



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

May 24, 2022

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 2023-2027, 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,

DocuSigned by:  
  
A2A9711769D2462...

Mark Wolfe  
Executive Director

# **REPORT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY**

**SPRING 2022**

**BY**

**THE TEXAS HISTORICAL COMMISSION**



## 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, 2021, the agency had authorized 284.5 full-time employees who work in various fields including archeology, architecture, history, economic development, heritage tourism, and 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. The 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 THC 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 2022, 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 6,300 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
- County Judge Assistants
- Members of Historic Sites Friends 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 using 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.

Eight 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 eight survey areas—facilities, staff interaction, communications, internet sites, complaint-handling processes, service timeliness, printed information, and overall satisfaction. 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 Dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Neutral, Satisfied, Strongly Satisfied, and Not Applicable). Point values ranging from 5, for Strongly Satisfied, to 1, for Strongly Dissatisfied, were assigned upon processing the data. Other choices included were Prefer Not to Answer/Don’t Know and Not Applicable with a value of 0. 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 March 29, 2022, to 6,300 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 16, 2022.

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. This survey resulted in a response rate of 8 percent, compared to a 10.9 percent response rate in 2020.

The tables below provide the response rate for past five surveys conducted and the customer types that responded.

	Spring 2022	Spring 2020	Spring 2018	Spring 2016	Spring 2014
<b>Total Distributed</b>	6,300	3,410	2,136	2,280	2,500
<b>Total Completed</b>	512	372	435	407	355
<b>Response Rate</b>	8%	10.9%	20%	18%	14%

<b>Select the customer type that best describes you:</b>		
Archeological Stewards	13	2.54%
County Historical Commissions	75	14.65%
Certified Local Governments	15	2.93%
Friends	15	2.93%
Courthouse Judge Assistants	5	.98%
County Judges	16	3.13%
Heritage Tourism	9	1.76%
Museum Services	313	61.13%
Texas Main Street Managers	13	2.54%
Other	38	7.42%

A sampling of other customer types included a historic site volunteer, librarian in a public library, cemetery preservationist, historian/author, THC marker and National Register nominator, interested citizen, museum professional, archeologist, economic development professional, 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’ scores 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 percent, 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 percent 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 5 percent error rate at the 95 percent 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 91.2 percent, compared to 92.2 percent in 2020. Of the remaining respondents, 5.9 percent were Neutral, and 2.9 percent 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 3.88. The highest score of 4.49 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?	4.49
2.	How satisfied are/were you with any agency brochures or other printed information, including the accuracy of that information?	4.39
3.	Please rate your overall satisfaction with the THC.	4.37
4.	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?	4.29
5.	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?	4.23
6.	How satisfied were you with the agency’s ability to timely serve you, including the amount of time you waited for service in person?	4.16
7.	How satisfied are/were you with the agency’s facilities, including your ability to access the agency, the office location, signs, and cleanliness?	4.06
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?	3.88

### **III. Customer Service Performance Measures**

#### **Outcome Measures**

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services Received: 92.2 percent

#### **Output Measures**

Number of Customers Surveyed: 512

#### **Efficiency Measures**

Cost Per Customer Surveyed: \$.20

#### **Explanatory Measures**

Number of Customers Identified: 6,300

Number of Customer Groups Inventoried: 11

## 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 eight items, which 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" suggests that customers perceive the issue more positively than negatively. Scores of "4" or higher indicate areas of substantial strength for the organization. Conversely, scores below "3" 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. 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 knowledgeability, and whether staff members adequately identify themselves by name, including the use of nameplates or tags for accountability?**

Number of Respondents: 479

Current Score: 4.49

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	288	60.13%
Satisfied	151	31.53%
Neutral	28	5.85%
Unsatisfied	9	1.88%
Strongly Unsatisfied	3	.63%

### Over Time Comparison

Current 4.49  
 Spring 2020: 4.54  
 Spring 2018: 4.50  
 Spring 2016: 4.44  
 Spring 2014: 4.44



**2. Facilities: If you visit or have visited a THC facility, how satisfied are/were you with the agency's facilities, including your ability to access the agency, the office location, signs, and cleanliness?**

Number of Respondents: 431

Current Score: 4.06

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	125	29%
Satisfied	218	50.58%
Neutral	80	18.56%
Unsatisfied	7	1.62%
Strongly Unsatisfied	1	.23%

**Over Time Comparison**

Current: 4.06

Spring 2020: 4.34

Spring 2018: 4.46

Spring 2016: 4.32

Spring 2014: 4.34

**3. Website: If you interact or have interacted with the THC's website, 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?**

Number of Respondents: 491

Current Score: 4.23

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	182	37.07%
Satisfied	262	53.36%
Neutral	28	5.7%
Unsatisfied	15	3.05%
Strongly Unsatisfied	4	.81%

Current: 4.23

Spring 2020: 4.26

**Previous question: The website was easy to use and well organized.**

**Over Time Comparison**

Spring 2018: 4.03

Spring 2016: 4.00

Spring 2014: 4.01

**Previous question: The website contained clear and accurate information on events, services, and contact information.**

**Over Time Comparison**

Spring 2018: 4.12

Spring 2016: 4.07

Spring 2014: 4.08

**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: 388

Current Score: 3.88

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	90	23.20%
Satisfied	175	45.1%
Neutral	112	28.87%
Unsatisfied	8	2.06%
Strongly Unsatisfied	3	.77%

#### Over Time Comparison

Current: 3.88  
 Spring 2020: 3.51  
 Spring 2018: 4.14  
 Spring 2016: 4.05  
 Spring 2014: 4.04

**5. Communication: If you communicate or have communicated with the 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 a live person, letters, electronic mail, and any applicable text messaging or mobile applications?**

Number of Respondents: 476  
 Current Score: 4.29

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	211	44.33%
Satisfied	210	44.12%
Neutral	43	9.03%
Unsatisfied	7	1.47%
Strongly Unsatisfied	5	1.05%

#### Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.29  
 Spring 2020: 4.47  
 Spring 2018: 4.26  
 Spring 2016: 4.18  
 Spring 2014: 4.15

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

Number of Respondents: 439  
 Current Score: 4.39

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	214	48.75%
Satisfied	189	43.05%
Neutral	30	6.83%
Unsatisfied	5	1.14%
Strongly Unsatisfied	1	.23%

#### Over Time Comparison

Current: 4.39  
 Spring 2020: 4.47  
 Spring 2018: 4.40

Spring 2016: 4.33  
 Spring 2014: 4.29

**7. Service Time: If you waited to receive a service from the THC, how satisfied were you with the agency's ability to serve you in a timely manner, including the amount of time you waited for service in person?**

Number of Respondents: 375  
 Current Score: 4.16

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	136	36.27%
Satisfied	180	48%
Neutral	46	12.27%
Unsatisfied	9	2.4%
Strongly Unsatisfied	4	1.07%

**Over Time Comparison**

Current: 4.16  
 Spring 2020: 4.08  
 Spring 2018: 4.37  
 Spring 2016: 4.25  
 Spring 2014: 4.19

**8. Overall Satisfaction: Please rate your overall satisfaction with the THC.**

Number of Respondents: 491  
 Current Score: 4.37

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Satisfied	242	49.29%
Satisfied	206	41.96%
Neutral	29	5.91%
Unsatisfied	11	2.24%
Strongly Unsatisfied	3	.61%

**Over Time Comparison**

Current: 4.37  
 Spring 2020: 4.48  
 Spring 2018: 4.40  
 Spring 2016: 4.23  
 Spring 2014: 4.22