

Tigue, P. (1994). Use of performance measures by GFOA members. *Government Finance Review 10* (6), 42-44.

Tigue, P. & D. Strachota (1994). *The use of performance measures in city and county budgets*. Chicago, Illinois: Government Finance Officers Association.

West, J. (1995). *Quality management today: What local government managers need to know*. Washington, D.C.: International City/County Management Association.

Wray, L. & Hauer, J. (1996). Best practices reviews by local government. *Public Management 78* (1), 7-11.

Keeping Selection Legal and Professional — Are the Uniform Guidelines Still Helpful?

A CALL FOR PAPERS

THE UNIFORM GUIDELINES on Employee Selection Procedures were developed to help employers pursue professionally acceptable practices while complying with disparate impact law. Since 1978 the Guidelines have remained unchanged, failing to acknowledge important changes that have occurred in both the law and professional practice.

Manuscript proposals are sought to address this dilemma from diverse perspectives. The symposium will examine the following issues:

- The Guidelines post-1978 impact on judicial decisions.
- Legal developments not effectively addressed by the Guidelines, such as Connecticut v. Teal and race norming provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1991.
- Implications of research testing the theory of differential validity. This research's impact on court decisions and professional practice.
- Implications of validity generalization research. This research's impact on court decisions and professional practice.
- The political environment within which the EEOC uses the Guidelines. Political forces supporting continuation of the Guidelines in their 1978 form, or supporting their revision.
- Value choices managers face when using professionally sound, legally defensible assessment measures. Means of simulataneously pursuing diversity, fairness to individuals, economy, and prediction of applicants' job performances.

Proposals for 20- to 25-page papers are welcome. Individuals are invited to submit a one-page outline to: *Christopher P. Daniel, School of Public Affairs, Kentucky State University, Frankfort, KY 40601; Tel: 502/227-6649.*

Proposals must be received no later than February 15, 2000. Completed manuscripts are due by August 1, 2000.