

Follow up on Recommendations From "A Performance Audit of the Department of Workforce Services Work Environment" (http://le.utah.gov/audit/13_13rpt.pdf)	
Recommendation	Status of Implementation Reported by the Department of Workforce Services
Chapter II PFP (Pay for Performance) Has Design and Implementation Flaw (Pages 32-33)	
"Improve data tracking and analysis to determine and isolate the efficiency gains achieved from any new process-improvement programs."	Eligibility Services Division has worked with GOMB to develop the QT/OE (Quality*throughput/Operating expenses) quotient and this is used to evaluate the positive and negative impacts of implemented changes. This calculation has been baselined and is monitored quarterly for progress. In addition, the Eligibility Services Division has historical determination, timeliness, and accuracy data that can be used for smaller strategies implemented to improve these specific performance measures.
"Address the financial and motivational sustainability of their Pay for Performance program given the reduction of incentive amounts resulting from increased employee participation."	DWS no longer has a pay for performance program.
"Continue to account for inequitable opportunities among employees by recognizing outputs that better define the performance of its workers."	Eligibility Services Division has begun an incentive plan that replaced the former Pay for Performance pilot. Previously in Pay for Performance, monetary payments were determined by a workers individual accuracy and determination volume. With the new incentive program, new improvement goals are selected every quarter by the division director and then each individual team across the division sets a specific, measurable team goal of what they will do (as a team) to contribute to the overarching division goal. The incentive plan payments are team based (formerly individual) and available to all employees (previously primarily limited to those making determinations) in the Eligibility Services Division.
"Tighten Eligibility Services Division controls over the determinations process or adjust incentives to control for potential negative employee behavior."	The Eligibility Services Division has ended the Pay for Performance pilot that rewarded determinations and has replaced it with an incentive plan that selects quarterly team goals.
"Consider improving its ability to track individual work process inputs and/or shifting focus from individual-oriented rewards to incentives better matching existing interdependent work processes."	The Eligibility Services Division has ended the Pay for Performance pilot that was rewarding individual performance and has replaced it with an incentive plan that is awarded at a team level.

Recommendation	Status of Implementation Reported by the Department of Workforce Services
<p>"Consider additional nonmonetary enrichments and work process changes that may cultivate employee trust and reestablish intrinsic, public-service-oriented motivators."</p>	<p>Eligibility Services Division employees are invited to participate in public service activities that not only help the public but also create camaraderie and trust within the agency. Some of these activities include outreach events with community partners, the Governor's clean air challenge, employee association fund raising to donate to local charities, local food bank drives and a current health challenge. Some additional work process changes recently implemented in an effort to cultivate employee trust are; annual leadership conferences for the entire Department (including the Executive and Deputy Directors), annual supervisor forums where division leadership (Division Director, Assistant Directors, and Managers) answer questions and provide training and support, regular conference calls between randomly selected staff across the state and the Eligibility Services Division Director, as well as the use of Throughput Rounds where leadership travel around the state to meet with front line staff and discuss operational, system, and policy bottlenecks that impact their ability to be successful or if changed could improve the process.</p>
<p>Chapter III Manager and Supervisor Inclusion in PFP (Pay for Performance) Is Concerning (Page 46)</p>	
<p>"Limit Pay for Performance incentives to only its eligibility specialists, unless supervisor and management incentives are redesigned to isolate the individual impacts of supervisors and management."</p>	<p>The Eligibility Services Division has ended the Pay for Performance pilot that was rewarding individual performance and has replaced it with an incentive plan that is awarded at a team level (including the supervisor and the manager). The incentive payment, if achieved, is identical for each member of the team.</p>

Recommendation	Status of Implementation Reported by the Department of Workforce Services
Chapter IV Accuracy Assessments Are Inconsistent and Inequitable (Page 65)	
<p>"Develop hierarchy-specific benchmarks for accuracy that are similar to existing productivity requirements."</p>	<p>In the new incentive plan, the division director selects a quarterly division goal. Each team sets an individual team goal of how they will help contribute to the overarching division goal. The team goal is tailored to that specific team because teams perform at different levels. For example, if the quarterly division goal were to improve accuracy, a team with current accuracy of 97% could set a goal to improve to 98% for the quarter, while another team at 94% could set a goal to improve to 95%. This incentive plan recognizes and allows for teams with unique challenges, which challenges previously made earning rewards in Pay for Performance difficult, an opportunity to earn an incentive at the same pace and level as others. Each individual team goal is reviewed and approved by the division director to ensure goals are both connected to the overarching division goal and will require acceptable improvement. Team goals are set based on historical team performance baselines. Each individual team goal is reviewed and approved by the division director to ensure goals are both connected to the overarching division goal and will require acceptable improvement. The Eligibility Services Division did not change the minimum performance accuracy expectation of 90%.</p>
<p>"Continue addressing any remaining issues associated with selection bias in the Performance Review Team case review process."</p>	<p>The Eligibility Services Division has eliminated the ability of internal case reviewers to exercise selection bias. The internal case review team simply selects the next edit listed in the case edit queue, and until that selection and assignment occurs, the case reviewer is unable to see the details of the case edit that needs to be performed.</p>
<p>"Develop processes to document the frequency and basis that errors identified by Performance Review Team case reviewers are being appealed and overturned."</p>	<p>The Performance Review Team has been manually tracking the cases that are overturned due to a case worker appeal. This data is used by the Performance Review Team managers to train and mentor the Performance Review Team case reviewers. A potential electronic tool (to replace the manual tracking) was added to eREP in June 2014 and is currently being tested by select teams, however, the manual tracking continues until the electronic tool is proven to be working properly and is implemented across the division.</p>

Recommendation	Status of Implementation Reported by the Department of Workforce Services
"Adjust its sampling methodology to provide a greater level of confidence in conclusions about employee performance."	The Performance Review Team worked with Management Information Systems to determine the appropriate volume of edits that must be completed on each worker in order to be statistically valid. This data was determined based on the hierarchy's level of determinations. The Performance Review Team is currently meeting the required edit volume suggested by the data to provide a high confidence level in the validity of the individual worker accuracy data.
"Adopt guidelines and tools that specify acceptable employee performance and clarify when negative personnel actions are appropriate."	The Eligibility Services Division has created such a tool. It is published on the DWS intranet and training was provided to all managers and supervisors at the May 2014 Supervisor Forum. The tool was reviewed and approved by Human Resources.
Chapter V Structural and Management Changes Have Caused Staff Unrest (Page 83)	
"Determine ways to slow the rate of large scale changes and ensure that employees are able to effectively adapt to changes."	The DWS is currently using Exepron, a project management tool that displays informational dashboards - providing real time visibility to all projects in the department's portfolio. The tool allows the executive team to visually see the volume and progress of current projects as well as future projects that will follow. The executive team uses Exepron to ensure that project deadlines are being met and to prevent unnecessary high change volumes.
"Update its client data access policy from zero tolerance to allow more firm but flexible policy."	DWS made the language of the zero tolerance policy more clear. The confidential nature of the information housed within the various DWS' databases makes it imperative that it is protected and that staff understand the importance of this. Therefore, DWS still believes a zero tolerance policy is necessary.