DATE    May 8, 2009

TO      Honorable Members of the Quality of Life Committee: Pauline Medrano (Chair),
        Vonciel Jones Hill (Vice Chair), Carolyn R. Davis, Angela Hunt, Sheffie Kadane,
        David A. Neumann, Steve Salazar

SUBJECT Code Accountability Report Card

On Monday, May 11, 2009, the “Code Accountability Report Card” briefing will be
presented to you at the Quality of Life Committee meeting. Attached is the
briefing material for your review prior to Monday’s discussion.

If you have questions or need additional information, please let me know.

Forest E. Turner,
Interim Assistant City Manager

CC:      Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
        Mary K. Suhm, City Manager
        Deborah A. Watkins, City Secretary
        Thomas P. Perkins, Jr., City Attorney
        Craig D. Kinton, City Auditor
        Judge C. Victor Lander, Judiciary
        Ryan S. Evans, First Assistant City Manager
        Ramon F. Miguez, P.E., Assistant City Manager
        A.C. Gonzalez, Assistant City Manager
        Jill A. Jordan, P.E., Assistant City Manager
        David K. Cook, Chief Financial Officer
        Helena Stevens-Thompson, Assistant to the City Manager
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Purpose

- Provide a detailed overview on how to read the Code Compliance Accountability Report Card and how it is used to provide better service to the residents of Dallas
Development of the Report Card began in May of 2008 as a means to provide the City Council and the public an overview of Code activities in each Community Code District.

- Report Card format was modeled after a 3rd grade report card.
- A,B,C,D,F format provides the reader a grading scale of which they are familiar.
Approach

- The report card takes a three-pronged approach in measuring staff performance
  - Service Delivery
    - Trend Analysis for top 10 Service Requests (SR)
    - Total weight for this section is 30% of the total score
  - Community Conduct
    - Quality of Service Provided by Code Compliance Staff
    - Total weight for this section is 40% of total score
  - Service Requests created by Inspectors
    - Amount of “work” created by our inspectors in the field
    - Total weight for this section is 30% of total score
- District Highlights section provides space for additional comments and information on other activities that took place in the Code District
Approach

- The report cards are distributed amongst the seven Community Code Districts, but all of the business units in Code Compliance are being evaluated.
- The work of Animal Services, Multi-Occupant Structure Team (MOST), Mow Clean, Rapid Intensified Inspection Program (RIIP), and the City Attorney’s Office Inspectors are also reflected in each of these seven report cards.
The cover page provides the overall “grade” or City-Wide SR Volume Improvement Rating.

The map shows where the 14 Council Districts are located in relation to our 7 Community Code Districts.

Total Service Request volume numbers are provided along with the most common request type for each Code District.
Community Code District Report Card

- Overall grade (1)
- Scores for the Fiscal Year Quarter (2)
- Service Delivery Grade Section (3)
- Service Delivery Section Grading Table (4)
- Community Conduct Section (5)
- Code District volume stats (6)
- Service Request Created by Inspectors Section (7)
- District Highlights (Comments) Section (8)
Service Delivery Grade Explained

- Only the Top 10 SRs for the district are included in this section
- The current month’s volume numbers are compared to the same month for the previous year
- These numbers only include requests that are entered by the public through 3-1-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery Indicators</th>
<th>FY 08 Actual</th>
<th>Apr 09 Actual</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Weeds</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-74%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals both Loose and Loose/Aggressive</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-47%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Confined</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on Unapproved Surfaces</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard Structure</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-76%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Sick/Injured</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulky Trash</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-44%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and Vacant Structure</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-65%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Cruelty</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Delivery Grade Explained

- Grades are assigned based upon how much the volume numbers are lowered.
- For example, lowering the volume by 10 percentage points is considered “acceptable” and earns a C.
- The table to the right shows the grading table that is used to assign the letter grades.
The Community Code Districts are expected to respond to the trends on the Service Delivery section of the card.

Example: If a district received an “F” on a particular SR type, it is expected that staff would take steps to raise that grade on subsequent report cards.
Service Requests Created by Inspectors Explained

- This section of the Report Card measures the volume of Service Requests that are created by our inspectors and weighs them against the total volume of Service Requests.
- The monthly goal is to increase the number of requests created by inspectors by 10 percentage points compared to the same month for the previous year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery Indicators</th>
<th>FY 08 Actual</th>
<th>FY 09 Target</th>
<th>Apr 09 Actual</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of service requests created by inspectors in the field</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Requests Created by Inspectors Explained

- The purpose of this section is to see how well our inspectors are balancing the referrals they receive via 3-1-1 versus the violations they see in the field.

- Our inspectors should not be passing up 5 code violations to respond to a single violation that was referred through 311.

- This measure also challenges the districts to leverage the contacts and resources in their districts to pick up on issues before they are called into 3-1-1.
Starting with the April 2009 Report Card, the Community Code Conduct section of the Report Card contains an audit of Service Requests for each district that examines how well we are actually working and documenting the work that we do.
Community Code Conduct Explained

- A statistically significant sample is taken from the top 10 request types for each District and they are audited by the Department’s ISO 9001 Business Analyst and other administrative staff.

- This sample only includes those requests where the Citizen requested contact from staff.
The different categories of the request that are audited include:

- Level of detail included on the notes
- All activities properly completed
- Was the customer contacted? (level of detail in the notes)
- Pictures, Notices and other pertinent documents attached to the case
- Was the case closed within the Service Level Agreement? (SLA)
This section of the card can be considered the most important because it explores the finer details of the requests that are worked by our inspectors.

Allows management staff to find deficiencies in their districts and even individual inspectors.

Corrective measures will be taken to ensure that all issues are addressed (i.e. additional training, counseling, etc.)
District Highlights (Comments) Explained

- This section of the report card allows for each Community Code district to inform the reader of any major projects or accomplishments they had that month.
- It also provides an avenue to provide details on any explanations for a failing score and how it can be corrected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Highlights (Comments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Central Code Community has continued their extensive efforts towards education and outreach initiatives. During the month of April, staff members made over 100 personal citizen contacts and distributed almost 200 educational pamphlets and door hangers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors from the Central Code Community removed 416 illegal signs from the public right of way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Direction

- The Code Accountability Report Card has evolved over the past 7 months and will continue to do so.
- Management will continue to set a bar that will challenge our staff to provide our customers with the highest level of service.
- Future drafts of the card will include responses directly from our customers on the level of service provided by our staff.
Future Direction

- We will seek community input through surveys and focus groups to learn the priorities of the people that live and work in that Code District
- The Code District would then be graded on how well they are addressing those priorities
Questions
Appendix

This is the initial Report Card that was distributed to Council for October 2008

City of Dallas
Code Accountability Report Card
October 2008

Manager: Phyllis Sparks
Assistant Manager: Steve Bennett

Community Code:
(3) Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Delivery Grade (100% of overall)</th>
<th>FY 07 Actual</th>
<th>FY 08 Target</th>
<th>Oct 08 Actual</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of Top 5 &amp; Request Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the volume of cases by 10% for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Needs</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the volume of cases by 10% for</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the volume of cases by 10% for</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the volume of cases by 10% for</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals both Loose and Loose/Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the volume of cases by 10% for</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction Alley/Sidewalk/Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Code Quality of Service</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Conduct</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * Only one case referred to court; only one of eleven (11)  
* Attended nine (9) neighborhood meetings with more than ten attendees  
* Attended nine (9) National Night Out meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Requests Created by Inspectors (4 of 35)</th>
<th>FY 07 Actual</th>
<th>FY 08 Target</th>
<th>Oct 08 Actual</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of service requests created by</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspectors in the field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
* The Southeast Code Community should receive recognition for the outstanding grade South Central received in October. The South Central area has been served by the Southeast and Southwest Code Communities until 10/13/08 when the South Central Code Community became operational. The South Central Code Community has seen the dividends of this work.
* Rapid Interfaced Inspection Program (RIIP) conducted a 3 day sign sweep within the Southeast Code Community. The sweep also concentrated on illegal land use as it relates to vehicles displayed "For Sale".
Appendix

- The November 2008 Report Card moved from a top 5 to a top 10 format for the Service Delivery Section of the Card
- The grading table was also added so the reader could better understand how the letter grades were calculated
Appendix

- Citizens who viewed the card suggested that the overall volume numbers for the Code Districts be included to provide perspective for the top 10 Service Request Volume numbers.

- This feature was added to the March 2009 Report Card.
The April 2009 edition of the Report Card introduced the SR audit evaluation as part of the Community Code Conduct Section.