

## Cross-Goal Strategy on Management

### Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.1: Maintain and strengthen financial integrity and management and internal controls

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
<b>4.1.A.</b> Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion <sup>1</sup>	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
<b>4.1.B.</b> Achieve and Maintain Compliance With the <i>Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002</i> <sup>2</sup>	NC	NC	C	NC	C	NC	C	NC
<b>4.1.C.</b> Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30 <sup>3</sup>	60	66	70	61	80	36	90	20

U = Unqualified (clean), NC = Non-compliant, C = Compliant.

Sources:

<sup>1</sup>Independent Auditors' annual financial statement audit report and related reports on internal control and compliance with laws and regulations.

<sup>2</sup>U.S. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General, annual *Federal Information Security Management Act* audit.

<sup>3</sup>U.S. Department of Education's Grant Administration and Payment System.

#### Measure 4.1.A.: Maintain an Unqualified (Clean) Audit Opinion

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department earned a ninth consecutive unqualified or "clean" audit opinion from independent auditors. The FY 2009 and FY 2010 targets were met for this measure.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Independent auditors follow professional standards and conduct the audit under the oversight of the Department's Office of Inspector General. There are no data limitations.

**Target Context:** An unqualified or "clean" opinion means that the Department's financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Department in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States.

#### Measure 4.1.B.: Achieve and Maintain Compliance With the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002*

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department's Office of Inspector General has determined the Department to be non-compliant in fulfilling the requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* each year since the first evaluation in FY 2003, and this determination for FY 2010 means that the Department did not meet its target. However, the Department is making progress in addressing OIG's concerns.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. § 3545, the Department's Office of Inspector General annually evaluates the effectiveness of the Department's information security program and practices. The evaluation includes testing of the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of the agency's information systems, as well as

an assessment of compliance with requirements of the *Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002* and related information security policies based upon the testing performed.

**Target Context:** The Department has made continued progress in addressing OIG's concerns over the years. In instances where OIG has identified areas where improvements were needed, the Department has provided remediation to put in place effective security policies and procedures to protect the Department's IT assets.

#### **Measure 4.1.C.: Percentage of New Discretionary Grants Awarded by June 30**

**Analysis of Progress:** In FY 2010 and 2009, the targets were not met. In FY 2010, the total number of new discretionary grants awarded was 4,800, which was a significant increase over 3,110 grants awarded in FY 2009. Despite the percentage of grant awards at the June 30 mark, by August 31, 78 percent of discretionary grants were awarded in FY 2009 and 65 percent were awarded in FY 2010, compared with 82 percent in FY 2008.

Concerted efforts by Department program managers to award new discretionary grants earlier in the fiscal year resulted in 66 percent of new FY 2007 awards being issued by June 30 of that fiscal year (three-fourths of the year complete). This exceeded the 60 percent FY 2007 target for this measure. In the previous four fiscal years, no more than 49 percent of new discretionary grants had been awarded by June 30. In FY 2008, the ambitious 70 percent target was not achieved by June 30, but the 61 percent award rate far exceeded the rates prior to FY 2007.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** The Department's Office of the Chief Financial Officer regularly collects data via the Grant Administration and Payment System from principal offices with responsibilities for directing discretionary grant programs. During the second half of the fiscal year, data are distributed frequently to senior Department officials to ensure that planned award deadlines are met successfully.

**Target Context:** The Department has made a concerted effort in the past three years to expedite the processing of new discretionary grant awards. The Department aims to streamline the process further in future years to enable program staff to spend more time on program monitoring and performance improvements. The 2006 actual data served as the baseline for this measure.

**Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.2: Improve the strategic management of the Department's human capital**

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Percentage of Employees Believing That:								
<b>4.2.A. Leaders Generate High Levels of Motivation and Commitment<sup>1*</sup></b>	31	37	34	33	40	37	43	41
<b>4.2.B. Managers Review and Evaluate the Organization's Progress Towards Meeting Its Goals and Objectives<sup>1*</sup></b>	56	58	59	56	68	51	71	60
<b>4.2.C. Steps Are Taken to Deal With a Poor Performer Who Cannot or Will Not Improve<sup>1</sup></b>	28	29	31	28	34	26	37	29
<b>4.2.D. Department Policies and Programs Promote Diversity in the Workplace<sup>1*</sup></b>	49	48	52	51	56	48	59	49
<b>4.2.E. They Are Held Accountable for Achieving Results<sup>1*</sup></b>	82	82	83	84	85	84	86	82
<b>4.2.F. The Workforce Has the Job-Relevant Knowledge and Skills Necessary to Accomplish Organizational Goals<sup>1*</sup></b>	69	70	71	70	72	68	74	68
<b>4.2.G. Average Number of Days to Hire Is at or Below the OPM 45-Day Hiring Model for Non-SES<sup>2**</sup></b>	45	27	45	28	45	26	45	22
<b>4.2.H. Percentage of Employees With Performance Standards in Place Within 30 Days of Start of Current Rating Cycle<sup>3</sup></b>	85	59	90	93	95	95	97	91
<b>4.2.I. Percentage of Employees Who Have Ratings of Record in the System Within 30 Days of Close of Rating Cycle<sup>4</sup></b>	90	97	95	98	99	96	100	96

\*These metrics are based on the percentage of favorable response to questions on the Federal Human Capital Survey and the Department's Annual Employee Survey. The Department's 2006 responses (Departmentwide) are used as the baseline.

\*\*The Office of Personnel Management 45-day hiring model for non-SES tracks the hiring process from the date of vacancy announcement closing to the date a job offer is extended. It is measured in workdays, not calendar days. The average is based on the total number of hires made within a specified period of time (quarterly).

## Sources:

<sup>1</sup> Federal Human Capital Survey.

<sup>2</sup> 2010 Employee Viewpoint Survey.

<sup>3</sup> Data from the Education Department Performance Appraisal System, ED's in-house performance management software.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of the Interior's Federal Personnel Payroll System.

NOTES: The Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) Regulation 5 CFR 250—"Personnel Management in Agencies: Employee Surveys" (specifically 250.303 (1)) requires agencies to annually evaluate and post their results on their public domains and send to OPM. The Regulation can be found at: <http://www.opm.gov/fedregis/2006/71-082406-49983-a.pdf>.

An evaluation of the Department's 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey results (Narrative Report) determined that the Department's two lowest scoring survey dimensions, when compared to the rest of the government, are Talent Management and Performance Culture. The evaluation and results can be found on at: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/otherplanrpts.html>, under the Office of Management.

### **Measure 4.2.A.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Leaders Generate High Levels of Motivation and Commitment**

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department of Education saw progress on this measure for the third consecutive year. In 2010, the Department closed the gap between the target score and actual score to within 2 percent.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** These data were collected and reviewed by the United States Office of Personnel Management (OPM) in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

**Target Context:** The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

### **Measure 4.2.B.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Managers Review and Evaluate the Organization's Progress Towards Meeting Its Goals and Objectives**

**Analysis of Progress:** After two years of decreasing scores, the Department saw a 9 percent improvement on this survey item in 2010. If the Department can duplicate this improvement over the next two surveys, scores will exceed targets in 2012.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

**Target Context:** The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

### **Measure 4.2.C.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Steps Are Taken to Deal With a Poor Performer Who Cannot or Will Not Improve**

**Analysis of Progress:** After two years of decreasing scores, the Department saw a 3 percent improvement on this survey item in 2010. The Department will need to make significant progress on this measure in order to reach its target in 2011.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

**Target Context:** The percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this survey item.

**Measure 4.2.D.: Percentage of Employees Believing That Department Policies and Programs Promote Diversity in the Workplace**

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department saw a slight increase on this item in 2010 but still remains 10 percent below the target. Significant progress will be required to reach the target goal in 2011 or 2012.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

**Target Context:** The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

**Measure 4.2.E.: Percentage of Employees Believing That They Are Held Accountable for Achieving Results**

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department saw a slight decrease on this survey item in 2010 and fell 4 percent below the target. The Department will need a 5 percent increase in positive responses to this survey item in 2011 to meet its target.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

**Target Context:** The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

**Measure 4.2.F.: Percentage of Employees Believing That the Workforce Has the Job-Relevant Knowledge and Skills Necessary to Accomplish Organizational Goals**

**Analysis of Progress:** The Department saw no increase or decrease in 2010 on this survey item. The Department fell 6 percent short of the target and will need an 8 percent improvement in 2011 to meet the target goal.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** These data were collected and reviewed by the OPM in the 2010 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey. There was a second review done by the Human Capital Planning, Policy, and Accountability Staff.

**Target Context:** The target represents the percentage of employees who gave a positive response to this item on the Employee Viewpoint Survey.

**Measure 4.2.G.: Average Number of Days to Hire Is at or Below the OPM 45-Day Hiring Model for Non-SES**

**Analysis of Progress:** For FY 2010, the Department averaged 22 days to hire, which is below the 45-day average hiring model. Target is exceeded.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** For this measure, the Department tracks progress against the 45-day hiring model for positions other than the Senior Executive Service. The model tracks the hiring

process from the closing date of the vacancy announcement to the date a job offer is extended. It is measured in business days rather than calendar days and is calculated quarterly based on an average process length of all hires completed within that quarter.

**Target Context:** The Department met the goal of the OPM hiring model repeatedly: in 2007, with an average hiring time of 27 business days; in 2008, with a revised average hiring time of 28 business days; and in 2009, with an average hiring time of 26 business days. In 2008, the Department restructured the Human Resources Services office, which enabled additional resources to focus on improving the staffing process. Improved interaction over time between the Human Resources Specialists and principal office managers is also credited with enabling hiring process improvements. Furthermore, Human Resources Services tracks the hiring cycles for each principal office and provides them with monthly reports on hiring progress. These actions provide continual incentives to shorten the hiring process.

When the Department's revised strategic plan was being developed, the median of the average hiring time for the four most recent quarters then known (July 2005 through June 2006) was 54 days. This data point was used to establish the 2006 baseline for this measure, which indicated that the Department had not achieved the standard.

#### **Measure 4.2.H.: Percentage of Employees With Performance Standards in Place Within 30 Days of Start of Current Rating Cycle**

**Analysis of Progress:** The FY 2010 target was not met. The 2009 target was met. The percentage of performance plans in place within 30 days of the start of the rating cycle has significantly increased since 2008. During 2008, 2009, and 2010, the percentages have been fluctuating around the 90 percent range. In 2010 the Department experienced a slight drop in percentage points; the Department will continue to monitor and enforce the need for plans within 30 days of the start of the rating cycle.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** To be considered successful on this measure, a Department employee or his or her supervisor must establish performance standards that align with the *Strategic Plan* and are approved by the supervisor. These standards must be entered no more than 30 days into the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure.

**Target Context:** The Department fell slightly below the target, specifically having timely performance plans in place for FY 2010. The 2010 performance cycle was a year of presidential transition, which resulted in new supervisors and managers becoming acclimated to ED's performance appraisal system.

#### **Measure 4.2.I.: Percentage of Employees Who Have Ratings of Record in the System Within 30 Days of Close of Rating Cycle**

**Analysis of Progress:** The FY 2010 and FY 2009 targets were not met. The FY 2008 target was exceeded.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** To be considered successful on this measure, an employee rating of the level of success achieved on established performance standards must be entered no more than 30 days after the fiscal year covered by the measure. SES employees are not included in this measure.

**Measures for Cross-Goal Strategy, Objective 4.3: Achieve budget and performance integration to link funding decisions to results**

	Results							
	FY 2007		FY 2008		FY 2009		FY 2010	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
<b>4.3.A.</b> Percentage of Department Program Dollars in Programs That Demonstrate Effectiveness in Terms of Outcomes, Either on Performance Indicators or through Rigorous Evaluations	79	86	86	88	86	88	Discontinued	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, analysis of Program Assessment Rating Tool findings.

**Analysis of Progress:** The FY 2009 target was met.

**Data Quality and Timeliness:** Calculation was based on dollars in Department programs with at least an *Adequate* PART rating in the given year divided by dollars in all Department programs rated through that year. The PART assessment cycle occurred during the spring and summer and OMB makes scores public via <http://www.expectmore.gov>. OMB suspended the PART process during FY 2009 and the measure was discontinued in FY 2010.

**Target Context:** As of October 2008, 91 funded Department programs had undergone a Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) review, representing 98 percent of the Department’s FY 2008 budget authority for programs subject to the PART. The FY 2009 results were static and the PART program was discontinued in FY 2010, as is this measure.