

Introduction

The *FY00 Annual Evaluation* continues the evaluation philosophy underlying the *FY96-99 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.

This year's publication eliminated the six key indicators. Three of these indicators were integrated into other sections of the report. The other key indicators were composites of existing items. They were eliminated because they did not add any new information. The *FY00 Annual Evaluation* also dropped a non-key indicator, employee tenure, because issues associated with it were no longer deemed critical, and added four new indicators: CPAC effectiveness, EEO complaints, interns, and new hires. CPAC effectiveness was added as an indicator of installation readiness. The other indicators were added as a result of Program Evaluation 21, a bottom-up review of the corporate-level CHR program evaluation system. The *FY00 Annual Evaluation* continues to attempt 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 FY00. 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. USACPEA selected review sites based upon

MACOM affiliation, with the intent of surveying each MACOM on a regular basis. It made 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. 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 sites selected for review align with the regionalization implementation schedule. They form 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 Personnel Attitude Survey. We have administered this survey biennially to random samples of civilian employees and supervisors since 1977. FY00 continued an annual administration cycle that began in FY97 to track the effects of organizational interventions such as downsizing and regionalization. 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.

As in previous years, we selected the FY00 sample from the population of Army US-citizen civilian employees and supervisors in appropriated fund positions (excluding National Guard technicians) stratified by Region, MACOM, gender, race/national origin, and white collar/blue collar. We mailed surveys to employee’s home address, continuing the procedure that we developed and tested in FY97. The return rate was 38%. 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.