



INTRODUCTION

The FY09 *Annual Evaluation* continues the evaluation philosophy underlying the FY96-08 *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 *FY09 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 background data used in developing the performance indicators. Command and CHR regional breakouts, 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 Commands. 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 – Indicators are collected from various internal sources to address regulatory and procedural compliance.
- Morale Indicators – Morale and customer satisfaction metrics (performance indicators 2-1 and 4-1) are collected from the 2009 Installation Status Report and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey. 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. 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. More detailed breakouts are available from Army’s EEO Agency.
- Categorization of Performance Indicators – Functional experts at HQDA placed indicators into 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, measuring, respectively, grade and assignment accuracy, are considered in this evaluation to be management responsibilities.

The Next Step

Evaluation results are used to develop CHR plans and policies. Where program performance falls below established objectives, we will recommend either policy interventions or special studies to determine causes of below-par performance.