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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Morale matters.

This has long been recognized by leaders of successful military organizations and industrial entities who thereby devote considerable attention to the subject. This is the case not only because they prefer a satisfied workforce as a matter of principle, but because individuals possessing high morale are far more likely to devote the extra effort needed and work together as a team to assure success in an organization’s most demanding undertakings.

Various independent surveys show rather convincingly that overall morale (“employee engagement”) within the Department of Homeland Security is inferior to virtually all other parts of the federal government, even though its employees individually express support for, and commitment to, the homeland security mission. There is no one reason for this situation. Driving factors include many within the Department’s purview as well as many external to the Department. Recent trends are not encouraging.

Certain well recognized practices and qualities characterize successful organizations (see, for example, “Good to Great,” by James Collins). These include empowering employees such that they can do their jobs to the best of their abilities; providing frequent informal feedback regarding job performance; listening to employees; and treating employees equitably. None of this is news to the senior management of the Department of Homeland Security. The challenge is to do the above within the constraints imposed on, and by, the Department; within the available resources; and under the circumstances that have been allowed to evolve over the life of the Department…or to change those constraints and circumstances.

The Task Force believes that there are a number of actions that can be taken that will markedly improve morale within the Department and concurrently enhance the extent of the Department’s success in carrying out its mission. The steps needed are not “rocket science;” but do require commitment by every level of management and extreme diligence in following through their implementation. The Task Force offers four general recommendations in the areas of management, training, personnel development and communications. More significantly, it also offers 27 implementing actions. Because of the intentional brevity of this report, these recommendations and actions are not repeated in this summary but can be found in the section entitled “Recommendations.”

One general observation, however, is offered; namely, experience strongly suggests that morale issues can only be dealt with by changing the conditions that underlie the extant morale—not by meetings, pronouncements or repeated surveys. In fact, the latter actions are often
counterproductive. When an individual is repeatedly asked (particularly by a person in a senior position), “Are you OK?”, soon that individual begins to wonder if indeed they are “OK.” In the case of the Department of Homeland Security, the time has come to cease discussing morale as an end in itself and focus on implementing the actions needed to correct the problems that undermine morale. As in most circumstances wherein an individual or organization suffers a loss of confidence, the only solution is to “perform.”
INTRODUCTION

The 2014 U.S. Office of Personnel Management employee survey placed the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Employee Engagement Index at 54 out of a possible 100 points, the lowest rating in government. The Engagement Index considers leadership, performance culture, talent management and job satisfaction. The above response is nine points below the government-wide average, 26 points below the leading government organization and represents a decline of two percentage points from the prior year’s survey. Of 84 individual questions on the survey that require a “yes/no” response, the Department was below the government-wide average for favorable replies in every instance…and at or very near the bottom of the government-wide range in 46 of the 84 queries.

In an analysis of the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey, conducted by the Partnership for Public Service, DHS scored 44 points out of a possible 100, placing it in 19th place out of 19 federal organizations having more than 15,000 employees, fully 11 points behind the next lowest-rated organization and reflecting a decline of 15 points (twice the government average) in the past four years.

There is a very wide variation of indicated employee engagement across the various components of DHS. In the Office of Personnel Management Survey, this span is 32 points, ranging from a low of 48 at Immigration and Customs Enforcement to a high of 80 at the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office. Approximately 70 percent of the overall DHS score is derived from responses by employees in just three of DHS’s components: Transportation Security Administration, Customs and Border Protection, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, all with scores below the government average—although ten of the fifteen DHS components for which data are individually available rank below the government-wide average. Clearly, if the prevailing circumstance within the Department as a whole is to improve, the above three organizational components will require particular attention.

The root causes of this result are also widespread, with no single driving factor being identifiable—although lack of confidence in leadership at many levels, perceived shortages of means to carry out job responsibilities, insufficient communications with supervision and higher management, and inadequate career development opportunities are fundamental issues. There also appear to be direct correlations between employee dissatisfaction and such parameters as organization size, extent of contact with the public, and geographical span of the entity; although causality is uncertain. The further need to clearly explain to all components the DHS mission and each component’s role in accomplishing that mission is apparent.
Among encouraging aspects is the fact that the Department’s leadership has clearly taken the above results seriously and has already initiated a series of actions to address the expressed concerns. The fact that such actions can make a difference is evidenced by the experience of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that, although a much smaller organization than DHS (approximately 10,000 employees), improved its position among federal sub-components from 172\textsuperscript{nd} place to first place in a period of just five years. Actions taken included, but were not limited to, empowering employees, increasing training, further involving first-line supervisors in management decisions, and establishing improved incentive systems.

There is ample evidence from a variety of organizations that employee engagement can have a profound impact on organizational effectiveness, amplifying the importance of addressing the problem indicated by the Office of Personnel Management surveys as well as other indicators. That this particular problem should exist at DHS seems paradoxical given the importance of the Department’s mission to protect the Homeland—a mission that virtually every citizen strongly embraces. Further, 86\% of DHS employees indicate their belief that the work they do is important. Eliminating the root causes of the problems cited herein will not only enhance the Department’s ability to effectively execute its critical mission but will also greatly enhance the quality of the work experience of the nearly one-quarter million dedicated men and women who serve the Department and the nation.
ASSESSMENT

Over the past five years the Partnership for Public Service's “Best Place to Work in Government” Index has placed the Department of Homeland Security between six points and thirteen points (today) behind the government-wide average (on a scale of 100). Further, a comparable survey of industrial firms positions the federal government as a whole 15 points behind the experience in industry—both reasons for concern.

The causes for the above marked differences include the “message” sent to DHS employees by furloughs, pay freezes, sequestration, leadership turnover, long periods without established leadership in key positions, and even the lack of timely budgets. In sharp contrast with industry, government personnel rules designed to protect employees from undue political influence have had the unintended consequence of making it extremely difficult to remove non-performing employees. The latter is especially counterproductive in that it is observed by the workforce as a whole and thereby produces a demoralizing impact on that majority of individuals who in fact are working hard and are significant contributors.

Examples of these factors include:

- More than 100 congressional committees, subcommittees or groups in the 113th Congress exercised oversight of DHS. DHS offices and officials participated in 4,066 hearings, briefings, and other congressional engagement events.
- In the case of DHS, six months after the current Administration was in place (2009), there were still 11 vacant Presidential Appointee positions that require Senate confirmation.
- Throughout 2014, vacancies in the Department's Presidential Appointee positions requiring Senate confirmation averaged 22 percent.
- Since its establishment over 13 years ago, DHS has operated under a continuing resolution throughout 11 of those years. When it did receive a fully processed budget, that budget on average was received one-fourth of the way through the operating year.

Little of the above, however, accounts for the differential in indicated employee morale between DHS and other federal agencies that operate in a generally comparable environment. (A recent exception was when DHS—after the conduct of the surveys cited herein—was singled out for possible “shut down” during budget negotiations, an extremely damaging message to employees.) DHS has also been confronted with the unique challenge of bringing together 22 separate organizations into a single operating entity. This is of course an extraordinarily complex and demanding task. Experience in industry indicates that 60-80 percent of mergers
and acquisitions fail, often for cultural reasons; with mergers of equals failing at a rate closer to the higher of the above figures. Notwithstanding this, sound reasons have been stated why organizations charged with key facets of missions as critical to the nation as homeland security should operate under a single chain of command. Furthermore, it has now been many years since the Department was formed and one might reasonably expect that the issues of concern would previously have been resolved.

Without substantial changes in such factors as those cited above that are external to DHS, it will be very difficult for the Department of Homeland Security to become a world-class organization. Nonetheless, there is much that can, and should, be accomplished within DHS. To that end, the following section of this report offers overarching recommendations and specific implementing actions.
RECOMMENDATIONS

One should not expect instant results when engaging an issue as fundamental and broadly-encompassing as morale. A true turnaround can be expected to take years—a fact that is exacerbated in the case of DHS by external forces, including a change in Administration that will take place just 20 months from the time of this report. This points to the need to institutionalize whatever remedial actions are taken.

Again, the Task Force recognizes that in a few instances implementing the recommendations presented herein does not reside entirely within the purview of the Department of Homeland Security leadership—but that does not make them unworthy of notice.

**RECOMMENDATION I: Greatly increase the emphasis on leadership qualities when filling managerial positions and when assessing the performance of incumbents.**

**Action 1 -** Substantially increase the weighting of employee engagement in every Senior Executive and manager’s responsibility statement and provide consequences for both positive and negative outcomes.

Given the negative assessment of DHS employee morale it seems evident that the levels of management that directly deal with the larger body of employees have not considered the issue to be a priority. This can be changed only if the factors that underlie employee engagement are made a matter of emphasis in assessing individual manager’s performance.

**Action 2 -** Establish councils (with revolving membership) at all levels of management to provide input on specific decisions that broadly affect the Department’s employees.

There is substantial evidence that employees as well as lower-level managers within the Department do not believe that they have significant input in formulating decisions that affect them. By establishing small advisory councils at each level of the organization that meet without higher levels of management present during deliberations, feedback that is important to arriving at sound decisions can be obtained. Further, employees can be assured that they have the opportunity to share their perspective.
Action 3 - After additional training, delegate greater authority to line managers to exercise judgment in carrying out their assigned responsibilities.

The criticality of many of the responsibilities of individuals even at lower levels of the DHS makes it more difficult to delegate authority than in organizations with less consequential outcomes. Nonetheless, to the extent that employees can be given the authority, after full training, to exercise their best judgment in some matters not only empowers employees and increases work satisfaction but often leads to better decisions.

Action 4 - Take decisive steps to remove non-performing employees, even when it may not seem cost-effective in the short-term to do so.

The time and cost associated with removing non-performing employees within the federal government is sufficiently great that supervisors often conclude that it is a preferable decision simply to live with the status quo. This is probably a justifiable short-term conclusion; however, the longer-term consequence of tolerating non-performing employees far exceeds this inconvenience because of the impact it has on the rest of the workforce that has no choice but to conclude that management condones, or at least tolerates, non-performance.

Action 5 - Heavily weight prior service in line-management positions, when selecting senior managers.

Too often individuals in significant line-management positions have not had adequate management experience. This is particularly true in technical organizations, but is by no means unique to them. There is no substitute for experience in producing strong leaders. In this regard, it is particularly important that individuals being assigned headquarters’ positions have had field experience—in most instances in “line” jobs. This should be an important factor in career planning and succession management.

Action 6 - Do not leave senior executive management positions unfilled, or filled on an “acting” basis, beyond a very brief period.

As has been noted, an inordinate number of Senior Executive Service management positions are filled on an “acting” basis awaiting identification and approval of incumbents. This is particularly chronic in the case of political appointees. In the business world, if senior positions can be filled on a
“temporary” basis for extended periods, or not filled at all, the most likely conclusion is that the positions may not be needed.

**Action 7 -** Vastly reduce the number of political appointees filling senior management positions in the Department and, where the positions are still deemed to be needed, convert them to the Senior Executive Service.

Political appointees perform an important function in assuring that the policies embraced by an Administration are indeed implemented. However, it would seem that 168 such individuals (26 in FEMA alone) is an excessive number, even for a department the size and complexity of DHS. Further, while many political employees are extremely well qualified for the positions they fill and make major contributions, there are many who hold assignments for which they have little background. This is a circumstance that demoralizes subordinates of these individuals and, perhaps more importantly, discourages highly sought-after potential employees from accepting positions in an organization where they will have little opportunity to rise into the senior ranks and where their leaders will change every few years. While the Task Force performed no formal analysis, it would seem that the number of political appointees in the Department could be reduced by a factor of five and the responsibilities they hold assigned to members of the Senior Executive Service…all while improving work outcomes..

**Action 8 -** Transfer high-performing managers and executives across operating components of the Department.

One of the best ways to build cohesiveness in an organization, particularly a newly-formed one, is to move qualified individuals across various segments of the organization. This not only serves to establish credibility and confidence in the overall quality of leadership but also creates ties among various organizational components and better prepares individuals to fill senior leadership positions.

**Action 9 -** Conduct separate but regular (twice per year) meetings of individuals representing like levels of management to exchange information on best practices.

No one person or organization has a monopoly on good ideas. By conducting meetings of individuals working at comparable levels with comparable responsibilities throughout the Department, ideas can be exchanged that
improve operations and at the same time break down “stovepipes” that are remnants of the components that made up the Department when it was created.

**Action 10** - Resolve issues of seemingly modest consequence that are provoking antagonism with unions, even if some concessions must be made.

The relationship between the Department’s unions and the Department’s leadership appears to be more confrontational than in many other governmental organizations. Some of the issues contributing to this circumstance, such as the fact that TSA employees do not have the right to outside review of work disputes, need to be taken off the table inasmuch as they contribute disproportionately to an adversarial relationship.

**Action 11** - Establish a small office reporting to the Secretary, overseen by a Senior Career person (Ombudsman), with accountability, to oversee implementation of leadership transformation activities.

Prior studies of morale within DHS have provided a number of suggestions to improve the situation that prevailed at the time of the individual studies. Unfortunately, that situation, if anything, has worsened over the years and the lack of follow-up to actions that were directed by top leadership or suggested by review boards has undoubtedly contributed to decay and morale. A formal follow-up mechanism is needed to assure that actions directed by senior management are in fact being implemented and to provide a place for employees to anonymously call attention to practices that are counterproductive to employee engagement efforts.

**RECOMMENDATION II: Significantly improve management training, particularly leadership training.**

**Action 12** - Require all individuals assuming significant new managerial responsibilities (from first-line supervisors to and including political appointees) to participate in a leadership training program adapted to their particular level of responsibility and other related circumstances.

While some argue, not without a degree of merit, that it is impossible to teach leadership, it is possible to place individuals in training circumstances where they can develop their own leadership capabilities and where they can learn from the experiences of others. A formal leadership training program that addresses real-world situations, preferably relating to the Department, should be
required of all individuals assuming increased management responsibilities. Following that training, a mentoring/shadowing cadre should be created composed of recognized leaders worthy of emulation. Some federal departments also offer voluntary programs in leadership development online, even making them available to Special Government Employees.

**Action 13 - Establish a separate, enduring, line-item to fund management training.**

Management training tends to be among the first casualties of budget reductions, yet is one of the most important long-term investments that the Department can make. To help protect against such eventualities, the establishment of a special line-item to fund management leadership training should be created.

**Action 14 - Include presentations on the culture expected within DHS in introductory programs for new employees.**

New employees cannot be expected to fully understand the culture sought by an organization they are joining. The best way to convey this culture, is of course, to have it exhibited by existing members of the organization, particularly those in management, who live the culture day-in and day-out. A DHS on-boarding course like DHS 101 should be mandatory for all incoming leadership and employees. Emphasis is needed on positive examples.

**RECOMMENDATION III: Adopt proven industrial standards for personnel development.**

**Action 15 - Substantially increase variability of bonuses to more accurately reflect differences in performance of members of the Senior Executive Service.**

The current bonus system provides little incentive. Ninety-four percent of the Senior Executive Service employees receive bonuses, and the variation in size of the bonuses is modest (for example, excluding the 24 employees who ranked in the bottom two of the five personnel rating categories, the difference, on average, between those in the highest and the lowest of the remaining categories was 1.6 percent of base salary). Much greater impact could be achieved from the investment made in bonuses by providing them to far fewer individuals and of significantly greater size.
Action 16 - Consider converting from the existing Senior Executive Service performance rating system to a system based on more meaningful adjectival ratings (e.g., “significantly exceeds expectations;” “exceeds expectations;” “meets expectations;” “needs improvement;” and “unacceptable”), and use the entire spectrum of categories, such that the extent of individual contributions can be discerned.

The current Senior Executive Service performance rating system places so many individuals in the Senior Executive Service in the top categories (94 percent at DHS [2014] versus government-wide 89.9 percent [2013]…with one department at 95 percent!) that it provides little incentive to employees to truly excel; provides little feedback to employees; provides management with correspondingly little information to discriminate between good performers and great performers and forms little basis for removal of inferior performers. While changes in employee rating systems must be implemented with great care, consideration should be given to adopting a rating system that makes clear what is acceptable, what is unacceptable and what is extraordinary. The current “Lake Woebegone” approach, wherein everyone is above average, should be abandoned.

Action 17 - Involve representatives from all levels of employees in a formal review of current promotion and compensation systems, identifying improvements in both equity and transparency.

There is substantial evidence that employees lack faith in the fairness of the existing promotion and General Schedule compensation system. While the Task Force has no basis to assess the validity of that belief, perceptions do matter, particularly in matters of such importance to individual members of the workforce. A special task force should be created within DHS but outside of the “personnel” function to assess the existing situation and make appropriate recommendations to be considered by senior management and implemented under the aegis of the personnel system.

Action 18 - Conduct personal interviews with employees leaving the Department (or, at least, when leaving the Federal Service) to gain deeper insight into the true reasons for separations, and provide periodic feedback to Departmental leadership.

While there are voluminous instructions regarding the separation of DHS employees, including “check the box” questionnaires as to the reasons for
leaving, most of the information obtained is highly pro forma. Individual interviews of (willing) departees by (independent) individuals in personnel functions would likely have provided early warning of many of the problems now confounding the Department. The overall attrition rate in 2014 was 6.8 percent (7.7 percent government-wide) and the rate among DHS executives was 10.1 percent. A more important metric is “regretted attrition rate” (loss of employees in the highest rating category); however, as discussed elsewhere herein, this latter category is so large as to offer little valuable information. Revealingly, 70 percent of departing employees government-wide say no effort was made to encourage them to remain with the government.

**Action 19 - Co-locate all headquarters functions at a single facility.**

Even short separation distances greatly impede cohesiveness and coordination within an organization. Currently, DHS senior leadership is physically widely scattered and this, coupled with the size of the organization, makes management particularly difficult. While it is recognized that accomplishing this goal takes time, the DHS is no longer an entity that can reasonably be termed to be in its infancy.

**RECOMMENDATION IV: Significantly strengthen communications (upward, downward and outward), making greater use of modern communication technology.**

**Action 20 - At the beginning of each (fiscal) year, managers at every level should commit to conduct Town Hall meetings and provide a two-page summary of the lessons-learned from those meetings to their immediate supervisor (to be used in the manager’s annual performance evaluation as well as in improving operating effectiveness).**

The large number of somewhat disparate organizations of which DHS is composed make it extremely challenging to build Department-wide loyalties. Further, the size of the Department makes communication relatively complex. Experience in other large organizations indicates that having managers, from the senior official through the chain of command, conduct periodic Town Hall meetings is an important mechanism for enhancing communication and team building. Importantly, these sessions should be two-way. One proven technique is for the “host” to accept questions submitted on cards anonymously during the meeting, read aloud and answered spontaneously. Properly handled,
this practice can greatly improve confidence in leadership and lead to resolution of many undesirable situations.

**Action 21 - Have managers and supervisors at all levels conduct brief, weekly staff meetings with their direct reports.**

As basic as is the idea of weekly staff meetings, all too many managers do not conduct such events or conduct them as superficial, one-way lectures. The reasons for this range from time demands imposed on the managers to discomfort in confronting issues that may be raised. Nonetheless, by far the best means of communication continues to be face-to-face, and all managers and supervisors should be expected to conduct such sessions weekly. Furthermore, higher levels of management should monitor that they are indeed being conducted.

**Action 22 - Encourage employees to submit written suggestions to increase organizational effectiveness and have immediate supervisors provide brief written responses, endorsed by the next higher level of management.**

No one knows their job better than the people performing them. Many have constructive suggestions and, if encouraged, are willing or even eager to share their ideas. However, when the suggestions that are offered are ignored, morale is eroded further than if the suggestions had not been sought in the first place. Some response needs to be provided to every suggestion and various forms of rewards need to be provided for particularly significant contributions.

**Action 23 - Expand the employee recognition program.**

The DHS employee recognition program sustained a serious setback when it was deferred for several years due to budget reductions. The implied sense of priority attributed to recognition was inevitably discerned by employees. The existing DHS recognition program is extremely important and could be strengthened by adopting some of the practices currently in use in other departments and other agencies. These are characterized by a variety of recognition mechanisms that address both individuals and groups. Teams composed of members from several components of DHS deserve special consideration in this regard, as does the possibility of employee-nominated, employee-selected (voted) awards. Importantly, employee exit interviews...
indicate great potential payoff when supervisors and managers simply express appreciation of special contributions.

**Action 24 - Publicize throughout the entirety of DHS the accomplishments of individual components of DHS.**

Continuing to build “One DHS” is an important goal that is fostered when all employees celebrate major triumphs of individuals and teams from specific components of the workforce. However, this is only possible if employees are aware of those accomplishments. Means should therefore be established to communicate the many significant contributions being made within individual DHS organizations such that they can be recognized and celebrated throughout the enterprise as a whole.

**Action 25 - Establish a hierarchical electronic communications system whereby news impacting any particular organizational element is provided in a timely fashion to members of all levels of management above that element, including important questions (and answers) that may arise from the affected workforce.**

The credibility of supervisors and their ability to act as true members of management depends in part upon their being promptly informed of key issues and being able to answer questions they confront from their associates. An electronic information dissemination system is needed that provides each supervisor and manager with information affecting their workers, but only that information, since flooding all news to everyone soon results in all news being ignored. Thus, a family of pre-established distribution lists needs to be maintained.

**Action 26 - Use social media to augment communications, especially with employees in the field.**

Many members of today’s workforce use social media as a primary source of information. Wherever possible, information should be distributed using social media in parallel with the more traditional means of communication. This is particularly important for younger employees and employees holding field assignments.
Action 27 - Have the Secretary of Homeland Security promptly and personally recognize individual employees or teams of employees that have made particularly significant contributions.

There is little that brings greater appreciation and encouragement to an individual or team than to have senior management acknowledge their contributions. In the case of truly major achievements, this recognition should be both immediate and from the highest level of management.
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Carie Lemack has more than a decade of experience in counterterrorism policy, advocacy, and entrepreneurial endeavors. Currently a Senior Fellow at GW's Center for Cyber and Homeland Security, she previously served as Director of the Bipartisan Policy Center’s Homeland Security Project. Before that, Lemack co-founded Global Survivors Network, an organization for victims of terror to speak out against terrorism and radicalization. She coordinated and inspired events globally and produced an Academy Award-nominated documentary film, Killing in the Name. In 2001, she co-founded and led Families of September 11.


Before entering the non-profit sector, Carie worked in the technology sector and received a Masters in Public Administration from the Harvard Kennedy School of Government after receiving an MBA from Stanford University Graduate School of Business. She graduated from Stanford University with a Bachelor of Science degree in symbolic systems.

Wilson “Bill” Livingood

Wilson “Bill” Livingood is the President and Partner of Livingood Advisors, LLC. Mr. Livingood is an accomplished Senior Federal Law Enforcement Executive. His expertise is in all aspects of management, planning, leadership, operations, security, and emergency preparedness gained through 17 years as the U.S. Congress Sergeant-at-Arms and 33 years in the U.S. Secret Service. As the 36th Sergeant At Arms, of the U.S. House of Representatives and Mr. Livingood was the third longest serving Sergeant at Arms in U.S. history and was also appointed by both Republican and Democratic administrations. Many of his key positions at the U.S. Secret Service included: Presidential, Foreign Dignitary, and Candidate Protection; Criminal Investigation; Headquarters and Field Office Management; Senior Agent in Office of Inspection; and Senior Advisor to several Secret Service Directors.
Walter McNeil

Walter McNeil is the former Police Chief for the City of Quincy and past President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Chief McNeil has more than 29 years of law enforcement experience, serving as the Secretary of the Florida Department of Corrections, and head of the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. Prior to being selected to lead the above named agencies, he was the Chief of Police for the City of Tallahassee, Florida. Chief McNeil holds a Master’s Degree in Criminal Justice and a Bachelor’s Degree in Criminology. Chief McNeil is also a graduate of the FBI National Academy.

Bonnie Michelman

Bonnie Michelman has extensive leadership and security management experience in diverse industries. Ms. Michelman currently is the Director of Police, Security and Outside Services at Massachusetts General Hospital and the Security Consultant for Partners Healthcare Inc. comprising 13 hospitals in Massachusetts. Ms. Michelman was formerly District Manager at First Security Services overseeing 60 diverse operations and Assistant Vice President for General Services/Operations at Newton Wellesley Hospital managing 16 departments. Ms. Michelman served as President in 2001 of ASIS-International, Chairman of the Board in 2002, and Foundation President from 2003-2005. Ms. Michelman is a Past President (2008 and 1995)/Chairman of the Board of the International Association for Healthcare Security and Safety (IAHSS). Ms. Michelman is currently on the Board of Directors for the International Security Management Association (ISMA) and instructor at Northeastern University, College of Criminal Justice in the Graduate and Undergraduate program. Bonnie is on the Regional Board of Directors for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and chairs their National Security Committee. Ms. Michelman has an MBA, and MS in Criminal Justice and a BA in Government and Sociology.
MEMORANDUM FOR: Judge William H. Webster  
Chairman  
Homeland Security Advisory Council  

FROM: Secretary Johnson  

SUBJECT: Homeland Security Advisory Council  
Establishing a DHS Employee Morale Task Force  

October 9, 2014

I request that the Homeland Security Advisory Council establish a Task Force to provide recommendations on how to improve employee morale throughout the DHS enterprise. As the Council is comprised of senior level officials from local and federal government, academic experts, and community leaders, the Council is uniquely positioned to provide updated analysis to its 2007 “Report on Culture Task Force” for how best to address the current challenges associated with low employee morale. The DHS Employee Morale Task Force should address, among other closely related topics, the following questions:

- **What are the core or root causes of continued low morale in the Department of Homeland Security?**
  - What do the results of the OPM Employee Viewpoint Survey tell us about core or root causes of continued low morale?
  - Are core or root causes different within DHS headquarters and Components? Are they different between Components? Are they different between all headquarters elements and the field?
  - What additional research, including surveys, studies, or other analysis, is necessary to understand core or root causes of low employee morale?

- **How can DHS strengthen its leadership cadre, in order to both enhance mission effectiveness and also increase employee morale?**
  - What do the results of the OPM Employee Viewpoint Survey tell us about strengths and weaknesses in the DHS leadership cadre?
  - Do strengths and weaknesses differ among Senate-confirmed leadership, the Senior Executive Service, and General Schedule supervisors and managers?
Among DHS headquarters and Components? Between Components? Between headquarters and the field?

- How does DHS's leadership cadre compare to the leadership cadres of similar organizations in the public and private sector with respect to key competencies, proficiency, mission effectiveness, and other factors materially impacting employee morale?
- What steps can DHS take within its current authorities to strengthen its leadership cadre? What additional authorities should DHS request?

- How can DHS work as a whole, across the agencies and recognizing their distinct cultures, to build a greater sense of belonging and improve employee morale?
  - What are DHS work culture priorities that should be defined and universally communicated to the whole organization?
  - How can DHS leadership help shape a better work culture to promote staff empowerment and innovation while also encouraging a healthy work-life balance?
  - Are there tools such as cross-Component rotational assignments and/or career paths that can help increase employee morale? Are there workforce concepts that might actually further hurt employee morale?

- Referencing the 2007 HSAC DHS Morale Assessment:
  - Which of those recommendations were successfully implemented?
  - For those items that were not and which still remain relevant, what changes should be made to increase the likelihood of successful implementation and organizational adoption?

Should you have questions, please communicate them to Ben Haiman, Deputy Executive Director of the Homeland Security Advisory Council, Office of Policy, U.S. Department of Homeland Security at (202) 380-8615.
APPENDIX C - SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS

Kim Baranof, Senior Counselor to the Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Charles F. Bolden, Jr., Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Jeri L. Buchholz, Chief Human Capital Officer and Assistant Administrator for Human Capital Management, National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Tina Cariola, Workforce Engagement Branch Manager, Office of Training and Workforce Engagement, Transportation Security Administration

J. David Cox, Sr., National President, American Federation of Government Employees

Andrew Edelson, Specialist Leader, Deloitte Counseling, LLC

Catherine Emerson, Chief Human Capital Officer, DHS

Kim Hutchinson, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Training and Workforce Engagement, Transportation Security Administration

Colleen Kelley, National President, National Treasury Employees Union

Travis Peterson, Senior Manager, People at Southwest Airlines

Marian Manlove, Manager, Workforce Engagement Division

Vince Micone, Chief of Staff, Office of Management

Steve McPeek, Executive Director, Strategic Workforce Planning and Analysis

Max Stier, President and CEO of Partnership for Public Service

Colleen Wilson, HR Specialist, National Aeronautics and Space Administration
APPENDIX D - BIBLIOGRAPHY


