

Civil Service Commission

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Civil Service Commission

Goal

To endeavor to resolve grievances at the earliest possible opportunity, encourage mediation and settlement and identify and support opportunities for delivery of training to employees and management prior to Commission hearings.

Objective

To ensure due process of appellants and to process the case workload in an effective and efficient manner by adjudicating appeals in an average of 2 meetings.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Grievance appeals involving final and binding decisions closed	17	15	20 / 16	20	20
Grievance appeals involving advisory decisions closed	5	5	5 / 5	5	5
Efficiency					
Staff hours per case in final and binding decisions	20	20	20 / 20	20	20
Service Quality					
Average waiting period for a hearing before the CSC for dismissals (in months)	3.0	2.7	2.0 / 2.7	2.0	2.0
Average waiting period for a hearing before the CSC for binding/adverse discipline other than dismissals (in months)	3.0	2.4	2.0 / 3.2	2.5	2.5
Average waiting period for a hearing before the CSC for advisory cases (in months)	2.0	2.1	2.0 / 3.0	2.0	2.0
Average days between conclusion of hearing and rendering written decision (in days)	7	7	7 / 7	7	7
Outcome					
Average meetings required to adjudicate appeals	2	2	2 / 2	2	2

Civil Service Commission

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Alternative Dispute Resolution Program

Goal

The Civil Service Commission develops, monitors and evaluates the County's Performance Management appeals through the use of the Alternative Dispute Resolution process. ADR staff provides formal mediation, conflict coaching and conflict resolution opportunities for County employees in workplace disputes and disagreements, in addition to administering appeals of performance evaluations.

Objective

To reach 9.0 percent of the workforce with information or training about the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program, toward a future target of 10 percent.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Customer contacts about ADR	1,650	1,420	1,500 / 2,118	2,000	2,000
Orientations/Information briefings held about ADR	2	6	6 / 25	15	15
Employees receiving conflict management training	411	301	350 / 351	350	350
Efficiency					
Cost per customer contact for information on ADR	\$3.50	\$3.75	\$4.00 / \$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00
Cost per customer trained in ADR program	\$6.50	\$6.75	\$6.50 / \$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.50
Service Quality					
Percent of participants indicating satisfaction with ADR training	92.0%	90.0%	85.0% / 85.0%	90.0%	90.0%
Outcome					
Percent of workforce that attended information briefings or training about ADR	4.1%	4.8%	9.0% / 4.2%	9.0%	9.0%

Civil Service Commission

FY 2015 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

Objective

To serve at least 450 participants in the ADR process, reflecting 3.7 percent of the merit workforce.

Performance Indicators

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2011 Actual	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Estimate/Actual	FY 2014	FY 2015
Output					
Customer contacts resulting in participation in ADR services	410	410	450 / 518	450	450
Efficiency					
Cost per session for ADR services	\$6.50	\$8.00	\$6.90 / \$6.90	\$6.90	\$6.90
Service Quality					
Percent of participants and clients indicating satisfaction with ADR services	82.0%	80.0%	80.0% / 80.0%	80.0%	80.0%
Outcome					
Percent of workforce that participated in a conflict resolution service	3.7%	3.8%	3.7% / 3.4%	3.7%	3.7%