

APPENDIX G

## **CIVILIAN PERSONNEL ADVISORY CENTER (CPAC) SUBPLAN**

- 1. Purpose.** To supplement the guidance contained in the Detroit District Quality Management Plan, relative to the quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC) of human resources management (HRM) programs and activities within the U.S. Army Engineer District, Detroit.
- 2. References.** See Appendix G, Item 2, of CELRDC 5-1-1.
- 3. Definitions.**
  - a. Quality Program Evaluation. Evaluation of HRM programs or their components, based on feedback or data obtained from employees, supervisors, senior leaders, union officials, CPAC members, Civilian Personnel Operations Center (CPOC) partners, data bases, etc.
  - b. Performance Indicators. Evaluation of HRM programs or their components based on quantifiable data.
- 4. Quality Control Responsibilities.**
  - a. General. The District Commander is responsible for civilian personnel actions and HRM programs. The CPAC and CPOC act for the Commander in the administration of the HRM program. Managers are responsible for many HRM functions, and may be delegated certain authorities, e.g., the authority to identify and approve training, and to classify positions.
  - b. Quality Control Activities. During FY03, the CPAC will be responsible for developing, refining, and instituting quality control processes relative to the following program areas. In subsequent years, the CPAC will help senior leaders integrate many of these QC activities within their own organizations, while maintaining oversight of the HRM portion of the District's Quality Management Plan. Evaluation of these items will be accomplished through either quality program evaluation (Q) or the review of performance indicators (P).
    - ◆ Evaluation of customer satisfaction with CPAC and CPOC service (Q). Measured with the use of Customer Service Response Cards and questionnaires administered by CELRD-HR.
    - ◆ Communications with customers (Q). Measured informally through feedback from customers, and by periodically reviewing the quality and quantity of our information-sharing efforts.

- ◆ Usefulness of Army-developed User Guides. Measured by directly querying users, i.e., supervisors, administrative staff, and CPAC.
- ◆ TAPES – Tie-in to USACE Strategic Goals and LRD Campaign Plan (Q). Measured by senior raters upon review of both TAPES support forms and evaluation reports (appraisals).
- ◆ Delegated classification authority (Q/P). Measured informally through observation of and feedback about managers' exercise of their authority. More formal measurement will include analysis of classification advisories issued by the CPOC, classification reviews (inspections) conducted by higher authority, and analysis of trends in areas such as average grade and supervisor/employee ratio.
- ◆ Delegated training authority (Q/P). Measured informally through observation of and feedback about managers' exercise of their authority.
- ◆ Pay-related actions (Q/P). Measured informally through customer feedback about pay accuracy. Formal measurement of the quality of pay actions is the responsibility of the CPOC.
- ◆ Retirement actions (Q/P). Measured informally through customer feedback. Formal measurement will include review of retirement action timeliness, both locally and by higher authority.
- ◆ Supervisor/employee ratio goals (P). Measured by statistical analysis, i.e., District performance compared to higher authority requirements.
- ◆ High-grade controls (P). Measured by statistical analysis, i.e., District performance compared to higher authority requirements.
- ◆ Implementing Leadership initiatives (Q). Measured informally by management review of local initiatives, and by continual assessment of program's relevance by senior leaders.