

REPORT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE

Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists

Submitted: June 1, 2018

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>Date of Term</u>	<u>Hometown</u>
John K. Bielowicz	2016-2021	Waxahachie
Donna Lord Black, M.A.	2007-2017	Frisco
Tim F. Branaman, Ph.D.	2008-2019	Dallas
Jo Ann Campbell, M.S.	2008-2017	Abilene
Angela A. Downes, J.D.	2008-2019	Irving
Susan Fletcher, Ph.D.	2016-2021	Plano
John Huffman, J.D.	2012-2017	Southlake
Lou Ann Todd Mock, Ph.D.	2008-2019	Bellaire
Ronald S. Palomares, Ph.D.	2016-2021	Denton

**Darrel D. Spinks
Executive Director**

**333 Guadalupe, 2-450
Austin, Texas 78701
512-305-7700**

Executive.Director@tsbep.texas.gov

REPORT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE 2016-2017

Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists

Submitted: June 1, 2018

A. Inventory of External Customers

Customers by strategy with the types of services provided:

Strategy: A.1.1. Licensing

Licensees:

Processing of fees; review and issuance of renewal permits, professional development audits, enforcement services; newsletter, online rulebook, website information; individual correspondence and Board opinions.

Applicants:

Processing of fees; distribution of application packets, application processing, issuance of licenses; enforcement; website information.

Patients/Clients of licensees:

Complaint packets, processing of complaints, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; website information.

Insurance companies:

Status of licenses; open records information; enforcement information.

Managed care entities:

Status of licenses; open records information; enforcement information

Students:

Application packets, online rulebooks, website.

Higher education training programs:

Information on agency programs, examination results, rules.

Licensees of other states who may wish to become licensed in Texas:

Processing of fees; distribution of application packets; dissemination of licensure and examination requirements.

Other states' psychology licensing boards:

Status of licenses; open records information; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Professional organizations:

Presentations, correspondence, information on licensees and agency programs.

National testing services:

Approval of candidates for national psychology exam; requests for scores

Legislators:

Provide various types of information, budget requests, constituents' requests for information, required fiscal and performance reporting.

Other state agencies:

Provide various types of information responsive to requests.

Federal agencies:

Cooperation on federal suits, information on licensees.

Strategy B.1.1. Enforcement

Patients/Clients of licensees:

Complaint packets, processing of complaints, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; website information

Licensees:

Processing of complaints, enforcement, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; professional development audits; newsletter and online rulebook.

Applicants:

Processing of complaints, enforcement, eligibility orders, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; newsletter and online rulebook.

Insurance companies:

Status of licenses; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Managed care entities:

Status of licenses; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Other states' psychology licensing boards:

Status of licenses; open records information; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Professional organizations:

Presentations, correspondence, disciplinary and enforcement information; information on licenses and agency programs.

Legislators:

Provide various types of information responsive to requests; budget requests, constituents' requests for information, required fiscal and performance reporting; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Other state agencies:

Provide various types of information responsive to requests from: Attorney General's Office, Comptroller's Office, Office of the Governor, Auditor's Office, etc.

Federal agencies:

Cooperation on federal suits and prosecutions.

Attorneys:

Negotiation of agreed orders for their clients.

B. Information Gathering Methods

- The Psychology Board, like all other state agencies, is mandated by Section 2113 of the Government Code to develop customer service standards and to implement customer satisfaction assessment plans. Of the customers identified for each of its strategies, the Board then selected its most prominent groups of customers who receive services directly. The agency used the surveys that it had developed previously for this report again for the 2016-2017 biennium as the results from previous years were appropriate, effective and reliable.
- Customer groups surveyed include: current licensees, applicants, written examinees, complainants, respondents, and persons who make open record requests to the agency. These groups involve the agency's two strategies: licensure and enforcement.
- Six different surveys were used for these six groups. The surveys were developed specifically for this mandate.
- The style of the surveys is similar; however, some questions on each are modified to better address the customer group being surveyed. Copies of the six surveys are provided.

- Each survey consists of approximately 6-10 statements, which the survey participant (participant) is asked to mark on a scale of 1 to 4 (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree). Additionally each survey includes a space for the participant to make suggestions if he/she thinks the process could be improved.
- A total of 825 surveys were distributed and 34 were returned. In an effort to reduce costs, the surveys were sent by e-mail rather than mailing them and including self-addressed, stamped envelopes. The name of the participant is always optional, therefore persons can respond anonymously. The survey response rate is provided in an accompanying chart. Overall the response rate was 4.12%, a 60.35% decrease from 2016-2017.
- Random sampling was used in this manner:

Current licensees: licensees who renewed in November 2017.

Applicants: persons approved for licensure in October, November and December 2017.

Written examinees: applicants who took the written examinations in October, November and December 2017.

Respondents: licensees whose cases were resolved in May and August 2016, and May and August 2017.

Complainants: persons whose complaints against licensees were resolved in May and August 2016 and May and August 2017.

Requestors for Open Records: persons who made open record requests from the agency between January 2017 and April 2018.

C. Customer-Determined Satisfaction Synopsis

The Psychology Board determines satisfaction on the surveys by considering a score of either 3 or 4 as satisfactory. A score of either 1 or 2 is not satisfactory. Each survey returned is entered into a spreadsheet noting the rating of 1-4 that each question on the survey received. A total satisfaction rating for each question on all surveys is obtained and then these are totaled for a final satisfaction rating for the survey type.

The satisfaction ratings can be compared in many ways including determining which surveys received the worst or best ratings from a target population, the question per survey type that received the best and worst ratings, and satisfaction ratings per survey type from year to year.

For the 2017-2018 surveys, the agency received an overall satisfaction rate of 80.72%, a decrease of 6.2%. The satisfaction rate for the 2015-2016 surveys was 86.92%, Fiscal Year 2012 was 91.73% and Fiscal Year 2011 was 90.52%. There is no apparent reason why the overall satisfaction rating should have dipped. It should be noted, however, that beginning with the 2015-2016 biennium surveys are collated by biennium rather than by individual fiscal year. Also noteworthy is that in previous years the agency has used eight (8) separate customer service surveys, while only six surveys were used for this biennium. As the agency's Oral Examination was discontinued, the two surveys that had been sent to Oral Examination candidates and examiners are no longer used.

For this biennium's surveys, the Psychology Board received a higher score on three of its six different surveys than it did the previous year.

The Psychology Board received overall favorable ratings (scores of 3 and 4) from five of the six groups surveyed.

Attached is a synopsis of the total number of surveys which were distributed, the number of surveys returned, the percentage of the responses for each survey that were satisfactory and the final overall satisfaction rate. Also attached are copies of the six surveys that were used: Licensee Survey, Complainant Survey, Respondent Survey, Applicant Survey, Written Exam Survey, and Open Records Requestor Survey.

D. Analysis of Survey Results

The Psychology Board believes that the overall results of the 2016-2017 surveys were favorable to the Board and its operations. The lowest scores were received on the Complainant Survey. Satisfaction rating for this survey has ranged from a high of 82.14% in 2011 to a low of 35.71% in 2000. It should be noted that only 4 of the 46 complainants surveyed chose to return their surveys. The fact that complainants chose not to respond could be interpreted as their being basically satisfied with the Board's resolution of their complaints. Also, since the majority of complaints filed with the Board cannot be substantiated and are therefore dismissed, this fact alone could account for why this survey reflects the lowest satisfaction rate.

In reviewing all the surveys and their responses, the questions that had the lowest satisfaction rating were on the Complainants' Survey. This survey has a total of eight questions. The questions with the lowest ratings state:

1. The Board kept me informed about the time expected for resolution of the complaint.
2. The Agency's investigation staff was accessible to me by phone when I had questions about the complaint and/or investigation.

3. My complaint was resolved in a reasonable period of time given the agency's limited resources and duty to review every complaint received thoroughly.
4. The Board does an adequate job of processing complaints.

Again, there is no apparent reason for the low ratings for these questions. All complainants are sent a letter informing them if the timelines for resolution of their complaints are delayed. Additionally, all complainants are sent a letter informing them of the final status of their complaint and, within the confines allowed by law, are informed of the reason for the Board's resolution of the complaint. Often, people are unhappy when their complaints are dismissed due to a lack of evidence or when the Board determines that no violation occurred.

One possible factor that may have played a significant role in the low ratings for these questions is, the Board lost both of its full-time investigators during the biennium, including the Enforcement Manager, and was left with only a part-time investigator to handle enforcement related matters. It wasn't until recently that the Board was able to fully staff its enforcement division. This could explain the delays in finalizing complaints and responding to telephone calls to the enforcement division.

All comments received are discussed with the agency staff. Comments identifying ways to improve services are weighed for feasibility and economic impact. In past years many of the comments have led to changes in procedures. All comments received on the surveys are presented to the Board for their review at a regularly scheduled Board meeting. The Board reviews the detailed statistics from the surveys returned.

In response to some of the comments received, the Board will continue to review and revise its website to ensure ease of accessibility and user friendliness. Additionally, the Board intends to begin using services such as SurveyMonkey and iContact to further improve its electronic interaction with its customer base.

The Board continues to make changes in its enforcement and licensing rules and processes to improve the timeliness of complaint resolution and license issuance. The advent of online renewals has assisted licensees in timely renewal and the requirement for online profiles as a condition of license renewal assists the consumer in accessing information about individual psychologists.

E. Customer-related Performance Measures Definitions

1. OUTCOME MEASURES:

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services Rendered

Short Definition: The percentage of persons who responded to the customer surveys who expressed general satisfaction with the agency's services that they were provided.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to show the percentage of agency customers that are generally satisfied with the services they received.

Source/Collection of Data: Information comes from different surveys which were e-mailed to representatives of each of the agency's customer groups on a biennial basis.

- a. Current licensees: licensees who renew in one month, varying the months for random sampling.
- b. New licensees: all those persons who received their licenses at three Board meetings.
- c. Written examinees: persons who took one of the agency's two required examinations during a three-month period.
- d. Persons who received Open Record request information: persons who received open record request information in any two consecutive months.
- e. Complainants: persons whose complaints were resolved at any four Board meetings (2 meetings per fiscal year).
- f. Respondents: licensees whose complaints were resolved at any four Board meetings (2 meetings per fiscal year).

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by placing the scores for each type of survey on one spreadsheet per type. Thus, there are six spreadsheets. Each spreadsheet provides the percentages of satisfactory responses on each question for each survey returned, arriving at one total percentage of satisfaction per each survey type. The usual method of calculating this Outcome Measure is to take these totals from each survey; adding them together and dividing the resulting number by 6, which is the number of the different types of surveys. For 2016-2017, the resulting totals were added together and divided by 5. This is due to the fact that no one who was sent the Respondent's Survey sent it back to the agency.

Data Limitations: Not all customers can be surveyed. Only the major customer groups are surveyed: current licensees, newly licensed persons, written examinees, persons who received open record request information, complainants and respondents.

Calculation: Non-cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher than target is preferable.

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to Improve Service Delivery

Short Definition: The percentage of customers surveyed by the agency that responded and identified ways for the agency to improve the delivery of services.

Purpose/Importance: The measure is intended to show the percentage of customers who offered suggestions of ways that services could be improved by the agency.

Source/Collection of Data: Information comes from different surveys which are e-mailed to representatives of each of the agency's customer groups. Responses are requested to be sent to an e-mail address listed on every survey.

- a. Current licensees: all those licensees who renew in any given month, varying the month for random sampling.
- b. New licensees: all those persons who received their licenses at three Board meetings.
- c. Written examinees: persons who took one of the agency's two required examinations during a three-month period.
- d. Persons who received Open Record request information: persons who received open record request information in any two consecutive months.
- e. Complainants: persons whose complaints were resolved at any four Board meetings (2 meetings per fiscal year).
- f. Respondents: licensees whose complaints were resolved at any four Board meetings (2 meetings per fiscal year).

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by totaling the number of surveys to all customer groups with suggestions for improvements and then dividing by the total number of all returned surveys.

Data Limitations: Not all customers are surveyed. Only the major customer groups are surveyed: current licensees, newly licensed persons, written examinees, persons who received open record request information, complainants and respondents.

Calculation: Non-cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher than target might show that there are more problems that need to be corrected. Performance that is lower than target might show that the agency is doing a better job and therefore there are fewer suggestions for corrections. The agency has no control over the number of customers who respond to its surveys.

2. **OUTPUT MEASURES:**

Number of Customers Surveyed

Short Definition: The total number of persons to whom a survey was sent.

Purpose/Importance: The measure is intended to show how extensive the survey was.

Source/Collection of Data: The information comes from counting the number of surveys that are sent.

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by counting the number of surveys that are sent.

Data Limitations: There are no data limitations. It is expected that the number surveyed will fluctuate from year to year, due to the source/collection of data methodology for random sampling.

Calculation Type: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: A higher performance would indicate that more persons were surveyed. A lower performance would indicate that fewer persons were surveyed.

The agency has no control over the number of customers that seek its services.

Number of Customers Served

Short Definition: Total number of customers served in target customer groups per fiscal year.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to show the total number of customers served in target customer groups per fiscal year.

Source/Collection of Data: Information comes from totaling the following:

- a. Total number of current licensees.
- b. Total number of persons who received licensure in the fiscal year.
- c. Total number of persons who took one of the Agency's two required examinations in the fiscal year.
- d. Total number of persons who received open record requests information in the fiscal year.
- e. Total number of complainants who had their cases resolved during the fiscal year.
- f. Total number of respondents who had their cases resolved during the fiscal year.

Method of Calculation: This measure is calculated by totaling all of the customers in the fiscal year for all the target customer groups.

Data Limitations: Not all customers are surveyed. Only the major customer groups are surveyed: current licensees, newly licensed persons, written examinees, persons who received open record request information, complainants and respondents.

Calculation: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher would indicate a greater number of customers. Performance that is lower would indicate a lower number of customers served. The agency has no control over the number of customers that seek its services.

3. EFFICIENCY MEASURES:

Cost per Customer Surveyed

Short Definition: The cost of sending a survey by e-mail.

Purpose/Importance: The measure is intended to assess the cost of surveying one person.

Source/Collection of Data: The measure is collected by totaling the cost of sending out the surveys.

Method of Calculation: The measure is collected by totaling the costs for sending out the surveys and dividing by the total number of surveys sent.

Data Limitations: The measure does not capture the amount of staff hours that are required to prepare the surveys for sending, receiving the surveys back, entering them in a database, and calculating the responses.

Calculation: Non-cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher would indicate that the costs for the surveys have increased. Performance that is lower would indicate that the costs for the surveys have decreased.

4. EXPLANATORY MEASURES

Number of Customers Identified

Short Definition: The total number of persons from the target customer groups for which the agency has a name and address.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to verify that the agency knows who its customers are.

Source/Collection of Data: This information is collected at the end of the fiscal year, when the agency can calculate the following:

- a. The total number of current licensees.
- b. The total number of persons who obtained licensure.
- c. The total number of persons who took the written examinations.
- d. The total number of persons who made written open record requests to the agency.
- e. The total number of complainants who had their cases resolved.
- f. The total number of respondents who had their cases resolved.

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by adding up the totals from all of these groups.

Data Limitations: The agency has other customer groups that it does not survey including: the state legislature, higher education institutions, other state agencies, etc.

Calculation: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: A performance that is higher would indicate that the agency has more customers in these customer groups. A performance that

is lower would indicate that the agency is serving fewer customers. The agency has no control over the number of customers that seek its services.

Number of Customer Groups Inventoried

Short Definition: The number of customer groups that the agency uses to calculate its customer service performance measures. These are the major customer groups for the agency.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to identify the total number of major customer groups for the agency.

Source/Collection of Data: Information for this measure comes from totaling the number of major customer groups surveyed.

Method of Calculation: Adding major customer groups

Data Limitations: None

Calculation: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: A higher performance would indicate that more customer groups were surveyed. A lower performance would indicate that fewer customer groups were surveyed.

F. Customer Service Performance Measures for 2016-2017

1.	Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services Rendered	80.72%
2.	Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to Improve Service Delivery	67.64%
3.	Number of Customers Surveyed	825
4.	Number of Customers Served	9,613
5.	Cost Per Customer Surveyed	\$0.00
6.	Number of Customers Identified	9,613
7.	Number of Customer Groups Inventoried	6

G. Estimated Fiscal Year 2014 Customer Service Performance Measures

1.	Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services rendered	91%
2.	Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to Improve Service Delivery	45%
3.	Number of Customers Surveyed	550

4.	Number of Customers Served	10,000
5.	Cost per Customer Served	\$0.62
6.	Number of Customers Identified	10,000
7.	Number of Customer Groups Inventoried	8

**Synopsis of Customer Service Assessment Surveys
2016-2017
Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists**

Written Examinees

Surveys Distributed:	125
Surveys Returned:	3
No. of Questions on Survey:	5
Satisfaction Rate:	93.33%
(FY2000: 103/56; 85.36%)	
(FY 2001: 103/49; 91.24%)	
(FY 2002: 50/11; 85.45%)	
(FY 2003: 50/32; 93.19%)	
(FY 2004: 50/34; 93.49%)	
(FY 2005: 50/30; 97.33%)	
(FY 2006: 50/27; 97.78%)	
(FY 2007: 50/23; 97.39%)	
(FY 2008: 50/23; 98.26%)	
(FY 2009:50/28; 94.95%)	
(FY 2010: 50/22; 97.23%)	
(FY 2011: 50/6; 85.36%)	
(FY 2012: 50/6; 96.67%)	
(2014-2015): 50/31; 94.80%)	

Open Records Requests

Surveys Distributed:	30
Surveys Returned:	2
No. of Questions on Survey:	5
Satisfaction Rate:	100.00%
(FY2000: 60/34; 83.73%)	
(FY 2001: 80/44; 88.83%)	
(FY 2002: 40/2; 100%)	
(FY 2003: 40/21; 92.24%)	
(FY 2004: 40/15; 96%)	
(FY 2005: 40/24; 90.26%)	
(FY 2006: 40/16; 96.17%)	
(FY 2007: 40/12; 98.33%)	
(FY 2008: 40/17; 86.25%)	
(FY 2009: 40/32; 84.54%)	
(FY 2010: 40/20; 93.61%)	
(FY 2011: 40/27; 97.66%)	

(FY 2012: 40/9; 100%)
(2014-2015: 40/20; 97.00%)

Applicants

Surveys Distributed: 91
Surveys Returned: 7
No. of Questions on Survey: 9
Satisfaction Rate: 80.36%
(FY 2000: 72/46; 70.47%)
(FY 2001: 162/82; 74.47%)
(FY 2002: 75/46; 82.14%)
(FY 2003: 75/44; 80.28%)
(FY 2004: 75/36; 79.41%)
(FY 2005: 75/35; 81.42%)
(FY 2006: 75/27; 84.97%)
(FY 2007: 75/26; 86.04%)
(FY 2008: 75/31; 82.66%)
(FY 2009: 75/35; 89.89%)
(FY 2010: 75/32; 93.61%)
(FY 2011: 75/28; 81.26%)
(FY 2012: 75/20; 91.12%)
(2014-2015: 75/30; 83.41%)

Current Licensees

Surveys Distributed: 531
Surveys Returned: 18
No. of Questions on Survey: 12
Satisfaction Rate: 89.29%
(FY 2000: 428/241; 78.33%)
(FY 2001: 300/249; 78.74%)
(FY 2002: 150/59; 78.88%)
(FY 2003: 150/80; 83.46%)
(FY 2004: 150/87; 86.03%)
(FY 2005: 150/78; 78.63%)
(FY 2006: 150/72; 80.09%)
(FY 2007: 150/57; 85.12%)
(FY 2008: 150/77; 86.54%)
(FY 2009: 150/68; 87.88%)
(FY 2010: 150/68; 89.47%)
(FY 2011: 150/68; 87.10%)
(FY 2012: 150/40; 90.59%)
(2014-2015: 200/61; 89.58%)

Complainants

Surveys Distributed: 48
Surveys Returned: 4

No. of Questions on Survey: 8
Satisfaction Rate: 40.63%
 (FY 2000: 15/2; 35.71%)
 (FY 2001: 34/8; 50.00%)
 (FY 2002: 30/10; 62.86%)
 (FY 2003: 30/18; 68.44%)
 (FY 2004: 30/11; 65.32%)
 (FY 2005: 30/11; 75.19%)
 (FY 2006: 30/10; 62.86%)
 (FY 2007: 30/12; 63.07%)
 (FY 2008: 43/12; 60.39%)
 (FY 2009: 30/14; 74.95%)
 (FY 2010: 11/8; 74.95%)
 (FY 2011: 9/9; 82.14%)
 (FY 2012: 30/11; 67.18%)
 (2014-2015: 30/11; 69.58%)

Respondents:

Surveys Distributed: 63
 Surveys Returned: 0
 No. of Questions on Survey: 8
Satisfaction Rate: Undetermined; Zero responses
 (FY 2000: 24/8; 60.04%)
 (FY 2001: 89/29; 80.70%)
 (FY 2002: 40/19; 79.30%)
 (FY 2003: 40/11; 88.31%)
 (FY 2004: 40/15; 85.27%)
 (FY 2005: 40/15; 88.03%)
 (FY 2006: 40/15; 85.87%)
 (FY 2007: 40/18; 79.14%)
 (FY 2008: 50/25; 81.27%)
 (FY 2009: 40/18; 94.96%)
 (FY 2010: 40/16; 86.30%)
 (FY 2011: 18/18; 85.16%)
 (2014-2015: 30/19; 77.36%)

TOTAL: 80.72%
 (FY2000: 73.74%)
 (FY 2001: 80.75%)
 (FY 2002: 83.15%)
 (FY 2003: 85.81%)
 (FY 2004: 86.12%)
 (FY 2005: 86.295%)
 (FY 2006: 87.87%)
 (FY 2007: 87.88%)
 (FY 2008: 86.01%)

(FY 2009: 90.38%)
(FY 2010: 90.70%)
(FY 2011: 90.52%)
(FY 2012: 91.73%)
(2014-2015: 88.27%)

* Scores of 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree) on a 4 point scale with 4 being the highest rate of satisfaction.