



## Texas Department of Criminal Justice

**Brad Livingston**  
Executive Director

May 27, 2008

Mr. John O'Brien, Director  
Legislative Budget Board  
Post Office Box 12666  
Austin, Texas 78711

Mr. Mike Morrissey, Director  
Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy  
Post Office Box 12428  
Austin, Texas 78711

RE: Report on Customer Service

Dear Gentlemen:

In fulfillment of statutory requirements and as directed by the Agency Strategic Plan Instructions for Fiscal Years 2009-13, 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 2008-2009 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,

**\*\* Signature on File \*\***

Jerry McGinty  
Chief Financial Officer

Enclosures

c: Susan Dow, Legislative Budget Board  
Kyle Mitchell, 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.state.tx.us](http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us)

## Texas Department of Criminal Justice Report on Customer Service, April 2008

<b>External Customers</b>	The general public has been identified as the external customer of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.													
<b>Description of Services Offered</b>	On behalf of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, the TDCJ Office of Ombudsman 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. ( <i>Note:</i> Confidentiality requirements can restrict some information from being released.)													
<b>Priority Populations of Customers</b>	In an effort to manage the number of customers contacted and to limit the frequency and degree of customer-information gathering, selection of a priority population was chosen as means to assess customer satisfaction for the original survey distribution in February 2000. Because the surveys were to be distributed throughout the entire state of Texas, a decision was made to poll county judges and offender advocate groups. This decision was approved in advance by TDCJ executive management and analysts from the Legislative Budget Board and Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy. In an effort to utilize previous reporting results as a comparison to this survey, we distributed the survey instrument to the same population pool.													
<b>Description of Information-Gathering Methods</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The written survey method was used to gather information related to customer service satisfaction. In an effort to minimize some of the cost of our data gathering methods and maximize customer ease in providing responses, yet maintain the priority customer population from past evaluations, the survey was emailed to prospective respondents. Approximately 5% of the surveys were faxed to county judges that either do not have email access or whose email delivery failed. The TDCJ Office of the Ombudsman provided email addresses for offender advocate groups.</li> <li>• The email/fax cover explained the purpose of the survey and asked recipients to complete and return the form via email or fax.</li> <li>• Upon arrival at TDCJ's Business and Finance Office, all returned survey instruments were reviewed by the survey coordinator and entered into a PC database. Hardcopies of the surveys were filed in the office for future reference.</li> </ul>													
<b>Summary Description of Survey</b>	The written survey instrument (originally developed in February 2000) was patterned after a similar survey formulated by the University of Texas. The survey assessed customer satisfaction in the areas of facilities, staff, communications, internet site, complaint handling process, timeliness and printed information. In 2004, the survey instrument was changed to remove duplicate questions without losing pertinent assessment areas. The 2008 survey questions were not changed, in order to allow a comparison for reporting purposes.													
<b>Customer Groups Excluded</b>	<i>As directed by the Legislative Budget Board and Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy in February 2000, the following groups of customers were excluded from the survey:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TDCJ employees</li> <li>• TDCJ offenders</li> </ul>													
<b>Data Collection Time Frames</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The survey instrument was sent to the prospective focus group respondents April 18, 2008.</li> <li>• Due to the brevity of the survey and to allow ample time for analysis, customers were asked to take a moment to complete the survey and return it by April 30, 2008. A reminder was distributed to those who had not responded on April 28, 2008.</li> </ul>													
<b>Number of Customers Surveyed</b>	<i>Surveys were distributed as follows:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 254 surveys were emailed to county judges (every Texas county)</li> <li>• 2 surveys were emailed to offender advocate groups</li> </ul>													
<b>Confidence Levels</b>	Comparison of confidence levels from the April 2006 survey to the present follows: <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">2006</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2008</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Surveyed customers that expressed overall satisfaction with services TDCJ offered</td> <td style="text-align: center;">72.06%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">71.27%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Surveyed customers that only partially completed the survey or felt the survey questions were not applicable</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26.47%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">24.14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Surveyed customers (four responses) that expressed dissatisfaction with services offered by TDCJ</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.47%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.60%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2006	2008	• Surveyed customers that expressed overall satisfaction with services TDCJ offered	72.06%	71.27%	• Surveyed customers that only partially completed the survey or felt the survey questions were not applicable	26.47%	24.14%	• Surveyed customers (four responses) that expressed dissatisfaction with services offered by TDCJ	1.47%	4.60%	
	2006	2008												
• Surveyed customers that expressed overall satisfaction with services TDCJ offered	72.06%	71.27%												
• Surveyed customers that only partially completed the survey or felt the survey questions were not applicable	26.47%	24.14%												
• Surveyed customers (four responses) that expressed dissatisfaction with services offered by TDCJ	1.47%	4.60%												
<b>Response Rates</b>	A complete report of survey responses follows this document. The table below summarizes responses to TDCJ's customer service survey: <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">2006</th> <th style="text-align: center;">2008</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Surveys Distributed</td> <td style="text-align: center;">257</td> <td style="text-align: center;">256</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Survey Response Rate</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26.45%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">33.98%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2006	2008	• Surveys Distributed	257	256	• Survey Response Rate	26.45%	33.98%				
	2006	2008												
• Surveys Distributed	257	256												
• Survey Response Rate	26.45%	33.98%												
<b>Agency's Response to Assessment</b>	In response to this assessment, the areas representing margin for improvement spoke to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ the customer not knowing how to make a complaint regarding this agency (<i>12 out of 87 customers</i>)</li> <li>➢ <i>The Agency has prominently displayed the "Compact with Texans" on the agency web site which explains the complaint process via the TDCJ Ombudsman Coordinator as the customer relations representative. Ombudsman Coordinators have also posted contact information at every facility and probation/parole offices.</i></li> </ul>													

## Texas Department of Criminal Justice Customer Related Performance Measures, April 2008

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 2008 depict actual data based upon the recent customer service survey. Agency-specific measures depict actual performance for fiscal year 2006 along with projected performance for fiscal year 2008.

<i>Measure Type</i>	<i>Measure</i>	<i>FY 2006 Performance</i>	<i>Projected FY 2008 Performance</i>
<b>Standard Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of surveyed customer respondents expressing overall satisfaction with services received</li> </ul>	72.06%	71.27%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of surveyed customer respondents identifying ways to improve service delivery</li> </ul>	0%	0%
<b>Standard Output</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of customers surveyed</li> </ul>	257	256
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of customers served</li> </ul>	68	87
<b>Standard Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost per customer surveyed</li> </ul>	No fiscal impact (existing resources utilized)	No fiscal impact (existing resources utilized)
<b>Standard Explanatory</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of customer identified</li> </ul>	The General Public	The General Public
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of customer groups inventoried</li> </ul>	2 Priority Groups <i>(County Judges, Offender Advocate Groups)</i>	2 Priority Groups <i>(County Judges, Offender Advocate Groups)</i>
<b>Agency-Specific Outcome</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average number of days to final response</li> </ul>	30	30
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percent of inquiries involving life threatening issues</li> </ul>	8%	8.1%
<b>Agency-Specific Output</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total number of inquires received by the TDCJ Ombudsman Office</li> </ul>	20,878	17,628
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of phone inquiries received</li> </ul>	5,240	5,436
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of mail inquires received</li> </ul>	4,651	4,374
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of internet inquires received</li> </ul>	10,987	7,816
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of inquiries in person</li> </ul>	0	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of legislative/government inquires received</li> </ul>	1,155	1,154
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of meetings held with offender advocate groups</li> </ul>	11	8