

# Pinal County - Managing For Results

## Annual Report

### FY 2009-2010

#### COUNTY MANAGER

#### Board of Supervisor Public Support Program

##### Board of Supervisor Public Support Activity

KR % of customers inquiring by phone that get information they request

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
FY10 Target	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
90.00%*	98.69%	90.00%	98.26%	95.00%	98.06%	95.00%	99.29%	98.00%	98.57%	98.00%

All three BOS offices have compiled and reported our data according to the methods agreed upon. We have consistently reviewed and evaluated the data. This is a compilation of numbers for the three offices, which makes analysis difficult to apply to each individual District. Therefore, to facilitate more accurate analysis, Districts will begin reporting individually in the 2010-2011 fiscal year.

#### Communications and Public Affairs Program

##### Communications and Public Affairs Activity

KR % of respondents (External Customers) who indicate they were satisfied or very satisfied with the service received

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
FY10 Target	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
95.00%*	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	95.00%	93.86%	94.00%	93.86%	94.00%

For the first annual survey, we wanted to gather not just opinions but information on what sources of information people turned to for news. More than 1000 people had an opportunity to complete our survey. The first survey yielded a respectable 139 total respondents returned surveys and 119 people completed the entire survey. Of 4 criteria asked about (Timeliness, Accuracy, Level of Detail Provided, Usefulness), there were 520 responses that were adequate to excellent. There were 34 responses below adequate. Some of the comments that trended negative were partisan but others signaled or low awareness of our ways to obtain information. We are placing a renewed focus on talking about how to get information from us in order to keep this number at or over 94%. As far as what is not going well, we did not hit the 95% goal but we are very close. Utilizing the same survey in 6 months, we expect to see some gains.

#### County Manager Support Program

##### County Manager Support Activity

KR % of respondents indicated that they were waited on in a timely manner at the BOS Reception window.

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
FY10 Target	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
90.00%*	91.18%	90.00%	96.77%	90.00%	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	90.00%	95.83%	90.00%

We tracked this measurement for almost 12 months and found that it doesn't appear to be an effective way to measure. We changed our measurement for the new fiscal year 2010-2011. We felt that it would help us improve customer service by measuring customer service given to Executive Managements and their staff.

# COUNTY MANAGER

## Managing for Results Program

### Managing for Results Activity

KR % of Departments reporting improved results for customers on MFROnline

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
FY10 Target	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
50.00%	83.33%	50.00%	77.27%	50.00%	72.73%	75.00%	77.78%	78.00%	77.72%	78.00%

Although we have exceeded our target by nearly 40% this measurement was determined as problematic early on, due to the subjective nature of its wording and our inability to control the independent application of MFR as a performance management tool within a department. What one department, Assistant County Manager, County Manager, Board of Supervisor or citizen may define "improved results for customers" as; another will have a different definition. We had other measurements that were tracking our customer service rating such as surveys or evaluations of training but we could not find a way to objectively measure the MFROnline reporting results and align them with our direct impact on them. What we came up with instead was to target that 75% MFR project milestones achieved (as define in the Corporate Calendar and ESC Status/Decision Slides) Upon the attainment of this target it is expected that County Elected Officials, County Management, and Departments will best utilize goal driven management practices to deliver improved results for their customers. The ESC's (Executive Steering Committee) role as a driver of the standardization of MFR across the organization will play a pertinent role in the possibility of exploring this measure again. Through our FY analysis of MFROnline data, our department interaction and an assessment performed by our consulting group; we believe this organizational culture change lies in top down drive, accountability at all levels and the strengthening of the Strategic Coordinator unit. As we have the greatest influential impact on the Strategic Coordinators and anticipated this greater need of involvement and experience level amongst them, a target date of implementation (2011) for a plan that will develop and support that unit has been set. We look forward to reporting on that piece next fiscal year as we are hopeful it will have a beneficial impact on the organization. The reporting will be done in the Office of Strategic Planning, as MFR has been removed as an activity from the County Manager's SBP and become a department of its' own with its' own SBP. We will continue in moving forward with measuring the milestone achievements (as outlined by the ESC) and analyzing those pieces that we control, as we remain committed to assessment, training, facilitation, and leadership in preparation for the organizational culture to support the MFR performance management principles we assist in implementing.

## Administrative

### Department Director

KR % of applicable Key Results achieved

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
FY10 Target	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

We started out the fiscal year with our best estimates on our measures and ended the year with a good idea of how well we estimated. We were 100% on target for each Key Result. Our customers responded they were waited on in a timely manner at our reception window. We have only been collecting this data since the 3rd week of August 2009. The number of customers we anticipated may be a little high, but we will continue to review the data. We were 100% on target for the percentage of applicable Key Results achieved. It took half a year of reporting to better understand the process and the 2nd half data was better reflected. The 360 Degree Survey was used to determine satisfaction with the services provided by the department. This was a good tool and provided good information. The financial services (p.o.'s) data showed that we are using the P-card more and entering less requisitions. We were 100% on target for all annual employee appraisals to HR by the due date. After understanding what comprised a "record series", we became compliant in record series management and have kept the files current. All money spent on training directly aligned to County/department strategic goals. We will continue to review data on all training costs. At the beginning of FY 09/10 we had 2 department vehicles. We returned 1 to Fleet Services as it was not being fully utilized. The 1 vehicle operated receives regular maintenance.

KR % of surveyed customers who say they are satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided by the department

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
FY10 Target	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
75.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	75.00%	0.00%	75.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

The first County Manager evaluation was sent out in late February with responses due in March. The results were compiled, analyzed and reported on in April. We received 34 responses to the survey indicating they were satisfied with the services provided by the County Manager. The survey questions will be reviewed to see if we are asking the appropriate questions.

## Financial Services

KR % of non-construction payment authorizations (purchase orders) entered into the system within three business days of receipt of goods

	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
FY10 Target	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
90.00%	87.50%	90.00%	90.91%	90.00%	100.00%	90.00%	100.00%	90.00%	93.55%	90.00%

31 PO's were entered this fiscal year and all but 2 were received on within 3 business days. I try to make sure that I receive on goods in the system the same day that we have received them. I will continue to keep Information on a spreadsheet as well as the hard copies provided by Finance, to maintain, update, and keep track of our PO's.

# COUNTY MANAGER

## Administrative

### Human Resources

KR % of all annual employee appraisals will be submitted to Human Resources by the end of January due date.

FY10 Target	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
98.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

This is an annual measurement which was reported on in the 3rd quarter. with the final numbers. All 9 employees of the County Manager were submitted to Human Resources by the end of January due date.

### Records Management

KR % of record series managed in compliance with legal and policy requirements as determined by the Arizona State Library of Archives.

FY10 Target	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

This department identified two Arizona State Library of Archives record series; #000-09-163 and 000-09-168. They are managed in compliance with legal and policy requirements as determined by the Arizona State Library of Archives.

### Training

KR % of training dollars spent that directly align to County or Department strategic goals.

FY10 Target	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
85.00%	0.00%	85.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	85.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

We began collecting data February 2010, so this number reflects only 5 months of data. Most of the training staff attends is free or low cost, so our estimate appears to be close to what we will actually spend. For the 5 months of data collection, a total of \$1197.50 was spent on training.

### Vehicle Management

KR % of department vehicles operated more than 10,000 miles per year

FY10 Target	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
95.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

During fiscal year 2009/10, vehicle #13284 was driven a total of 14,930 miles. It has become easier to anticipate when oil changes will be needed based on collecting the data.

KR % of department vehicles with preventative maintenance performed as scheduled

FY10 Target	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		FY10 YTD	
	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate	Actual	YE Estimate
95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	95.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

During fiscal year 2009/10, vehicle #13284 has had PM twice and a replacement of the power steering pump. By keeping the Excel spreadsheet, it is easier to anticipate when PM needs to be scheduled.