

N16 NP2

Involuntary Administrative Separation (Officer)

OBJECTIVE

To facilitate sessions to validate the current application system within the Officer Involuntary Administrative Separation while also identifying key challenges. Propose actionable solutions to improve the process, streamline workflows, reduce manual errors, enhance efficiency, and modernize the overall experience by leveraging automation, system integration, and standardized practices.

SCOPE

To Review the current (“as-is”) business process models (BPMs) and functional process data tools (FPDTs). Focus on internal and external workflows, manual task load, update intervals, and process knowledge. Address manning challenges, manual processes, and communication inefficiencies. Plan future-state workflows leveraging automation.

TRANSFORMATION SIGNIFICANCE

Enhancing the package processing timeline for the acquisition and flow of information from Involuntary Administrative Separation members through an automated procedure will significantly improve the capacity of processors to obtain information and offer timely updates, thereby mitigating delays associated with manual verification. Additionally, implementing a comprehensive training program that encompasses the essential skills required for processing separations will enhance efficiency while reducing process delays.

EXPERIENCE MAPS

Refer to the attached experience map to gain a visual overview of the Involuntary Administrative Separation process.

Current-state (As-Is) Experience Map

Illustrates the current-state process which includes process steps, operational activities, stakeholders, data, and systems. It also includes the collected pain points and opportunities mapped to their appropriate process step.

Future-state (To-Be) Experience Map

Illustrates ideal future-state process with new process steps and stakeholders. It also includes opportunity statements (represented in the current state) and the quotes that support those points.

INVOLUNTARY ADMINISTRATIVE SEPARATION / KEY PROCESS TAKEAWAYS

The Involuntary Administrative Separation process is confronted with considerable inefficiencies, largely attributable to manual workflows, a limited number of processors, disparate systems containing essential packages and forms, as well as challenges in communication. The Navy can enhance this process by implementing a unified system for package management, which would eliminate redundancies and automate various steps. Such modifications are expected to reduce delays, mitigate errors, and enable processors to concentrate on ensuring the accuracy of information and the timeliness of updates.

By adopting these proposed solutions, the Navy can significantly improve the experience for legal processors, commands, and servicemembers. Additionally, these enhancements will promote operational efficiency and decrease the time required to process separations, ultimately leading to a more expedient and effective procedure.

Pain Points:

1. Processing Time

There are not enough service members to manage and complete all the processing leg work that is required and meet the high demand, creating bottlenecks.

2. Case Information Updates

The processing office receives multiple calls a day requesting an update on case statuses which in turn eats up case handling time.

3. Communication Gaps

There are challenges in establishing reliable and efficient communication process with Commands and Sailors.

4. Manual Process

Relying on email exchange and DOD Safe for package transfers, lead to inefficiencies in the process.

5. Training Limitations

With no formal training before joining the team, inconsistent knowledge levels and longer onboarding timelines result in inefficiencies for such a high demanding job.

NOTABLE QUOTES

“...lack of knowledge in the process from personnel is the main concern for delays.”

KEY FINDINGS & SOLUTIONS

1. Insufficient Staffing

Pain Point:

The limited team size used to process packages in such a high-demand and workload environment creates bottlenecks that delay processing times.

Recommendation:

Increase staffing or resources to reduce pressure on existing team members, thus reducing bottlenecks and improving the process.

2. Communication / Update Gaps

Pain Point:

There are challenges in establishing a reliable and efficient communication process with Commands and Sailors. The processing office receives multiple calls a day requesting an update on case statuses which in turn eats up case handling time.

Recommendation:

Enhance the transparency and reliability of communication processes between Command, PERS 834, and Sailors. Establish a dedicated support system to effectively manage inquiries and provide timely status updates.

3. Manual Process

Pain Point:

Relying on email exchange and DOD Safe for package transfers, lead to inefficiencies in the process.

Recommendation:

Establish automated and structured workflows to minimize manual interventions. Implement automated systems for package processing and tracking to reduce the manual workload and enhance overall accuracy.

4. Knowledge Enhancement

Pain Point:

The absence of formal training leads to varying levels of knowledge among members, resulting in prolonged onboarding processes for new staff members.

Recommendation:

Establish a comprehensive training program that will endow team members with the essential skills and knowledge required to perform their duties with efficiency and effectiveness.

WORKSHOP & STAKEHOLDER SESSIONS

The IAT facilitated six remote workshops with a varied audience of stakeholders, subject matter experts (SMEs), and functional users—which bolstered synergized human-centered design (HCD) and business process re-engineering (BPR)—ignited conversation, identified key pain points with a process, recognized opportunities for transformation, and assisted with formulating BPR efforts. The IAT conducted these remote workshops using Mural and MS Teams to validate and conduct BPR and HCD Exercises.

- **Tuesday, October 8, 2024** – First discussion with stakeholders – defined and validated current state Business Process Model (BPM) for Officer Involuntary Administrative Separation.
- **Tuesday, October 22, 2024** – Review and verify As-Is state Business Process Model (BPM) by addressing process flow with SME's.
- **Friday, October 25, 2024** – Review As-Is draft Business Process Model (BPM) for validation with SME's.
- **Wednesday, October 30, 2024** – Finalized updates to current state Business Process Model (BPM), verified process with SME's and waiting on concurrence before proceeding to Functional Process Data Tool (FPDT) review.
- **Wednesday, February 5, 2025** – Reviewed, refined and validated the current process Functional Process Data Tool (FPDT).
- **Thursday, February 13, 2025** – Finalized updates to future state Business Process Model (BPM) terminology and ensured alignment across all steps, while addressing gaps or changes necessary for upcoming implementation.

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Workshops were conducted to define, validate, and accept the As-Is / To-Be Business Process Models (BPM) and Functional Process Data Tools (FPDT) for the Manage Separation and Retirements Involuntary Administrative Separation processes.
- Workshops were conducted to draft, refine, and improve the To-Be Business Process Models (BPM) and Functional Process Data Tools (FPDT) for the Manage Separation and Retirements Involuntary Administrative Separation processes.

STAKEHOLDER LIST

Name	Role	Organization
LCDR Andrew Gates	SME	PERS-834
ENS Chauncey Kimmons	SME	PERS-834
PS1 Cosharvia Poe	SME	NPPSC

Name	Role	Organization
PSCS Tito Zendejas	SME	NPPSC
PSC Raymond Francis	SME	CNPC
PS1 Emily MacWilliams	SME	CNPC

IAT TEAM PARTICIPANTS

Name	Role
Georgia Barnett	Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) Lead
Stephen Hunter	BPR
Blair Corey	BPR
Phil Thompson	BPR
Payton Yance	BPR
Teri Burnett	BPR
Lenelle Williams	Requirements Lead
Janet Rodriguez	Requirements Co-Lead
Mike Simrell	Requirements
Paul Jenkins	Requirements
Derrick Francis	TSCTI Deputy Program Manager
Renette Calixte	TSCTI Lead IAT Project Manager
Tian Song	TSCTI HCD Strategist
David Salcedo	TSCTI Business Analyst

Name	Role
Subha Radhakrishnan	TSCTI Business Analyst
Melanie Boettner	Costing Lead
Laurence Cole	Costing