

Introduction

The FY01 *Annual Evaluation* continues the evaluation philosophy underlying the FY96-00 *Annual Evaluations*, which represented a shift in the approach to program evaluation by the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civilian Personnel Policy) (ODASA (CPP)). Beginning in FY96, ODASA (CPP) has evaluated Civilian Human Resources (CHR) from an Army-wide perspective, focusing on program outcomes and results. It is part of a larger effort to improve business practices in the Army civilian personnel program.

The *FY01 Annual Evaluation* continues to balance the various aspects of CHR, from the effectiveness of service delivery on a year-to-year basis to how well Army supervisors and managers exercise their responsibility to lead and care for the civilian work force. Analyses presented here provide critical feedback necessary for sound policy decisions, strategic planning, and guiding the CHR program successfully into the future.

Organization

The *Annual Evaluation* consists of the following sections:

- **Executive Summary** - A synopsis of the evaluation of all elements within the *Annual Evaluation*.
- **The Year in Review** - A narrative of events impacting on the CHR program and the civilian work force in FY01. The Year in Review is non-evaluative but provides context for the analyses presented in subsequent sections.
- **Performance Indicators** - Report on CHR performance against 51 indicators designed to inform the Army leadership about the health of the CHR program. The indicators are divided into six categories: Cost/Efficiency, Effectiveness of Civilian

Personnel Administration, Effectiveness of Civilian Personnel Management, Civilian Work Force Morale, Civilian Work Force Quality, and Civilian Work Force Representation. Performance data are presented graphically with accompanying analyses.

- **Appendix** - Provides raw data used in the performance indicators. Major Command (MACOM) and Region breakouts of the data, where available, are included in this section.

Performance Indicators

Performance indicators for the *Annual Evaluation* are the result of an extensive review of the professional literature on program evaluation, discussions with functional experts at Headquarters, Department of Army (HQDA), and staffing with the MACOMs. The criteria used to select these

indicators were spelled out in the *Evaluation Plan* (Appendix D to the *FY97-98 CPA/M Strategic Plan*). In brief, the indicators are intended to:

- Evaluate the CHR program overall, without breaking out Civilian Personnel Advisory Center (CPAC) and Civilian Personnel Operations Center (CPOC) responsibilities.
- Measure areas beyond the direct control of the CHR function (e.g., civilian work force morale), emphasizing that Army managers and supervisors share in the responsibility to develop and care for the civilian work force.
- Impose minimal burden on the field in terms of additional reporting requirements. Almost all of the data for the indicators were obtained through automated sources.
- Set quantitative performance objectives for as many of the indicators as possible. Throughout the evaluation, the term “objective” is used to mean the threshold below which an intervention or special study may be necessary. It is a “trip wire” to warn of potential problems, rather than a “goal” which, arguably, should always be 100% (accuracy, compliance, satisfaction, etc.).
- **Present facts without undue analysis or interpretation.** Special studies are needed to determine the reasons for most of the trends identified.

Notes on Methodology

Definition of Work Force

Except as noted, work force data in the *Annual Evaluation* are shown for Army U.S. citizen appropriated fund employees in military and civil functions. Army National Guard Technicians are not included, unless otherwise specified.

Performance Indicators

- **Regulatory and Procedural Compliance Indicators –** U.S. Army Civilian Personnel Evaluation Agency (USACPEA) on-site surveys provided data for the items dealing with regulatory and procedural compliance (performance indicators 2-4, 2-5, 3-1, 3-2, and 3-3). FY89-92 data result from USACPEA’s normal review cycle. FY93-94 data are not available because USACPEA conducted only special studies during those years. FY95-00 data are based mainly on USACPEA’s regionalization-related reviews. The FY01 data are based again on USACPEA’s regular cycle of personnel management evaluations.

Since USACPEA selects review sites based upon MACOM affiliation, with the intent of surveying each MACOM on a regular basis, it makes no attempt to create a sample representative of Army as a whole. This MACOM “bias” in the sample must be kept in mind when comparing data across

fiscal years. The data, taken in total, forms a reasonably representative sample of Army. However, since USACPEA did not develop its yearly review schedules with the goal of providing Army-wide data that could be compared across fiscal years, this report attempts to draw only general conclusions from USACPEA survey data.

- **Morale Indicators** – We collected data for items dealing with work force morale and customer satisfaction (performance indicators 2-1, 4-1 through 4-11, 4-14) from the Army Civilian Attitude Survey. Army administered this survey biennially to random samples of civilian employees and supervisors from FY77 to FY96 and annually since FY97. In FY01, for the first time, Army surveyed all of its US-citizen civilian employees and supervisors in appropriated and non-appropriated fund positions (excluding contractor, foreign national, and National Guard technician employees) via the internet. The return rate was approximately 25%.

Performance indicators do not report results of individual survey items but rely on composites of items that measure like concepts. Individual survey item results are found in the Appendix.

Morale indicator 4-15, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Complaints was collected from the EEO Compliance and

Complaints Review Agency (EEOCCRA).

- **Work Force Representation** – We provide three general indicators of representation and four demographic indicators of new hires and interns. Readers requiring more detailed breakouts should contact Army's EEO Agency.
- **Categorization of Performance Indicators** – Functional experts at HQDA placed indicators into the various categories (e.g., Effectiveness of Civilian Personnel Administration, Effectiveness of Civilian Personnel Management). In some instances, the placement has significant implications regarding the roles of CHR professionals. For instance, items 3-1 and 3-2, measuring, respectively, grade and assignment accuracy, are considered in this evaluation to be management responsibilities.

The Next Step

We will use evaluation results presented here in developing the next HQDA CHR operational plan. Where program performance falls below established objectives, we will recommend either policy interventions or special studies to determine causes of below-par performance.