

Executive Summary

The FY06 *Annual Evaluation* assesses the effectiveness of Army's civilian personnel system -- from the morale, quality and representation of the work force to the effectiveness of personnelists and managers. Where possible, performance was measured against objectives. For some indicators, where objectives were not available, we compared Army performance against DoD and Government-wide data. For other indicators, where new items were included, baseline information was reported and will be used to establish future objectives. Whenever possible, we used historical data for perspective. Key findings are reported below.

Cost/Efficiency

- Servicing ratios continued to improve, exceeding the Department of Defense (DoD) objectives (pages 1-3).
- Overall civilian strength (military function) increased and was 4 employees above target (page 4).
- Civilian personnel productivity per operating personnelist increased by 1% and per serviced customer decreased by 6% (pages 5-6).

CPA Effectiveness

- Customer satisfaction: new customer satisfaction items were developed with the 2005 administration of the Army Civilian Attitude Survey and serve as the baseline. Although both employee and supervisor satisfaction with civilian personnel service results improved somewhat over FY05 in terms of overall quality and timeliness of advice and assistance, overall favorability is still quite low, mirroring the pattern of results typically found following major organizational interventions like regionalization, BRAC, and NSPS. (page 7).
- Timeliness of benefits processing: average processing time did not meet the objective in three of the four quarters for FY06 (page 8).
- Timeliness of filling jobs: average fill-time exceeded the objective of 55 calendar days. At the end of FY06, average timeliness was 44 days. Six years ago, average fill-time was 73 days (page 9).

Management Effectiveness

- Labor-management relations: Army continues to do well in arbitration decisions: 62% favored management, 16% were either split/mitigated, and 22% favored the union. As for Unfair Labor Practices, the FLRA issued complaints in 5% of the charges (pages 10-11).
- Classification appeals: Army did not meet the 90% objective – only 80% were sustained. This was primarily due to Local National appeals to a new grading plan in USAREUR (page 12).
- Controlling Federal Employees Compensation Act claims and costs: FY06 DOL chargeback costs increased by 7.6 million while long-term injury claim rates decreased (pages 13-14).

- Estimating ACTEDS intern needs and executing allocated resources: Army executed 100% of its allocated ACTEDS intern dollars and workyears (page 15).
- Identifying emergency essential employees: Army did not meet the 90% objective. Only 84.5% of emergency essential employees in emergency essential positions signed agreements (page 16).

Work Force Morale

- Morale: New morale items and composites were developed in conjunction with the National Security Personnel System program evaluation in FY05. The overall assessment for FY06 shows mixed results on how employees and supervisors rate leadership and management, performance culture, training and development, fairness, and overall satisfaction. Results for supervisors are higher than results for employees. Satisfaction with leadership and management was rated highest by both employees and supervisors. (page 17).
- Formal grievances (administrative and negotiated procedures): The number of formal grievances increased slightly in FY06, but is still within multi-year range (pages 18-19).
- Percent DA final findings of discrimination: The FY06 percentage increased from 2.8% in FY05 to 3.5%. The percent findings are still lower than FY01 - 04. Most complaints are resolved locally (page 20).

Work Force Quality

- Education level: The percent of DA interns with a college degree has dropped by 6.4 percentage points – from 83.9% in FY03 to 77.5% this year. The percent of local interns with college degrees in FY06 was 73.9%. The education level of civilian Army professional, technical, administrative, and clerical employees has been reasonably constant over the years. Army's education levels were similar to DOD but lower than the Federal Government. Army's education level for professional series was nearly identical to DOD and the Federal Government (pages 22-24).
- The rate of incentive awards is higher than the Federal Government and lower than DOD (page 25).
- Army's rate of disciplinary and adverse actions continues to be lower than DOD or Federal Government rates (page 26).

Work Force Representation

- Army's percentage of minority employees remained close to last year's. The percentage has increased slightly since FY96. It was higher than the DOD percentage but slightly lower than the Federal Government (pages 27-29).
- Army's percentage of female employees was about the same as last year's. The percentage is 1.7 percentage points lower than in FY96. It was slightly higher than the

DOD percentage and 5.8 percentage points lower than that of the Federal Government (page 30).

- Army's percentage of employees with disabilities decreased by .7 percentage points and is still within 1 percentage point of where it was in FY96. It is higher than both the DOD and Federal Government percents (page 31).
- Army's percentage of female intern new hires continued to be higher than local interns (page 32).
- The percentage of Army DA intern minority new hires is higher than local intern for Black and American Indian/Alaskan Native. The percentage of local interns is higher than DA interns for Hispanic and Asian American/Pacific Islander (page 33).
- Army's percentage of female new hires increased 3% from last year; however, it is 5 percentage points lower than in FY99 (page 34).
- Army is hiring minority employees at a rate that is similar to their overall representation in the workforce (page 35).