Office of Employee Appeals  
OEA (CH0)

MISSION
The Office of Employee Appeals (OEA) is an independent agency of the District of Columbia Government created by the DC Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act (CMPA) of 1978 (DC Code 1-601.01 et seq.). Our mission is to administer the CMPA by adjudicating employee appeals and rendering impartial decisions with sound legal reasoning in a timely manner.

SUMMARY OF SERVICES
In accordance with DC Official Code §1-606.03, the Office of Employee Appeals adjudicates the following types of personnel actions: (a) An employee may appeal a final agency decision affecting a performance rating which results in removal of the employee (pursuant to subchapter XIII-A of this chapter), an adverse action for cause that results in removal, reduction in force (pursuant to subchapter XXIV of this chapter), reduction in grade, placement on enforced leave, or suspension for 10 days or more (pursuant to subchapter XVI-A of this chapter) to the Office upon the record and pursuant to other rules and regulations which the Office may issue.

 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

✓ OEA issued 333 Initial Decisions and 34 Opinions and Orders.

✓ Administrative Judges issued decisions more efficiently by compiling monthly reports.

✓ Appeals filed were simultaneously assigned to a Mediator and Administrative Judge.
OVERALL AGENCY PERFORMANCE

TOTAL MEASURES AND INITIATIVES – PENDING FINAL REVIEW

[Rated Measures and Initiatives chart with 80% Fully Achieved, 20% Partially Achieved, and 0% Not Achieved]

Note: Workload and Baseline Measurements are not included
Performance Initiatives – Assessment Details

Performance Assessment Key:
- Green: Fully achieved
- Yellow: Partially achieved
- Red: Not achieved
- Gray: Data not reported

Adjudication

**OBJECTIVE 1: Render impartial, legally sound decisions in a timely manner.**

**INITIATIVE 1.1: Provide an estimated date of issuance for Initial Decisions**

**This initiative was fully achieved.** At the beginning of Fiscal Year 2014, a spreadsheet was developed to capture certain information which pertained to the process for issuing Initial Decisions. Among the information contained within the spreadsheet were the dates on which the most recent action on an appeal had been taken and the approximate date on which the Administrative Judge believed he or she could issue the decision. Based on this information as well as the other information contained within the spreadsheet, the Administrative Judges were able to see how long they were taking to issue a decision and thereby determine how to process an appeal so that a decision could be issued in a timelier manner.

**INITIATIVE 1.2: Utilize a Law Clerk to assist the Administrative Judges.**

**This initiative was fully achieved.** During Fiscal Year 2014, the Office hired a Law Clerk who worked exclusively with the Administrative Judges unit. The assistance which the Law Clerk provided to the Administrative Judges unit culminated in the Office issuing more Initial Decisions than it had projected would be issued thereby helping to reduce the backlog of cases.

**OBJECTIVE 2: Streamline the adjudication process.**

**INITIATIVE 2.1: Conduct an examination of the Office’s procedures.**

**This Initiative was partially achieved.** The Certified Public Manager began research for which methodology could be used for the agency from the Six Sigma curriculum. The first phase is expected to be fully complete by December 31, 2014.

**OBJECTIVE 3: Maintain a system to allow the public to have access to all decisions rendered by the Office.**

**INITIATIVE 3.1: Issue a twice-yearly newsletter.**

**This initiative was partially achieved.** The newsletter is still in the draft phase and will be finalized and issued by December 31, 2014.
### Key Performance Indicators – Details

**Performance Assessment Key:**
- [ ] Fully achieved
- [ ] Partially achieved
- [ ] Not achieved
- [ ] Data not reported
- [ ] Workload Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>Measure Name</th>
<th>FY 2013 YE Actual</th>
<th>FY 2014 YE Target</th>
<th>FY 2014 YE Revised Target</th>
<th>FY 2014 YE Actual</th>
<th>FY 2014 YE Rating</th>
<th>Budget Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Number of Initial Decisions Issued</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>134.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Number of Opinions and Orders Issued</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>136%</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Time Required to Complete Adjudications</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>107.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Time Required to Resolve Petitions for Review</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Percent of Cases Reversing Agency Decisions¹</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>6.72%</td>
<td>Not Rated Workload Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Percentage of OEA decisions upheld by D.C. Superior Court or D.C. Court of Appeals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>89.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Number of Petitions for Appeal Filed</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Not Rated Workload Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Number of Petitions for Review Filed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Not Rated Workload Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Number of Superior Court Case Filings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not Rated Workload Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUDICATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This workload measure was inadvertently entered into the FY14 Performance Plan as a Key Performance Indicator.