

Public Personnel Management and Good Governance: An Analysis of President George W. Bush Administration

Haroon A. Khan

Abstract

Though the demand for good governance was directed toward the developing countries, the developed countries also faced the issue of improving governance as a result of the financial crises, and a growing demand for government reforms. The inherent values of good governance were echoed in the demand for reinventing government and new public management. An analysis of public personnel management from the point of good governance illustrates the steps taken by President George W. Bush to reform public personnel management. The steps taken by President Bush can be replicated in other countries to reform the bureaucracy with modifications based on the contextual features in every political system.

Key Words: Public personnel management, good governance, President George W. Bush, OPM

Introduction

The emphasis on good governance was in vogue since the World Bank introduced the concept in 1989. The World Bank and other major donor institutions like European Union (EU), International Monetary Fund (IMF), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and United Nations (UN), considered good governance as a criterion for development aids. The issue of good governance has attracted academics and practitioners in different areas and fields. Researchers on good governance emphasize inclusiveness, efficiency and accountability in bureaucracy (World Bank, 1997; IMF, 2005; DFID, 2001; USAID, 2005; Hyden. et al., 2004; Kauffman, 2003). Unless a country improves its governance, it cannot attain progress and development that each country seeks to achieve.

Though the demand for good governance was directed toward the developing countries, the developed countries also faced the issue of improving governance as a result of the financial crises, and a growing demand for government reforms. The inherent values of good governance were echoed in the demand for reinventing government and new public management. "The notion of good governance refers to a policy strategy in which aid distributors combine New Public Management with advocacy of liberal democracy in stressing the political, administrative, and economic legitimacy and efficiency" (Doevern, 2011, 303). Modern governments faced with globalization and increased financial problems need to be more efficient and effective.

The efficient public personnel are essential to achieve the values of good governance, which emphasizes the delivery of public service in an effective manner. President George W. Bush made a commitment to reform the government with a proposal to reform the personnel system. After September 11, 2001, he argued that the old rules and regulations stifle government's ability to respond quickly, and they need to be reformed. He emphasized that public service must be citizen centered, not bureaucracy centered, results oriented and market based. It should be promoting rather than stifling innovation through competition. The five goals of the administration were (1) strategic management of capital in terms of each agency's mission, goals and objectives, (2) competitive sourcing, (3) expanded E-government, (4) budget and performance integration and (5) improved financial performances.

Kay Coles James (2003, a), Director of OPM (Office of Personnel Management) under President George W. Bush mentioned, "The Federal government today faces unprecedented challenges in personnel management. They derive in part from antiquated civil service laws, designed for workforce that exists only in the history books." In her directives to the government, she mentioned about the antiquated civil service and reiterated the necessity of a mobile and marketable civil service to deal with the complex problems of recent times.

President George W. Bush made strategic management of the federal government's human capital as one of his priorities. Kay James (2003, b) also mentioned that to "transform OPM from the personnel bunny of the federal government to a strategic partner, we had to start with our own strategic plan. Well, given that we have an MBA President who loves baseball-it should therefore be no surprise that yes, we have a method by which we can keep score at how we're doing on accomplishing his agenda. The agencies are going to be monitored and scored." This paper seeks to analyze public personnel management under President George W. Bush from the criteria of good governance.

What is good governance?

Despite the different definitions of good governance, the important criteria involve the processes and performance in delivering the services of the government. The goal of good governance is to improve the government delivery of services to the public. Ultimately, an effective service delivery is evaluated on the basis of the processes used and performance.

Processes

Good governance involves the nature of the processes by which government delivers the services. The processes must include participation in decision making. The processes need to emphasize decentralization of the power structure and participation in decision making. Kaufmann, et al. (2004, 3) define good governance in terms of (1) the process by which government is selected, monitored, and replaced; (2) the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and

implement sound policies; and (3) the respect of citizens, and state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.

Good governance requires that the government must meet the needs of the people in an equitable way through a transparent process. Good governance requires an agreement on the long term goals of the community. The agreement needs to include sustainable human development and the means to achieve the goals. "Good governance means that the government should achieve the results with the best utilization of resources at its disposal" (Agere, 2000).

The process of decision-making needs to be based on the rule of law with an established legal/judicial framework. Agere (2000) emphasizes accountability, transparency, combating corruption, participatory governance and an enabling legal/judicial framework.

The United Nations emphasized that the minority views are recognized and are taken into consideration in the decision making process. The main features of good governance include: how the people of a country are governed, how the country's affairs are administered, and the quality of management and institutional capacity to be found in public agencies (Agere, 2000, 23). The processes of good governance include the values of transparency, decentralization, partnering, participation, accountability, impartiality, and diversity.

Transparency

Agere (2000) emphasizes accountability and transparency to combat corruption. Good governance requires that the government must respond to the needs of the people and make policies in a transparent way.

In order to make the government more transparent, the OPM under President George W. Bush introduced more instruments for E-governance so that people have access to more information. The Bush administration also introduced the Transparency Act by ensuring that any expenses \$25000 and over must be reported. Even though there was some apprehension about publishing the results of the government through score cards, but OMB Director, Daniels, under Bush, argued that it would lead agencies to take positive action.

The federal government's website, 'Expectmore.gov' was set up in 2006 to ensure accountability and transparency in government operations by posting questions, answers, evidence, and scores from the PART (Program Assessment Rating Tool) reviews (Breul and Kamensky, 2008, 1019).

Decentralization

Good governance emphasizes decentralization of decision-making for power sharing. One of the major goals of President Bush was to streamline bureaucratic procedures by decentralizing the personnel functions. The rationale was based on the argument that excessive bureaucracy stifles the effectiveness of the agency to make a prompt decision. The best way to reduce bureaucracy is by decentralizing the personnel function to the respective agencies. Pursuant to this objective, the

Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense were given significant discretion in terms of personnel functions. His rationale for discretion was based on the increased need for security and prevention of terrorism. 'The Homeland Security Act' gave the Bush Administration great discretion regarding personnel reform. It authorized the Secretary for Homeland Security and the Director of the U. S. Office of Personnel Management to establish a new personnel system for the new department. The law required that the DHS personnel system needed to be "flexible and contemporary" (Nigro, et al., 2007, 312). The Act also gave managers wider discretionary powers and flexibility.

New personnel regulation at the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense dramatically changed the way 860,000 workers were paid, promoted, demoted and disciplined. There would not be any automatic pay raises, pass-fail evaluations, and permanency in jobs. There would be broad salary ranges known as pay bands. Raises would be based on occupation, labor market rates and job performance ratings. In terms of laying off employees, performance rather than seniority would be the basis. The Pentagon would create an internal National Security Labor Board to resolve labor-management disputes, by diminishing the role of the FLRA (Federal Labor Relations Authority). There was concern about employee rights and the rights of the Unions. The reforms also included reduction in the number of layers in management and a reduction of time in decision making.

Partnering

Good governance emphasizes partnering with different stakeholders in delivering government services to promote efficiency. The President's Management Agenda (PMA) included efforts in partnering with public, private and not-for profit organizations in terms of service delivery system. One of the efforts in partnering was the 'Faith Based Initiative' proposed by Bush.

The other aspect that had an impact on partnering was its emphasis on competitive sourcing, which implied competition with the private sector for service delivery. It also meant privatization whenever possible to achieve the goal of less bureaucracy.

The OMB used Competitive Sourcing initiative 'Commercial Services Management' (CSM) to implement a variety of techniques to improve the operation of the commercial functions. Since 2003 government agencies had conducted roughly 1400 public-private competitions of their commercial activities. The OMB's Office of Procurement Policy was also strengthening contracting practices, which included enhancing the capabilities and professionalism of the acquisition workforce, increasing the use of competition among private contractors, improving contract administration skills, and strengthening contracting ethics.

The OMB issued guidance to the President's Management Council to monitor management decisions made through the use of public-private competition ensuring the taxpayers receiving benefits through post-competition review. The OMB also directed to compare actual cost incurred and performance to projected costs, performance standards and ensure corrective actions taken by the

appropriate officials. It also required reviews performed by individuals separate from those who were responsible for the management.

Several agencies had established award programs to recognize employees who had contributed to improving competition. In fiscal year 2007, the Department of Homeland Security gave seven awards to individuals for saving over \$5.2 million. The government initiated several programs to promote competition in fiscal year 2007, several initiatives had been undertaken to encourage competition and discourage procurements without competition.

Participation

Good governance implies the process of management through the involvement of different stakeholders (Farazmand, 2004). President Bush emphasized that the public agencies should be citizenship centered rather than bureaucracy centered. In order to promote citizenship centered bureaucracy, the new personnel management emphasized participation of the people in government. The government introduced E-Government initiatives and made efforts to get feedback from the employees and the citizens. The E-Government initiatives included creating an easy way to find a single point of access to government services. It also sought to reduce the reporting burden for the businesses. It made easier for the government to share information with federal, state and local agencies. It also made easier the internal processes of the agencies so that people could receive the services with relative ease.

Accountability

The accountability in government was to be ensured by the emphasis on performance. It also made budgeting decisions tied with performance. Each agency was required to develop outcome measures against which performance will be measured. The OMB would assist the agencies to develop objectives for a few programs, and to assess what programs would do to achieve the objectives, how much it would cost and how effectiveness would be achieved. Accountability would be ensured through increased financial performance. Efforts to ensure financial accountability included requiring the agencies to produce accurate financial report, reforming the reporting systems with emphasis on web technologies, ensuring quarterly financial statements, and increased accountability to the people through audited financial reports.

One of the objectives of the PMA was to provide people with confidence in the executive agencies with the purpose of improving the financial reporting of the agencies. The Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act of 1990 started the federal financial statements and the balance sheet, with details of "what we own and owe."

The reforms also included five human capital systems that would provide a consistent, comprehensive representation of human capital management for the federal government. These were: strategic alignment, leadership and knowledge management, results oriented performance culture, talent management and

accountability. The five human capital systems would form a coherent structure supporting strategic human capital management in compliance with merit system principles. Metrics had been established to help agencies accomplish the standards for the three systems that would implement strategic human capital plans and programs (i. e., leadership and knowledge management, results oriented performance culture, and talent management). The required metrics focused on human capital management activities that would support outcome metrics and show the health of a specific critical success factor.

The strategic alignment system focused on having a human capital strategy aligned with mission, goals, and organizational objectives. The critical factors for strategic alignment system were human capital planning, workforce planning, human capital practices and knowledge sharing, human resources as strategic partners.

Leadership standard would promote agency leaders and managers effectively manage people, ensure continuity of leadership, and would promote a learning environment, which would provide for continuous improvement in knowledge, sharing of critical knowledge, supported by training and technology. The critical success factors were leadership succession management, change management, integrity and inspiring employee commitment, continuous learning and knowledge management.

Result oriented culture would promote a diverse, high performing workforce and a performance management system that would differentiate between high and low levels of performance and would link individual/ team/ unit performance to the organization's goals and desired results effectively. The critical factors were communication, performance appraisal, award, pay for performance, diversity management, and labor management relations.

Standards on accountability would emphasize data collection; results oriented planning and accountability system. It required compliance with merit and other laws, independent audit and reporting of the results. The critical factors were effectiveness and compliance.

Impartiality and Diversity

Good governance involved the use of natural, financial and human resources in the interest of the people and in compliance with the principles of justice, fairness, equity, efficiency, transparency and accountability (Farazmand, 2004, 78).

The reform proposals by President George W. Bush included protection of the merit system as the MSPB (Merit System Protection Board) was authorized to oversee the role of merit in federal hiring. In terms of recruitment and retention of employees, knowledge and competency would be emphasized.

In order to give opportunities for minorities and women, the administration proposed for development of minority hiring by establishing fellowship programs and partnering with the universities. The merit system was the core idea of the OPM. The civil service system would ensure that politics and political party, as well as other non-merit factors, had no bearing on the tenure of the civil servants.

The merit principles would assure that the federal employees were hired, promoted, paid and discharged solely on the basis of knowledge, skill and ability to perform the job. The civil service regulations also provided special protections for the veterans, minorities and those who would expose government waste and fraud.

Performance

The other major criterion of good governance is the performance of the government in terms of providing services to the people. Performance is defined as the effectiveness in providing services that the government is responsible for. Good governance includes transparency, accountability, ethics and efficiency in delivering the services. Good governance implies that the tasks are performed in a responsible manner. "Good governance refers to a condition whereby a responsibility acquired through election; appointment or delegation is discharged in an effective, transparent, and accountable manner while bad governance is associated with maladministration in the discharge of responsibility" (www.uneca.org/itca/governance/index.htm).

President George W. Bush emphasized in President's Management Agenda (PMA) that government should be result oriented. In order to improve the performance of the agencies and the individuals, he introduced pay for performance. The agency would be required to use pay for performance systems, where authorized by law and regulation, to link salary levels and adjustments to an individual's overall performance and contribution to the agency's mission.

Bush Administration also wanted to abolish the General Schedule (GS) pay system and insisted that the pay should be based on an annual performance evaluation. Clay Johnson III, a Deputy Director of the OMB remarked, "The federal government, as a rule, is pretty bad about managing people. We tend to treat people and manage our people as if they are bureaucrats. They are all the same; let's treat them all the same. The goal is to treat them, as professional public servants, not as bureaucrats... Until we can tie some small portion to pay to it, it will never happen" (Lee ,2005). The administration claimed that the present system rewards longevity rather than performance.

In January 2003 the bipartisan National Commission on the Public Service, chaired by Paul Volcker, called for abolishing the General Schedule. The new rules would have replaced the old GS schedule with a pay-for-performance system.

The pay system should maintain internal and external equity. Internal equity would be maintained by comparing the performance with pay of each individual opposed to across the board pay system under the traditional system. The external equity would be maintained by comparing the pay in the government sector with an equivalent job in the private sector. President Bush also proposed for a performance culture so that the government employees were socialized into the new culture of performance rather than the age old system of automatic pay increase and promotion. The other proposal was to come up with pay banding so that the managers were given discretion in the determination of pay to reward

good performers. The general schedule, the decades-old 15-grade pay system, would be replaced by broad salary ranges known as pay bands. It made it easier for federal managers to offer higher salaries to talented newcomers, and to give employees pay raises without necessarily giving them a promotion. The grade increase and step increases based on longevity would be abolished. The Bush administration introduced traffic light signals to evaluate and assess the agencies. The green signals would symbolize good performance, yellow would symbolize needing improvement; and red was considered unacceptable, and would be required to make significant improvement soon.

The PMA sought to build effective performance management systems that would give employees a clear idea from their individual performance plans to agency outcomes; that would hold employees accountable for results and performance.

In addition, the Bush administration had launched separate efforts in 2002 to improve the performance of the individual program in each agency. "This effort, called the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), was intended to explicitly fuse performance information with the budget formulation process at a funding decision level" (Breul and Kennedy, 2008). The PART included four criteria: first, a clear purpose and ways to achieve the purpose; second, evaluation of strategic planning with long term goals; third, quality of efforts to improve the efficiency; and fourth, assessment of results and reporting of the results with accuracy and consistency.

On September 12, 2008, the OMB released the annual Program Assessment Rating Tool results for the federal agencies which showed that more than 1000 programs or 98 percent of the budget accounting \$2.6 trillion dollars of federal spending had been assessed and 80 percent had been rated effective, moderately effective or adequate.

Under PMA, the agencies were instructed to develop alternative pay system. Performance based alternative system was divided into three categories: Demonstration Projects, Independent Systems and Government wide Executive Pay.

Demonstration Projects

Employees in the Demonstration projects reported a much stronger link between pay and performance than under the GS system. There were increasing differences in pay between high and average or poor performers. After 4 years performance accounted for 25% of differences in pay compared to 0% under the GS system, annual pay increases ranged from 0% for low performers to as much as 20% for top performers. Performance driven pay progression would replace statutory waiting periods of 1 to 3 years for step increases and career ladder promotions. Where unions objected, the GS practice was followed, and the general increase was guaranteed, regardless of performance.

Demonstration projects consolidated the 15 narrowly defined grades of the GS into three to five bands or work levels that was organized in modern work settings, defining levels of work as entry, development, full performance, senior

expert, and managerial levels. Satisfaction with classification procedures increased. It was 59% for the lab demos, compared to 41% under the GS system. Classification authority based on broader definitions of work levels was delegated to managers. Some demonstration projects used competencies to define the factors applied in classifying positions and assessing performance.

Evaluation of agency demonstration projects showed that federal agencies successfully changed their pay and performance management systems to be modern, effective, validated, credible and transparent.

Independent Systems

The second category of alternative pay systems were agency specific and were established under independent authority of Congress. Market sensitivity driven pay and performance, not time would drive pay increases. The highest rated performers would be paid the most. Both IRS (Internal Revenue Service) and GAO (General Accounting Office) concentrated on training the managers. Competencies were assessed, and meaningful performance distinctions were made. The GAO was successful in overhauling performance management system and transforming agency's culture to focus on core competencies and market based pay.

Government wide Executive Pay

Since January 13, 2004, all SES (Senior Executive Service) members had been covered with the Federal government's enhanced performance based pay system for executives and any increase in senior executive's rate of base pay was linked to performance. The OPM had one year to implement SES performance appraisal systems. As a further enhancement and incentives, agencies that would meet OPM and congressionally mandated requirements for effective appraisal systems might offer a higher rate of base pay to their senior executives. The base pay was set, and adjusted using an open pay range, without fixed rates or steps. Agencies were holding executives responsible for achieving results that were clearly tied to organizational goals. The OPM and the OMB would review organizational performance information during the certification process. Agencies were making distinctions in levels of performance. Agencies were holding executives accountable for the performance of subordinates. They were establishing oversight and accountability systems for their performance.

Based on the alternative pay system, there was considerable progress in implementing performance based pay system. The results showed that agencies discarded the General Schedule in favor of more practical classification and market sensitive pay. The EPA previously appraised executives solely on critical elements based on Executive Core Competencies (ECQs), which were not result driven. After consultation with the OPM, the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) revised its performance plans. The first part had fixed elements and requirements that would focus on ECQs. The Second part was called individual commitments

and focused on specific business results. The results were to be achieved by the executive and the organization for which he or she was accountable.

The regulations issued jointly by the OPM and the OMB in 2004 appraisal system certification requirements recognized the variation found in the quality of SES appraisal systems government wide. This gave agencies access to pay increases while working to enhance their appraisal systems further. All recommendations must be reviewed by agency Performance Review Boards which would make the final recommendation. The OPM as the Gatekeeper would grant agencies provisional or full certification for the SES appraisal system. It required the OPM to conduct a thorough review of the systems, including a detailed review of a sample of executive performance plans.

The strategic compensation system to be established under the Working for America Act (WFAA) included three key elements: (1) a core classification system, (2) a core market-based pay system and (3) a performance appraisal and performance-based pay system. The first two would be managed and designed by the OPM for general applicability for all covered federal agencies. The third element would be managed and applied by each federal agency based on government policy set by the OPM.

Despite all the reasons for reforms in the public personnel administration, the reforms faced potential problems.

Political Favoritism

One of the concerns with the new personnel system was the possibility of favoritism in pay and promotion because the agencies were given wider discretion in determining the pay. The possibility of favoritism would lead to a loss of motivation if the pay was not conducted without thorough performance evaluation.

John Gage, President of the American Federation of Government Employees, said that the union viewed the proposed fund "as a slush fund for Bush's political appointees and their friends. We never believed it would trickle down to front-line rank and file federal employees" (Lee, 2003). Even though all the presidents seek to maintain control over the federal bureaucracy, the Bush administration had gone further than any predecessor" (Savage, 2008). There were allegations that political candidates had been placed in Senior Executive positions for which they were not qualified (*Washington Post*, Nov 30, 2008).

Concerns about Pay Equity

President Bush's proposal to increase pay also faced opposition. Barr (2004) citing Rep. Thomas M. Davis III (R-VA), Chairman of the House Government Reform Committee, said in a statement that the "committee continues to support efforts to improve personnel management, including performance-based pay. Still, Davis said, "the simple fact remains that if we are to be successful, whether under another personnel system or the General Schedule, pay must be competitive." Congressman Davis emphasized the necessity of maintaining parity to attract

potential recruits in government services. Even the Republicans in the House were opposed to pay raise. Kay Coles James, Director of the OPM, "across the board pay raises for federal workers are a relic of the past" (Lee, 2003). The critics were apprehensive about Bush's pay increase in terms of motivation for the federal employees. "Critics including lawmakers from both parties said Bush's fund was unlikely to provide federal workers much of an incentive for good performance. Even if fully funded, it would represent only 0.5 percent of the overall civilian roll of about \$100 billion" (Lee, 2003).

Outsourcing/Privatization

The emphasis on privatization as emphasized by the PMA has the potential for corruption and loss of accountability. Under the Bush administration, government services were transferred to private corporations in great numbers. The bottom line for the private agencies is making a profit. The emphasis of the government is providing adequate and quality services. The profit motive of the private sector may conflict with the adequacy and quality requirement of the public services. Moreover, when services are delegated to the private sector, it is difficult to ensure accountability. Accountability for the private sector can be ensured only by terminating the services. Accountability through constant monitoring and improving the internal processes would be difficult to maintain because the government cannot oversee the performance of the employees at the private sector. However, the termination of the contract to the private sector may not be an efficient tool to improve the performance because there is no opportunity to intervene before the problem occurs.

Barr (2006) claims that Bush's agenda of contracting out and methods of performance measure had been very controversial. The unions consistently opposed outsourcing by the government. President George W. Bush's policy was challenged in Congress and the courts, especially when it threatened union rights.

Resistance by the Unions

Bush's reform proposals were vehemently opposed by the unions because of the lack of the protection of their rights. "The Senate Government Management Subcommittee met the first week of this month to review DHS (Department of Homeland Security) rules and soon will meet again to question the Defense proposals. The No. 1 recalcitrant has been the federal unions, which unsurprisingly oppose any change. Their Democratic allies (and some Republicans) complain the unions have not been consulted enough and that it is unfair to pay civil servants according to performance because good work is difficult to measure" (Devine, 2005).

The unions challenged in the federal court the provision that would allow DHS to abrogate collective bargaining agreements and its role in limiting the employee appeals. The court agreed that the proposed rule would interfere with the authority of the Federal Labor Relations Authority and the Merit System Protection Board.

The proposal would retain the MSPB in hearing employees' appeals of disciplinary actions, and the FLRA in resolving labor disputes, but would develop a faster process for both. It would also remove requirements that management bargain with unions in preparing for emergencies, making minor changes in working conditions and developing pay-for performance (Lee, 2005).

The House Democrats in 2007 came up with a major revision of the personnel system, which prompted Bush advisers to suggest a veto of the bill. Senior Bush advisers said that they would recommend a veto of the House bill because it would create administrative burdens and back away from performance-based pay system (Barr, 2007 a). The House in August of 2007 passed an amendment to the National Security Personnel System. The amendment was offered by Rep. Jay Inslee (D-Wash) on behalf of himself, Van Hollen and Rep. Walter B. Jones (R-NC). The House members expressed concern on the fairness to the employees because it made the independent third parties resolve disputes in workplaces (Barr, 2007b).

The efforts of the Bush administration to implement the personnel reforms evolved through three main phases, where the first phase lasted from November 2002 into February 2004, with attempts by top executives to involve union leaders and employees in designing a model human resource system called MaxHR, the second phase, in 2004 with attempts by the unions to persuade the OPM and the DHS to modify the specifics of their proposal; and the third phase from February 2005 through 2007, with efforts by the unions and others to block implementation of the new MaxHR system (Ricucci and Thompson 2008, 880). President Bush on December 1, 2008, issued an executive order which would deny collective bargaining rights to federal employees affiliated with law enforcement, intelligence and national security. The justification was based on the argument that allowing collective bargaining for them would be inconsistent with national security (Pear, 2008). 'The Civil Service Reforms Act' of 1978 allows bargaining rights to federal employees but allows the President to strip of the rights to some employees.

When the Democrats regained control of the House in the election of 2006, they tried to block many of the proposals of President Bush. In March 2007, the House Committees on Homeland Security moved to repeal many of the DHSs proposed changes to personnel administration (Ricucci and Thompson, 2008, 883).

As a result of win by the Democrats in the Congress, and the White House in 2008, many of the reform proposals were blocked. With the coming of the Obama Administration, there is more emphasis on protecting the employee rights. The new administration limited discretion of the agencies in dealing with collective bargaining rights. Though the Obama administration is committed to performance improvement, the protection of the employee union is an important priority.

Despite the opposition on some reform proposal, the Bush administration has achieved significant progress in public personnel management based on the criteria on good governance.

The OPM uses a traffic light scoring using 'green' for success, 'yellow' for mixed results and 'red' for unsatisfactory. Based on President's management agenda, the OPM has achieved success in all areas except in electronic government. However, the OPM strived to do better in electronic government in the years to

come. The results based on Table 1 show that the Bush administration has achieved success in its goal consistent with good governance on accountability, financial and other performance, and in the improvement of human capital.

Table 1 : OPM's 2006 progress on President's management agenda

	STATUS	PURPOSE	PROGRESS
Human Capital	Green	Green	Workforce planning and restructuring will be defined in terms of each agency's mission, goals, and objectives.
Competitive Sourcing	Green	Green	Competition between public and private sources becomes a standard management tool to promote innovation, efficiency, and effectiveness.
Financial Performance	Green	Green	Financial services support Strategic decision making by Federal program managers and appropriate use of Federal financial resources.
Electronic Government	Yellow	Green	Expand the Federal Government's use of electronic technologies to provide better services at a lower cost that is easier for citizens to obtain.
Performance Improvement	Green	Green	provide a greater focus on performance, better control over resources used, and accountability for results by program managers.

Source: OPM Fiscal Year 2007 Performance and Accountability Report

Table 2 : Percentage of agencies with a weighted average PART scoring at least 80 Points out of 100

YEAR	PERCENTAGE
2005	N/A
2006	8
2007	20
2008	33
2009	42.7

Source: 2009 Annual Performance Report

Table 2 shows the results based on PART (Performance Assessment Rating Tool). It confirms consistent increase on the scores on the agencies. PART was a tool for assessment on the criteria of good governance.

Table 3 : Percentage increase in learning of leadership capacity

YEAR	PERCENTAGE
2005	40
2006	40
2007	52
2008	60
2009	58

Source: 2009 Annual Performance Report

Table 3 shows the results of the percentage increase in learning leadership capacities, which is vital for the efficiency of administration. Again, the results show consistent increase with the exception of 2009, the year the percentage fell off slightly. The Bush administration leadership capacity and training is one of the major goals in management of human capital.

Table 4 : Number of agencies that fully implement merit system for accountability

YEAR	PERCENTAGE
2005	2
2006	20
2007	25
2008	25
2009	25

Source: 2009 Annual Performance Report

Implementation of the merit system in agencies was one of the major goals of the Bush administration. The merit system is important for ensuring accountability in terms of hiring and promotion. It is required for the effectiveness of the government. Table 4 shows that more agencies had implemented the merit system.

Table 5 :Performance Culture: Percentage of performance plans certified

YEAR	PERCENTAGE
2005	4
2006	6
2007	33
2008	66
2009	64

Source: 2009 Annual Performance Report

From the very beginning, President Bush insisted on performance culture by the bureaucrats. Table 5 shows the results of the percentage of the SES (Senior

Executive service) plans certified. The results show significant increase in the percentage of certification among the SES plan from four percent to sixty four percent in 2009.

Conclusion

An analysis of public personnel management from the point of good governance illustrates the steps taken by President George W. Bush. The steps taken by President Bush can be replicated in other countries to reform the bureaucracy with modifications based on the contextual features in every political system. After all, good governance requires the implementation of the important values in the bureaucrats, who are responsible for providing public services. I would consider that reforming the bureaucracy based on the values of good governance should be regarded as the first step.

However, the opposition faced by the Bush administration in implementing reforms exemplifies the importance of cooperation of the important stake holders: Congress and the unions, which are vital to the public personnel system. This research brings the issue of good governance for who as questioned by researchers. The case study on Bush shows that any attempt to reform public personnel on the basis of good governance will not be successful unless supported by the important actors. Of course, the researchers on good governance emphasized participation in decision making as an important criterion for good governance. Unless decision making is shared by important actors, any attempt at good governance will be futile. Despite the opposition, the Bush administration had achieved progress in performance, based on the criteria of good governance.

References

- Agere, S. (2000). *Promoting Good Governance: Principles, Practices, and Perspective*. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Barr, S. (2004, February 27). Congressional Committee Cast Votes for Parity in Pay Raises. *The Washington Post*.
- Barr, S. (2006, October 9). OMB Paper aims to clear up Bush's Management Agenda. *The Washington Post*.
- Barr, S. (2007a, May 29). Remembering Military Personnel with a Bigger Pay Raise. *The Washington Post*.
- Barr, S. (2007b, August 7). New Personnel System Hits another Snag, *The Washington Post*.
- Breul, J.D., & Kamensky, J.M. (2008). Federal Government Reform: Lessons from Clinton's "Reinventing Government" and Bush's Management Agenda Initiatives. *Public Administration Review*.
- Devine, D. (2005, March 17). Getting Serious on Bureaucracy Reform. *The Washington Post*.
- Doevern, V.V. (2011). Rethinking good governance. *Public Integrity*, 13 (4), 301-318.