

# GOVERNOR'S AWARD FOR QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE

## Application Cover Page

Project or Team: Strategic Advancement Forum Team

(Lead) Agency: Washington State Patrol

Other agencies participating (if any): None

Partner organizations (outside of state government, if any) None

Contact Person: Chief Lowell M. Porter      Email: Lowell.Porter@wsp.wa.gov      Phone: (360) 586-2355      MS: 42600

Internal Quality Consultant: Ms. Susan Ramsey      Email: Susan.Ramsey@wsp.wa.gov      Phone: (360) 753-0678      MS: 42600

**Team members (by agency or organization)** *The team member names will appear on any plaques/certificates presented to the team. Please make sure all the team members are included and their names are spelled correctly.*

**Washington State Patrol: Chief Ronal Serpas, Chief Annette Sandberg, Ms. Marlene Boisvert, Mr. Ed Borgatti, Dr. Doug Cederblom, Deputy Chief Maurice King, Mr. Marty Knorr, Captain Robert Lenz, Chief Lowell Porter, Captain Brian Ursino, Director Diane Perry, State Fire Marshal Mary Corso, Dr. Barry Logan, Deputy Chief Steven Jewell, Acting Deputy Chief Paul Beckley, Captain Michael Matlick, Ms. Diane Bowers, Ms. Angie Peterson**

TEAM and IQC: For each question in the application, enter the score that you believe is appropriate (see instructions, page 2)

A\_\_\_ B\_\_\_ C\_\_\_ D\_\_\_ E\_\_\_ Total A thru E \_\_\_\_\_  
F\_\_\_ G\_\_\_ H\_\_\_ I\_\_\_ J\_\_\_ Total F thru J \_\_\_\_\_

Total self score \_\_\_\_\_

**Don't  
forget!**

Submitted by:

Chief Lowell M. Porter

Team Contact

Ms. Susan Ramsey

Internal Quality Consultant

Agency Director (for email submittal, enter date of director review)

Date

Send completed application to:

**Mary Campbell**  
**Special Assistant for Quality and Performance**  
**Office of the Governor**  
**PO Box 42460**  
**Olympia, WA 98504-2460**

**Executive Summary: In 200 words or less, describe the project, including the problem, the solution applied and the results. This description will be used to promote the project if it is selected as a finalist. (No points applied)**

The Washington State Patrol lacked a mechanism to assist District/Division managers in driving the implementation of our strategic planning efforts while providing a visible accountability link between managers and executive staff.

The development of the State Patrol's Strategic Advancement Forum (SAF) process (Accountability Driven Leadership Model) was modeled after the COMPSTAT model created in the New York City Police Department. The New York COMPSTAT process was operationalized through a weekly forum where Executive Staff and managers provide an oral report that focuses on how their resources are being utilized in pursuit of their goals. Typically, crime mapping and other computerized data (thus the acronym COMPSTAT, short for computer statistics) are reviewed in detail and compared to the goals. Managers are held personally responsible for the activities within their units.

We believe that our Accountability Driven Leadership model embraces many of the principals of COMPSTAT. This includes new and evolving strategies to hold non-traditional policing activities (e.g., State Fire Marshal and State Toxicologist duties) to these same standards of accountability. By using accurate and timely data, effective tactics, rapid deployment, and relentless follow-up, we achieve high standards of public service.

The SAF allows idea sharing among peers and managers and provides visible two-way accountability and communication links between managers and executive level management. The alignment of District/Division operational plans with the agency's strategic plan creates and communicates an agency-wide vision of direction and mission, both short and long term. This equates to job satisfaction, employee growth and development, and increased productivity and creativity for future contribution to the successful accomplishment of the agency strategic plan.

## **Part 1: Why did you do this project?**

**A. STRATEGIC IMPACT: Briefly explain the problem, how it was identified, the impact it was having, its relevance to the agency mission, and the reason it was chosen as a project. Provide relevant baseline data.**

- 0 **No evidence** provided as to why the project was selected or its relevance to the agency mission. "We just knew what we were trying to do."
- 1 **Anecdotal evidence of problems** (or need) led to project selection. "People told us it was a problem." Team had an objective that was explicitly agreed to among all members.
- 2 **Surveys, frequency data, research, or other analysis** indicated that there would be benefit to agency staff, customers, citizens or stakeholders if the problem were addressed. Team had a clear **objective and performance measure related to an agency goal**.
- 3 Project was selected in response to a need or problem, using a **process of analysis that included the use of surveys, frequency data, research or other analysis**. Team had a **formal objective related to an agency goal, as well as performance measures and baseline data**.
- 4 Project selected in response to a need or problem, using a fully **integrated data system and decision-making tools**. Team had a **formal objective related to an agency goal**, and the decision to address this problem was based on an informed decision-making process that considered the relative importance and priorities in agency goals. The team had a **performance measure and baseline data**, and used **benchmarking or other best practices to establish a target**.

### **What was the problem?**

The Washington State Patrol lacked:

- a system to support the implementation of our strategic plan
- accurate and timely data to demonstrate effectiveness
- a system to hold staff accountable for activities within their Divisions/Districts
- a commitment to the strategic planning process
- a systematic way to improve the coordination of our public safety efforts
- a communication and information sharing forum for all levels of staff
- a method to advance our strategic plan through partnerships and problem solving
- a system to identify implementation problems and resources needed to continue progress

### **How was the problem identified?**

The agency's five-year strategic plan was first implemented in July 1998. During the review and update of the plan in September 1999 it became clear that we didn't have a mechanism to keep the strategic plan objectives moving forward.

In March 1999, the Washington State Patrol began to study the potential of implementing a computer statistics (COMPSTAT) strategy. In July 2000, the Patrol adopted a strategy known as the Strategic Advancement Forum (SAF).

### **What impact was the problem having?**

Our agency had a strategic plan that sat on a shelf. There was no system in place to report on the progress of the objectives identified in the plan. The accountability link was identified in the plan but staff was not asked to report on the progress, which led to complacency. If no one was watching or cared about the progress of the strategic plan, why should anyone be held accountable? As a result, our agency was basing decisions on feeling rather than having the performance data and analysis to make educated decisions.

### **Why was the project chosen and what is its relevance to the agency mission?**

This project was critical for the continuing update, review, and implementation of the agency strategic plan. The SAF process directly affects our success in fulfilling our agency's mission: The Washington State Patrol makes a difference every day by providing public safety services to everyone where they live, work, travel, and play.

## **Part 2: How did you do it?**

**B. EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT: Describe who was on the project team, and the basis for selecting them.**

- 0 Ad hoc assembly of interested volunteers.**
- 1 Team members were chosen based on workload availability and relevance to work.**
- 2 In addition to 2 above, internal stakeholder input was considered or they were included in the team.**
- 3 In addition to 3 above, input from suppliers, partners, customers and stakeholders were also considered or they were on the team.**
- 4 Team was selected based on defined standardized agency process that assures representation of appropriate internal/external suppliers, partners and customers, as well as needed skills, aptitudes, knowledge and styles.**

### **The team was selected based on a standard agency process:**

Creating a team with membership from all levels of staff within the agency is our standard practice to ensure all input is gathered and valued from each perspective to include all work areas that may be affected by the new process.

### **This Phase I cross-functional team consisted of:**

- Staff from the Information Technology Department who assisted in development of database, technology parameters agency-wide and were involved in the implementation, training, and success of the project.
- Executive management members providing input to the forum template of information for each District/Division Manager as well as suggestions for improvement throughout the project development, implementation, and follow-up.
- Our agency Internal Quality Consultant was extremely instrumental in providing training to staff in baseline establishment, performance goals, data elements, identifying outputs, and outcomes. During the development and follow-up of the project this position has assisted in ensuring staff stay on target with their performance measures.
- Human Resource staff, in coordination with our Training Academy staff, provided training in presentation skills, emphasizing the ability to analyze data, interpret questions and provide meaningful answers. Training was also given to managers on implementing change and dealing with resistance.

### **Phase II implementation team consists of:**

- The SAF committee assigned moderators to make appropriate introductions, describe ground rules, serve as timekeeper, and moderate discussion between managers and questions from the audience.
- Information Technology staff provided technical support to presenters using laptop and projector equipment.

- Managers were a part of the implementation team identifying key areas to report in their respective areas.

**The basis for selecting the members:**

Organization-wide commitment was crucial in the development of the SAF process. This included District/Division leaders attending the SAF meetings, each observing their peers—regardless of assignment—and everyone being held accountable to the same standards of performance. The team members’ knowledge of their specific areas and of the agency strategic direction was very instrumental in the success of this project. The “cross-pollination” of the participants (troopers and professional staff from many different units) at the SAF demonstrates internally and externally to all that a team of leaders is working in a coordinated and collaborative way to ensure the overall success of the agency.

**C. CUSTOMER FOCUS: Describe how you involved customers/stakeholders in defining the project, identifying and testing potential solutions, evaluating the result and building support during implementation. Attach relevant survey data or other customer feedback.**

- 0 Team **did not solicit or use customer input** in any stage of the project Team did not attempt to bring other stakeholders on board
- 1 Team considered **anecdotal customer feedback** in project selection Team **responded to questions and concerns from customers or stakeholders as they came up**
- 2 Team reviewed **existing customer requirement data** to determine the need for the project. As the project evolved, team **anticipated potential areas of resistance**, as well as potential mitigation measures, and **addressed them with relevant stakeholders in advance**.
- 3 Team **solicited customer input to define the problem, as well as the possible solution(s)**. As the project evolved, team **identified potential benefits** for stakeholders from the project and **communicated both benefits and mitigating measures to the appropriate stakeholders**. Team **solicited feedback from stakeholders as project progressed**
- 4 Team **specifically sought customer input, suggestions and feedback** related to the identified problem and possible solutions. Team **developed and implemented a communication plan** for proactively communicating to stakeholders about the work in progress. Team **solicited feedback from customers on completion of the project**.

**Customers/stakeholders participated in defining the project:**

The Chief, Executive Management, and Division/District managers are the customers of the SAF process. They were involved from the beginning in defining and implementing the accountability driven leadership model. Managers identified their own performance measures, Executive Management determined key areas identified in the strategic plan to concentrate our resources, and the Chief assisted by “guiding the ship” and telling the public our story as successes became apparent through the SAF process.

**Customers/stakeholders identified and tested potential solutions:**

Our SAF process began with the need to implement and keep our strategic plan moving throughout its life. The SAF was convened on a quarterly basis for this purpose. After testing this concept it became clear the data we were gathering wasn’t timely enough to react and make changes to affect our outcomes. We determined that a weekly SAF process would benefit managers in managing the front line staff. Executive Management agreed the weekly SAF process assisted them also in having timely data to convey to the public and manage their District and Division Commanders in high profile areas.

**Additional communications:**

We encourage Districts/Divisions to invite external stakeholders to observe and participate in SAFs. They are open to the public to observe and provide comment. We have invited many other state agencies that are interested in implementing a similar process in their own agencies.

**D. PROBLEM ANALYSIS: Describe the data used to understand the problem, identify its causes and prioritize them for solution. Attach relevant flow charts, cause and effect diagrams, process data, or other information used.**

- 0 No potential root causes identified, and no process was used to narrow potential causes of the problem to root cause. Team went **from problem identification to solution(s)**
- 1 Team **identified potential causes by assumptions, brainstorming, fishbone or other intuitive tools**, and narrowed list through group processes or consensus.
- 2 Team **used process data to identify potential causes**, and **narrowed the list to root causes by using decision-making tools** and basic data analysis
- 3 Team used **statistical tools (run charts, statistical analysis) to identify potential causes**, and sought additional data as needed to support decision-making process.
- 4 Team used a **data-driven process** to narrow the problem down to the root cause or primary issue. **Team tested assumptions and conclusions using additional research or data gathering.**

**What data was used to understand the problem?**

The challenge for the Patrol was to expand the COMPSTAT concept to other areas in public safety and general management, for example:

- Children and senior citizens at risk because they are living in facilities that are out of compliance with fire safety codes.
- Budgetary practices that historically resulted in overspending, inefficiencies, and under achievement.
- Forensic Laboratory Services provided in a timely manner to law enforcement and coroners statewide while ensuring quality and correctness.
- Traditional management functions such as accounting, fleet and property management, human resources, and information technology.

For years, the statistics in the State Patrol that drew the most attention were the number of arrests and the reaction times to emergency calls. In fact, neither represent the ultimate goals of the State Patrol: public safety and crime reduction. As you can see from the charts included in this application, we collect and report data in our SAF on key initiatives to drive improved performance. Once our SAF moved to reporting on strategic plan objectives and holding managers accountable for results, we began to see improvements in our performance measures.

We determined it was critical to pursue more than just matters of efficiency – the number of reports written, tickets issued, or people arrested (outputs). It is the pursuit of effectiveness (outcomes) that led us to an Accountability Driven Leadership model. Our effectiveness was now being measured: how many less crimes occurred, how many fewer lives were lost to DUI, or how many more people are living in facilities that are fire code compliant. Bridging the gap from a law enforcement centric strategy of policing to a strategy of comprehensive public safety and effective management of a large multifaceted agency was at the heart of our efforts in developing the Accountability Driven Leadership model.

Managers rely on the SAF reports to identify patterns and allocate resources. Before SAF, it was anyone's guess whether, perhaps, a pattern of aggressive driving, non-seatbelt usage, or speeding was emerging. A sharp-eyed trooper might notice their own activity concentrating in certain areas at certain times, but they would have no way of knowing whether their colleagues were fielding the same type of incident at the same time and place. Even if an astute manager recognized a pattern, they couldn't know whether it was occurring in a neighboring detachment, and thus wouldn't think to seek intelligence from the detachment. Using SAF, the goal of preventing crime rather than reacting to it was fulfilled. With patterns identified early, the manager deploys troopers to probable targets.

The SAF reports are distributed agency-wide. Everyone from the Chief and the Executive Management staff to the Division/District managers can see which numbers are improving and which are not. Successful managers can be asked for advice; those in need can be offered remedies.

#### **How were priorities assigned and assumptions tested?**

We began by assembling people into teams, each assigned to envision the Patrol with no preconceptions. The very fact that we were acting on the suggestions of people who worked in the agency sent a message to everyone that it was not business as usual.

The centerpiece of our efforts was the SAF process. This combined two techniques, neither of which had previously been implemented. First, crime statistics were collected and analyzed, at the beginning semi-annually, to recognize patterns and potential trouble before it spread. Anywhere from fifty to one hundred staff at a time, executive officers joined by others from throughout the state, would convene in a large room in which each commander's data was thoroughly evaluated.

Next, we set about determining who bought into the idea of accountability and who did not. Bureaucracies sometimes resist change because they think large ships can not be turned around, and even the biggest agency is made up of people who are skeptics.

At the same time, we set our sights on clarifying the purpose of the Washington State Patrol and crafting indicators to tell us whether our goals were being met: accountability again.

The original SAF in July 2000 focused on questions such as:

- What have you done to implement the strategic plan?
- What happened? (descriptive – included process in establishing performance measures and baselines)
- Why do you think that happened? (diagnostic)
- What do think will happen? (predictive)
- Which is the best choice? (evaluative)

The SAF was informative but not timely, as the data reported was up to six months old and incomplete. The SAF did not focus attention on effective tactics or rapid deployment. For example, one SAF presenter discussed efforts to reduce DUI and speed related collisions, but there was no clear link made in the data or presentation about the efforts of the work unit to assess, compare, or enhance DUI or speed enforcement to achieve the desired outcome. The last principle of relentless follow up was not met, as the SAF meeting was scheduled on a semi-annual basis.

To move to a full integration of an Accountability Driven Leadership model, we needed to incorporate the core principles of the COMPSTAT process that were not being fully utilized with our existing SAF process. We wanted to increase the focus on Accountability Driven Leadership through efficiencies (outputs) and effectiveness (outcomes) in a unification of all agency activities.

In January 2002, the Patrol implemented a new and revised SAF strategy that established the Accountability Driven Leadership approach. A weekly SAF schedule allowed for relentless follow-up, using greatly expanded measures of efficiency and development of effectiveness measures to achieve the goal of accurate and timely data that is linked to the purpose of the agency. The original SAF strategy of meeting once every six months did not provide for a sense of urgency within the agency, and did not provide for timely monitoring or response to critical issues that may be developing simultaneously.

| <b>E. SOLUTION EVALUATION: Describe how you used data to identify and evaluate potential solutions. Describe how you tested the solution you chose and evaluated its effectiveness during implementation. Attach relevant test data.</b> |  |
|--|--|
| <b>0</b>   | Team chose and implemented a solution(s) without considering alternatives and with no plan for evaluating impact   |
| <b>1</b>   | Team identified options for solution by assumptions, brainstorming, or other intuitive tools, and narrowed the list through consensus or other group process tools. Team chose a solution and implemented it with some consideration given to downstream impact  |
| <b>2</b>   | Team used process data to identify potential causes, and narrowed the list to root causes by using decision-making tools and basic data analysis. Team communicated with and involved managers, customers, partners and suppliers in the implementation of the chosen option   |
| <b>3</b>   | Team used process data to identify potential causes, and narrowed the list to root causes by using decision-making tools and basic data analysis. Team developed an implementation plan, as well as a system to measure and monitor the results, before the implementation.  |
| <b>4</b>   | Team used process data to identify potential causes, and narrowed the list to root causes by using decision-making tools and basic data analysis. Team developed an implementation plan, as well as a system to measure and monitor the results, before the implementation. Team implementation plan included provisions for monitoring, training, contingencies, documentation and standardization of processes |

**How were solutions implemented and measured?**

In July 2000, the Patrol adopted a systematic approach to strategic plan implementation that focused individual work efforts toward goals, objectives, action plans, and performance measures of their work unit and provided accountability and communication links throughout the entire agency. We measured progress in our six bureaus prior, during, and after implementation of the SAF process. (See attached charts.)

In January 2002, managers and Executive Staff reviewed our existing SAF forum to look at adopting an Accountability Driven Leadership model. Implementing this concept required reengineering to infuse this new concept into the agency’s culture. Each bureau created bureau-wide efficiency (output) measures with linked effectiveness (outcome) measures to serve as the basic components of the new leadership model. The identification

of core mission elements in each bureau is critical to establishing the measures of efficiency that would be set and then linked to the measures of effectiveness desired. Each bureau has been assigned one Friday each month to make its presentation to the executive staff. The Accountability Driven Leadership strategy expands the idea of effectiveness and efficiencies through managerial accountability from law enforcement specific to public safety and the general administrative activities of a diverse, statewide agency.

**Part 3: What results did you get? Show your results in a way that communicates the impact of the work the team did in an easily understandable way. You must have significant, measurable, sustainable results in at least two areas to become a finalist for the governor’s award.**

**F. Show how the solution improved the BENEFIT PROVIDED TO THE PUBLIC.**

- 0 No improvement to public benefit or value was identified.
- 1 The public benefit or value was of **limited duration, for a relatively narrow constituency.**
- 2 The public benefit or value had **some impact to a relatively narrow constituency.**
- 3 Project resulted in a **significant one-time public benefit to a small group.**
- 4 Project resulted in a **significant one-time public benefit to a significant constituency.**
- 5 Project resulted in the establishment of **significant ongoing benefit to a small constituency.** The standards have been **documented and incorporated as “the new way to do business”** to ensure sustainability
- 6 Project resulted in the establishment of **significant ongoing benefit to a significant constituency.** The standards have been **documented and incorporated as “the new way to do business”** to ensure sustainability.
- 7 Project resulted in the establishment of **significant best practices with ongoing benefit to a significant group and significantly advanced the agency’s ability** to provide public benefit in the future. The standards have been **documented and incorporated as “the new way to do business”** to ensure sustainability.
- 8 Project resulted in the establishment of **significant best practices with ongoing benefit to the general public and significantly advanced the agency’s ability** to provide public benefit in the future. The standards have been **documented and incorporated as “the new way to do business”** to ensure sustainability.

**Benefit to the public:**

The results of the Patrol’s focus on Accountability Driven Leadership, within every component of the agency, have been dramatic. Each Bureau of the agency has realized remarkable improvements in efficiencies and effectiveness. The Field Operations Bureau and Commercial Vehicle Division data covers a 22-month before and after comparison: March 2000 through December 2001 versus January 2002 through October 2003. Holding our managers accountable in all areas of our public service has increased our public safety services to the citizenry of Washington State.

**Field Operations Bureau**

| Injury Collisions By Highway Type | Mar 00– Dec 01 | Jan 02 – Oct 03 | Difference | % Change for Period |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|---------------------|
| Interstate                        | 8,374          | 7,276           | (1,098)    | -13%                |
| State Route                       | 10,766         | 9,855           | (911)      | -8%                 |
| County Road                       | 2,149          | 1,769           | (380)      | -18%                |
| Other                             | 3              | 0               | (3)        | -100%               |
| Totals                            | 21,292         | 18,900          | (2,392)    | -11%                |

| Fatality Collisions By Highway Type | Mar 00- Dec 01 | Jan 02-Oct 03 | Difference | % Change for Period |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|---------------------|
| Interstate                          | 146            | 115           | (31)       | -21%                |
| State Route                         | 336            | 348           | 12         | 4%                  |
| County Road                         | 142            | 134           | (8)        | -6%                 |
| Totals                              | 624            | 598           | (26)       | -4%                 |

**Agency Arrests or Infractions Issued**

| <b>Violations</b>  | <b>March 00<br/>–<br/>Dec 01</b> | <b>Jan 02 - Oct<br/>03</b> | <b>Difference</b> | <b>% Change for Period</b> |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| DUI  | 25,664                           | 35,987                     | 10,343            | 40%                        |
| Seat Belt  | 81,682                           | 144,227                    | 62,545            | 77%                        |
| Speed  | 297,549                          | 468,689                    | 171,140           | 58%                        |
| Aggressive Driving   | 30,311                           | 80,347                     | 50,036            | 165%                       |
| DRE Evaluations  | 574                              | 1,116                      | 542               | 94%                        |
| Felony Warrant   | 3,323                            | 4,468                      | 1,145             | 34%                        |
| Misdemeanor Warrant  | 10,860                           | 15,946                     | 5,086             | 47%                        |
| Drug Arrest – Felony   | 2,178                            | 3,467                      | 1,289             | 59%                        |
| Drug Arrest – Misdemeanor  | 7,739                            | 13,337                     | 5,598             | 72%                        |
| Asset Seizure Cases – Traffic Stop<br>Initiated Narcotics Arrest | 155                              | 204                        | 49                | 32%                        |
| Total Traffic Stops  | 2,251,557                        | 2,705,175                  | 453,618           | 20%                        |
| Total Citizens Complaints Filed<br>against Troopers              | 328                              | 229                        | (99)              | -30%                       |
| Total Misconduct Complaints                                      | 597                              | 494                        | (103)             | -17%                       |

| <b>Agency Collisions</b> | <b>Mar 00 –<br/>Dec 01</b> | <b>Jan 02 - Oct<br/>03</b> | <b>Difference</b> | <b>% Change for Period</b> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Non-Reportable           | 12,806                     | 11,679                     | (1,127)           | -9%                        |
| Property Damage          | 34,230                     | 36,008                     | 1,778             | 5%                         |
| Injury                   | 21,292                     | 18,900                     | (2,392)           | -11%                       |
| Fatality                 | 624                        | 598                        | (26)              | -4%                        |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>68,952</b>              | <b>67,185</b>              | <b>(1,767)</b>    | <b>-2.5%</b>               |

| <b>Seat Belt Collisions By Highway<br/>Type</b> | <b>Mar 00-<br/>Dec 01</b> | <b>Jan 02-Oct 03</b> | <b>Difference</b> | <b>% Change for Period</b> |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Interstate                                      | 265                       | 184                  | (81)              | -31%                       |
| State Route                                     | 577                       | 358                  | (219)             | -38%                       |
| County Road                                     | 174                       | 143                  | (31)              | -18%                       |
| <b>Totals</b>                                   | <b>1016</b>               | <b>687</b>           | <b>(329)</b>      | <b>-32%</b>                |

**Commercial Vehicle Division Enforcement Efforts (CVD)**

| <b>CVD Totals</b>             | <b>Mar 00-<br/>Dec 01</b> | <b>Jan 02 - Oct<br/>03</b> | <b>Difference</b> | <b>% Change for Period</b> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Total Stops                   | 218,483                   | 288,117                    | 69,634            | 32%                        |
| Speed                         | 12,298                    | 24,834                     | 12,536            | 102%                       |
| Follow Too Close              | 918                       | 2,665                      | 1,747             | 190%                       |
| Total Aggressive Driving      | 265                       | 1,938                      | 1,673             | 631%                       |
| Commercial Vehicle Inspection | 121,681                   | 219,346                    | 97,665            | 80%                        |

- Fatalities involving commercial vehicles at a five year low:
  - 2002=50
  - 2001=56
  - 2000=65
  - 1999=66

**G. Show how the solution improved service to CUSTOMERS (the direct recipients of an agency service or product).**

- 0 No improvement in customer service.
- 1 The improvement was of limited duration for a relatively narrow customer pool.
- 2 The improvement had limited impact on a relatively narrow customer pool.
- 3 One-time improvement in service to a significant customer group.
- 4 One-time improvement in service to a MAJOR customer group.
- 5 Adoption of significantly improved customer service standards, policies, procedures, products or processes for some agency customer group. The standards have been documented and incorporated as "the new way to do business" to ensure sustainability.
- 6 Adoption of significantly improved customer service standards, policies, procedures, products or processes for a MAJOR agency customer group. Standards have been documented and incorporated as "the new way to do business" to ensure sustainability.
- 7 Introduction of best practices in customer service, which significantly advanced the agency's ability to provide service to some customer group in the future. Improvements are transferable or replicable in other agencies or organizations.
- 8 Introduction of best practices in customer service, which significantly advanced the agency's ability to provide service to a MAJOR agency customer group in the future. Improvements are transferable or replicable in other agencies or organizations.

**Significantly improved the agency's ability to provide service to major agency customer group in providing public safety services. Creating a methodology to replicate these processes to other agencies or organizations by:**

Often contentious situations develop with the communities we serve mainly because the community did not trust the State Patrol. This severe lack of community trust in the police was created in part by a breakdown in communication and sharing of information between the community and the police. To win back the citizens' trust, we put systems into place to create an organization where information and changes occurring in the department would be freely shared with our customers and the media.

Our SAF process has been adapted and expanded to other state agencies. We also believe this process could be adapted and expanded to other public/private entities. This process is about holding staff accountable, sharing successes, challenges, and tracking trends. The SAF process shows the leadership team that all staff are being held to the same standards of excellence and accountability, thereby demonstrating that every unit is critical to the success of the agency. As one group rightfully celebrates the success of their contributions, they are reminded that many other groups are also performing at remarkable levels. This process supports a synergy of excellence that is promoted and maintained throughout the agency. When an agency witnesses its senior leadership investing their time on a weekly basis to ensure the success of the agency, a sense of urgency is cultivated. This is vital to creating an environment that continuously improves the Accountability Driven Leadership model. Accountability starts at the top, and the SAF forum provides an unparalleled opportunity to lead. In this forum, staff and bureaucracy do not protect the executive. This forum provides leaders the environment to exercise informal authority over the agency, to set expectations of behavior, and to bring diverse people and wide-ranging issues into focus. The leaders' expanded knowledge base gives them increased credibility as they discuss the entire agency with others outside the agency.

The Attorney General's Office has recently implemented a similar process to the State Patrol's SAF. It is another example of the versatility of accountability. No matter what you are tracking, comparing results to previous indicators and then demanding improvement is the best way to achieve goals. These accountability measures lead, not only to better accountability, but also to improved morale. As each agency becomes more efficient and more effective, people will feel more positive. Everybody likes to play for a winning team.

The Accountability Driven Leadership model may have increased the historically high support the State Patrol has enjoyed from the public. The Washington State University's Division of Governmental Studies and Services conducts periodic citizen surveys under contract with the Washington State Patrol. According to Michael J. Gaffney, assistant director of the Division of Governmental Studies and Services,

Trends in responses over time indicate that the patrol has not suffered a decline in ratings on critical indicators despite a marked increase in enforcement activity. Of particular note is an issue addressed in this iteration of the survey – the question of support for seatbelt enforcement under Washington's new "primary offense" law. Even for this area of new, aggressive enforcement activity, the Patrol is viewed in a positive light, with nearly 70% of respondents to date approving of the Patrol's enforcement program. The same

response pattern exists with regard to DUI enforcement (77.8%), as well. Finally, both this year's responses to date and the trend analysis indicate that the Patrol is meeting the needs of Washington citizens, with 87.4% of this year's respondents indicating they are satisfied with Patrol services and overall performance.

**H. Show how the project REDUCED COSTS or INCREASED REVENUE for the agency or its stakeholders?**

- 0 No cost savings or additional revenue identified.
- 1 Minimal cost savings or additional revenue to the **agency**.
- 2 Minimal cost savings or additional revenue for to **other entities**.
- 3 **One-time** cost savings or additional revenue to the **agency**.
- 4 **One time** cost savings or additional revenue to **other entities**.
- 5 **Ongoing significant** savings or revenue for the **agency** in the future, **as a result of** new practices that have been documented and adopted as a "**new way to do business**."
- 6 **Ongoing significant** savings or new revenue for **other entities** in the future **as a result of** new practices that have been documented and adopted as a "**new way to do business**."
- 7 New **best practices in financial management for the agency adopted**, which is **transferable or replicable to others**.
- 8 New best practices in financial management **for other entities**, which are transferable or replicable to others.

**Financial management best practices established, which are replicable to others:**

Beyond just measures of effectiveness and efficiencies in activities, each District/Division is also responsible for managing and reporting on its budget to the Executive Staff at the SAF. The SAF process provided that budget management responsibilities were decentralized to the lowest possible level.

Significant efficiencies have been realized in the areas of supplies, equipment, and overtime, because each commander/administrator is given a dollar allotment to work with and then held responsible for balancing their own "checkbooks." The decentralizing of the budget process also provided managers with a more realistic understanding of what it cost the Patrol to run its business, thereby making them better financial managers and decision makers. Finally, the decentralization provides an accelerated process for ordering and providing supplies, equipment, and overtime at the lowest level of execution without the cost of time and going through the bureaucracy of headquarters. Commanders are free to make budgetary decisions within monthly allotments, across these fund types, in the pursuit of managing their District/Division effectively and efficiently.

As an example, at the end of the 2001 FY, the Field Operations Bureau overtime fund was overspent by nearly one million dollars. During this same time, Field Force productivity was at 10-year lows. By November 2001, five months into the new 01-03 biennial budgets, Field Force overtime was overspent by \$258,000. At the end of the calendar year 2002, the Field Force overtime budget had a positive variance of \$11,500, while simultaneously Field Force activity was at 10-year highs. Overtime and supply funds placed under the control of District Commanders, were under spent, and those dollars were reassigned to purchase needed equipment and supplies. Efficiencies gained in Field Operations Bureau budget management of overtime and supplies has allowed for the purchase of new firearms for every commissioned member of the Patrol, a \$270,000 expenditure, as well as a \$211,000 investment in an agency wide T1 communication lines and email upgrades within 01-03 agency allotments.

Another example, fuel tax evasion and fraud assessments (citations given to parties who transport red fuel into our state that are not licensed to import, blend, or manufacture red fuel) for the first six months of FY 03 (July 02-Dec 02) were up \$574,982, an increase of 117% compared to the full FY 02 (July 01-June 02). Fuel tax evasion dollars recovered for the first six months of FY 03 (July 02-Dec 02) were up \$129,852, an increase of 116% compared to the full FY 02 (July 01-June 02)

**I. Show how the project streamlined agency INTERNAL PROCESSES, or improved relationships with SUPPLIERS or PARTNERS.**

- 0 No improvements in productivity or efficiency identified.
- 1 Minimal improvements in productivity or efficiency in an **agency support process**.
- 2 Minimal improvements in productivity or efficiency in a **key agency business process**.
- 3 **Significant one-time improvements** in productivity or efficiency in an **agency support process**.
- 4 **Significant one-time improvements** in productivity or efficiency in a **key agency business process**.
- 5 **Ongoing significant improvements** in productivity or efficiency **of any agency support process**, due to new practices, **documented and adopted as a "new way to do business."**
- 6 **Ongoing significant improvements** in productivity or efficiency **of a key agency business process** due to new practices **documented and adopted as a "new way to do business."**
- 7 **New best practices in efficiency and productivity which significantly advanced the ability of the agency, as well as partner, supplier or customer organizations, to provide support services efficiently in the future and are transferable or replicable to**

others.

- 8 New best practices in efficiency and productivity, which significantly advanced the ability of the agency, as well as partner, supplier or customer organizations, to provide **key business** services efficiently in the future and are transferable or replicable to others.

**Established new best practices in efficiency and productivity, which have improved our ability to provide our key business service (public safety) more efficiently in the future and have been replicated across the agency.**

The Washington State Patrol is divided into eight Districts and 21 Divisions statewide. Almost every Friday at 8 a.m., representatives from a different one of those Districts or Divisions stands before their peers, the Chief, and Executive Staff to explain their area's performance over the previous four to eight weeks. This assembly – the monthly SAF meeting – is truly extraordinary. We believe the regular SAF meetings are probably the most powerful accountability tool ever devised. In 1996, COMPSTAT, after which SAF was modeled, won Harvard's Innovations in Government Award.

One of the strongest proofs that the model works is sustainability. It continues to do so even after the initial sponsors move on. After Chief Sandberg left as Chief, Chief Serpas was able to continue the SAF process. In fact, he not only continued the process, but also made many enhancements and improvements to SAF. The process is not about any specific individuals or even the Chief. As long as the person in charge believes in the process, makes sure everyone beneath them buys into it, and has the necessary support and resources, no one person is irreplaceable.

Putting the SAF information on our Intranet has held the agency's feet even closer to the fire. Employees can now hold the agency accountable in the same way executive leadership does. Employees want to know how well our agency is doing, and we place our performance measures for everyone to see. This reinforces the idea that it is not only about answering to whoever was above you on the organizational chart, but letting everyone in the agency know what great work the agency was doing.

Below is a before and after comparison to the SAF process, identifying some of our productivity efficiencies October YTD 2003, calendar year 2002, compared to calendar year 2001.

– **Forensic Laboratory Services Bureau**

- Completed 994 DNA cases, a 10% increase over 2001
  - 2003 YTD up 19%
- 4% decrease in backlog of cases pending DNA (receive 96 new cases/month)
- Toxicology lab experienced an 11% increase in cases (receive 1,100 new cases/month), completed 12% more cases, and maintained a median turnaround of 6-8 days
  - 2003 YTD cases received up 7.5%; completed up 12%
- Chemistry Section backlog of 1,905 cases was reduced to 919 cases (660 new cases/month), and the median age of cases awaiting analysis dropped from 47 to 18 days by year's end

– **State Fire Marshal – Fire Protection Bureau**

- 120 Days – Health Care and Child Care facilities out of code compliance
  - January 2002 = 31, end 2002=5, 2003 YTD=0
- 180 Days – Boarding Home and Nursing Home facilities out of code compliance
  - January 2002 = 48, end 2002=2, 2003 YTD=0
- State Fire Marshal fire code inspection activity up 21%
  - 400 additional inspections of child care centers, nursing homes, boarding homes, alcohol/drug treatment facilities – housing 70-75,000 vulnerable people
  - 2003 YTD Inspections up 43%
- Average days to compliance after fire code violation notice
  - 2001=90
  - 2002=49
  - 2003 YTD=38
- National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS 5.0)

- 2001=60 Fire Departments of 544
- 2002=220 Fire Departments of 544
- 14% increase in students trained at Fire Basic Training Academy
  - 2003 YTD up 12%
- 18% increase in training to local/state First Responders to Terrorism awareness and operations
- **Investigative Services Bureau**
  - Computer Crimes Unit – 123 cases, a 6% increase
    - 57 Child Pornography Cases, a 37% increase
  - 20 Statewide Byrne Fund Narcotics Task Forces: WSP lead in 9
  - SWAT opened 50 proactive Methamphetamine investigations versus 7 in 2001 while conducting 40 Tactical Operations & 226 Methamphetamine Lab investigations
    - 2003 YTD up 25%
  - Methamphetamine/Drug Awareness Students trained, was up by 1,284, an increase of 54%
  - State Asset Seizure funds deposited increased by \$90,580, a 59% increase
    - 2003 YTD up 104%
  - Auto Theft Cases Opened up by 59, an increase of 19%
    - 2003 YTD up 105%
  - Auto Theft Arrest up by 40, an increase of 310%
    - 2003 YTD up 473% (90)
  - Overall Detective Activity: 2003 compared to 2002 through October
    - Cases completed up 38% (232)
    - Cycle time (mean) down 17%
    - Cases submitted to prosecutor up 19%
    - Cases declined by prosecutor down 38%
    - Declination rate down 48%

**J. Show how the project contributed to ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND GROWTH.**

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| <b>0</b> | <b>No institutional learning</b> or professional growth.  |
| <b>1</b> | <b>Agency staff gained limited insights</b> from the project.   |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Agency and stakeholders gained limited insights.</b>   |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Some involved staff increased their skills</b> and abilities somewhat.   |
| <b>4</b> | Some involved <b>agency and stakeholder staff increased skills</b> somewhat.  |
| <b>5</b> | Project resulted in <b>significant professional development for agency staff.</b>   |
| <b>6</b> | Project resulted in <b>significant professional development for agency staff, as well as external stakeholders.</b>   |
| <b>7</b> | Project resulted in <b>organizational transformation for the agency.</b> The improvements constitute <b>best practices in organizational learning, transferable or replicable to others.</b>  |
| <b>8</b> | Project resulted in <b>organizational transformation for the agency, its partners, suppliers, customers or others.</b> The improvements constitute best practices in organizational learning, which are transferable or replicable for other organizations. |

**Organizational transformation as a result of the project.**

Chief Sandberg and Chief Serpas were masters at both carrot and stick. Sure, there were times when someone needed to be called on the carpet. This was not to humiliate the person concerned, but to ensure that they would know people were paying attention and expected them to improve. The Chief and executive management would grill the manager and point out areas of concern. Calling attention to lack of performance might clear the way for that manager to ask for help; maybe they were not bringing it up so no one would notice they needed it. Judging how deeply a manager accepted responsibility demonstrated to his/her bosses a lot about how committed he or she was to the principle of accountability. There are also plenty of opportunities to offer compliments and to recognize superior bravery or insight. One of the benefits of SAF is that managers have objective proof of their good performance.

The meeting's other main function was to serve as a brainstorming session. The manager of particular Departments/Divisions, such as the Implied Consent Section or the Crime Laboratory, were on hand to share ideas, and other troopers shared techniques they would gather in their own Districts/Divisions that might help elsewhere. In the early days of implementation, a certain amount of performance anxiety could get to those who were expected to defend their District/Division performance.

For any system to remain effective, it must continually challenge itself. SAF's success was so conspicuous; it would have been easy to sit around congratulating ourselves. But a leader's role is to raise the bar. The State Patrol was successful in performing well in the four core mission categories for the Field Operations Bureau. We have also been successful implementing similar performance measure systems in other areas. That is how SAF has evolved into a much more sophisticated tool. Every time we would add a performance indicator, we would see a similar pattern of improvement. For example, when we first started tracking seatbelt usage in 1998, the State Patrol made a total of 29,932 citations. By 2003, that number was 84,889. As we say, "If we could count it, we could SAF it."

The SAF meeting is the ultimate expression of how much success relies on acting as a team, sharing ideas, and consistently holding meetings. In all this, the overall leader must identify and inspire the right managers. Under a smoothly functioning accountability system, such figures wield considerable power and enjoy plenty of creative maneuvering space. Those who need their hands held and want every move to originate at headquarters will never succeed in this process. The leader's job is to set the tone and agenda, including specific targets for managers in the field, and to supply whatever advice, encouragement, and resources are needed to meet those targets.

The State Patrol is using the SAF process as a full management tool, making it the focal point around which we manage the agency. Everything from use-of-force incidents in the Field Operations Bureau to average case cycle time in the Forensic Laboratory – an estimated total of over 250 indicators – was tracked and analyzed and defended at the accountability sessions. Each District/Division was allowed to create its own system of performance measures, and thus could decide how best to solve its problems. Creating indicators that have real impact is one of the toughest challenges of implementing a SAF-style accountability system.

SAF's emphasis on numbers gives some critics the impression that it is a coldly analytical way to go about achieving a goal. In fact, the opposite is true. By utilizing results to analyze methods, executive management can hold their managers responsible for improvements on their performance indicator but also give them considerable latitude to experiment with achieving those improvements. What works in one area may not be the best method elsewhere. The State Patrol's SAF, for example, decentralized decision-making. Each District/Division manager developed and implemented strategies designed to produce the best results in their particular areas.

There are many uncontrollable variables at play in the efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement and public safety initiatives, related to increases or decreases in desired outcomes. Clearly, steps taken by law enforcement and public safety agencies alone cannot account for all changes in outcomes. But law enforcement and public safety agencies can do much to increase public safety; and the Washington State Patrol's Accountability Driven Leadership model is designed to help managers and staff improve their effectiveness by increasing their efficiency.

Leadership must focus its energies on the overwhelming majority of employees who want to contribute to the success of an organization. The Accountability Driven Leadership model allows for personalized remediation and intervention designed to invigorate those who are resistant to change. One of the most effective strategies for combating this negative influence is continuous internal and external messaging of the agency's vision, direction, challenges, and successes. However, in the end, accountability driven leadership exposes impediments to progress, obligating the agency's leadership to react with the best interest of the organization in mind.