

Introduction

The *FY06 Annual Evaluation* continues the evaluation philosophy underlying the *FY96-05 Annual Evaluations*, focusing on Army-wide program outcomes and results. The evaluation is part of a larger effort to improve business practices in the Army civilian personnel program.

The *FY06 Annual Evaluation* balances all aspects of CHR, from the effectiveness of service delivery to how well Army supervisors and managers exercise their responsibility to lead and care for the civilian work force. Analyses presented provide critical feedback for sound policy decisions, strategic planning, and future CHR program guidance.

Organization

The *Annual Evaluation* consists of the following sections:

- **Executive Summary** - A synopsis of overall results for all performance indicators.
- **The Year in Review** - A narrative of events and accomplishments that impact the CHR program and the civilian work force. Although the Year in Review is non-evaluative, it provides context for the analyses presented in subsequent sections.
- **Performance Indicators** – An individual report on CHR performance against 30 metrics designed to inform the Army leadership of CHR program health. 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. All metrics are presented with accompanying analyses.

- **Appendix** – A section showing much of the data used in the development of 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. 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 are 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 (CPEA) on-site surveys ordinarily provide data for the items dealing with regulatory and procedural compliance (e.g., staffing, management employee relations, classification, and performance appraisal regulatory and compliance performance indicators). CPEA did not conduct any on-site reviews in FY06 because they were selected as Executive Agent to lead, plan, conduct, and report on a review for the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) performance management system.
- **Morale Indicators** – Morale and customer satisfaction metrics (performance indicators 2-1 and 4-1) are collected from the Army Civilian Attitude Survey. Historically, this survey has been administered to samples of civilian employees and supervisors according to the following schedule: every two years from FY77 to FY96, every year from FY97 to FY01, and every two years since then. Currently, the survey is a census: all US-citizen and local national workforces are eligible to take the survey over the web. The census method allows for drill-down results reportable at the lowest organizational levels in Army.

Morale and customer satisfaction performance indicators are not

reported on the basis of individual survey items. Rather, reports are based on “composites” of items that measure the same concept. Individual survey item results are found in the Appendix.

The FY06 survey covers individual items and composites used to evaluate the National Security Personnel System (NSPS). This version of the survey is expected to be in effect through FY10. The FY05 survey served as a baseline assessment of pre-NSPS perceptions.

The EEO Compliance and Complaints Review Agency (EEOCCRA) provides the morale indicator covering Equal Employment Opportunity.

- **Work Force Representation** – We provide three general representation indicators 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., Civilian Personnel Administration Effectiveness, Civilian Personnel Management Effectiveness). In some instances, the placement has significant implications regarding the roles of CHR professionals. For instance, regulatory and compliance indicators, when evaluated by CPEA, 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 CHR Performance Plan. Where program performance falls below established objectives, we will recommend either policy interventions or special studies to determine causes of below-par performance.