

# Civil Service Commission

## FY 2016 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 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Estimate/Actual	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>Output</b>					
Grievance appeals involving final and binding decisions closed	15	16	20 / 14	20	20
Grievance appeals involving advisory decisions closed	5	5	5 / 5	5	5
<b>Efficiency</b>					
Staff hours per case in final and binding decisions	20	20	20 / 20	20	20
<b>Service Quality</b>					
Average waiting period for a hearing before the CSC for dismissals (in months)	2.7	2.7	2.0 / 2.4	2.3	2.3
Average waiting period for a hearing before the CSC for binding/adverse discipline other than dismissals (in months)	2.4	3.2	2.5 / 2.4	2.5	2.5
Average waiting period for a hearing before the CSC for advisory cases (in months)	2.1	3.0	2.0 / 2.4	2.3	2.3
Average days between conclusion of hearing and rendering written decision (in days)	7	7	27 / 7	7	7
<b>Outcome</b>					
Average meetings required to adjudicate appeals	2	2	2 / 2	2	2

# Civil Service Commission

## FY 2016 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 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Estimate/Actual	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>Output</b>					
Customer contacts about ADR	1,420	2,118	2,000 / 2,200	2,000	2,000
Orientations/Information briefings held about ADR	6	25	15 / 8	15	15
Employees receiving conflict management training	301	351	350 / 419	400	450
<b>Efficiency</b>					
Cost per customer contact for information on ADR	\$3.75	\$4.00	\$4.00 / \$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00
Cost per customer trained in ADR program	\$6.75	\$6.50	\$6.50 / \$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.50
<b>Service Quality</b>					
Percent of participants indicating satisfaction with ADR training	90.0%	85.0%	90.0% / 90.0%	90.0%	90.0%
<b>Outcome</b>					
Percent of workforce that attended information briefings or training about ADR	4.8%	4.2%	9.0% / 9.0%	9.0%	9.0%

# Civil Service Commission

## FY 2016 Adopted Budget Plan: Performance Measures

---

**Objective**

To serve at least 484 participants in the ADR process, reflecting 3.9 percent of the merit workforce.

**Performance Indicators**

Indicator	Prior Year Actuals			Current Estimate	Future Estimate
	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Estimate/Actual	FY 2015	FY 2016
<b>Output</b>					
Customer contacts resulting in participation in ADR services	410	518	450 / 484	484	484
<b>Efficiency</b>					
Cost per session for ADR services	\$8.00	\$6.90	\$6.90 / \$6.90	\$6.90	\$6.90
<b>Service Quality</b>					
Percent of participants and clients indicating satisfaction with ADR services	80.0%	80.0%	80.0% / 86.0%	85.0%	85.0%
<b>Outcome</b>					
Percent of workforce that participated in a conflict resolution service	3.8%	3.4%	3.7% / 3.9%	3.9%	3.9%