In recent years, headlines and articles have declared that the American workforce is rapidly approaching a crisis. Changing demographics are producing an increasing percentage of employees who are eligible for retirement and a shortage of younger workers who can take their place. This crisis is of particular concern to local governments, with 46 percent of their workforces composed of employees aged 45–64. In the private sector, the proportion is only 31 percent.

The anticipated workforce crisis is just one of numerous reasons that succession planning has become so essential. Leadership talent always has been considered to be in short supply. For example, in a 1998 study conducted by McKinsey, 75 percent of executives who were surveyed said that their companies were continually short of leadership talent.

Contributing to this leadership crisis is a decline in employee loyalty, which was exacerbated by the private- and public-sector downsizing of the late 1980s and the 1990s. This decline happened when employees were experiencing much greater mobility than they had in the past.

For these reasons and many more, organizations began realizing that they needed to develop leadership talent from within, and find a way to retain it. Succession planning is a way for organizations to respond to leadership challenges. Yet despite the apparent need for succession planning, a 1996 survey of federal human resource executives conducted by the National Academy of Public Administration’s (NAPA) Center for Human Resources Management revealed that only 28 percent of respondents had, or planned to have, a succession management program. Recent studies yield similar results. In January 2004 the International Public Management Association for Human Resources (IPMA–HR) surveyed its members regarding their workforce planning efforts. Only 39 percent of respondents reported being actively involved in succession planning.

Research concerning local government succession planning is limited, making the full extent of succession planning unknown. However, a recent survey of fifty North Carolina municipalities revealed that few were conducting succession planning. This article presents the findings of that survey, describes succession planning, and recommends ways in which North Carolina local government leaders can start or strengthen succession planning efforts.

**Definition of Succession Planning**

Simply defined, “succession planning” is a systematic effort to project future leadership requirements, identify leadership candidates, and develop those candidates through deliberate learning experiences.

**Components of Succession Planning**

Although modern succession planning varies by organization, a comprehensive
A review of public- and private-sector research suggests that planning efforts have certain common components, as follows.

Inclusion and support of senior management. A persistent theme in the research is the importance of including senior management in the development of a succession plan. Robert Fulmer and Jay Conger, who studied organizations with the best practices in succession management, report that all the organizations “felt fortunate to have the enthusiastic support of top management. But this support was not gratuitous; instead, it was earned by providing an essential service to the executives.”

Senior management also must be advocates of succession planning, making it an organizational priority and helping lower-level managers and employees see its importance and value. With such a mindset, for example, one department might give up a top performer temporarily to another department for a developmental experience in the best interest of the organization as a whole.

Assessment of current and future workforce needs. Like workforce planning, succession planning begins with an organization having a clear view of the current and future needs of its workforce. A key part of obtaining this view is collection and analysis of workforce data, such as age distribution, turnover rates, projected retirements, and skills. Once collected, these data must be compared with future workforce needs, as detailed through business plans and organizational strategic planning. Gov-
ernmental succession-planning consultant Patrick Ibarra stresses the importance of building a succession plan from the current and future priorities identified in an organization’s strategic plan. He notes that, too often, employees’ developmental needs are left out of the strategic planning process.11

Identification of key positions. Key positions are those that exert “critical influence on organizational activities—operationally, strategically, or both.”12 When they are left vacant, difficulties arise in meeting or exceeding public expectations or in following through on projects of crucial significance.13 Traditional succession planning focused only on senior management positions. Today, experts recommend that succession planning apply to key positions at any level of the organization. For example, certain information technology or health care jobs that require a high degree of technical or subject-area knowledge may not traditionally be considered leadership positions but may be of critical importance in an organization.

Identification of organizational leadership competencies. “Competencies” are the actions and skills necessary for success in a particular role. Experts recommend development of common organizational leadership competencies for reasons such as conveying clear expectations and standards, linking developmental activities to organizational goals, and providing a common organizational language and framework for evaluating personnel and setting leadership development strategies.14 The National Academy of Public Administration strongly recommends that public organizations develop their own list of leadership competencies from a set developed by the Office of Personnel Management (see Table 1), adapting it to their organizational culture as necessary.15

Creation of talent pools. Modern succession plans create talent pools rather than identifying a few employees as potential successors for specific positions. One of the reasons for using this approach is the suggestion that succession planning not focus on linear career paths but identify talent across departments. Human resource consultant William Byham recommends using the term “acceleration pools” instead of “talent pools” or “high-potential pools.” He reports that companies prefer this term to “high-potential pools” because the latter implies that people not in the pool do not have high potential.16 Succession planning expert William Rothwell recommends that talent pools be coordinated with competency models, performance management, evaluation strategies, and developmental opportunities.17

Linkage with development. A crucial part of succession planning is identification or creation of developmental op-

### Table 1. Office of Personnel Management Leadership Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading Change</th>
<th>Leading People</th>
<th>Results Driven</th>
<th>Business Acumen</th>
<th>Building Coalitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continual learning</td>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>Influencing/negotiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and innovation</td>
<td>Integrity/honesty</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>Human resources management</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External awareness</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Technology management</td>
<td>Oral communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>Partnering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Political savvy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Influencing/negotiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service motivation</td>
<td>Technical credibility</td>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Another popular tool is the individual development plan, which serves as a kind of learning contract between the employee, his or her supervisor, and the organization. It details what the employee will do to close any competency gaps or to become better qualified for advancement.

Monitoring and evaluation of the initiative. Monitoring and evaluation are necessary to ensure that the program is meeting workforce needs, that organizational competencies have not changed, and that program goals are being achieved. Assessing employees’ development is one part of this process. For example, annual evaluations of employees’ progress toward meeting developmental goals can help an organization determine the effectiveness of its developmental activities and show whether or not progress has been made in preparing the employees to assume new leadership roles when necessary.

Performance measures also should be put in place to determine the effectiveness of succession planning efforts. Examples of performance measures to be used in the evaluation of succession planning initiatives are the number of vacancies filled internally versus externally, the number of high-potential employees who leave the organization, and the length of time that key positions stay vacant.

### North Carolina Research Findings

To determine the extent to which North Carolina municipalities were employing the components of succession planning, the School of Government administered a survey in 2004. The survey was distributed to the fifty medium-sized and large municipalities in North Carolina...
with populations of more than 15,000.\textsuperscript{19} Thirty responded. Survey content covered the nature of succession planning efforts, the identification of succession planning as a need, timeframes for developing plans, workforce data collected, planning and analysis activities conducted, training and development activities conducted, and barriers to implementation of succession planning initiatives. Although only medium-sized and large municipalities were surveyed, lessons and recommendations also may have value for small municipalities. Survey findings can be categorized into five areas: the nature of planning, the need for planning, intention to develop plans, current efforts and activities, and barriers to succession planning.

**The nature of planning.** Survey respondents were first asked to identify the nature of their efforts in succession planning. The great majority (83 percent) indicated that they did not conduct succession planning, and no one reported having “formal” succession planning. Few (17 percent) indicated that their municipality had informal or departmentally based plans.

Data from the 2004 IPMA–HR survey suggest that North Carolina municipalities may be considerably behind other public-sector organizations. In the IPMA–HR survey, 39 percent of the respondents reported that they were actively involved in succession planning. Overall, 51 percent of the respondents identified themselves as city or town/village governments.

**The need for planning.** Although only a small number of respondents conducted succession planning, a majority—65 percent—reported that their municipality had identified such planning as a need. Jurisdictions’ identifying succession planning as a need is no guarantee that they will implement it, but it is an indicator that they recognize its importance.

**Intention to develop plans.** A majority of survey respondents (64 percent) reported that they intended to develop a succession plan within three years (see Figure 1). About 25 percent indicated that they did not intend to develop a plan. This figure is noteworthy, considering the plethora of literature that indicates the need for this type of strategic planning. Potential reasons that these municipalities do not intend to develop plans are explored later.

**Current efforts and activities.** To determine the scope of activities related to succession planning that already had been undertaken by North Carolina municipalities, the survey identified such activities and grouped them into one of three categories: workforce data collection, analysis and planning, and training and development (see Table 2). These categories were considered to be sequential: Data must be collected before they can be analyzed and plans can be developed. After the data have been analyzed and plans have been developed, the resulting concepts can be put into action through training and development. Given this sequential nature, it is not surprising that a majority of survey respondents had collected workforce data, whereas a much smaller proportion had...
conducted training and development activities. (See the article on page 9 for detailed tables of municipalities’ survey responses.)

A majority of municipalities indicated that they collected most of the workforce data identified by the survey, such as demographics, turnover rates, and age distribution. However, less than 25 percent reported that they collected data about the skills or competencies of the current workforce. Although most municipalities indicated that they had identified such data as a need or were developing a system to collect them, 20–24 percent indicated that data on the skills and competencies of their workforce had not been identified as a need.

Of the 12 analysis and planning activities identified in the survey, only 5 were selected by more than 50 percent of municipalities. Also, municipalities were more likely to indicate that they had not identified these analysis and planning activities as a need than they were to indicate that they had not identified workforce data collection as a need. For example, only 31 percent of respondents reported that their municipality identified high-potential employees, and 28 percent of those who did not conduct this activity reported that identifying high-potential employees had not been identified as a need.

In the training and development category, there was even less uniformity among municipalities. Ten of the 12 activities identified for survey respondents were conducted by 50 percent or fewer municipalities. Basic components of succession planning such as mentoring and individual-development gap analysis (analysis of the gap between an individual’s current competencies and the desired competencies for his or her position) were performed by less than 15 percent of respondents. Additionally, 40–50 percent of respondents did not identify advanced developmental activities such as rotational work assignments and 360-degree evaluations as a need. This finding suggests that municipalities may require a better understanding of why these activities are important to their organizational success.

**Barriers to succession planning.**

Finally, survey recipients were presented with a list of ten obstacles to succession planning and asked which, if any, they considered to be barriers to implementation of succession planning initiatives in their municipality. The most frequently cited obstacles were a lack of personnel to manage the program, a lack of time to participate, organizational culture, low priority given by senior management, and insufficient financial resources (see Table 3).

> Overall, these obstacles suggest that human resources is not seen as a strategic player in the responding municipalities. This observation is supported by the finding that only 41 percent of respondents had a human resource section in their municipality’s strategic plan. If management does not generally support human resources in the organization, initiatives led by human resource departments will encounter difficulties. Although recent research suggests that all medium-sized and large North Carolina municipalities are conducting strategic planning (see the article on page 4), clearly a better case needs to be made for the inclusion of human resources as a key player in strategic planning.²⁰

**Table 3. Barriers to Succession Planning (n = 30)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Percentage Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Insufficient human resources to manage program</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Insufficient time to participate</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low priority given by senior management</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insufficient financial resources</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low priority given by elected officials</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of mobility of employees</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lack of role models</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Inadequate rewards for initiative/risk</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Conclusions about North Carolina’s Preparedess

Although formal succession planning was not occurring in a majority of North Carolina municipalities responding, a majority identified such planning as a need, and most intended to develop plans within the next three years. Overall, the survey findings revealed three tiers of succession planning preparedness in the state’s municipalities (see Table 4). Tier 1 municipalities were the least prepared, conducting about one-third of the activities related to workforce and succession planning identified in the literature. Before they attempt development of a succession planning and management program, these municipalities should strengthen their data collection and analysis and planning activities.

The municipalities in Tier 2 were better prepared to implement succession planning, for they conducted about one-half to two-thirds of the identified activities. Tier 2 municipalities may need to focus on expanding their training and development opportunities, developing a mentoring network, and conducting evaluative measures such as analysis of gaps in individual development.

Tier 3 municipalities already were conducting many of the essential components of succession planning, even if they did not have a formal plan. The next steps for these municipalities may be to garner organizational support for a formal succession plan, identify high-potential employees, and take a more organized, centralized approach to planning for the future leadership of their workforce.

About 29 percent of the North Carolina municipalities surveyed fell into Tier 1; about 52 percent, into Tier 2; and about 19 percent, into Tier 3 (see Table 4). Although this suggests that most municipalities were not ready to implement formal succession planning,
Tier 2 municipalities already were conducting roughly one-half to two-thirds of the identified workforce and succession planning activities. If these municipalities can find the time, personnel, money, and support to expand their current efforts, they should be able to move to Tier 3 and implement succession planning fully. Open-ended survey responses indicated a desire among some respondents for training in succession planning or for collaboration with other organizations on succession planning. Training, including programs such as those offered through the ICMA Next Generation Initiative, can assist municipalities in moving to greater preparedness. These municipalities also can look to other local governments for examples of what succession planning looks like in practice.

Local Government Succession Planning in Practice

Case studies or illustrations of succession planning in practice in local government are hard to find. Furthermore, even the organizations that have implemented some form of succession planning have been doing so for such a short period that evaluating their initiatives is difficult. Nevertheless, local governments all across the country are taking steps to implement forms of succession planning in their jurisdictions. The following three examples show some of the variety among initiatives, from a relatively simple city-manager internship program to a fully developed succession-management program. These examples demonstrate that, regardless of organizational size or resources, all local governments can take some steps to improve their leadership development efforts and succession preparedness.

Three Florida Cities: A City-Manager Internship Program

Concerned about the availability of high-potential candidates to fill future vacancies in city management, three Florida cities—Daytona Beach Shores, Port Orange, and South Daytona Beach—partnered to create a two-year city-manager internship program. The program was designed to attract young talent to city government, specifically recent master's degree graduates. Interns serve eight-month rotations in each city, giving them exposure to cities varying in population from 4,300 to 50,000. Across the internship, participants work with three city managers and city councils, gaining exposure to a wide variety of local government issues and challenges. They also gain exposure to a network of managers and cities throughout Florida.

The program is cost-efficient for the cities involved, for they split the interns’ salary ($25,000) and benefit costs. In terms of the resources demanded of the participating cities, besides the financial commitment, the program requires a time commitment from existing city managers and a willingness on the part of the managers and city councils to focus on the long-term organizational benefit of the program. On completion of the program, interns are considered prepared for a job as a city manager of a small community or as an assistant city manager of a medium-sized one.

Roseville, California: A Management-Development Assessment Center

In 1997, succession planning became a priority in Roseville, California, population 100,000, when city leaders realized that 11 of 15 department heads would be eligible for retirement by 2003. Roseville has since developed an integrated leadership-development strategy, including a competency model for senior managers, a succession plan, a mentoring program, and individual development plans.

A unique component of Roseville’s strategy is a management-development assessment center, which helps managers develop the core competencies critical to the city’s success. The city hired a consultant to identify the competencies through interviews with its managers. The interviews produced eight well-defined “management dimensions” that all department heads must master to be effective—communication, decision making, interpersonal effectiveness, leadership style, administrative effectiveness, flexibility, planning/organization skills, and a developmental orientation. Department directors also described what each dimension “looked like” in action and gave examples of actual situations that required exercising one or more of the eight dimensions.

Following the identification of the dimensions, the city put in place an integrated assessment-center process to develop the competencies. The assessment center has six elements: (1) a background questionnaire, in which participants assess themselves on the eight dimensions and describe a work experience that illustrates a strength in one dimension and a need to develop in another; (2) a personal interview, which focuses on the eight dimensions; (3) an in-basket exercise that enables participants to demonstrate skills in six of the management dimensions; (4) a group-interaction activity to analyze a citywide issue and make recommendations, while assessors observe; (5) a team activity in which participants develop implementation plans for their recommendations.
and prepare formal presentations to the city manager, again while assessors observe; and (6) completion of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (a widely used instrument for assessing personality type and showing how personality type influences interactions with others).

Following completion of the assessment center, participants receive formal feedback via a written report and through an in-person meeting with an assessment center consultant. Participants are expected to use the feedback in constructing their individual development plans. Roseville also uses the assessment center data to develop citywide training and development programs.

The cost to the city for the program has been about $850 per participant. In 2000 the city won an award from the California League of Cities for its use of assessment centers to promote employee development.

Henrico County, Virginia: A Succession Management Program

The succession management program of Henrico County, Virginia, population 262,300, has been recognized by the National Association of Counties and the Richmond Human Resources Management Association. The program began following a review of county workforce data in 2003, which revealed that 44 percent of upper-level managers would be eligible for full retirement by 2008. The program was implemented to address two concerns: (1) the loss of intellectual capital in key positions as upper-level managers became eligible to retire in record numbers and (2) the decreasing number of younger adults in the workforce available to develop the skills necessary to move into higher-level positions. Five steps for an effective succession-management program were described to upper-level managers, including identifying key positions, identifying competencies of key positions, developing employees, assessing the results of development, and evaluating the program. The program consisted of two phases: (1) teaching supervisors how to guide employees through a professional development process using individualized learning plans; and (2) providing information to upper-level managers on strategies for developing subordinate managers to plan for succession.

In the two years before implementation of the initiative, only 2 of 7 upper-level manager positions were filled with internal candidates. In the years since the initiative was introduced, internal candidates have filled 16 of 18 such positions.

The county later widened the initiative by also identifying middle managers as key position holders. According to George H. Cauble Jr., Henrico's director of human resources, “Henrico County is working hard to maintain leadership continuity both now and in the future so as to ensure the knowledge acquired by those in key positions in the County will not leave when these individuals do.”

Recommendations for Starting or Strengthening Succession Planning

Based on the School of Government survey findings and the review of the succession planning research, the following recommendations are provided for organizations that want to begin succession planning or strengthen their existing planning efforts.

1. Advocate for the importance of human resources as a strategic partner in the organization.

For the workforce to be responsive to changing environments, human resources must be integrated into the organization’s general strategic planning. Organizational leaders must make the case to both elected and appointed officials that human resource employees are more than just enforcers of regulations and should be involved in strategic planning as a key part of the management team. With regard to succession planning specifically, those spearheading the initiative must provide the management team with evidence of the importance of long-term leadership planning to the organization’s future success. If an organization generally lacks an overall long-term vision, leadership needs to make a broader case that long-term planning is essential for organizational effectiveness. Acquiring senior management support will help ensure allocation of time to planning, and dedication of monetary and human resources to it.

2. Evaluate organizational readiness for succession planning.

An organization seeking to evaluate how well equipped it is to implement succession planning may want first to determine in which tier of preparedness it is located. It can do this by examining how many of the activities related to workforce and succession planning it currently conducts (see Table 2). Evaluating current preparedness also will help the organization determine what needs to be done next for succession planning to be effective.

Tier 1 organizations might begin by strengthening their overall data collection and workforce planning efforts. Tier 2 organizations might focus on bolstering their training and development activities. Tier 3 organizations might look to other local government examples such as Henrico County, Virginia, for assistance in implementing formal succession planning.

3. Strengthen employee evaluation and development activities.

To ensure that current employees will be capable of filling future leadership vacancies, organizations need to evaluate employee readiness better and offer training and development opportunities to fill in individual gaps. Development of organizational leadership competencies is one way to give leadership candidates a clear guide to the traits and skills that they should cultivate to be successful. Individual development plans are a tool that organizations and employees can use to hold each other accountable for the employees’ development. Opportunities such as rotational work assignments may strengthen organizational knowledge and are another way to create a cadre of well-rounded leaders. Further, employee development programs can be a recruitment tool and a way to be seen as an employer of choice in a market in which high-potential young workers often are choosing the private sector over the public sector.

4. Commit to improving planning efforts, regardless of organizational size or resources.

Approaches such as talent pools or assessment centers may not be possible in municipalities with few employees,
but this should not deter succession planning altogether. Even small organizations can take such steps as identifying organizational competencies, developing mentoring programs, and creating employee development plans. Small organizations might consider following the example of the three Florida cities and partnering with neighboring local governments to share the costs of succession planning initiatives. Because succession planning does require some organizational investment regardless of the scope of the program, it also is important for organizations to establish some program performance measures or evaluative tools.

Conclusion
Although the 2004 School of Government survey revealed that few North Carolina municipalities were conducting succession planning efforts, it was encouraging to learn that most municipalities had identified it as a need. The next 5–10 years will be of crucial importance for local governments as they attempt to develop their leadership talent pool and prevent the loss of organizational knowledge when the baby boomers retire. The examples and recommendations provided in this article offer organizations ways to begin or improve planning efforts. Although many organizations have heard the succession planning alarm, they may have been hitting the snooze button. It now is time to wake up: organizations should wait no longer to begin implementing succession planning efforts.
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