



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

July 21, 2016

OIG-16-049

MEMORANDUM FOR SHERYL R. MORROW
COMMISSIONER
BUREAU OF THE FISCAL SERVICE

FROM: James L. Lisle, Jr. /s/
Acting Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audit

SUBJECT: Treatment of Legacy Financial Management Service
Employees

This memorandum presents the results of our audit of the treatment of employees at the Bureau of the Fiscal Service (Fiscal Service) who were formerly employees of the Financial Management Service (legacy FMS). We performed this work in response to Senate Report 114-97,¹ which directed our office to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations (Committee) concerning the treatment of legacy FMS employees at Fiscal Service with special attention given to whether any employees had faced intimidation, demotion, or actions that would discourage the employees from continuing their employment with Fiscal Service. Accordingly, we conducted an audit with the objective of assessing the treatment of legacy FMS employees consistent with the Committee's directive.

As discussed in more detail below, we found no evidence of widespread adverse action against legacy FMS employees. However, there were concerns raised by some employees during our interviews with respect to fear of demotion, impact on job responsibilities, and fear of management's reaction to expressing concerns over the consolidation plan.

In performing our work, we analyzed legacy FMS employee information, along with summary reporting of National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU) grievances, and Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaints. In addition, we conducted interviews with key personnel in Fiscal Service management, NTEU, and 25 legacy FMS employees. The 25 legacy FMS employees were those who came to us or those we sought out after they were mentioned by others. Overall, they did not constitute a representative sample of legacy FMS employees.

¹ Senate Report 114-97, *Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill 2016*: (July 30, 2015).

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

On May 9, 2016, we briefed Committee staff on our audit objectives, scope, and methodology and interim audit results, which are now final and summarized in this memorandum. Our briefing document is provided in Attachment 1 of this memorandum. It should be noted that we do not plan to immediately undertake the next steps described on slide 25 of the briefing document. Rather, we plan to include audit follow-up on the treatment of legacy FMS employees in our annual audit plan.

Background

In October 2012, FMS and the Bureau of the Public Debt (BPD) were consolidated and designated as Fiscal Service. Fiscal Service initially estimated that the consolidation would save a total of \$96 million over five years, primarily by eliminating duplicative positions and relocating approximately 450 employees from Hyattsville, Maryland to Parkersburg, West Virginia or Kansas City, Missouri.²

Due to concerns raised by members of the Maryland Congressional delegation regarding the relocation plan, Fiscal Service delayed the employee relocation until December 31, 2019. In the interim, Fiscal Service reorganized job functions, as needed, to more efficiently execute Fiscal Service's mission. As a result, some job functions were transferred from Hyattsville to Parkersburg and vacant positions, formerly in Hyattsville, were backfilled in Parkersburg.

In October 2015, Fiscal Service began a bureau-wide Position Management Review (PMR) to align the bureaus position descriptions with evolving technologies, job processes, functions, reorganizations and government-wide standards. It is expected that the PMR will continue in phases over the next 3 to 4 years. Fiscal Service officials described a number of controls they had or planned to put in place to ensure that the PMR is fair and balanced, including: NTEU collaboration, an employee appeal process, grade and pay retention options, and bureau-wide use of a priority placement program for impacted staff.

² The original savings estimates were revised due to a delay in employee relocation. Fiscal Service officials told us that, as of March 2016, savings are estimated at \$152 million over a ten-year period ending in fiscal year 2024.

No Evidence of Widespread Adverse Action, But Legacy FMS Employees Raised Concerns With Treatment

Although we found no evidence of widespread adverse action against legacy FMS employees in our analysis of employee data or summary reporting of NTEU grievances and EEO complaints, the following concerns were raised in our interviews with 25 legacy FMS employees:

- **Ongoing reorganization activity and the concurrent Position Management Review have led to fear of demotion**

Over half of the legacy FMS employees that we interviewed (16 of the 25) expressed concerns over a perceived loss of grade-equivalent work due to the transfer of their job functions to Parkersburg and a corresponding fear that the PMR will result in demotion.

- **Transfer of responsibilities may have created dissatisfaction or discouragement**

Over 70 percent of the legacy FMS employees that we interviewed (18 of the 25) cited some degree of dissatisfaction due to impact of the transfer of positions or job responsibilities from Hyattsville to Parkersburg. In addition to the perceived loss of grade equivalent work as discussed above, there were concerns with Hyattsville staff being left with less work and “out of the loop” as decisions were made in Parkersburg.

- **Management’s Reaction to Supervisor’s Failure to Support Consolidation Plans May Have Been Perceived as Intimidation**

Two interviewees, who were in supervisory positions at the time of consolidation, told us that that they were admonished by management for publically criticizing the consolidation plans. While these individuals’ roles as supervisors give management a right to expect public support of Fiscal Service initiatives, management’s reaction may have caused other employees to fear negative consequences if concerns about the consolidation were voiced. In fact, 6 of the 25 interviewees told us that they feared negative consequences for voicing concerns and two of these attributed their fear directly to management’s reaction to the two supervisors.

Best practices for reorganizations point to the need to begin planning for reorganization early by tackling hard issues, creating implementation plans for mission critical activities, and engaging key stakeholders, including unions, to build relationships. They emphasize the need to communicate early and often to build

trust, ensure consistency of message, encourage two-way communications, and provide information to meet specific needs of employees.³

Fiscal Service officials pointed to a number of initiatives that they have undertaken to improve communication bureau-wide; however, they told us that they have not developed or communicated a formal plan for the expected 2019 relocation of employees. Without a specific relocation plan, employees may be unable to make informed career decisions or put the impact of the ongoing transfer of responsibilities in perspective. This may intensify the sense of uncertainty and discouragement felt by many Hyattsville employees.

Recommendations

We recommend that the Commissioner of Fiscal Service do the following:

1. Develop and document a formal plan for 2019 relocation that (a) specifically identifies the employees that will relocate and those that will remain; (b) specifies steps management will take to facilitate the post relocation integration of all employees into the resulting organizational structure, work and culture, regardless of location; and (c) sets out the specific steps that management will take to ensure fair and equitable treatment of displaced workers, including access to reasonable transition assistance.

Management Response

Fiscal Service management agreed with this recommendation and will target December 31, 2016 to finalize the 2019 Directed Reassignment Plan.

OIG Comment

Management's commitment to developing a formal plan for the 2019 relocation is responsive to our recommendation.

2. Continue to engage NTEU to ensure that information regarding the relocation plan and provision of resources for affected employees are communicated early and often.

³ Best practices for reorganization used in our review were derived from the following documents: (1) U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Results-Oriented Cultures: Implementation Steps to Assist Mergers and Organizational Transformations*, GAO-03-669 (Washington, DC, 2003), 2-3; (2) U.S. Office of Personnel Management, *Workforce Reshaping Operations Handbook*, (Washington, DC, 2009), 5-6; and (3) Booze Allen Hamilton, *Research & Analysis: Organizational Stand-ups Lessons Learned and Key Insights*, (Washington, DC, 2010), 5

Management Response

Fiscal Service management agreed with this recommendation and plans to continue regular collaboration with the NTEU as it develops and executes its Directed Reassignment Plan.

OIG Comment

Management's commitment to continued collaboration with NTEU on the 2019 relocation plan is responsive to our recommendation.

3. Continue to actively monitor Fiscal Service's Position Management Review process, as it is executed, to ensure that planned actions to facilitate employee engagement, outcomes aligned with Fiscal Service positions and OPM guidance, and fair treatment of employees changed to a lower grade are consistently followed. Management should also ensure that reasons for significant changes to a lower grade, should they occur, are fully understood and addressed.

Management Response

Fiscal Service management agreed with this recommendation and plans to continue employee engagement activities and assessing results. In addition, management will continue the use of disciplined processes to review positions, document findings and make informed and consistent decisions, thus ensuring the Position Management Review and follow-up actions are fair and balanced for all Fiscal Service staff. Management plans to include steps that ensure continual improvement in the planning and execution of future phases; regular collaboration and communication with NTEU, Fiscal Service management and staff; and professional development opportunities for our staff.

OIG Comment

Management's commitment to actively monitor the Position Management Review is responsive to our recommendation.

4. Continue existing efforts to build communication and trust across the organization.

Management Response

Fiscal Service management agreed with this recommendation and is committed to continual improvements in communication and collaboration. Management understands that major organizational changes, like the consolidation decision and activities, result in significant stress to all parties.

In addition, management realizes that individuals within the organization will each manage the change differently and in very personal ways. Because of this, management stated that it is committed to regular and open communication throughout the process and to identifying and offering programs that minimize the concerns and uncertainty of those impacted. These include continuing to provide personalized forums with Executives and Management Team, broad information sharing and anonymous forums, and development opportunities to assist staff in transitioning to new roles or changing work streams. Management believes that continuing to improve the transparency of plans and communication methods, through efforts like the 40 sessions the commissioner held with employees, will gain the full trust of staff and reinforce the organization's support for the Mission, Vision, and Values.

OIG Comment

Management's commitment to improve communication with staff is responsive to our recommendation.

Management's response is provided in its entirety in Attachment 2 to this memorandum.

* * * * *

We appreciate the courtesies and cooperation provided to our staff during the audit. If you wish to discuss this audit, you may contact me at (202) 927-6345 or Myung Han, Audit Manager, at (202) 927-4878.

Attachments

Interim Results
Review of the Treatment of Legacy
Financial Management Service Employees

Treasury Office of the Inspector General

Briefing to Senate Appropriations Staff

May 9, 2016

Directive and Review Objective

- **Senate Report 114-97** “The Committee directs the Department of the Treasury’s Office of Inspector General [OIG] to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations within 120 days of enactment concerning the treatment of workers at the Treasury Department’s Bureau of the Fiscal Service who were formerly employees of the Financial Management Service. The OIG is directed to pay special attention to whether any employees have faced intimidation, demotion, or actions that would discourage the employees from continuing their employment with the Bureau.”
- **Review Objective** To assess, consistent with the directive of the Senate Report, the treatment of workers at Fiscal Service who were formerly employees at Financial Management Service (FMS), focusing on intimidation, demotion, or actions that would discourage employees from continuing their employment with Fiscal Service.

Review Methodology

- **Review of Background Information**
 - ✓ Consolidation plans and related implementation documentation
- **Data Review**
 - ✓ Legacy FMS employees only
 - ✓ Standard Form 50, Notification of Personnel Action (SF-50) data (February 2012 through February 2016)
 - ✓ Performance ratings (2011 through 2015)
- **Review of other information reports**
 - ✓ Federal Employee View Point Survey results
 - ✓ EEO complaints
 - ✓ NTEU grievances

Interviews

- **Fiscal Assistant Secretary**
- **Fiscal Service**
 - ✓ Fiscal Service Commissioner
 - ✓ Assistant Commissioner for Management Services
 - ✓ Human Capital officials
 - ✓ EEO Leader
- **NTEU Representatives**
 - ✓ National Negotiator
 - ✓ Chapter Presidents
- **Legacy FMS employees**

➤ **Interviews with legacy FMS employees**

- ✓ Announced our presence and spent time on-site at Fiscal Service's Liberty Center and Hyattsville office
- ✓ Spoke to all who came to us and sought out certain people mentioned by others
- ✓ Allowed employees to tell their stories, as they related to the review objectives – interviewees were asked to provide documentation concerning any cited instances of mistreatment
- ✓ In total, 25 current and former legacy FMS employees were interviewed
- ✓ Not a representative sample

Background

➤ Consolidation of BPD and FMS

- ✓ Initiated to streamline financial management processes and realign duplicative positions
- ✓ Announced on February 13, 2012, and officially completed October 7, 2012

➤ Planned Savings

- ✓ Initial estimated savings of \$96 million over 5-year period; in April 2013, the savings estimates were revised to \$112 million over 10 years; and later to \$152 million over the period
- ✓ Position realignment primarily achieved by relocating approximately 450 legacy FMS positions in Hyattsville, MD and eliminating duplicate positions

➤ Realignment Delayed

- ✓ A Treasury official told us that Fiscal Service committed to keep 200 to 300 positions in Hyattsville after 2019

Agreement with Maryland Delegation

- **Legacy FMS jobs in Hyattsville were originally slated for relocation to Parkersburg by January 2015**
- **Relocations postponed until December 2019 at the request of Maryland Congressional Delegation**
 - ✓ On January 3, 2013, the Maryland delegation announced that “the Treasury Department and General Service Administration (GSA) will delay their plan to move 450 jobs out of Prince George’s County to December 31, 2019”
 - ✓ On the same day, the Commissioner of Fiscal Service announced that “employees affected by the consolidation will have until December 31, 2019, to relocate, find another position, or retire”

Data Review Highlights

- **Limitations in the data received (missing or anomalous data) exist; however, the data received was not indicative of widespread adverse actions against legacy FMS employees**
- **SF-50 Data**
 - ✓ Population of legacy FMS workers was 1,531 at February 2012 and 1,090 in February 2016
 - ✓ 612 permanent separations
 - 308 retirements, 75 resignations, 168 agency transfer, 7 deaths, 7 reduction-in-force, 39 terminations
 - 14 removals (6 of these stayed on as term employees)
 - ✓ 66 employees changed to lower grades during the period of 2012 to 2015 (13 were located in Hyattsville)
 - ✓ 1 denial of within-grade increase

➤ **Legacy FMS Performance Ratings**

- ✓ Percentage of outstanding performance ratings decreased by 11 percent over period 2011 to 2015; 44 percent of ratings given in 2015 were outstanding

➤ **Other**

- ✓ 70 NTEU grievances were filed – 35 (50 percent) were related to performance measurement disputes
- ✓ 63 EEO complaints (39 formal, 23 informal, and 1 class action suit) were filed (specific details not yet researched)
- ✓ Our analysis of Federal Employee Viewpoint survey for Legacy FMS employees shows a marked decrease in certain scores over the period 2011 to 2015

Performance Ratings

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Total legacy FMS employee	1,492	1,457	1,262	1,168	1,101
Employees not rated	44	184	102	97	84
Employees rated	1,448	1,273	1,160	1,071	1,017
"Outstanding" ratings	800 (55%)	684 (54%)	559 (48%)	505 (47%)	452 (44%)
"Exceeds" ratings	473 (33%)	457 (36%)	416 (36%)	419 (39%)	390 (38%)
"Meets" ratings	175 (12%)	132 (10%)	185 (16%)	147 (14%)	174 (17%)

Functions Moved to Parkersburg

- **According to Fiscal Service officials, job functions have transferred from Hyattsville to Parkersburg due to attrition and reorganization**
 - ✓ Vacant positions from Hyattsville have been backfilled in Parkersburg
 - ✓ According to Fiscal Service officials, agreement with Maryland Delegation was to delay employee relocations until 2019; agreement did not include the delay of moving functions and responsibilities to Parkersburg

Position Management Review In-Process

➤ **Reasons for Review**

- ✓ To align with evolving technologies, [job] processes, functions, and reorganizations
- ✓ Ensure position descriptions align with government-wide standards
- ✓ Eliminate “generic” position descriptions

➤ **Extent of Review**

- ✓ All General Schedule and Wage Grade Fiscal Service employees

➤ **Timeline of Review**

- ✓ Review started in October 2015 and will continue in phases
- ✓ Phase 1 was set to be completed by end of April 2016 but final grade determinations have not yet been made
- ✓ Multi-year process currently estimated at 3–4 years

Interviews - Potential Demotion

- **Perceived loss of grade-equivalent work may have created fear of demotion**
 - ✓ 16 of 25 interviewees told us that some job functions and responsibilities have been transferred from Hyattsville to Parkersburg
 - ✓ 11 of 25 interviewees told us that their new job functions are not grade-equivalent
 - ✓ 12 of 25 interviewees expressed concern that Position Management Review will result in demotions since functions have been transferred to Parkersburg and few individuals have received grade-equivalent work

Interviews - Potential Intimidation

- **Management's reaction to supervisor failure to support consolidation plans may have been perceived as intimidation**
 - ✓ 2 of 25 interviewees stated that they were pressured by management to support the consolidation plans
 - Both individuals were in supervisory positions at time of consolidation
 - Further inquiry needed to confirm or refute intimidation
 - ✓ 6 of 25 interviewees said they fear negative consequences if they bring up concerns about the consolidation
 - Some of the six interviewees referred to the treatment one of the above mentioned supervisors as reason for this fear

Interviews - Discouragement

- **Transfer of responsibilities may have created dissatisfaction or discouragement**
 - ✓ 18 of 25 interviewees cited some degree of dissatisfaction, primarily because transfer of positions has left Hyattsville staff with:
 - Work of a higher grade without due compensation
 - Work that is not equivalent to their skills and expertise
 - Less amount of work
 - Positions “out of the loop” as decisions are made in Parkersburg
 - ✓ 9 of 25 interviewees stated that they were asked to train or assist Parkersburg employees to do tasks that were formerly Hyattsville employee responsibilities and were held accountable for the trainees’ mistakes

Management Efforts to Improve Communication and Morale

- **Professional development assistance for current employees**
 - ✓ 40 hours of annual training
 - ✓ Professional certification assistance
 - ✓ Tuition reimbursements
 - ✓ Commissioner's Scholarship Program
- **Communication with Employees**
 - ✓ Town hall meetings
 - ✓ More frequent staff meetings and morale/team building events
 - ✓ Information dissemination via intranet – ALEX
 - ✓ Online newsletters – What's Up?
 - ✓ Online forum – Ask It!

Planned Actions Regarding Position Management Review

- **Planned actions to ensure the Position Management Review is fair and balanced**
 - ✓ NTEU will be involved after position descriptions are classified
 - ✓ Grade and pay retention
 - ✓ Use of priority placement for impacted employees (PPP and CTAP)
 - ✓ Appeal process for employees
 - ✓ Overview of Position Management Review and a guideline regarding grade/pay retention posted on Fiscal Service intranet

Management Actions Not Yet Planned/Taken

- **Fiscal Service officials told us that they have not developed a formal plan for the expected 2019 relocation of employees from Hyattsville to Parkersburg because there is still 3 years until the relocation is to occur**
- **We believe such a plan should cover:**
 - ✓ Identification of specific employees that will be required to relocate and a timeline for the relocation
 - ✓ Identification of specific employee assistance options for displaced employees
 - ✓ Communication of relocation plan with the affected employees

Reorganization Negotiation Timeline

- **Recent negotiations with NTEU regarding reorganization of accounting positions**
 - ✓ June 2014 – Fiscal Service notified NTEU of reorganization of across the board fiscal accounting operations (Reorg 2.0)
 - ✓ May 2015 – Fiscal Service withdrew from negotiations on Reorg 2.0 due to length of time required to resolve impasse
 - ✓ May 2015 – Notified NTEU of plan for consolidating accounting work and hiring 100 new employees in Parkersburg (Reorg 2.1)
 - ✓ July 2015 – NTEU proposed a pilot telework program, but rejected by Fiscal Service
 - ✓ July 2015 – Fiscal Service started implementing Reorg 2.1 unilaterally
 - ✓ August 2015 – NTEU filed a unfair labor practice charge with the Federal Labor Relations Authority alleging that Fiscal Service had failed to complete its bargaining obligation before implementing Reorg 2.1 (resolved April 2016)

Best Practices for Reorganization/ Change Management

- **Get an early start** – Begin planning for reorganization early by tackling hard issues, creating implementation plans for mission critical activities, and engaging key stakeholders to build relationships (*Research & Analysis: Organizational Stand-ups Lessons Learned and Key Insights, Booz Allen Hamilton, May 2010*)
- **Establish and execute a comprehensive communication strategy** – Communicate early and often to build trust; ensure consistency of message; encourage two-way communications; and provide information to meet specific needs of employees (*Results-Oriented Cultures: Implementation Steps to Assist Mergers and Organizational Transformations, GAO, July 2003*)

Guidance for Reorganization/Change Management

➤ Union Relations

- ✓ While management has the right to reshape its workforce, including running a RIF, many aspects of the impact and the implementation of such efforts are negotiable. Management must fulfill any collective bargaining obligations and should consult with labor relations staff prior to announcing a reshaping effort (*Workforce Reshaping Operations Handbook, OPM, July 2009*)

➤ Treat employees fairly:

- ✓ Management should consider the scope and time of workforce reshaping; have an effective communication strategy for all parts of the organization; have union support; and provide certain transition assistance programs for affected employees (*Workforce Reshaping Operations Handbook, OPM, July 2009*)

Preliminary Conclusions

- **No evidence of widespread adverse action to date; however, there are indications that:**
 - ✓ Ongoing reorganization activity and the concurrent Position Management Review have led to fear of demotion
 - ✓ Length of the transition period coupled with a lack of communication surrounding the 2019 relocation plans may be exacerbating a sense of uncertainty and discouragement
 - ✓ Management's reaction to supervisors' failure to support consolidation plans may have been perceived by some as intimidation

Recommendations Under Consideration

The Commissioner of the Fiscal Service should:

- **Develop and document a formal plan for 2019 relocation which:**
 - ✓ Specifically identifies the employees that will relocate and those that will remain
 - ✓ Specifies steps management will take to facilitate the post relocation integration of all employees into the resulting organizational structure, work and culture, regardless of location
 - ✓ Sets out the specific steps that management will take to ensure fair and equitable treatment of displaced workers, including access to reasonable transition assistance

-
- **Continue to engage NTEU to ensure that information regarding the relocation plan and provision of resources for affected employees are communicated early and often**
 - **Continue to actively monitor Fiscal Service's Position Management Review process, as it is executed, to:**
 - ✓ Ensure that planned actions to facilitate employee engagement, appropriate outcomes, and fair treatment of employees changed to a lower grade are consistently followed
 - ✓ Ensure that reasons for significant changes to a lower grade, should they occur, are fully understood and addressed
 - **Continue efforts to build communication and trust across the organization**

Discussion of Next Steps

- **Would expanded audit work result in different conclusions?**
 - ✓ Broad survey of existing employees (survey of former employees may not be allowable)
 - ✓ Random sample of interviews
 - ✓ Detail inquiry into employee claims of discouragement or intimidation
 - ✓ Broader data review and comparison to other agency benchmarks
 - ✓ Anticipate additional work would take 6-8 months



DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
BUREAU OF THE FISCAL SERVICE
WASHINGTON, DC 20227

July 15, 2016

Mr. James L. Lisle, Jr
Acting Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audit
Treasury Office of Inspector General
Washington, DC 20220

Subject: *Performance Audit: Treatment of Legacy Financial Management Services Employees*

Dear Mr. Lisle:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft report entitled "Treatment of Legacy Financial Management Services Employees." We are pleased the audit of our actions as part of the Fiscal Service consolidation of the Bureau of the Public Debt and the Financial Management Service (FMS) resulted in no evidence of widespread adverse actions, and that nothing came to your attention that led you to believe inappropriate adverse actions had been taken against the over 1,500 Legacy FMS staff. We appreciate your report highlighting the discipline and care we've taken to mitigate the impact of this significant organizational change on the organizations and particularly on our employees.

Fiscal Service is committed to continuing our consolidation and ensuring that our employees have insight into our future consolidation activities, feel valued by the organization and the management team, and are provided meaningful work that contributes to the consolidated bureau's mission and vision. In follow-up to your recommendations, we offer the following responses and plans.

Develop and Document a Formal Plan for the 2019 Relocation

Fiscal Service agrees with this recommendation and will target December 31, 2016 to finalize our 2019 Directed Reassignment Plan.

Continue to Engage NTEU and Communicate Early and Often

Fiscal Service agrees with this recommendation and plans to continue our regular and ongoing collaboration with the NTEU as we develop our Directed Reassignment Plan by December 31, 2016, and as we execute the plan in subsequent periods.

Continue to Actively Monitor the Position Management Review

Fiscal Service agrees with this recommendation and plans to continue our employee engagement activities and assess our results. In addition, we will continue the use of disciplined processes to review positions, document our findings, and make informed and consistent decisions, thus ensuring our Position Management Review and follow-up actions are fair and balanced for all Fiscal Service staff. We plan to include steps that ensure continual improvement in our planning and execution of future phases; regular collaboration and communication with NTEU, Fiscal Service management and staff; and professional development opportunities for our staff.

Continue Efforts to Build Communication and Trust

Fiscal Service agrees with this recommendation and is committed to continual improvements in communication and collaboration. We understand that major organizational changes, like our consolidation decision and activities, result in significant stress to all parties. In addition, we realize that individuals within the organization will each manage the change differently and in very personal ways. Because of this, we are committed to regular and open communication throughout the process and to identifying and offering programs that minimize the concerns and uncertainty of those impacted. These include personalized forums with our Executives and Management Team, broad information sharing and anonymous forums, and development opportunities to assist staff in transitioning to new roles or changing work streams. We believe that continuing to improve the transparency of our plans and communication methods, through efforts like the over 40 sessions I held with employees, will gain the full trust of our staff and reinforce the organization's support for its Mission, Vision, and Values.

Sincerely,



Sheryl R. Morrow
Commissioner