



OCJS CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY SUMMARY

Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services

1970 W. Broad Street, 4th Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43223

Toll-Free: (888) 448-4842

Telephone: (614) 466-7782

Fax: (614) 466-0308

www.ocjs.ohio.gov



OCJS Customer Satisfaction Survey Summary

The following is a summary of the OCJS Customer Satisfaction Survey. It is divided into the following categories: RFP Process, Application Process, Grant Awards Process, Grant Denials, Orientation, Grant Administration, Monitoring, and Customer Service.

Demographics and Methodology

The OCJS customer satisfaction survey was administered from September 26, 2007, through October 16, 2007, via Survey Monkey, an online survey provider. The survey was described as having a focus on the administration of federal grant programs. An announcement regarding the survey's availability was sent to all current OCJS grant recipients (approximately 350 total) as well as through the *Criminal Justice Weekly*, an OCJS bulletin distributed to approximately 1,700 subscribers. Current grant recipients make up a subset of subscribers to the *Criminal Justice Weekly* bulletin.

One hundred sixty-one individuals responded to the customer satisfaction survey. The respondents represented agencies in 60 of Ohio's 88 counties (some represented more than one county).

Of the 161 respondents, 93 percent reported ever having received a grant from OCJS. The following is a breakdown of what respondents received in 2007:

Funding Source	Grants that Respondents are Currently Receiving
JAG or JAG LE	87
VAWA	56
FVPSA	39
RSAT	1
PSN	4
Paul Coverdell	5
Anti-Gang	10

*Some agencies receive more than one type of funding

Twelve respondents reported that this is the first year their agency has received an OCJS grant.

Many questions required a rating response. Because each respondent's perception of the meaning of a particular score could differ, some assumptions were made in order to aggregate the responses. Unless otherwise specified, the scale ranged from 1 to 10, where 1 corresponded to 'not at all... (important, satisfied, etc.)' and 10 corresponded to 'very...(important, satisfied, etc.)'. A rating of one to three was interpreted as an

unfavorable response, a rating of four to six was interpreted as being a neutral response, and a rating of seven to 10 was interpreted favorably.

Request for Proposal (RFP) Process

Forty-three percent of respondents found out about the OCJS RFP through the OCJS web site, while others became aware of it through word of mouth and through the OCJS *Criminal Justice Weekly*. Nearly all (96 percent) accessed the RFP via the web site.

When asked how well the goals and requirements for each program area were explained in the RFP, 86 percent were satisfied or very satisfied (score of seven or above). Eighty-six percent of customers were also satisfied or very satisfied with the information in the RFP on the proposal narrative. Another 86 percent felt that it was important or very important for the RFP to state how points will be allocated when the application is scored.

Application Process

Sixty-one percent of agencies ranked the importance of providing training on the application process as important or very important, while 28 percent were neutral on the issue (score of 4-6). Not surprisingly, 99 percent of respondents said it was important or very important to know the timeline of the grant application process, with nearly 75 percent ranking this issue a '10'. Eighty-seven percent of customers were satisfied with the information in the OCJS grants calendar on the timeline for grant applications.

Sixty-one percent of agencies applied for the grant online, while most of the remaining respondents downloaded the application and submitted it by mail. Approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the 98 respondents who submitted online reported no technical difficulties. Of those 23 respondents who did report technical difficulties, there was a split in their thoughts regarding how well the difficulties were resolved — 53 percent were satisfied, scoring an eight or above (there were no 'seven' responses), while 47 percent were neutral or slightly dissatisfied with the resolution, scoring a three, four, five, or six.

Eighty-three percent felt it was easy or very easy to determine the appropriate forms that were needed to submit a complete grant application.

OCJS asked respondents to report their satisfaction with the different parts of the application (problem statement, project description, project objectives and outcomes, timeline and activities, budget, and collaboration). Overall, respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with how all sections were defined, with no score averaging below 7.7 (out of 10). Additionally, the majority (89 percent) were satisfied or very satisfied with the ease of completing the OCJS application.

Ninety-six percent of respondents felt it was important or very important to be able to contact OCJS staff with questions about the applications, and of these, 72 percent rated it a "10". Of those who had to contact OCJS staff with questions regarding the application, 91 percent reporting being satisfied or very satisfied with the responsiveness of OCJS

staff. The majority, or 60 percent, of these individuals who expressed satisfaction gave OCJS staff a “10” for responsiveness.

Ninety-three percent of respondents have received an OCJS grant in the past. Sixty percent reported that their agency was notified of its grant award within the timeline specified in the RFP. Given this finding, when asked about the timeliness in which the agency was notified of its grant award, satisfaction levels varied. While the majority, 59 percent, reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the timeliness of notification, 25 percent were neutral on the issue, and 16 percent were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

Eighty-five percent of respondents were satisfied with the clarity of the pre-award conditions. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents reported that the special program conditions assigned to their grant were understandable, and 95 percent felt that they were relevant to the agency’s program.

Sixty-nine respondents reported having been denied a grant in the past. Of these, about half, 48 percent, requested feedback. Of the 33 respondents who had requested feedback, 64 percent felt that the feedback they received was valuable or very valuable, while 21 percent were neutral on the issue. Four individuals reported that the feedback was not at all valuable.

Of the 33 who requested feedback on their denied grant, 64 percent were made aware of their right to review the findings leading to the denial decision.¹

Orientation Training

Eight-two percent of respondents reported having someone from their agency attend an OCJS orientation training at some point in time. Respondents were satisfied with the information provided in the training, which included information on draw down of funds, grant adjustments, quarterly subgrant reports, semi-annual performance reports, fiscal monitoring, programmatic monitoring, audits, and grant closeout procedures. Each aspect of training received an average rating of 7.8 or above out of 10.

Grant Administration

While the majority (80 percent) of respondents felt that the quarterly subgrant reports (QSRs) were easy or very easy to complete, 20 percent were less positive about the ease of filling out the QSR, with 18 percent giving it a neutral score and 2 percent of respondents giving it an unsatisfactory score. Most respondents (74 percent) have asked for assistance at one time or another filling out the QSR. Of those who have asked for assistance, 90 percent were satisfied or very satisfied with the assistance they received, and of these, 63 percent rated their satisfaction as a “10”.

Eighty-six percent of respondents reported that the performance reports were easy or very easy to fill out. Despite their ease, there was mixed reaction regarding the ability of the

¹ The ordering of the questions was such that it only allowed those who were denied and requested feedback to answer this question. Ideally, it should have allowed all those who had been denied to answer the question, regardless of whether or not they requested feedback.

performance reports to adequately demonstrate an agency's progress with the grant. Seventy-three percent of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with this aspect of the performance report, while 20 percent were less satisfied, giving performance reports a neutral score on their ability to demonstrate grant progress. When respondents asked for assistance filling out the performance reports, 91 percent felt satisfied or very satisfied with the assistance they received from staff.

Monitoring

Forty-one percent of respondents reported undergoing a fiscal monitoring. Of those who underwent a fiscal monitoring, 60 percent were conducted by telephone and 40 percent were done on-site.

Forty percent of respondents reported undergoing a programmatic monitoring, with a higher percentage done on-site (55 percent) than by telephone (45 percent).

Forty-eight percent of respondents stated that their agency had not undergone any fiscal or programmatic monitoring.

Customer Service

Ninety-one percent of respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the service provided by OCJS staff.

Additionally, respondents were asked to rate the customer service they received from OCJS grant coordinators in the following areas:

- Helpfulness in providing technical assistance
- Reasonableness in response time
- Knowledge of grants
- Accuracy of information relayed
- Courteous behavior

Overall, respondents were very pleased with the customer service they received. On a five-point scale (five being "strongly agree"), the average rating OCJS grant coordinators received in each of these areas ranged from a 4.5 to a 4.7. "Strongly agree" was also the most frequently reported response for each of the areas.

Eighty-nine percent of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with how OCJS administers the grant program. Likewise, 89 percent of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the OCJS grants web site.

Additional Comments Regarding Grant Administration

Respondents were offered the chance to comment on aspects of grant administration that OCJS does particularly well or that OCJS could improve upon. The following summarizes many of the comments received.

What OCJS and its staff do well...

- Trainings and seminars are very helpful.

- Staff display willingness to assist subgrantees.
- Staff are professional and knowledgeable.
- Staff are timely and responsive.
- Ability to apply online is appreciated.

What OCJS could improve upon...

- Timeliness in notification of grant awards and denials.
- Timeliness in disbursement of funds.
- Streamlining the application process.
- Reminding subgrantees of important information such as upcoming deadlines (perhaps by e-mail or a listserv), as well as notifying subgrantees promptly of late reports.
- Providing more in-depth grants training, as well as training on the use of the web site.

Finally, respondents were offered the chance to discuss other ways in which OCJS could assist agencies with the grants process. The responses were similar to those provided in the previous question on ways to improve grant administration, mostly focusing on timeliness in notification of awards and denials, timeliness in disbursement of funds, additional training, and keeping subgrantees informed, whether it be regarding deadlines, providing feedback on reporting requirements, etc.