

## Executive Summary

The FY03 *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. Whenever possible, we used historical data for perspective. Key findings are reported below.

### Cost/Efficiency

- Servicing ratios were mixed. While the number of operating-level personnelists stayed about the same, the number of administrative support increased by 29% and the number of staff-level personnelists decreased by 6%. The increase in administrative support comes exclusively from operating foreign nationals. (pages 1-4)
- Overall civilian strength (military function) declined and was 670 employees below target. (page 5)
- As measured by the Civilian Productivity Reporting System (CivPro), productivity per personnelist dropped back to FY01 levels due to system shutdowns in May and July for Mod-to-Mod and 11i implementation. (pages 6-7)

### CPA Effectiveness

- Customer satisfaction: improvement continues. Supervisor customer satisfaction is up approximately 26% over the last two survey cycles. Employee customer satisfaction is up almost as much (21%). (page 8)
- Timeliness of benefits processing: average processing time met the objective in each of the four quarters in FY03. Army exceeded the OPM standard by a wide margin. (page 9)
- Timeliness of filling jobs: average fill-time dropped by 8 days from 58 to 50. Four years ago, average fill-time was 73 days. (page 10)
- Regulatory and procedural compliance: Army met both the management-employee relations and staffing objectives. (page 11-12)\*
- Data quality: Army met the all three OPM, HQ ACPERS, and DCPDS data quality objectives. (pages 13-15)

### Management Effectiveness

- Grade and assignment accuracy: grade accuracy improved and is above the 90% objective for the fourth year in a row. Assignment accuracy, however, is lower than the 90% objective for the fourth year in a row. (pages 16-17)\*
- Regulatory and procedural compliance of TAPES: management continues to badly lag in this area, missing the objective for the fourth year in a row. (page 18)\*

- Labor-management relations: Army continues to do well in avoiding Unfair Labor Practice complaints. As for arbitration decisions, 56% favored management, 27% were either split/mitigated, and 17% favored the union. (pages 19-20)
- Classification appeals: the number of appeals continues their long-term declining trend. Although Army did not meet the objective, it would have met the 90% objective had two more appeals been sustained. (page 21)
- Controlling Federal Employees Compensation Act claims and costs: FY03 DOL chargeback costs increased by just over 6 million over FY02. Lost time has increased for the second year in a row. The number and rate of long-term injury claims increased in FY03. (pages 22-23)
- Estimating ACTEDS intern needs and executing allocated resources: Army executed 100% of its allocated ACTEDS intern dollars and 94% of its distributed workyears. (page 24)
- Identifying emergency essential employees: For the first time in three years Army did not meet the 90% objective. (page 25)

### **Work Force Morale**

- Morale: In FY01 morale improved across all dimensions, and in some areas dramatically. The most recent FY03 survey shows morale continuing to hold at FY01 levels. Improvements over baseline objectives were met for all morale items. Supervisor morale is higher than employee morale. Employees and supervisors are relatively satisfied with their jobs, careers, co-workers, training and development opportunities and supervisors. Career satisfaction is lower than job satisfaction. Employees are relatively dissatisfied with awards and recognition, disciplinary procedures, and promotion systems. (pages 26-36)
- Formal grievances: The number of formal grievances continues to be at multi-year lows. (pages 37-38)
- Percent DA final findings of discrimination: The percentage declined in FY03 by .6 percent over FY02. It is now at approximately 4.5%. The relative rise over the past three years may be due to the fact that in FY01 administrative judges were given the authority to render rather than recommend decisions. (page 39)

### **Work Force Quality**

- The education level of civilian Army professional, technical, administrative, and clerical employees has been reasonably constant since FY92. Army's education level was similar to that of DOD but was lower than that of the Federal Government. Army's education level for professional series was nearly identical to that of DOD and that of the Federal Government. Approximately 84% of centrally funded interns and 82% of locally funded interns had college degrees in FY03. (pages 40-43)
- The rate of incentive awards has nearly doubled in ten years. (page 44)

- Army's rate of disciplinary and adverse actions rose from 6.5 to 9.7 actions per 1000 employees. This represents a big increase relative to previous years. Historically, Army's rate has been lower than the rates in DOD and the Federal Government (page 45). Within Army the rate of disciplinary and adverse actions is lower for minority than for non-minority employees. (page 46)

### **Work Force Representation**

- Army's percentage of minority employees was approximately the same as last year's. The percentage has increased slightly since FY92. It was approximately the same as the DOD percentage but lower than that of the Federal Government. (pages 47-49)
- Army's percentage of female employees was the same as last year's. The percentage is about the same as it was in FY93. It was about the same as the DOD percentage and about five percentage points lower than that of the Federal Government. (page 50)
- Army's percentage of disabled employees decreased slightly, but is still within one percentage point of where it was in FY92. It was slightly lower than the DOD percentage but higher than that of the Federal Government. (page 51)
- Army's percentage of female intern new hires continued to be higher than local interns. (page 52)
- Army's percentage of minority DA interns and local intern new hires declined somewhat in FY03. (page 53)
- Army's percentage of FY03 female new hires was one percentage point lower than FY02. This is within one-half of one percent of female representation in the total workforce. (page 54)
- Army's overall percentage of FY03 minority new hires stayed about the same in FY03. Gains in Hispanic hiring were somewhat offset by decreases in black new hires. (page 55)

\*Findings based on USCPEA site visits do not represent total Army performance.