



P.O. Box 12276
Austin, Texas 78711-2276
512-463-6100
thc.texas.gov

June 1, 2020

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 2021-2025, 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,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Mark Wolfe". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping tail on the letter "e".

Mark Wolfe
Executive Director

REPORT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY

SPRING 2020

BY

THE TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION



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, 2019, the agency had authorized 283.2 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 2020, 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 3,410 and included these priority populations:

- County Historical Commission Members
- Archeological Stewards
- Certified Local Government Coordinators
- Texas Heritage Trail Region Constituents
- Texas Main Street Managers
- Museum Services Constituents
- County Judges
- Courthouse Facility 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.

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 and restoration specialist.

II. Analysis

Survey responses were compiled, analyzed and the 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 Satisfied” and 1 being “Strongly Dissatisfied.” The agency had a positive overall satisfaction rating of 92.2%, compared to 89.60% in 2018. Of the remaining respondents, 7.5% were neutral, and .3% of the population surveyed responded disagree or strongly disagree.

On a scale of 1 to 5, the agency achieved a score of 4 or over in all areas surveyed except on the complaint handling question of 3.51. The highest score of 4.54 related to staff members being knowledgeable and helpful. The scores are as follows in descending order:

Item		Avg.
1.	How satisfied are/were you with the agency’s staff, including employee courtesy, friendliness, and knowledgeability, and whether staff members adequately identify themselves by name, including the use of nameplates or tags for accountability.	4.54
2.	Please rate your overall satisfaction with THC.	4.48
3.	How satisfied are/were you with agency communications, including toll-free telephone access, the average time you spend on hold, call transfer, access to live person, letters, electronic mail, and any applicable text messaging or mobile applications.	4.47
4.	How satisfied are/were you with any agency brochures or other printed information, including the accuracy of that information.	4.47
5.	How satisfied are/were you with the agency’s facilities, including your ability to access the agency, the office location, signs, and cleanliness.	4.34
6.	How satisfied are/were you with the agency’s website, including the ease of use of the site, mobile access to the site, information on the location of the site and the agency, and information accessible through the site such as listing of services and programs and whom to contact for further information or to complain.	4.26
7.	How satisfied were you with the agency’s ability to timely serve you, including the amount of time you waited for service in person.	4.08
8.	How satisfied were you with the agency’s complaint handling process, including whether it is easy to file a complaint and whether responses are timely.	3.51

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 8 Items. These items are scored as follows:

- (1) Strongly Unsatisfied
- (2) Unsatisfied
- (3) Neutral
- (4) Satisfied
- (5) Strongly Satisfied
- (Not scored) Prefer Not to Answer/Don't Know and Not Applicable

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 overtime data is presented in numerical format.

1. Staff: If you interact or have interacted with THC staff, how satisfied are/were you with the agency's staff, including employee courtesy, friendliness, and knowledgeable, and whether staff members adequately identify themselves by name, including the use of nameplates or tags for accountability.

Number of Respondents: 329

Current Score: 4.54

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	211	64.1%
Satisfied	97	29.5%
Neutral	10	3.0%
Unsatisfied	9	2.7%
Strongly Unsatisfied	2	.6%

Over Time Comparison

Current	4.54
Spring 2018:	4.50
Spring 2016:	4.44
Spring 2014:	4.44
Spring 2012:	4.50

4. Complaint Handling Process: If you have filed a formal complaint, how satisfied were you with the agency's complaint handling process, including whether it is easy to file a complaint and whether responses are timely.

Number of Respondents: 39
 Current Score: 3.51

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	6	15.4%
Satisfied	15	38.5%
Neutral	12	30.8%
Unsatisfied	5	12.8%
Strongly Unsatisfied	1	2.6%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 3.51
 Spring 2018: 4.14
 Spring 2016: 4.05
 Spring 2014: 4.04
 Spring 2012: 3.91

5. Communication: If you communicate or have communicated with THC, how satisfied are/were you with agency communications, including toll-free telephone access, the average time you spend on hold, call transfer, access to live person, letters, electronic mail, and any applicable text messaging or mobile applications.

Number of Respondents: 323
 Current Score: 4.47

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	185	57.3%
Satisfied	115	35.6%
Neutral	14	4.3%
Unsatisfied	8	2.5%
Strongly Unsatisfied	1	.3%

Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.47
 Spring 2018: 4.26
 Spring 2016: 4.18
 Spring 2014: 4.15
 Spring 2012: 4.39

6. Printed Information: If you receive or have received printed information from THC, how satisfied are/were you with any agency brochures or other printed information, including the accuracy of that information.

Number of Respondents: 296
 Current Score: 4.47

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	158	53.4%
Satisfied	122	41.2%
Neutral	14	4.7%
Unsatisfied	1	.3%
Strongly Unsatisfied	1	.3%