# Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>External Customers</strong></th>
<th>The general public has been identified as the external customer of the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Services Offered</strong></td>
<td>The Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles (BPP), facilitates the provision of information to the public in response to specific inquiries regarding the agency, offenders, or staff. The Agency also provides resolution regarding written inquiries from families and friends of offenders. When necessary, investigations are coordinated through the appropriate BPP officials. <em>(Note: Confidentiality requirements can restrict some information from being released.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Populations of Customers</strong></td>
<td>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 this survey. Because the surveys were to be distributed throughout the entire state of Texas, a decision was made to poll district attorneys, sheriffs and offender advocate groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of Information-Gathering Methods</strong></td>
<td>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, the survey was emailed to prospective respondents. Upon arrival at BPP's Board Central Office, all returned survey instruments were reviewed by the board administrator and entered into a PC database. Hardcopies of the surveys were retained for future reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Description of Survey</strong></td>
<td>The written survey instrument 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, and complaint handling process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Groups Excluded</strong></td>
<td>As directed by the Legislative Budget Board and Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy, the following group of customers were excluded from the survey: BPP Employee's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection Time Frame</strong></td>
<td>The survey instrument was sent to a random sampling of the prospective focus groups respondents on May 2, 2016. Due to brevity of the survey and to allow time for analysis, customers were asked to take a moment to complete the survey and return it by May 26, 2016. A reminder was distributed to those who had not responded on May 19, 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Number of Customers Surveyed** | Surveys were distributed as follows: 
68 surveys were emailed to District Attorneys. 
55 surveys were emailed to Sheriffs. 
3 surveys were emailed to offender advocate groups. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed customers that expressed overall satisfaction with services BPP provides.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed customers that only partially completed the survey or felt the survey questions were not applicable.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed customers (responses) that expressed dissatisfaction with some services offered by BPP.</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Response Rates** | The table below summarizes responses to BPP's customer service survey: |
|---|---|---|
| Surveys Distributed | 121 | 129 |
| Survey Response Rate | 31 | 35 |
| **Agency's Response to Assessment** | In Response to this assessment, the areas representing margin for improvement spoke to: 
*The customer is not knowledgeable on how to make a complaint to the BPP (4 out of 34 customers).* 
*The Board has prominently displayed on the board's web site how to file a complaint and provides links to a large volume of information for all of our internal and external customers to access/information.* 
*The Board will contact the affected customers and address their specific concerns. Additionally, as part of the Board's upcoming Board Meeting, all stakeholders will be allowed to address any concerns they may have regarding any of the Board processes/recommendations for improvements.* |
Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles

Customer Related Performance Measures, May 2016

All Texas state agencies have been instructed to include standard measures (as developed by the Legislative Budget Board and Governors Office of Budget, Planning and Policy) as well as agency-specific performance measures related to customer service standards and customer satisfaction. Standard measures for fiscal year 2016 depict actual data based upon recent customer service survey. Agency-specific measures depict actual performance for the fiscal year 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Type</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Actual FY 2014 Performance</th>
<th>Projected FY 2016 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Percentage of surveyed customer respondents expressing overall satisfaction with services received.</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Percentage of surveyed customer respondents identifying ways to improve service delivery</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Number of customers surveyed</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of customers served/responding</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Cost per customer surveyed</td>
<td>No fiscal impact (existing resources utilized)</td>
<td>No fiscal impact (existing resources utilized)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Number of customers identified</td>
<td>The General Public</td>
<td>The General Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory</td>
<td>Number of customer groups inventoried</td>
<td>3 Priority Groups(District Attorneys, Sheriffs, Advocate Groups)</td>
<td>3 Priority Groups(District Attorneys, Sheriffs, Advocate Groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency-Specific Outcome</td>
<td>Average number of days to final responses</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of inquiries involving life threatening issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of phone inquiries received</td>
<td>242,379</td>
<td>173,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of mail inquiries received</td>
<td>51,036</td>
<td>46,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet Information Views (available in FY 2015)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,742,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of e-mail inquiries received</td>
<td>11,663</td>
<td>7,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of meetings held with offender advocate groups</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>