

TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
real places telling real stories

June 1, 2018

Governor's Office of Budget and Policy
(Hand Delivered)

Legislative Budget Board
(Hand Delivered)

Subject: Enclosed Biennial Report on Customer Service

In accordance with the instructions received from the Governor's Office of Budget and Policy, and the Legislative Budget Board for Preparing and Submitting Agency Strategic Plans for Fiscal Years 2019-2023, attached is the completed biennial report on Customer Service.

This report was also submitted electronically for the Legislative Budget Board as required.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 512.463.6383.

Sincerely,



Mark Wolfe
Executive Director



REPORT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

SPRING 2018

BY

THE TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION



TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION
real places telling real stories

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Overview	2
II.	Analysis	5
III.	Customer Service Performance Measures	6
IV.	Survey Items	7

I. Overview

The Texas Historical Commission (THC) is the state agency for historic preservation. THC staff consults with citizens and organizations to preserve Texas' architectural, archeological and cultural landmarks. The agency is recognized nationally for its preservation programs.

The THC is composed of 15 citizen members appointed by the governor to staggered six-year terms. As of September 1, 2017, the agency had 224.2 authorized full-time employees who work in various fields including archeology, architecture, history, economic development, heritage tourism, public and historic site administration.

Since 1953 – when it was established as the Texas State Historical Survey Committee – the agency now known as the Texas Historical Commission has served as the Lone Star State's leader in the preservation of Texas history. THC administers more than two dozen programs that protect the precious places Texans value – colonial missions, courthouses, battlefields and more. Through our stewardship of Texas' State Historic Sites, National Register properties, irreplaceable archeological sites and historic county courthouses, the Texas Historical Commission has become one of the most respected state preservation offices in the nation. We have also become a powerful engine of economic development for Texas communities.

The mission of the THC is to protect and preserve the state's historic and prehistoric resources for the education, enjoyment and economic benefit of present and future generations.

The Texas Historical Commission's Customer Service Goals

The THC has always committed itself to serving the needs of the public, particularly those involved in historic preservation. The agency recognizes that the public is our customer base, just as any private sector business has customers. It is our intention to provide the best possible service to them and our goal is to be recognized for the pursuit of excellence in the area of customer service.

In April 2018, the THC contracted with the Institute for Organizational Excellence at the University of Texas at Austin to administer an electronic survey of the customers of the agency. One goal of this survey was to assess customer satisfaction with the THC in compliance with the Customer Service Standards Act of 1999, Senate Bill 1563. Another goal was to provide agency leadership with primary research information on how well the THC responds to the expressed needs of those who call upon the agency for assistance. This will allow the agency leadership and staff to make any changes necessary to be more responsive to the customers of the agency and better stewards of the state's resources.

Inventory of External Customers Surveyed

The total number surveyed was 2,136 and included these priority populations:

- County Historical Commission Members
- Archeological Stewards
- Certified Local Government Coordinators
- Texas Heritage Trail Region Constituents
- Texas Main Street Managers
- Members of Historic Sites Friend's Organizations

The THC provides technical assistance to all these groups along with on-site consultations, in many cases regarding historical markers, historic zoning ordinances, heritage tourism, downtown revitalization, planning, and architectural and archeological site identification and protection.

Information-Gathering Methodology

The design process incorporated three objectives. First, the survey created substantive customer service survey data for strategic planning and organizational initiatives. Second, the design accurately portrayed and represented the perceptions of customers through the use of standard and tested surveying techniques. Lastly, implementing the survey established an open forum in which both the residents of Texas and the direct recipients of services could evaluate interactions, recognize outstanding service and/or offer insights into how service was delivered and where service needed to improve.

Seven survey areas were specifically listed in the Legislative Budget Board's strategic planning instructions derived from the Customer Service Standards Act. The THC chose to use these seven survey areas—facilities, staff, communications, internet

sites, complaint-handling processes, service timeliness and printed information. For each dimension, the survey participants were asked to respond to various items concerning perceptions of customer service.

The customer perceptions were measured on a Likert-type scale with six possible responses (strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree, and not applicable). Point values ranging from 5, for strongly agree, to 1, for strongly disagree, were assigned upon processing the data. The higher the response the more strongly respondents agreed with the statement. All items were positively worded so higher values represent higher levels of agreement or may be viewed as more positive perceptions of customer service.

Survey Instrument Type, Rate of Response and Respondent Demographics

A survey invitation was sent out on April 2, 2018 to 2136 subscribers on the Texas Historical Commission email listservs. The invitation provided information about the survey and assured the respondent that their comments would be confidential and anonymous. The survey was closed on April 20, 2018.

The survey served as a general customer service diagnostic that assessed customer perceptions in broad topical areas. While many inferences can be made from the survey data, low scoring areas may require additional assessment to determine underlying causes. Conversely, further examination of high scoring dimensions may produce examples of an organization’s “best practices” that can be shared among other parts of the agency. Also, the general nature of the survey enables the agency to use the instrument in different settings; therefore, the survey results allow for comparison of dimensions across the organization. In addition, instruments such as these (voluntary questionnaires of customers) are succinct so each respondent can complete the survey in only a few minutes. Typically, long questionnaires discourage participation due to the specificity of items and considerable length of time to complete the survey. Experience indicates that response rates for concise surveys achieve an acceptable returned percentage of greater than 10%. This survey resulted in a response rate of 20%, compared to a 18% response rate in 2016.

The table below provides the response rate for past five surveys conducted.

	Spring 2018	Spring 2016	Spring 2014	Spring 2012	Spring 2010	Spring 2008
Total Distributed	2136	2280	2500	2000	2000	1192
Total Completed	435	407	355	441	355	252
Response Rate	20%	18%	14%	22%	17%	21%

The table below provides the respondent demographics for the 2018 survey.

Respondent Demographics	Response Number	Response Percent
I am a:		
Female	242	56.67%
Male	185	43.33%
(skipped this question)	8	
My race/ethnicity is:		
African-American/Black	7	1.69%
Hispanic/Latino/a	15	3.62%
Anglo-American/White	378	91.30%
Asian-American/Native American	4	.97%
Multiracial/Other	10	2.42%
(skipped this question)	21	
My age (in years) is:		
Under 18	0	0.00%
18-30	6	1.41%
31-45	34	7.98%
46-59	55	12.91%
60 or older	331	77.70%
(skipped this question)	9	
Select the customer type that best describes you:		
Archeological Stewards	41	9.74%
County Historical Commissions	206	48.93%
Certified Local Governments	46	10.93%
Heritage Tourism	38	9.03%
Texas Main Street Managers	33	7.84%
Other	57	13.54%
(skipped this question)	14	

A sampling of other customer types included historic site volunteer, librarian in a public library, cemetery preservation, historian/author, THC marker and National Register nominator, interested citizen, museum professional, archaeologist, economic development department and restoration specialist.

II. Analysis

Survey responses were compiled and analyzed. For the demographic items, frequency counts and percentage of respondents were tabulated. Furthermore, for each category code such as industry and program, an average score for this item was calculated: “Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.” This item is a general statement about the agency’s customer service performance. Providing these scores for each category permits direct comparisons across the various response options. For the scaled items (the non-demographic items listed at the bottom of the survey), average scores, number of respondents, standard deviations and frequency counts of response choices were calculated. The statistical calculation of standard deviation measures variability of responses. The smaller the standard deviation, the closer together the distribution of the respondents’ score are. The greater the standard deviation, the more scores are spread among the responses. Once item averages were calculated, dimensional averages were computed by taking an average of all the mean item responses, which comprised the different dimensions.

Additional analysis of the survey instrument was conducted. Confidence intervals (set at 95%, the most commonly reported level) were calculated for all scaled items. The level creates an interval (a range around the average item score). This means that the agency can be 95% confident that the interval contained the average scores for the selected customer sample. Reliability (a consistency measure of the survey instrument) was calculated and had an internal consistency coefficient exceeding the generally accepted value. Sample sizes and anticipated rates of response allowed for a plus/minus five percent error rate at the 95% confidence level. Subject research, face validity and factor analysis were used to assure general validity. In other terms, the survey measured what it intended to measure.

Item Score Summary

The items were scored on a five-point scale with 5 being “Strongly Agree” and 1 being “Strongly Disagree.” The agency had a positive overall satisfaction rating of 89.60%, compared to 86.67% in 2016. Of the remaining respondents, 6.38% were neutral, and 2.36% of the population surveyed responded disagree or strongly disagree. (1.65% replied not applicable/do not know). In summary, if the “Not Applicable” responses are excluded, the percentage of respondents stating that overall they were satisfied with their experience with the agency increases to 91.25%.

On a scale of 1 to 5, the agency achieved a score of 4 or over in all areas surveyed. The highest score of 4.50 related to staff members being knowledgeable and helpful. Even the lowest scoring area relating to ease and use of the website was 4.03, a very positive score level. The scores are as follows in descending order:

Item		Avg.
1.	If I interacted with staff, the staff members were knowledgeable and helpful.	4.50
2.	If I received printed information, it was clear and understandable.	4.40
3.	If I visited the facility, it was clean, orderly and accessible.	4.46
4.	I received the information I needed to obtain services.	4.37
5.	Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.	4.40
6.	My telephone call, letter or email inquiry was responded to in a reasonable amount of time.	4.26
7.	The website contained clear and accurate information on events, services and contact information.	4.12
8.	If I complained, I believe it would be addressed in a reasonable manner.	4.14
9.	The website was easy to use and well organized.	4.03

III. Customer Service Performance Measures

Outcome Measures

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services Received: 89.60%

Output Measures

Number of Customers Surveyed: 2,136

Efficiency Measures

Cost Per Customer Surveyed: \$0.46

Explanatory Measures

Number of Customers Identified: 2,136

Number of Customer Groups Inventoried: 6

IV. Survey Items

For the following section, customers are asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree that the statement describes their experience. Possible responses and related point value for the response are listed below:

The survey consists of 9 Items. These items are scored as follows:

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neutral
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree
- (Not scored) Not Applicable/Don't Know

Any survey item with an average (mean) score above the neutral midpoint of "3.0" suggests that customers perceive the issue more positively than negatively. Scores of "4.0" or higher indicate areas of substantial strength for the organization. Conversely, scores below "3.0" are viewed more negatively by customers and should be a significant source of concern for the organization and receive immediate attention.

Number of Respondents

Number of Respondents is the number of valid responses. This includes those responding "Not Applicable."

Current Score

Current Score is calculated by taking the numerical average of the responses for that item. "Not Applicable" responses are not used in this calculation.

Frequency Distribution

Frequency Distribution is provided by presenting both the frequency and corresponding percentage for each possible response. This is provided in a numerical table.

Over Time Comparison Data

Over Time Comparison Data is available to see how responses have changed over time and how different the average score is from the benchmark. The over time data is presented in numerical format.

1. If I interacted with staff, the staff members were knowledgeable and helpful.

Number of Respondents: 426

Current Score: 4.50

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	233	54.69%
Agree	139	32.63%
Neutral	14	3.29%
Disagree	7	1.64
Strongly Disagree	2	.47%
Not Applicable/Don't Know	31	7.28%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.50

Spring 2016: 4.44

Spring 2014: 4.44

Spring 2012: 4.50

Spring 2010: 4.39

2. If I visited the facility, it was clean, orderly and accessible.

Number of Respondents: 390

Current Score: 4.46

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	111	28.46%
Agree	71	18.21%
Neutral	11	2.82%
Disagree	2	.51%
Strongly Disagree	2	.51%
Not Applicable/ Don't Know	193	49.49%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.46

Spring 2016: 4.32

Spring 2014: 4.34

Spring 2012: 4.43

Spring 2010: 4.00

3. The website was easy to use and well organized.

Number of Respondents: 421

Current Score: 4.03

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	116	27.55%
Agree	202	47.98%
Neutral	53	12.59%
Disagree	18	4.28%
Strongly Disagree	5	1.19%
Not Applicable/Don't Know	27	6.41%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.03

Spring 2016: 4.00

Spring 2014: 4.01

Spring 2012: 4.04

Spring 2010: 3.94

4. The website contained clear and accurate information on events, services and contact information.

Number of Respondents: 420

Current Score: 4.12

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	124	29.52%
Agree	207	49.29%
Neutral	48	11.43%
Disagree	9	2.14%
Strongly Disagree	4	.95%
Not Applicable/Don't Know	28	6.67%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.12

Spring 2016: 4.07

Spring 2014: 4.08

Spring 2012: 4.09

Spring 2010: 3.93

5. If I complained, I believe it would be addressed in a reasonable manner.

Number of Respondents: 409

Current Score: 4.14

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	127	31.05%
Agree	124	30.32%
Neutral	39	9.54%
Disagree	13	3.18%
Strongly Disagree	6	1.47%
Not Applicable/Don't Know	100	24.45%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.14

Spring 2016: 4.05

Spring 2014: 4.04

Spring 2012: 3.91

Spring 2010: 3.67

6. My telephone call, letter or email inquiry was responded to in a reasonable amount of time.

Number of Respondents: 413

Current Score: 4.26

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	149	36.08%
Agree	151	36.56%
Neutral	24	5.81%
Disagree	13	3.15%
Strongly Disagree	4	.97%
Not Applicable/Don't Know	72	17.43%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.26

Spring 2016: 4.18

Spring 2014: 4.15

Spring 2012: 4.39

Spring 2010: 4.13

7. If I received printed information, it was clear and understandable.

Number of Respondents: 417

Current Score: 4.40

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	184	44.12%
Agree	168	40.29%
Neutral	24	5.76%
Disagree	4	.96%
Strongly Disagree	0	.00%
Not Applicable/ Don't Know	37	8.87%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.40

Spring 2016: 4.33

Spring 2014: 4.29

Spring 2012: 4.34

Spring 2010: 4.13

8. I received the information I needed to obtain services.

Number of Respondents: 411

Current Score: 4.37

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	172	41.85%
Agree	169	41.12%
Neutral	18	4.38%
Disagree	8	1.95%
Strongly Disagree	1	.24%
Not Applicable/Don't Know	43	10.46%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.37

Spring 2016: 4.25

Spring 2014: 4.19

Spring 2012: 4.34

Spring 2010: 4.18

9. Overall, I am satisfied with my experience.

Number of Respondents: 423

Current Score: 4.40

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	217	51.30%
Agree	162	38.30%
Neutral	27	6.38%
Disagree	8	1.89%
Strongly Disagree	2	.47%
Not Applicable/ Don't Know	7	1.65%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.40

Spring 2016: 4.23

Spring 2014: 4.22

Spring 2012: 4.38

Spring 2010: 4.17