



V. REPRESENTATION PETITIONS (REP'S) - PART B OF THE SURVEY

Representation petitions may be filed by an agency, union or individual to resolve any matter relating to the representation of employees under the Statute. Respondents who participated in representation petitions during 1996 and/or 1997 responded to questions about their beliefs of the case handling of the regional office, the quality of services provided and their perceptions of the decisions rendered.

A. OGC Processes

1. Case Handling Procedures. A group of questions asked respondents to assess the quality and effectiveness of the Regional Office's procedures for opening and processing REP petitions. Issues addressed included: case handling procedures, quality of service provided by the agent, elections and hearings conducted by the RO, stipulations that result in the issuance of a Decision and Order or an Election Agreement and Regional Director's Decisions and Orders. In question B1, 314 respondents indicated participation in REP proceedings in 1996/1997 and were identified from the case tracking system of FLRA as having been a participant. Only these latter respondents were asked to complete the remainder of the questions in Part B.

164 individuals indicated involvement at the investigative state of case processing (question B2). This group of respondents constituted the total potential group of individuals who provided their perceptions about case handling procedures and quality of service provided by the agent in charge of the case. See Table 21. (There were too few individual respondents (2) to report on their views. However, the two individuals were very positive.)

All results related to REP case handling procedures are very positive. With the exception of two issues, "...providing information need for processing REP cases" and "...given the opportunity to provide relevant information," the two sets of respondents were in agreement on the quality of service rendered. Following is a break-out of these data. 75% agreed with the statement, "the Regional Office provided me with the information I needed about processing REP cases," 12% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 13% disagreed. 80% of agency respondents and 69% of union respondents agreed.

66% of respondents agreed with the statement, "the Regional Office identified all issues that were necessary to resolve the petition," 15% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 19% disagreed. There were little differences between agency and union respondents. 67% of respondents agreed with the statement, "the Regional Office outlined the information necessary to resolve the underlying issues," 16% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 17% disagreed. Again, there were little differences between agency and union respondents. 81% of respondents agreed with the statement "I was given the opportunity to provide relevant information necessary to resolve the underlying issues," 7% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 9% disagreed. Of the agency respondents, 91% agreed, and 76% of union respondents agreed.



TABLE 21
REGIONAL OFFICE REP CASE HANDLING PROCEDURES

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B1. Did you participate in any REP proceedings in 1996 and/or 1997?				
Total Respondents Who Answered Yes:			314	
B2a The Regional Office provided me with the information I needed about processing REP cases.				
Representation Petitions	161	75%	12%	13%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	76	80%	8%	12%
Union	75	69%	16%	15%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%
B2b The Regional Office identified all issues that were necessary to resolve the petition.				
Representation Petitions	161	66%	15%	19%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	76	67%	15%	18%
Union	75	64%	19%	17%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%
B2c The Regional Office outlined the information necessary to resolve the underlying issues.				
Representation Petitions	159	67%	16%	17%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	76	67%	16%	17%
Union	73	66%	18%	16%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%



TABLE 21 Continued
REGIONAL OFFICE REP CASE HANDLING PROCEDURES

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B2d I was given the opportunity to provide relevant information necessary to resolve the underlying issues.				
Representation Petitions	160	84%	7%	9%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	76	91%	1%	8%
Union	74	76%	13%	11%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%
B2e The petition was processed in a timely manner.				
Representation Petitions	159	61%	9%	30%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	76	66%	4%	30%
Union	73	53%	15%	32%
Individual	2	50%	0%	50%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%
B2f The meetings that I attended to narrow and resolve the underlying representation issue(s) were helpful.				
Representation Petitions	132	58%	25%	17%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	61	56%	25%	20%
Union	62	58%	27%	15%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%



TABLE 21 Continued
REGIONAL OFFICE REP CASE HANDLING PROCEDURES

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B2g The Regional Office kept me informed of the status of the investigation.				
Representation Petitions	156	66%	12%	22%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	74	66%	8%	26%
Union	72	64%	17%	19%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%

Unlike some of the other timeliness questions, the response for the Regional Office’s REP case handling procedures was very positive. Of 159 respondents, 61% agreed with the statement, “the petition was processed in a timely manner,” 9% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 30% disagreed. Of 76 agency respondents, 66 agreed; and of 73 union respondents, 53% agreed. Again, on a very positive note, of 132 respondents, 58% agreed with the statement, “the meetings that I attended to narrow and resolve the underlying representation issue(s) were helpful,” 25% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 17% disagreed. There were little differences between agency and union respondents.

Of 156 respondents, 66% agreed with the statement, “the Regional Office kept me informed of the status of the investigation,” 12% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 22% disagreed. There were little differences between agency and union respondents.

2. Quality of Service Provided by Agent. Respondents were asked to assess the perceived quality of service provided by the agent in charge of the case. There was agreement that the service was of the highest quality. (There were too few individual respondents (2) to report on their views; however, the two individuals were very positive.)

Of 161 respondents, 71% agreed with the statement, “the agent was helpful in explaining the requirements for processing the petition,” 16% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 13% disagreed. There was little difference between agency and union respondents. Of 160 respondents, 81% agreed with the statement, “the agent treated me fairly,” 11% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 8% disagreed. Of 75 agency respondents, 88% agreed, and of 75 union respondents, 76% agreed. Of 157 respondents, 79% agreed with the statement, “the agent answered my questions about case handling procedures,” 14% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7% disagreed. There was little difference between agency and union respondents. Of 157 respondents, 75% agreed with the statement, “the agent was knowledgeable about the Statute, the regulations and applicable case law,” 13% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 12% disagreed. There was little difference between agency and union respondents. Of 161 respondents, 71%



agreed with the statement, “the agent gave no indication of favoring one party’s position over another’s”, 14% neither agreed nor disagreed,

TABLE 22
QUALITY OF SERVICE PROVIDED BY THE AGENT

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B3a The agent: was helpful in explaining the requirements for processing the petition.				
Representation Petitions	161	71%	16%	13%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	77	71%	15%	14%
Union	74	70%	18%	12%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%
B3b The agent: treated me fairly.				
Representation Petitions	160	81%	11%	8%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	75	88%	5%	7%
Union	75	76%	16%	8%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%
B3c The agent: answered my questions about case handling procedures.				
Representation Petitions	157	79%	14%	7%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	75	82%	13%	5%
Union	72	77%	15%	8%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%



TABLE 22 Continued
 QUALITY OF SERVICE PROVIDED BY THE AGENT

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B3d The agent: was knowledgeable about the Statute, the regulations and applicable case law.				
Representation Petitions	157	75%	13%	12%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	75	75%	15%	10%
Union	75	75%	11%	14%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%
B3e The agent: gave no indication of favoring one party's position over another's.				
Representation Petitions	161	71%	14%	15%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	76	68%	16%	16%
Union	75	75%	13%	12%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
Other	2	100%	0%	0%

and 15% disagreed. There was essentially little difference between agency and union respondents. These high percent agreements clearly show that FLRA is meeting the needs of its customers in this area.

3. Representation Elections. 33% (103) of REP participants were a party in an election proceeding conducted by the FLRA. Only those who used these services were requested to answer the questions. The response to these services were very favorable. (There were too few individual respondents (3) to report on their views. However, the three individuals were very positive.) Of 102 respondents, 87% agreed with the statement, “the election agreement included all election details,” 7% neither agreed nor disagreed, and only 6% disagreed. There were little differences between agency and union respondents. See Table 23.

The responses to timeliness were positive. Of 103 respondents, 83% agreed with the statement, “the election was scheduled in a timely manner,” 6% neither agreed nor disagreed, and only 11% disagreed. Of 50 agency respondents, 86% agreed, of 45 union respondents, 76% agreed.



TABLE 23
 REPRESENTATION ELECTIONS CONDUCTED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICES

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B4b The election agreement included all election details.				
Representation Petitions	102	87%	7%	6%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	49	84%	8%	8%
Union	45	89%	9%	2%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B4c The election was scheduled in a timely manner.				
Representation Petitions	103	83%	6%	11%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	50	86%	8%	6%
Union	45	76%	4%	20%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B4d The election was conducted in a fair and impartial manner.				
Representation Petitions	103	84%	10%	6%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	50	84%	8%	8%
Union	45	82%	16%	2%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%



TABLE 23 Continued
REPRESENTATION ELECTIONS CONDUCTED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICES

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B4e Each eligible voter had an opportunity to cast a secret, uncoerced ballot.				
Representation Petitions	103	87%	7%	6%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	50	90%	4%	6%
Union	45	82%	11%	7%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B4f After the election, the Regional Director issued the certification(s) in a timely manner.				
Representation Petitions	101	88%	6%	6%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	50	86%	6%	8%
Union	44	84%	9%	7%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%

Of 103 respondents, the vast majority (84%) agreed with the statement, “the election was conducted in a fair and impartial manner,” 10% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 6% disagreed. Again, there were little differences between agency and union respondents. Of 103 respondents, 88% agreed with the statement, “each eligible voter had an opportunity to cast a secret, uncoerced ballot,” 6% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 6% disagreed. There was essentially little difference between agency and union respondents. Of 101 respondents, 88% agreed with the statement, “after the election, the Regional Director issued the certification(s) in a timely manner,” 6% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 6% disagreed. There was essentially little difference between agency and union respondents.

4. Hearings Conducted by Regional Offices. Representation hearings are normally conducted when the parties are unable to reach an election agreement, when a material issue of fact exists or when a question exists regarding unit appropriateness. 17% (52) of REP participants indicated participating in a hearing conducted by a hearing officer on behalf of a Regional Director. Again, this is a skip section of questions; only those who participated in hearing conducted by the Regional Office were asked to answer these questions. All of these percentages are high and indicate a high degree of fairness for both parties. (There were no individual respondents to this set of questions. Also, with the exception of the last item



TABLE 24
HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</u>
B5b The Notice of Hearing and its attachments adequately informed me about the hearing, issues and information I needed to develop a complete record.				
Representation Petitions	52	89%	0%	11%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	26	85%	0%	15%
Union	25	92%	0%	8%
Individual	0	0%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B5c The hearing was conducted in a timely manner.				
Representation Petitions	52	74%	9%	17%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	25	72%	4%	24%
Union	25	72%	16%	12%
Individual	0	0%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B5d The hearing officer outlined the issues to be decided.				
Representation Petitions	52	85%	8%	7%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	26	85%	4%	11%
Union	24	88%	0%	12%
Individual	0	0%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%



TABLE 24 Continued
HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B5e The hearing officer explained the hearing procedures.				
Representation Petitions	52	80%	9%	11%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	26	77%	8%	15%
Union	25	84%	8%	8%
Individual	0	0%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B5f I was given the opportunity to provide all relevant evidence on the issues.				
Representation Petitions	52	89%	6%	5%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	26	88%	8%	4%
Union	25	88%	4%	8%
Individual	0	0%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B5g I was given the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses and review all documentary evidence.				
Representation Petitions	52	91%	4%	5%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	24	92%	4%	4%
Union	25	92%	0%	8%
Individual	0	0%	0%	0%
Other	1	0%	100%	0%



TABLE 24 Continued
HEARINGS CONDUCTED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B5h The hearing officer was fair and impartial.				
Representation Petitions	44	71%	22%	7%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	26	65%	23%	12%
Union	25	76%	20%	4%
Individual	0	0%	0%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%

concerning the fairness of the hearing officer, there were little differences between the agency and union respondents. Following is a breakout of this information.

Of 52 respondents, 89% agreed with the statement, “the Notice of Hearing and its attachments adequately informed me about the hearing, issues and information I needed to develop a complete record,” no one neither agreed nor disagreed, 11% disagreed. Of the respondents, 74% agreed with the statement, “the hearing was conducted in a timely manner,” 9% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 17% disagreed. 85% agreed with the statement, “the hearing officer outlined the issues to be decided,” 8% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7% disagreed. Of 52 respondents, 80% agreed with the statement, “the hearing officer explained the hearing procedures” 9% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 11% disagreed. Of 52 respondents, 89% agreed with the statement, “I was given the opportunity to provide all relevant evidence on the issues,” 6% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 5% disagreed. Of 52 respondents, 91% agreed with the statement, “I was given the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses and review all documentary evidence,” 4% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 5% disagreed. Of 44 respondents, 71% agreed with the statement, “the hearing officer was fair and impartial,” 22% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7% disagreed. On this last item, while the view of all respondents was excellent, of 25 agency respondents, 65% agreed with the statement and of 25 union respondents, 76% agreed with the statement.

5. Stipulations that result in issue of a Decision and Order or an Election Agreement. A stipulation, rather than a formal representation hearing, is permissible and often encouraged by a Regional Office. 25% (78) of REP respondents indicated they participated in drafting a stipulation in 1996/1997. Only those who individuals who participated were asked to answer. Of the respondents who participated in drafting a stipulation, 78% reported the stipulation resulted in issuance of a Regional Director Decision and order or an approved Election Agreement. Of 78 respondents, 89% said that the “stipulation resulted in issuance of a Regional Director Decision and Order or an approved Election Agreement. Of 34 agency respondents, 85% agreed, and of 37 union respondents, 95% agreed. See Table 25.



TABLE 25
STIPULATIONS THAT RESULT IN THE ISSUANCE OF A DECISION AND ORDER OR
AN ELECTION AGREEMENT

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>
B6b Did the stipulation result in issuance of a Regional Director Decision and Order or an approved Election Agreement?			
Representation Petitions	78	9 11%	69 89%
Role Represented before FLRA			
Agency	34	5 15%	29 85%
Union	37	2 5%	35 95%
Individual	2	0 0%	2 100%
Other	1	1 100%	0 0%

Comments. B6. A stipulation, rather than a formal representation hearing, is permissible and often encouraged. Did you participate in drafting a stipulation? Yes. No; explain why the parties were unable, or did not try, to obtain a stipulation. Of those respondents who did not participate in drafting a stipulation with the assistance of the Regional Office, the following are examples of their comments: (These are examples; they do not represent a systematic representation of the comments. See Appendix B for the complete set of comments.) (1) I do not know. (2) There was no stipulation offered by FLRA. (3) Case dismissed prior to hearing. (4) Neither side could agree on anything. (5) Did not need a hearing. (6) Petitioner withdrew. (7) Was not advised it could be done and did not desire to. (8) Too many issues in dispute. (9) First representation petition was withdrawn. Changed from local to national.

6. Regional Director’s Decisions and Orders. Almost half of the respondents who answered the question (47%) believed the Decisions and Orders issued by the Regional Director were done so in a timely manner. Following is a break-out of these data. See Table 26.

Of 149 respondents, 54% agreed with the statement, “Decisions and Orders were issued in a timely manner,” 13% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 33% disagreed. There was little difference between agency and union respondents. Of 142 respondents, 76% agreed with the statement, “Decisions and Orders addressed and resolved the issues raised by the petition,” 8% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 16% disagreed. Of 67 agency respondents, 85% agreed, and of 66 union respondents, 68% agreed. Of 141 respondents, 75% agreed with the statement, “Decisions and Orders contained sufficient facts and legal analyses to enable me to understand the decision(s) (even if I did not agree with it),” 11% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 14% disagreed. Of 67 agency respondents, 85% agreed, while of 65 union respondents, 66% agreed.

TABLE 26



REGIONAL DIRECTOR’S DECISIONS AND ORDERS

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B7a Decisions and Orders were issued in a timely manner.				
Representation Petitions	149	54%	13%	33%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	71	55%	13%	32%
Union	69	49%	15%	36%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	3	0%	100%	0%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B7b Decisions and Orders addressed and resolved the issues raised by the petition.				
Representation Petitions	142	76%	8%	16%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	67	85%	6%	9%
Union	66	68%	11%	21%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	2	50%	0%	50%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B7c Decisions and Orders contained sufficient facts and legal analyses to enable me to understand the decision(s) (even if I did not agree with it).				
Representation Petitions	141	75%	11%	14%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	67	85%	9%	6%
Union	65	66%	14%	20%
Individual	2	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	2	50%	0%	50%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%



Comments. B8. Please add any comments about REP case handling procedures in the Regional Offices. (These are examples only; they do not represent a systematic representation of the comments. See Appendix B for the complete set of comments.) (1) I have dealt with two Regional Offices on complex issues and successor-ship and am very pleased with the responses. (2) We need decisions faster because the issue usually affects other issues. (3) Very poor process. (4) This is an area the Authority does a good job with. (5) Not consistent with existing case law. (6) Overall staff is very helpful, informative and neutral. (7) New manual greatly aid in processing unit cases. (8) Hearings should be more formal and follow standard court room procedures. (9) Regional Office helped us resolve several CU's informally - very helpful agents.

B. Authority Decisions.

Decisions and Orders of the Regional Director may be appealed to the Authority and may be affirmed, modified, remanded or reversed in whole or in part. 20% (62) of REP respondents were a party to or represented a party in REP cases decided by the Authority in 1996/1997. Again, this was a skip pattern where only those respondents involved in the service were asked to answer the questions. Results of analysis of responses to issues related to the decisions are presented in the following paragraphs. These responses show that FLRA is meeting its customer requirements. (There were to few individual respondents (3) to make any statement about them, however they were all very positive.)

Of 62 respondents, 76% agreed with the statement, "the Authority decision accurately presented the facts of the case," 16% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 8% disagreed. There was essentially little difference between agency and union respondents on this question. Of 62 respondents, 76% agreed with the statement, "the Authority decision explained the issues in the case," 14% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 10% disagreed. There was essentially little difference between agency and union respondents on this question. Of 61 respondents, 82% agreed with the statement, "the Authority decision explained the arguments in the case," 11% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 7% disagreed. There were differences between agency and union views on this question. Of 22 agency respondents, 91% agreed; of 31 union respondents, 74% agreed.

Of 62 respondents, 81% agreed with the statement, "the Authority decision decided the issues raised by the parties," 8% neither agreed nor disagreed, 11% disagreed. Of 23 agency respondents, 91% agreed, and of 31 union respondents, 71% agreed. Of 62 respondents, 47% agreed with the statement "the Authority decision was issued in a timely manner," 18% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 35% disagreed. There was only minor differences between agency and union respondents. Of 62 respondents, 76% agreed with the statement, "the Authority decision explained the reasons for the conclusions reached," 14% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 10% disagreed. There was essentially little differences between agency and union respondents.



TABLE 27
AUTHORITY DECISIONS

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B10a1 The Authority decision: accurately presented the facts of the case.				
Representation Petitions	62	76%	16%	8%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	23	78%	13%	9%
Union	31	71%	23%	6%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	7	71%	0%	29%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B10a2 The Authority decision: explained the issues in the case.				
Representation Petitions	62	76%	14%	10%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	23	78%	13%	9%
Union	31	71%	19%	10%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	7	57%	29%	14%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B10a3 The Authority decision: explained the arguments in the case.				
Representation Petitions	61	82%	11%	7%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	22	91%	5%	4%
Union	31	74%	19%	7%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	7	43%	43%	14%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%



TABLE 27 Continued
AUTHORITY DECISIONS

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B10a4 The Authority decision: decided the issues raised by the parties.				
Representation Petitions	62	81%	8%	11%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	23	91%	0%	9%
Union	31	71%	16%	13%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	7	43%	0%	57%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B10a5 The Authority decision: was issued in a timely manner.				
Representation Petitions	62	47%	18%	35%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	23	48%	13%	39%
Union	31	39%	22%	39%
Individual	3	67%	33%	0%
FLRA	7	0%	0%	100%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%
B10a6 The Authority decision: explained the reasons for the conclusions reached.				
Representation Petitions	62	76%	14%	10%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	23	78%	13%	9%
Union	31	71%	19%	10%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	7	43%	29%	28%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%



TABLE 27 Continued
AUTHORITY DECISIONS

	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Agree/ Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree/ Strongly Disagree</u>
B10a7 The Authority decision: resolved the dispute between the parties.				
Representation Petitions	62	55%	27%	18%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	23	65%	22%	13%
Union	31	45%	36%	19%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	7	29%	14%	57%
Other	1	0%	0%	100%
B10b I understood (even if I did not agree with) the Authority’s reasons for reaching the conclusions stated in the decision.				
Representation Petitions	61	79%	10%	11%
Role Represented before FLRA				
Agency	23	83%	9%	8%
Union	30	74%	13%	13%
Individual	3	100%	0%	0%
FLRA	7	14%	0%	86%
Other	1	100%	0%	0%

Of 62 respondents, 55% agreed with the statement, “the Authority decision resolved the dispute between the parties,” 27% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 18% disagreed. Of 23 agency respondents, 65% agreed; however, of 31 union respondents, 45% agreed. Of 61 respondents, 79% agreed with the statement, “I understood (even if I did not agree with) the Authority’s reasons for reaching the conclusions stated in the decision,” 10% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 11% disagreed. There were essentially little differences between agency and union respondents. See Table 27.

Comments. B11. How did the timeliness of the Authority’s REP decision(s) affect your labor-management relationship(s)? (These are examples only; they do not represent a systematic representation of the comments. See Appendix B for the complete set of comments.) (1) No effect. (2) Helped with improving relationships. (3) Unknown. (4) Strained ever more so. (5) Most were on time and allowed us to move on. (6) Denied local its right to represent unit employees. (7) It was fine. Management and union recognized it was a difficult case. (8) The timeliness of the process was very important. It kept the process from breaking down.



Comments. B12. Please add any comments about the Authority's REP decisions.
(These are examples only; they do not represent a systematic representation of the comments. See Appendix B for the complete set of comments.) (1) Very good. (2) It was a tough decision for everyone. (3) A decision made, without a formal hearing, is something we find to be incredible. This negates all semblance of due process and fairness. (4) Decision easy to read and understand. (5) Timely, clear, authoritative. (6) Speed them up! (7) Decision easy to read and understand. (8) The agents are doing well. The process however, is still not a one-stop petition.