



Texas Department of Criminal Justice

Brad Livingston
Executive Director

June 1, 2012

Ms. Ursula Parks, Acting Director
Legislative Budget Board
1501 Congress Ave., 5th Floor
Post Office Box 12666
Austin, Texas 78711-1266

Mr. Jonathan Hurst, Director
Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy
Old Insurance Building, 4th Floor
Post Office Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711-2428


RE: Report on Customer Service

Dear Ms. Parks and Mr. Hurst:

In fulfillment of statutory requirements and as directed by the Instructions for Preparing and Submitting Agency Strategic Plans for Fiscal Years 2013-17, issued jointly by the Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy and the Legislative Budget Board, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Report on Customer Service for the 2012-2013 biennium is provided. The report includes response rates, confidence levels, and customer related performance measures.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at (936) 437-2107.

Sincerely,



Jerry McGinty
Chief Financial Officer

Enclosures

cc: John Newton, Legislative Budget Board
Chelsea Buchholtz, Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy

Our mission is to provide public safety, promote positive change in offender behavior, reintegrate offenders into society, and assist victims of crime.

P.O. Box 99
Huntsville, Texas 77342-0099
(936) 437-2107
www.tdcj.texas.gov

Texas Department of Criminal Justice 2012 Report on Customer Service

External Customers	The general public has been identified as the external customer of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.
Description of Services Offered	The mission of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) is to provide public safety, promote positive change in offender behavior, reintegrate offenders into society, and assist victims of crime. On behalf of the agency, information is primarily disseminated to the public through the TDCJ Ombudsman Office and the Victim Services Division. <i>(Note: Confidentiality requirements can restrict some information from being released.)</i> The Ombudsman Office facilitates the provision of information to the public in response to specific inquiries regarding the agency, offenders, or staff. The office also provides resolution regarding written inquiries from families and friends of offenders. When necessary, investigations are coordinated through the appropriate TDCJ officials. Additionally, the Victim Services Division provides information and services to victims, surviving family members, witnesses, concerned citizens, victim service providers and criminal justice professionals.
Priority Populations of Customers	<p>In previous customer service reports, the agency had a targeted distribution to county judges and offender advocate groups. This year, the agency chose to distribute the survey instrument to the same population pool in an effort to utilize previous reporting results as a comparison to this survey.</p> <p>Additionally, the agency continued the use of an online survey originally implemented in 2010. This year, the agency chose to place the survey more prominently on the TDCJ website homepage and for a longer time period in an effort to broaden our customer base and reach interested members of the general public. Both survey instruments included the same series of questions.</p>
Description of Information-Gathering Methods	<p><u>MAIL</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As in previous years, the written survey method was used to gather information from county judges and offender advocate groups related to customer service satisfaction. Approximately 12% of the surveys were faxed to county judges whose email delivery failed. The TDCJ Ombudsman Office provided email addresses for offender advocate groups. • The email/fax cover explained the purpose of the survey and asked recipients to complete and return the form via email or fax. • Upon arrival at TDCJ’s Business and Finance Office, all survey responses were reviewed and entered into a PC database. Hardcopies of the surveys were filed in the office for future reference. <p><u>WEBSITE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A link to the online survey was placed on the agency website homepage under “News & Announcements” for a period of five weeks. Limitations of one submission per IP address were set to help prevent multiple submissions from one survey taker. • Weekly results of the online survey were collected in a database and forwarded by agency IT staff to the Business and Finance Office for compilation and analysis.
Summary Description of Survey	Patterned after a similar survey used by the agency over the past several years, the survey asks respondents to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with survey statements that assess their levels of customer satisfaction in the areas of facilities, staff, communications, internet site, complaint handling process, timeliness and printed information. In 2010, some questions were updated for clarity and relevance, though the assessment areas remained the same.
Customer Groups Excluded	As the agency’s two-pronged survey approach targeted county judges and offender advocate groups via email/fax and all members of the general public via the online survey, the only group that was excluded was currently incarcerated TDCJ offenders.
Data Collection Time Frames	<p><u>MAIL</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey instrument was emailed/faxed to the prospective focus group respondents April 17, 2012. • Due to the brevity of the survey and to allow ample time for analysis, county judges and offender advocate groups were asked to take a moment to complete the survey and return it by May 4, 2012. A reminder was distributed to those who had not responded on April 27, 2012. <p><u>WEBSITE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The online survey was posted under “News & Announcements” on the TDCJ website homepage on April 6, 2012 and was available through May 14, 2012.

Texas Department of Criminal Justice 2012 Report on Customer Service *(continued)*

Number of Customers Surveyed	<p><i>Surveys were distributed as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 254 surveys were emailed to county judges (every Texas county) • 2 surveys were emailed to offender advocate groups • While the online survey resulted in 1,165 total hits to the survey link, 120 individuals provided survey submissions. 																		
Confidence Levels	<p>Comparison of confidence levels from the 2010 survey to the present follows:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"></th> <th style="width: 10%;">2010 Mail Only</th> <th style="width: 10%;">2010 TOTAL</th> <th style="width: 10%;">2012 Mail Only</th> <th style="width: 10%;">2012 TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Respondents that expressed overall satisfaction with services TDCJ offered</td> <td style="text-align: center;">95.24%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">59.52%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">98.15%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">57.23%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Respondents that expressed dissatisfaction with services offered by TDCJ</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.76%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40.48%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.85%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">42.77%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					2010 Mail Only	2010 TOTAL	2012 Mail Only	2012 TOTAL	• Respondents that expressed overall satisfaction with services TDCJ offered	95.24%	59.52%	98.15%	57.23%	• Respondents that expressed dissatisfaction with services offered by TDCJ	4.76%	40.48%	1.85%	42.77%
	2010 Mail Only	2010 TOTAL	2012 Mail Only	2012 TOTAL															
• Respondents that expressed overall satisfaction with services TDCJ offered	95.24%	59.52%	98.15%	57.23%															
• Respondents that expressed dissatisfaction with services offered by TDCJ	4.76%	40.48%	1.85%	42.77%															
Response Rates	<p>Comparison of response rates from the 2010 survey to the present follows:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 60%;"></th> <th style="width: 10%;">2010 Mail Only</th> <th style="width: 10%;">2012 Mail Only</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Surveys Distributed</td> <td style="text-align: center;">256</td> <td style="text-align: center;">256</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Survey Response Rate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">24.22%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">28.52%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NOTE: The use of the website survey resulted in an additional 120 respondents completing the survey. As the survey instrument was made available to the entire general public, a response rate for this survey is not applicable.</p>					2010 Mail Only	2012 Mail Only	• Surveys Distributed	256	256	• Survey Response Rate	24.22%	28.52%						
	2010 Mail Only	2012 Mail Only																	
• Surveys Distributed	256	256																	
• Survey Response Rate	24.22%	28.52%																	
Agency's Response to Assessment	<p>While the majority of survey submissions reflect favorable results, the following represent areas for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ the customer not believing the agency will address a complaint ➤ the customer not receiving the information they were looking for in a timely manner ➤ the customer not receiving clear explanation about services available <p>In addition, open-ended comments identifying ways to improve service delivery were related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ communication and availability of information <p><i>In response to this assessment, the agency has identified areas of improvement, both in the process of conducting this assessment and in areas identified in the survey results.</i></p> <p><i>The process for conducting the survey continued to include the online survey instrument originally implemented in 2010; however, this year the survey was displayed more prominently online and for a longer time period in an effort to increase public participation. Future assessments will continue to prominently display the survey online for an extended period of time.</i></p> <p><i>The agency has identified the TDCJ Ombudsman Coordinator as the customer relations representative and Ombudsman Coordinators have posted contact information at every facility and probation/parole offices. Additionally, the agency holds an annual Public Awareness – Corrections Today (PACT) Conference focused entirely on providing families of incarcerated individuals with direct access to information they need about TDCJ programs, services and policies. The agency will continue to further analyze assessment results and comments, using the insights gained for improving customer service.</i></p>																		

Texas Department of Criminal Justice 2012 Customer Related Performance Measures

All Texas state agencies have been instructed to include standard measures (as developed by the LBB and GOBPP) as well as agency-specific performance measures related to customer service standards and customer satisfaction. Standard measures for fiscal year 2012 depict actual data based upon the recent customer service survey. Agency-specific measures depict actual performance for fiscal year 2010 along with projected performance for fiscal year 2012.

<i>Standard Measure</i>	<i>FY 2010 Performance</i>		<i>FY 2012 Performance</i>	
	MAIL	TOTAL	MAIL	TOTAL
• Percentage of surveyed customer respondents expressing overall satisfaction with services received	95.24%	59.52%	98.15%	57.23%
• Percentage of surveyed customer respondents identifying ways to improve service delivery	0%	10.48%	4.11%	15.03%
• Number of customers surveyed	256	N/A	256	N/A
• Cost per customer surveyed	No fiscal impact (existing resources utilized)		No fiscal impact (existing resources utilized)	
• Number of customers identified/served	The General Public		The General Public	
• Number of customer groups inventoried	2 Priority Groups (County Judges, Offender Advocate Groups)	2 Priority Groups (County Judges, Offender Advocate Groups) and Online Submissions	2 Priority Groups (County Judges, Offender Advocate Groups)	2 Priority Groups (County Judges, Offender Advocate Groups) and Online Submissions

<i>Agency-Specific Measure</i>	<i>FY 2010 Performance</i>	<i>Projected FY 2012 Performance</i>
• Average number of days from initial inquiry to final response	5.6	5.9
• Percent of inquiries involving life threatening issues	10.4%	7.9%
• Total number of inquires received by the TDCJ Ombudsman Office	15,483	18,789
• Number of phone inquiries received	4,400	7,258
• Number of mail inquires received	4,135	3,456
• Number of internet inquires received	6,943	8,073
• Number of inquiries in person	5	2
• Number of legislative/government inquires received	716	379
• Number of meetings held with offender advocate groups	2	3