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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>CUSTOMER SERVICE – The percentage of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency’s customer service as “good” or “excellent”: overall, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise, information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IT CUSTOMERS - The percentage of customers rating overall satisfaction with problem solution as above average or excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WEB-SITE – The percentage approval rating of web-site users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DIVERSITY – Racial/ethnic diversity in Legislative Administration as compared to the total State’s diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TURNOVER – Annual voluntary turnover rate of the Legislative Administration continuing workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GOLD STAR CERTIFICATE – Number of years out of last five that Financial Services earns State Controller’s Division Gold Star Certificate for the Legislative agencies it serves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legislative Administration supports the Oregon Legislature, promotes access to the legislative process, and provides efficient, effective, accountable and customer-oriented services to all legislators, legislative departments, the public, and other government agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Mission:</th>
<th>Legislative Administration supports the Oregon Legislature, promotes access to the legislative process, and provides efficient, effective, accountable and customer-oriented services to all legislators, legislative departments, the public, and other government agencies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td>Kevin Hayden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green = Target to -5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow = Target -6% to -15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red = Target &gt; -15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exception: Can not calculate status (zero entered for either Actual or

1. SCOPE OF REPORT

This report reflects results of a customer satisfaction surveys conducted among members of the Oregon Legislative Assembly and their staff on services provided by Legislative Administration and other data collected and analyzed to determine the degree to which Legislative Administration is meeting its mission. The report relates to accuracy, timeliness and usefulness of information provided to legislators and staff; resolution of problems involving computer technology; completion of technology projects within budget and on time; usefulness of the legislative website; availability of legislative information on cable television systems throughout the state; ethnic and cultural diversity of staff; staff turnover rates; the number and cost
of workers’ compensation claims; and fiscal accountability.

Agency operations are addressed overall, as are some specific areas (e.g., diversity, website). Several agency programs (e.g., Capitol security, IT project costs) are not singled out for specific performance measures.

2. THE OREGON CONTEXT

Legislative Administration provides much of the administrative support to the Oregon Legislative Assembly, the constitutional body with the authority to raise and expend state funds. Virtually every issue affecting Oregonians (education funding, transportation, health care, public safety, etc.) comes before the Assembly for funding and policy direction. Legislative Administration supports the entire process, from providing the technology used for drafting measures, to staffing committee meetings, to maintaining the physical plant of the Capitol, to managing the budget and providing human resource support for the Legislative Assembly. We partner with the Oregon State Police for security, the Oregon State Library for information resources and research, and the Department of Administrative Services for general support.

3. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

The performance results are grouped into three primary categories: Green (100-95% of the target), Yellow (94 – 85% of the target), and Red (84% or less of the target). Of the current set of 6 measures, 4 are green and 2 are red.

4. CHALLENGES

The major challenge for Legislative Administration is performing its multiple, inter-related responsibilities at the highest quality level and to the satisfaction of everyone affected given the number of services provided by the Agency to the Legislature as a separate level of government within the Capitol, which functions as a monument, seat of government, and office building. This challenge has been increased with reduced resources and increased workload in order to cope with difficult economic conditions facing the State.

5. RESOURCES AND EFFICIENCY

The 2011-13 approved budget (all funds) for Legislative Administration is $33,456,050.
II. KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

KPM #1

CUSTOMER SERVICE – The percentage of customers rating their satisfaction with the agency’s customer service as “good” or “excellent”: overall, timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise, information available.

Goal
Provide efficient, effective, accountable, and customer oriented services to all legislators.

Oregon Context
Agency Mission

Data Source
Post session customer satisfaction survey of legislators and their staff.

Owner
Legislative Administration, Kevin Hayden, 503-986-1847.

1. OUR STRATEGY

Legislative Administration exists to serve the members of the Legislative Assembly, other legislative support offices and the public. In this age of easy access to information, customers demand accurate, timely information from people who are helpful and demonstrate expertise in their field. Legislative Administration has worked to expand the availability of information through the legislative website, as well as by telephone and broadcast media, and to drop-in visitors. We now have more accurate information available more quickly due to all of these efforts.
2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The targets are set at 90% for each service component.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

Following the 2005 legislative session, we conducted a customer satisfaction survey of the 90 members of the Legislative Assembly. In that survey, members were asked to rate our performance in the areas of timeliness, accuracy, helpfulness, expertise and availability of information, as well as overall performance. Potential responses ranged from poor to fair to good to excellent, and included a “don’t know” option. All 90 legislators were surveyed.

We repeated the survey after the sessions in 2008, 2010, and 2012. In 2012, there were a total of 89 responses. Here is a summary of the results:

- Accuracy 92%
- Information Availability 86%
- Knowledge and Expertise 96%
- Helpfulness 90%
- Overall Quality 89%
- Timeliness 92%

4. HOW WE COMPARE

Legislative Administration has not identified a reasonable comparable entity where similar survey information is readily available.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Unfortunately, the number of individuals responding is low, especially among legislators (5). Total responses decreased to 89 from 103 in 2010, and 138 in 2008, even though we conducted it at the end of the session when the services were fresh in everyone’s’ minds.

Additionally, there is no way to determine the specific office or service that drew Fair/Poor responses, nor can we differentiate between continuing staff and session staff.
6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

We will continue to value and deliver excellent customer service. We must inform our staff that regular customer satisfaction surveys will be conducted, and we will expect regular improvement or maintenance of positive ratings in the results. The results must be used in our regular performance evaluation process to ensure that the survey results are reflected in the evaluations. We must also explore and employ additional measures to garner additional responses.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The survey was conducted through the SurveyMonkey tool to all legislators and legislative staff.
## 1. OUR STRATEGY

Legislative Administration Information Services (IS) strives to provide timely, quality service. After responding to an IT request, a survey link is emailed to the requester for 20% of the IT requests. The requester rates the help desk on three measurements and the staff on four measures of satisfaction. The ratings range from 1 which is needs improvement to 5, which is excellent. Currently surveys are sent out for 20% of the IT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM #2</th>
<th>IT CUSTOMERS - The percentage of customers rating overall satisfaction with problem solution as above average or excellent.</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Resolve IT problems quickly and to the user's satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>Agency Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Comments returned by users after IT problem resolution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Information Services, Shancy Saban, 503-986-1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is represented by percent

User satisfaction with IT problem resolution

Bar is actual, line is target

Data is represented by percent
2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Positive responses from customers indicate IS is meeting the goal to provide quality service to Legislative customers at the target rate of 95% or better. Of the customers who responded to the surveys, 95% of customers rated service as “above average” or “excellent”.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

Positive responses from customers indicate we are meeting our goal to provide quality service to Legislative customers. 95% of customers who responded rated service as “above average” or “excellent”.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

IS is unaware of any reliable comparative data.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The Legislature has a strong IT organization, with committed staff, a high standard for customer service, attention to unique user requirements, and continuously-improving policies and procedures.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Legislative Information Services will continue to monitor the quality and timeliness of services, and implement solutions that will help the strategic objective or providing service excellence to all customers.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The satisfaction rate of 95% (“above average” or “excellent service”) was based on 253 responses to surveys which were automatically delivered from July 2012–June 2013. The total IT Requests processed for this period were 9,311 compared to 6,401 tickets processed in 2011/2012. The number of tickets processed during the period was up by 2,910. This is due to the fact that the current reporting year includes a five month session, where the prior reporting year included a one month session.
### I. OUR STRATEGY

Legislative Administration Information Services strives to provide timely and complete information to the public about the Legislature, members, legislative activities and the legislative process. The legislative website was designed in conjunction with representatives from
each of the legislative agencies and leadership offices.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Positive responses from citizens about the legislative website indicate that the legislative information provided on the legislative website is meaningful, accessible, accurate, timely, and of value to the public, however, the website is not as intuitive as the public expects.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

33% of people responding to a survey posted on the legislative website during the 2013 survey period felt that the legislative website was good or excellent. The target of 80% or better satisfactory rating was not achieved, and the current survey shows a decrease in satisfaction from the previous year of 49%.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

We are unaware of any reliable comparative data.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

The method of collecting data may not provide an accurate measure of overall customer satisfaction. As survey responses are self-reporting and not a random sample of all website users, the results may be skewed by a disproportionate number of survey respondents who had complaints about the site. The total number of survey respondents was up from the previous year (49 in 2013 and 35 in 2012).

Due to the focus of the Internet redesign project, a limited number of enhancements were made to the website during the period of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2013, including the development of pages easily accessible by personal devices like smart phones and tablets, and a new mobile Measure Search function that returned direct links to measure text, committee assignments, impact statements, and measure history.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

The user survey for this reporting period shows a downward trend in satisfaction of the legislative website (33% positive rating in 2013, 49% positive rating in 2012, 58% positive rating in 2011, 64% positive rating in 2010, 61% positive rating in 2008-2009 and 72% in
There has been a project proposal since 2004 to redesign the Legislature’s website, but other high priority projects and initiatives have delayed work on the proposed project. The current legislative website was developed in 1999, and only routine maintenance with minor enhancements has been performed since that time. A majority of the negative comments deal with the outdated look of the site and the difficulty in finding consolidated information relating to a measure. A project to redesign the website was approved by the IT Governance Board in the 2011–2013 biennium, with an anticipated rollout of the new website after the 2013 session for use during the 2014 session.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

For the 2012-2013 reporting year, a web survey was posted soliciting information from January 2, 2013 through June 30, 2013. Forty-nine responses were recorded. When asked to rate their satisfaction with the legislative website overall, 33% responded favorably (good or excellent), 8% had no opinion, 31% rated the site as “Fair” and 28% rated the site as “Poor”. The greatest change from the previous year was an increase in the “fair” ranking. The survey inquired as to the overall user experience, the look of the legislative website, and the ease of finding information. Ratings were fairly consistent for all questions.
### KPM #4

**DIVERSITY –** Racial/ethnic diversity in Legislative Administration as compared to the total State’s diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Legislative Administration workforce that reflects the diversity in the State.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Context</td>
<td>Agency Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010, self-reporting by Legislative Administration Committee (LAC) employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Employee Services, Lore Christopher, 503-986-1370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Workforce diversity representation

Bar is actual, line is target

Data is represented by percent

![Workforce diversity representation chart]

#### 1. OUR STRATEGY

Our strategy to maintain a workforce that represents the diversity of Oregon begins with recruitment in a low-cost, broad-based manner, using the statewide NEOGOV on-line system and additional low or no cost website to reach all qualified applications. This broad-based approach will provide multiple attempts to will reach qualified applicants of under-represented and diverse populations.
Our strategy to retain our diverse workforce includes presentation of topical and interesting information and education through monthly diversity newsletters (“Diversity Diamonds”), agency participation in training opportunities (such as the annual Statewide Diversity Conference), agency encouragement of additional diversity training by managers through goal setting in annual performance evaluations, involvement and advocacy of diversity issues and topics as a member of the Governor’s Diversity and Inclusion (Affirmative Action) Board.

2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The targets reflect the percentage of people of color represented in Oregon based on the 2010 census.

The actuals reflect the percentage of non-white people working in Legislative Administration as of June 2013.

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

The population of Oregon includes 28% non-white Oregonians based on the 2010 census. This is total population and not just the working population.

Although we are only as 43% of our goal, our retention of diverse populations in our workplace remains steady through conscientious efforts. We have established cultural competence as a performance measure in performance evaluations for all LAC employees. We have increased training to include a monthly cultural competency newsletter. We have a dedicated employee who acts as our “Diversity Advocate” with direct responsibility to inform, train and educate our workforce about diversity and workplace inclusion topics.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

2011-12 Goal = 28%, based on the Oregon reported non-white population per the 2010 census.
2011-12 LAC results = 12%, based on LAC workforce (self identifying) reports as of June 2013.
Percent to goal = 43%, target to reach is 100% of 28% non-white target.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

Employee reporting of ethnicity is voluntary and therefore may not accurately reflect our true workforce ethnicity.

Seasonal employment opportunities (legislative sessions) tend to see a high percentage of returning employees each session. This reduces the amount of new employees to the legislative branch;
A four year salary freeze has impacted our ability to recruit in general, and to retain. Salary freeze was removed 7/1/2013.
Small state agencies (the largest being Legislative Administration with 91 continuing employees) has shallow career paths with limited opportunity for advancement.

Direct political appointments impact our ability to attract and retain a diverse workforce.

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Consistent compensation parity (COLA and Merit) with the Executive and Judicial Branches (as required by ORS) will improve our ability to recruit.

Demanding work environment needs to be mitigated by allowing flexible work schedules to promote work-life balance and flexibility of different cultural norms.

Retention of workforce diversity by continued emphasis on:
- Regular presentation of topical and interesting information and education through monthly diversity newsletters (“Diversity Diamonds”),
- Agency participation in training opportunities (such as the annual Statewide Diversity Conference),
- Agency encouragement of additional diversity training by managers through goal setting in annual performance evaluations,
- Agency involvement and advocacy of diversity issues and topics as a member of the Governor’s Diversity and Inclusion (Affirmative Action) Board

7. ABOUT THE DATA

The comparative data was taken from 2010 census data.
Agency data is a “snapshot” specific to one date in time of how our workforce looked in June 2013.

Voluntary self-disclosure of race and ethnicity is how we gather ethnicity information; therefore, we may not have accurate or complete data that could impact our true diversity ratios.
### II. KEY MEASURE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPM #5</th>
<th>TURNOVER – Annual voluntary turnover rate of the Legislative Administration continuing workforce.</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>A stable workforce in well trained, experienced and knowledgeable state employees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Context</strong></td>
<td>Agency Mission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
<td>On-line exit surveys and data inserted into the Human Resource Information System data is compiled annually.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner</strong></td>
<td>Employee Services, Lore Christopher, 503-986-1370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Annual turnover due to voluntary resignation

*Bar is actual, line is target*

Data is represented by percent

---

### 1. OUR STRATEGY

Retain an experienced, well-trained and competent workforce by making changes that are controllable and contribute to voluntary resignations.
2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

Reasons for leaving are coded into the Personnel Position Data Base (PPDB), statewide Human Resource Information System (HRIS), and HRVantage, the legislative HRIS system. Target is to have no greater turnover than the national average for Government Jobs as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

2008 Turnover Goal was no greater than 20.0%; actual was 26.8% (07/01/07 - 06/30/08)
2009 Turnover Goal was no greater than 20.0%; actual was 16.4% (07/01/08 - 06/30/09)
2010 Turnover Goal was no greater than 17.5%; actual was 16% (07/01/09 - 06/30/10)
2011 Turnover Goal was no greater than 11.8%; actual was 6.4% (07/01/10 - 06/30/11)
2012 Turnover Goal was no greater than 16.3%; actual was 12.5% (07/01/11 - 06/30/12) 2013 Turnover Goal was no greater than 16.8%; actual was 13.5% (07/01/12 - 06/30/13)

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

Our annual turnover continues to be lower than the national average for government jobs. Exit interviews that are being delivered hard copy and via electronic survey are giving us higher volume and more accurate information about why employees are choosing to leave.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

We are performing better than the national average by being under our target of 16.8% by 3.3%.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

1. Promotional opportunities in or outside of government = 62% (8)
2. An aging workforce, i.e. retirements = 15% (2)
3. A demanding work environment; job pressure (long hours; weekends; short timelines to complete projects; fewer resources) = 15% (2)
4. Continuing education, i.e. employees returning to school = 0%
6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Continue to collect data from exiting employees, analyze the reasons for leaving, and form a strategy for addressing the issues that impact exit.

1. Retirees. This circumstance will continue as “Baby Boomers” continue to work through the employment cycle through the next decade.

1. Promotional opportunities. The legislative branch is the smallest branch of government with approximately 350 continuing (year-round) employees. Promotional opportunities are very limited within the branch; however, many legislative employees are able to promote into other state agencies. There has been increased interest in employment opportunities inside and outside of government jobs. The Legislative Branch employees have had frozen salaries for 4 years (2 biennia) and have fallen behind the Executive Branch employees who had 1 year of frozen salaries, but varying levels of furloughed leave during the past 2 biennia. The salary freeze was removed effective 7/1/13. Consistent compensation parity (COLA and Merit) with the Executive and Judicial Branches (as required by ORS) will reduce turnover in this area.

1. Demanding work environment. Continued work with employees to flex schedules and maintain work-life balance through employee counseling and continue to train managers in ways to meet the needs and demands of today’s workforce.

1. Education. The legislative branch traditionally has a high degree of younger employees who return to school to complete advanced degrees. Continue to explore additional training and educational opportunities while working. (Weekend classes, night school, etc).

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Review period was 7/1/12 – 6/30/13, and based on actual termination coding. This is coded into the HRIS systems used in Legislative Administration; however, the voluntary resignation category can be a “catch all” for many reasons that can only be identified through anonymous exit interviews via Survey Monkey and hard copy mail-outs that have been implemented.
1. OUR STRATEGY

As an office that provides accounting services to five legislative agencies, it is important to earn credibility and provide fiscal accountability to our customers.
2. ABOUT THE TARGETS

The target is based on the State Controller’s Division key performance measure objective to track years out of last 5 that a clean audit opinion was received on the State’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

3. HOW WE ARE DOING

Our goal is to earn this certificate every year, which we have thus far.

4. HOW WE COMPARE

As reported by the State Controller’s Division in their fiscal year 2011 performance measure report, 94% of state agencies earned their Gold Star Certificate. Their target was 90%.

5. FACTORS AFFECTING RESULTS

In any given year, actual results may be impacted by staff turnover, resource constraints within Legislative Administration, and the extent and complexity of new accounting and financial reporting standards promulgated by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB).

6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

Financial Services continues to make fiscal year financial reporting a priority.

7. ABOUT THE DATA

Oregon fiscal year.
### III. USING PERFORMANCE DATA

**Agency Mission:** Legislative Administration supports the Oregon Legislature, promotes access to the legislative process, and provides efficient, effective, accountable and customer-oriented services to all legislators, legislative departments, the public, and other government agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contact:</strong></th>
<th>Kevin Hayden</th>
<th><strong>Contact Phone:</strong></th>
<th>503-986-1847</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternate:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alternate Phone:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### 1. INCLUSIVITY

* **Staff:** Key Performance Measures were developed by the Legislative Administration Leadership Team, consisting of managers and supervisors from all functional units of the agency.

* **Elected Officials:** Elected officials were surveyed to determine our level of performance.

* **Stakeholders:** In 2008, we expanded our customer satisfaction survey to include legislative agency staff.

* **Citizens:** Not involved, except for soliciting their input on the legislative website.

#### 2 MANAGING FOR RESULTS

Performance measures will be incorporated in performance evaluations for all Legislative Administration managers and supervisors. Some aspects of the measures have been incorporated into revised performance evaluation forms for the past year.

#### 3 STAFF TRAINING

Staff has received training on specific aspects of the performance measures, including the practical value of the measures.

#### 4 COMMUNICATING RESULTS

* **Staff:** Performance measures are included in annual performance evaluation of all staff.

* **Elected Officials:** The Legislative Administration Committee receives periodic reports on performance measures.

* **Stakeholders:** Beginning in 2008, the results of the survey were shared with legislative agency staff.

* **Citizens:** No report to citizens.