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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013 KPM #</th>
<th>2012-2013 Approved Key Performance Measures (KPMs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of School District Compliance with SLPA supervision requirements outlined in OAR 335-095-0050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compliant Professional Development Reported - Percentage of licensees audited who are in compliance with continuing professional development requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Customer Service - Percent of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency’s customer service as &quot;good&quot; or &quot;excellent&quot;: overall, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise, availability of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Best Practices - Percent of total best practices met by the Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. SCOPE OF REPORT

The Board currently evaluates its work through four approved Key Performance Measures (KPMs). These are: compliance with Board rules regarding supervision of Speech-Language Pathology Assistants (SLPAs) and required professional development; customer service; and the Board Governance self-assessment tool adopted by the Legislature in 2007.

2. THE OREGON CONTEXT
Agency Purpose

The Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology (BSPA) was established in 1973, and is authorized by Oregon Revised Statute 681 (ORS 681), which is implemented through Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 335 (OAR 335). The Board is appointed by, and responsible to, the Governor.

BSPA has adopted the following mission statement:

“The Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology seeks to protect the public by licensing and regulating the performance of speech-language pathologists, speech-language pathology assistants and audiologists.”

Statute and Rules outline the Board’s role in regulating the activities of these professions by insuring that education, training, and professional conduct requirements are met prior to initial and renewed licensure. Additionally, the Board reviews and investigates complaints against licensees, and takes necessary disciplinary action that may include license revocation and/or civil penalties.

Societal Outcomes Informed by the Board’s Work

Speech-language pathologists (SLPs), audiologists, and SLPAs provide vital clinical and rehabilitative services in various settings, including educational service districts, schools, private practice, hospitals, clinics, and rehabilitation facilities. Audiologists also may consult with businesses and industries to prevent hearing loss. Speech and hearing professionals prevent and treat disabilities and disorders that impact individuals' ability to function in schools, families and workplaces; decrease quality of life; and can even be life-threatening (such as swallowing disorders).

SLPs evaluate, diagnose and treat speech, language, cognitive-communication and swallowing disorders in persons of all ages, from infants to the elderly. Audiologists address hearing and balance impairments and their relationship to communication disorders. Audiologists also identify, assess, diagnose, and treat individuals with impairment of peripheral or central auditory and/or vestibular function, and strive to prevent such impairments. Audiologists also may fit and dispense hearing aids in their practice. Board-certified SLPAs assist speech-language pathologists in treating communication disorders, under the regular supervision of licensed SLPs.

The need for speech and hearing professionals is expected to grow faster than average through the year 2014, as “baby boomers” increasingly develop age-related neurological disorders and associated speech, language, swallowing, and hearing impairments. The demand for speech-language pathology services has also increased in treating premature infants, trauma and stroke victims. Federal law guarantees special education and related services to all eligible children with disabilities. Greater awareness of the importance of early identification and diagnosis of speech, language, swallowing, and hearing disorders is also increasing the need for speech professionals.

Oregon universities have responded to these increased needs by increasing the supply of new professionals. Oregon now has three programs (Portland State, Pacific University, and University of Oregon) that confer master’s degrees in speech-language pathology. This is the entry-level credential for the field. Chemeketa Community College trains SLPAs in a certificate program equivalent to an associate’s degree. The entry level credential in audiology was previously a master’s degree, but as of 2007, a clinical doctoral degree (Aud.D) is required. Pacific University began a doctoral program in Audiology in 2012. PSU also increased its cohort size by 50% in 2012, increasing the number of SLP graduates in Oregon. These local training programs are expected to further increase the number of licensed speech and hearing professionals in Oregon.

As of August 1, 2013, the breakdown of current licensees was:

Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs) – 1553 Active, 53 Inactive, 1 Limited, 1 Probation, 54 Conditional (these are SLPs in their post-graduate fellowship year)
Audiologists – 271 Active, 2 Limited, 0 Probation, 5 Inactive
Dual Licensees – 10 active, 0 Inactive, 0 Conditional
Speech-Language Pathology Assistants (SLPAs) – 316 Active, 1 Probation, 16 Inactive
This is a total of 2210 Active Licensees, 74 Inactive, 3 Limited, 2 Probation, and 54 Conditional. It is most relevant to look at this volume compared to the same time two years ago, because of the biennial licensing cycle. When compared to August 2011. Total licensees are up 14.6% since August 2011; up 24.3% since 2009, and up 33.2% since 2007.

Government Partners

Board statute allows that SLPs employed exclusively in K-12 districts are not required to obtain licensure from BSPA; rather they may be licensed by the Teacher Professional Standards Commission (TSPC). To eliminate the confusion and duplication of regulatory oversight for speech professionals, in August 2009 TSPC voted to “get out of the business” of licensing SLPs. In early 2010, the Commission changed its direction, but further efforts to coordinate SLP licensing are underway at the professional association and inter-agency level. In 2012-13, BSPA and TSPC directors jointly wrote a newsletter article for Board licensees and distributed information to school personnel to clarify licensing requirements for SLPs in the schools. Importantly, we clarified that districts may not require a TSPC license for SLPs working in the schools as long as that SLP is acting within their professional scope (and is not being asked to perform educator duties). This has allowed many SLPs to drop their dual licensure.

Hearing aid dispensers are regulated by the Oregon Health Licensing Agency (OHLA), which oversees contracts with consumers regarding these devices. Audiologists may dispense hearing aids within the scope of their professional practice.

SLPAs are certified only by BSPA.

3. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

1. KPMS TARGETS MAKING PROGRESS
   - Compliance with SLPA Supervision Rules
   - Customer Satisfaction
   - Board Best Practices

2. KPMS NOT MAKING PROGRESS
   None.

3. KPMS NOT MEASURED IN 2012-13
   Compliant Professional Development Reported

4. CHALLENGES

   During 2012-13, the agency’s budgeted staff remained at 0.6 FTE Executive Director (ED) and 0.8 FTE Administrative Assistant. The Executive Director is responsible for policy development and implementation, agency administrative oversight, and staffing all Board functions. The ED also serves as the investigator, with some support from contracted clinical consultants and volunteer peer reviewers. The ED must comply with State policy and procedures, and communicate regularly with multiple constituents. The administrative workload and complexity require additional resources.

   An unexpected resignation of the Administrative Assistant in April was followed by two temporary employees and a period with a vacancy. The current employee was hired in December 2012. This significantly impacted the workload of the ED as she covered both positions during the vacancy, engaged in multiple recruitment processes, and provided training and close supervision of the new employees.
The number of complaints received and other cases investigated increased geometrically in the last several years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Cases Opened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33 through August 1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several serious cases regarding professional competence and conduct have led to disciplinary action, as confidence in the Board’s willingness to take action has grown. The Board has also engaged in more compliance activities related to unlicensed practice and its KPM audits. These factors increased the investigative workload for Board and staff, and increasing legal fees and other costs of doing business over the last few years. Additional staff needed to support these regulatory and administrative functions were requested in the 2011-13 Governor’s Balanced Budget (and were temporarily approved by the E-Board in December 2010), but not approved by the 2011 Legislature. Total staff of 2.5 FTE was requested in the 2013-15 Governor’s Recommended Budget; however, only 2.0 FTE were approved. It will be a challenge to expand criminal background checks for applicants and licensees and to keep up with the investigative work without the requested half-time investigator position.

5. RESOURCES AND EFFICIENCY

BSPA’s 2011-13 legislatively-adopted expenditures budget was $403,043. This represents an 8% increase over the previous biennium. The actual resources used were approximately $372,000. The increased licensing volume allowed the Board to realize more revenue than budgeted as well. The Board was able to increase its ending balance by just over $100,000 as a result. A fee increase was implemented in 2013-15 to support the new staffing level.

Cost savings are realized in several ways, including:
· Sharing office overhead (IT, copier, shredding, etc.) with other licensing boards in PSOB Suite 407
· Using electronic correspondence whenever appropriate.
· Implementing on-line renewals, including payment, in January 2010.
· Enhancing information on the website to improve 24/7 customer service and reduce unnecessary inquiries to agency staff.
· Executive Director working beyond budgeted FTE to meet administrative demands.
1. OUR STRATEGY

KPM #1 monitors compliance with Board rules regarding the SLP-SLPA supervisory relationship, and the hours and type of supervision received. Since most SLPAs work in school districts, the Board has requested audit responses from school administrators. This also provides a way to link supervision compliance to administrative decisions regarding staffing.
2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

This measure was initiated in 2010, with a target of 50%. The 2013 target was 60%.

In 2013, the Board requested audit responses from 13 ESDs and school districts. This represented 48 SLPAs (about 16% of those licensed), and 193 monthly logs. [Additionally, 14 SLPAs not working in schools were audited, and they submitted 18 logs.] Districts are evaluated based on compliance with reporting requirements (“Were supervisory relationships reported on a timely basis to the Board?”) and with documentation requirements (clinical logs showing appropriate hours of direct and indirect supervision for each caseload), and with rules regarding supervisor qualifications.

Thus, each district has many data points that need to be evaluated. It is probably unreasonable to expect that a “pass” should require a district to have 100% accuracy for each of 5 variables on each log submitted. Large districts submitted 40 or 60 logs; smaller districts only 8. The target should be revised to remove this bias. Also, a passing score of less than 100% compliance on all variables should be considered, such as 90%.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

Of the 13 districts audited, 7 (54%) passed with 100% of logs meeting all audit criteria. This is up significantly from only 2 districts in 2012. [Of the SLPAs audited individually, 70% passed with a perfect score.]

However, if each district’s performance is looked at individually, the number of compliant logs per district ranged from 60% to 100%, and overall 83% of the logs submitted were completely compliant. This may be a more relevant measure of performance on SLPA supervision and its documentation.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

The Board is not aware of other entities auditing this function.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

- Board supervision requirements are specific, and outlined in OARs that licensees are requested to review before initial licensure and regularly thereafter.
- Board staff created a “smart form” that automatically calculates the required percentages of supervision. This convenient tool has helped increase the level of compliance.
6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

- Ongoing education and feedback on SLPA supervision requirements and audit results in Board newsletters and regular licensee communications.
- Ongoing regular consultation and communication about SLPA supervision and other issues regarding SLP and SLPA practice in schools with Oregon School Personnel Association (OSPA), Oregon Department of Education (ODE), Teachers Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) and other groups.
- Consider revising the measure to avoid disadvantaging larger districts.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Currently, data is expected to be collected annually in the spring, for two months (fall and spring) of each academic year. These data points should encompass staffing patterns that are established, and possibly changed, during the course of each school year.

- Audits continue to be time-consuming for Board staff. Unless the requested staff increase is implemented in 2013, the Board will likely recommend a shift to biennial rather than annual audits.
- Several districts employ many SLPAs, and two log forms are required for each SLPA. If an SLPA is supervised by more than one SLP, then two forms are required per SLPA-SLP pair.
- A revision of the audit measure may be warranted so that districts continue to be audited, but that their performance is rated based on the number of compliant logs. If this measure were applied to these audit results, there would have been 83% compliance.
II. KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM #2</th>
<th>Compliant Professional Development Reported - Percentage of licensees audited who are in compliance with continuing professional development requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Protect the public from sub-standard practice in Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>Agency Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>5-15% of professional development reported on biennial license renewals audited for conformance to OAR 335-070-0030 and evidence of completion/attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. OUR STRATEGY

The Board's mission is to protect the public by ensuring that speech and hearing services are provided competently. Licensees demonstrate their competency...
by meeting initial licensing standards based upon their training, and by meeting ongoing professional development requirements to stay current with new practices in the field.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Not measured in 2013. This is only measured in even-numbered years, as part of the audit cycle that coincides with the biennial license renewal.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

Not measured in 2013.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

The American Speech-Language Pathology & Hearing Association (ASHA) maintains a program of professional certification; ASHA requires only 30 hours every 3 years for SLPs and audiologists.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Not measured in 2013.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Not measured in 2013.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Reporting cycle: every two years, with license renewal.
**1. OUR STRATEGY**

The Board endeavors to provide excellent customer service to citizens, licensees, and stakeholders. The Board's primary mission is to protect the public. A positive interaction with customers is essential to the Board's work in promoting citizen involvement and trust. The Board's interaction with licensees and stakeholders is equally important in fostering compliance, collaboration, and positive working relationships. The Board measures its customer service rating through customer service surveys that are reviewed annually. Areas for improvement are identified and reasonable changes implemented.
II. KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The targets establish a level of customer service rating the Board aspires to achieve. Targets have been set at 94% since 2008. However, these may be too high given national benchmarks and agency staffing limitations. The 2013 Legislature approved some additional staff for the agency; as this new level is experienced, it will become clearer whether the measures should be revised.

The ratings are used to determine whether the Board is meeting its targeted performance goal in the areas measured. Ancillary comments are also considered to identify specific areas for improvement.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

For July 2012-June 2013, BSPA's overall agency customer satisfaction rating was 86%, up from 83% in 2012. Ratings for the separate dimensions measured were: Timeliness (85%), Accuracy (90%), Helpfulness (83%), Expertise (88%), Availability of Information (79%), and Comparison to Others (81%).

Timeliness was up 2% from 2012; Accuracy was up 3% from 2012; Helpfulness, Expertise and Availability of Information, and Comparison to Others stayed the same as 2012. These results were based on 168 responses (about 8% of active licensees), a significantly lower N than in 2012, which had 294 responses, or 15% of licensees.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

The American Customer Satisfaction Index reports customer satisfaction ratings with all surveyed federal government agencies at 68.4% for 2012. Ratings were somewhat higher for public administration/government (68.8%) and local government (garbage/police) 69.1%. BSPA well exceeds these averages with an 86% overall satisfaction rating.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

- Being small has the advantage of allowing Board staff to stay close to the customer. We do not need to transfer calls between departments, and we issue licenses on a daily basis. Most applicants are pleasantly surprised to find that BSPA generally issues licenses within a day or two of receiving all application materials.
- Licensees interacting either positively or negatively with the agency do not generally take time to complete a survey. At the same time, many compliments are given agency staff on a regular basis during phone calls with applicants or licensees.
- Sometimes a licensee does not agree with Board rules or policies, and it is difficult to satisfy that customer regardless of the quality of the staff interaction.
- Limited and part-time staffing (1.4 FTE total) to handle the agency's workload and shifting priorities has impacted availability and timeliness of responses to customer needs.
- The long-time Administrative Assistant resigned in April 2012, and since then there have been 3 other employees in that position (on the learning curve), as well as several weeks when the Executive Director was covering both jobs. This would tend to lower accuracy and expertise, and availability of information.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE
II. KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

- Additional administrative staff has been approved for 2013-15 to handle increasing administrative complexity and volume of work, and to continue to improve customer satisfaction.
- Evaluate and improve the Board’s website so that accurate information is available on-line 24/7.
- Continue to survey licensees in the fall so to improve the validity of customer service data.
- Consider revising the targets, since they are much higher than external ratings of government agencies, and may be unrealistic.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Reporting cycle: Data from routine web- or email-based input is compiled monthly, and reviewed and reported annually. The Board has implemented a formal survey annually to boost response rates and obtain more valid data.

Every email transmittal by the Board office includes a link to the online customer service survey providing equal and ample opportunity for customers to share their opinion on the level of service received. A link is also on the website.
Customer satisfaction data is collected electronically via an online survey tool managed by independent IT contractor. This tool offers convenience and anonymity to participants while increasing the efficiency and integrity of data collected. Board members and staff do not have access to data input.

Customer service data may be viewed upon request at the Board office located in the Portland State Office Building.
II. KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

KPM #4
Best Practices - Percent of total best practices met by the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure public protection; Achieve efficient, effective, transparent government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oregon Context</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best practices established for all state agencies (boards and commissions) by 2007 legislature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual self-assessment by Board members and Executive Director.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. OUR STRATEGY

The Board is committed to 100% compliance with the Best Practices performance measure. The Board’s primary mission is to protect the public. To carry out its mission, the Board institutes best practices to promote effective governance, accountability for agency operations, and effective and efficient use agency funds.
2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

In 2006, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) identified 15 best practices for Oregon Boards and Commissions that have governance oversight (such as licensing boards), have their own budgets, and hire the agency’s executive director. BSPA is one of approximately 45 such Boards. These best practices were combined into a performance measure during the 2007 Legislature Joint Ways and Means process, and included in the listing of final Key Performance Measures for 2007-2009.

Best practices are measured in 15 areas, including executive director selection, expectations, and feedback; strategic management; strategic policy development; fiscal oversight; and board management. The target is 100% compliance with the best practices identified in a self-assessment survey.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

On June 24, 2013, at its regular Board meeting, the BSPA conducted its self-evaluation. Methods of meeting these objectives are tailored to the BSPA's needs and resources.

The Board Self-Assessment shows that we are currently meeting best practice objectives in all areas in ways that are appropriate for such a small agency. Resource limitations outside of the Board’s control have sometimes created delays in meeting external reporting requirements, but the reports have been completed.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Other agencies’ policies and practices are shared through formal and informal mechanisms, such as regular communication with directors of other Health Related Licensing Boards.

A formal peer review process for these agencies has been implemented, and the first two reviews completed. BSPA requested a peer review in 2012, and it is scheduled for September 2013. The Board is also part of an audit of all health related licensing boards by the Secretary of State Audits Division in August 2013.

Methods of meeting Board objectives and statewide program directives need to be tailored to the BSPA's needs and resources.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

- The current Executive Director has 30 years of experience in management in complex non-profit and governmental roles, including previous experience reporting to, and supporting Boards. Board members are engaged and dedicated to their roles.
- Repeated turnover in the Administrative Assistant this position during 2012, negatively impacted the time the Executive Director could spend on policy and planning initiatives and disciplinary caseload.
- The Executive Director carries out the Board’s functions and policy directives and to maintain best practices. This position was finally approved at full-time, beginning in 2013-15.
II. KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

- The Board has only 7 members, and operates as a “committee of the whole”. The Board and Executive Director work together to create practical and cost-effective ways to implement best practices.
- Formal self-assessment and goal-setting are scheduled annually, and regular meetings include a formal Executive Director update on agency goals and financial status.
- Funds are extremely limited for Board or management training and travel.
- Funds are limited for Board per-diems, and the limitation on PERS employees makes BSPA essentially a volunteer Board. Thus, Board meetings need to focus on top priorities and tasks.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

- The Board should continue ongoing processes to:
  - Perform Board self-assessment;
  - Obtain increased permanent funding to carry out Board’s mission;
  - Stabilize funding for Board training;
  - Use input from peer review activities; and
  - Research other states and Canada for best practices in regulatory policy and processes.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

  Reporting cycle: Oregon fiscal year. Survey data is based on a self-assessment, and is qualitative.
### III. USING PERFORMANCE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY &amp; AUDIOLOGY</th>
<th>III. USING PERFORMANCE DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Mission:</strong> The Board adopts rules governing standards of practice, investigates alleged violations and grants, denies, suspends and revokes licenses for Speech-Language Pathologists, Speech-Language Pathology Assistants, and Audiologists for consumer protection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact: Sandy Leybold, Executive Director</th>
<th>Alternate Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact Phone:</strong> 971-673-0087</td>
<td><strong>Alternate Phone:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The following questions indicate how performance measures and data are used for management and accountability purposes.

1. **INCLUSIVITY**

   - **Staff:** The Executive Director and the seven Board members consider the Board's mission and goals during the development of its performance measures. Emphasis is placed on public protection, agency efficiency, and customer satisfaction.

   - **Elected Officials:** Agency KPMs are reviewed and approved by the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

   - **Stakeholders:** The Board conducts an annual review of KPMs during a meeting that is open to the public. Stakeholders and citizens are welcome to attend and invited to express their views and opinions as time allows.

   - **Citizens:** Customer survey responses are considered when developing agency performance measures and operational goals.

2. **MANAGING FOR RESULTS**

   Agency KPMs demonstrate program accomplishments, identify areas for increased efficiencies, and confirm that internal and external expectations are met. KPMs are utilized with other relevant factors to determine uses of agency funds and resources, to identify areas for improvement, and to evaluate operational effectiveness. BSPA's budget is challenged by the rising costs of investigating and resolving an increased volume and complexity of complaints, as well as ever-increasing costs of state government services.

3. **STAFF TRAINING**

   Training of staff and Board members is critical to effective performance. Membership in the National Council of State Boards of Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology (NCSB) facilitates on-line networking about regulatory issues in the speech and hearing professions. Sending two Board members per year to the NCSB training/conference would be extremely beneficial. National organizations such as the Federated Association of Regulatory Boards (FARB) and Council on Licensing, Enforcement and Regulation (CLEAR) also conduct training courses and conferences that would provide additional skills for BSPA Board and staff.

   A solid understanding of legal proceedings is critical to the Board’s work. BSPA would welcome additional training sessions conducted by the Attorney General’s office.

   Since travel time and expense for training is a major constraint for our small agency, it would be helpful if other state agencies would provide regular tele-conferencing opportunities for all administrative meetings and trainings.
### 4 COMMUNICATING RESULTS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff:</strong></td>
<td>The Executive Director is responsible for collecting, compiling, and reporting results regarding KPM performance. The Executive Director assists the Board with the development and review of agency KPMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected Officials:</strong></td>
<td>The agency prepares and submits annual KPM progress reports to DAS and on to the Legislature. The most recent progress report is included in its biennial budget request document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td>Specific KPM results may be featured in newsletter articles, and are incorporated into Board goals, policies and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizens:</strong></td>
<td>The agency posts a link to past and current KPM progress reports on the home page of its website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>