

For Reporting Period: July 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015

#### I. General Information:

Lead agency name: Office of Financial Management (OFM)
Partner agencies: List other agencies involved in the project

Improvement project title: Employee Survey Administration

Date improvement project was initiated: 9/22/2014

Project type: Previously reported project

Project is directly connected to: If applicable, specify the alignment:

□ Results Washington performance

measure

☐ Agency Strategic Plan Dynamic Leadership – We provide vision, direction and

Goal 5.1.3

support for statewide initiatives and efforts internal

for OFM

Communication and Trust – We are a trusted partner in all interactions because we use clear, open and

honest communications

☐ Other

Report reviewed and approved by: Tracy Guerin

### II. Project Summary:

The Office of Financial Management improved the Employee Survey Administration Process, resulting in:

- 1. Special Needs Requests Increased the percent of agencies with timely response of special needs requests by due date from 50% to 73%.
- 2. Communication Review Process Reduced number of handoffs from 23 to 10.
- 3. Contacting the Right People Increased the number of agency contacts that confirmed they were correct from 33% to 100%.

### I. Project Details:

# Identify the problem:

In 2015, the Employee Survey doubled in frequency to every year. Because of the frequency change and no adjustment to resources, there was a need to review the process and make adjustments for an annual implementation. In 2014, in preparation for the change, the team participated in a Lean workshop to improve the process. The pain points they identified in 2014 included:

- 1. Timely responses from agencies identifying their special needs for administering the survey were low causing delays in building the survey, workload peaks for staff and increased risks to survey quality.
- 2. The internal review of communication materials for the survey kick-off took too much time and had a lot of rework.
- 3. The agencies considered "Executive Branch" change yearly, as do the agency



## Problem statement:

deputies (or equivalent) and agency survey contacts. There are no current lists for these three groups that are ready and effective for survey.

- 1. Special Needs Requests Currently only 50% percent of agencies responded timely with their special needs requests for survey administration compared to our target of 100% which we want to reach by 2017 survey (3 years).
- 2. Communication Review Process Currently we have 23 handoffs during the communication review process, we would like to reduce this to our target of 10 hand offs.
- 3. Contacting the Right People Currently only 33% of agencies received kickoff survey packet compared to our target of 98% which we want to reach by 2017.

# Improvement description:

- Using g-PDCA cycles, the team worked on improving communication of special needs requests. With a few rounds of tests, they found that in person meetings with agency contacts were especially effective to help agencies with special needs requests related to the survey.
- 2. The survey administration team clearly identified reviewers' roles and expectations and communicated them to each of the parties involved in the communication review process.
- 3. The team led an effort to create a new deputy director listserv to ensure that deputies received notices regarding the survey launch this listserv is updated as soon as changes occur. In addition, all emails to agency points of contact include a brief paragraph to alert contacts to notify OFM SHR when their agency's contact is/has changed.

Note: These improvements, along with agency improvements, contributed to a significant increase in the statewide survey response rate. It increased from 52% to 72% from 2014 to 2015.

# Customer involvement:

The team used input and feedback from customers internally and with representatives from Department of Enterprise Services, Board of Accountancy, Parks Department, and Military participated in the initial workshop in 2014 and additional agencies have provided additional feedback and support throughout the 2015 survey process.

### II. Project Details:

Improved	Specific results achieved:	Total	Results
process as	(Complete the narrative boxes below)	Impact:	status:
measured by:		(Actuals;	
(Click those that		Current Reporting	
apply)		Period)	
		·	
□ Quality	Increased percentage of agencies with timely response		Final
	of special needs requests by due date from 50% to		
	73%.		
	Increased number of agency contacts that confirmed		
	they were correct from 33% to 100%.		



Decreased number of handoffs in communication review **from** 23 **to** 10.

**III.** Contact information:

Name: e-mail:

Phone number:

IV. Optional Visuals





Continuous Improvement/"Kaizen" Form						
Project Employee Survey Admin.  Threats identified:						
Timing, logistics, size, value to custaness						
Whose Idea is it? Date:						
Danica, Melissa 9/28/14						
Action Plan for Mini PDCA – be Task W	sure to address threat ho	s: By When				
Gather agency Redbut w/survey	Nichole	4/30/5				
Schedule 1st /	Nichole	5/15/15				
Hold 1st POCO	Team	6/9/15				
Schedule shortened 2nd ADC Media	Nichole	7/1/5				
Hold 2nd POC	Team	7/14/15				
Add POC Meetings to process does	Melissa	8/30 /5				
no process does	TRALLICE DE	944				
Section 10 to 10 t						

٧.



For Reporting Period: July 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015

### I. General Information:

Project type:

Lead agency name: Office of Financial Management Partner agencies: Employment Security Department

Improvement project title: Serve Washington Sub-Grantee Invoicing Project

Date improvement project was initiated: 2/9/2016

Project is directly connected to:

☐ Results Washington performance

If applicable, specify the alignment:

measure

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{ Dynamic Leadership - We provide vision, direction and }$ 

□ Agency Strategic Plan

support for statewide initiatives and efforts internal for OFM.

Communication and Trust – We are a trusted partner in all interactions because we use clear, open and

honest communications.

☐ Other

Report reviewed and approved by: Tracy Guerin

### **II. Project Summary:**

The Office of Financial Management Serve Washington division improved the Sub-Grantee Invoicing Process, resulting in increased timeliness from 13/15 programs (87%) to 15/15 programs (100%) ontime and increased accuracy from 7/15 programs (47%) accurate to 11/15 programs (73%) accurate after improvements. Additional improvements included decreased paper use/handling and 100% of customers were satisfied with the improvements to the process which included reducing paper and allowing electronic submissions.

### **III. Project Details:**

# Identify the problem:

- Organizations completing and submitting the invoice packages often have multiple people in different roles completing the forms, as forms required include fiscal forms and program-specific forms. This often results in forms submitted separately, at different times, with inconsistent information between them.
- Due to the complexity of the process and a desire to be flexible, Serve WA
  program officers have not been enforcing the monthly reporting deadline of
  the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month.
- Serve WA program officers often do not receive all of the forms at the same time and forms submitted are often missing information or inaccurate, requiring additional effort to follow up with organizations and rework forms



submitted.

Once Serve WA program officers submit invoice packages to OFM fiscal staff, additional issues are often identified, requiring rework by Serve WA

**Problem** statement: Currently, invoice packages are received timely by 87% of programs compared to our target of 100% of programs, which we want to reach by 2017.

Currently, invoice packages are received accurate by 47% of programs compared to

our target of 100% of programs, which we want to reach by 2017.

Improvement description:

Using Gemba Walks, a Value Stream Mapping and Problem-Solving Workshop and subsequent iterative testing of countermeasures by the improvement team to eliminate waste, they made the following changes to improve the process:

- 1. Communicating with sub-grantees to enable fully scanned/digitized invoice submission
- 2. Eliminated x of x paper copies of invoice packets
- 3. Build quality at the source through standard work and included fiscal staff on initial submission (concurrent review steps instead of consecutive) to save review time and improve flow of invoice packets through the value stream.
- 4. Changed from one single due date for entire packet to two separate due dates (one for reports and one for invoices) to improve flow.
- 5. Eliminated excessive copies and distribution of internal transmittal forms.

Customer involvement: Conducted phone interviews with many sub-grantees and one from Employment Security Department was able to attend the workshop in-person.

### **IV. Project Details:**

Improved process as measured by: (Click those that apply)	Specific results achieved: (Complete the narrative boxes below)	Total Impact: (Actuals; Current Reporting Period)	Results status:
<b>⊠</b> Quality	Increased on-time submissions <b>from</b> 87% timely <b>to</b> 100% timely. Increased accurate submissions <b>from</b> 47% accurate <b>to</b> 73% accurate.	15 out of 15 programs on- time and 11 out of 15 programs accurate	Final
□ Customer Satisfaction	Increased customer satisfaction with process <b>from</b> under 100% <b>to</b> 100% satisfied.	□N/A (or) 100% customer satisfaction achieved	Final

### V. Contact information:

Name: Robyn Harris e-mail: Robyn.Harris@ofm.wa.gov

**Phone number**: 360.902.0663