

## Analyzing and Improving Business Process Training Review

July 11, 2016

Consulting Engagement 201516-34

### Executive Summary

---

The Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (Department) is required by section 216.03, Florida Statutes (F.S.), to develop a Long Range Program Plan (LRPP). The intent of this requirement is to encourage state agencies to plan for the future and continuously update their operations in order to serve the citizens of Florida in the best possible manner. As part of this requirement, the Department has to create performance measures that measure its success in following the LRPP and report on these measures to the Governor's Cabinet.

In pursuit of improving the Department's processes, the Executive Director, Terry Rhodes, tasked the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) with procuring and facilitating a course on analyzing and improving business processes for 60 Department members. The purpose of this engagement was to document the OIG's efforts to identify, procure, and facilitate training that provided Department staff with appropriate tools and techniques to evaluate and improve Department processes.

We reviewed the training's sourcing<sup>1</sup> documentation, class summary, post-test, and interviewed Department members that attended the training. We also reviewed Florida Statutes, Department policies, and Governor's Measures that reference business processes.

Upon reviewing the aforementioned documents and conducting interviews with Department members, the following conclusions were determined:

- Members are using the skills learned to evaluate their business models and establish improved processes; and
- Class members are working with other Department personnel to train them on the topics covered.

---

<sup>1</sup> The sourcing project was a request for bids that included detailed requirements for what the Department wanted the training to cover, key dates, and deliverables.

## Background and Introduction

---

The Government Accountability and Performance Act of 1994 requires state agencies to implement performance-based program budgeting, which includes establishing legislatively approved performance measures and standards.

Section 216.013, F.S., requires state agencies to develop a LRPP that is policy based, priority driven, accountable, and developed through careful examination and justification of all agency and judicial branch programs. The statute requires state agencies to post their LRPPs on their internet websites, no later than September 30th of each year, and provide written notice to the Governor and the Legislature that the plans have been posted.

The Department's Governor's Measures report on the Department's success in fulfilling its performance measures. There are two measures that require implementation of programs or initiatives that improve the Department's ability to be successful in achieving the LRPP. These measures are: how many programs or initiatives has the agency implemented to improve agency operation and reduce costs and how many new initiatives have been implemented by leadership.

The OIG was tasked with facilitating training in support of the aforementioned statutes, policy, and Governor's Measures. The course was to be two, two day classes, and focused on preparing managers to mitigate risk, increase efficiency, and effectiveness. The following concepts were to be taught: process mapping, tool selection, process analysis, issue identification, process redesign, change management, and measuring success.

## The Training

---

### *Procurement*

OIG members tasked with procuring the training met with members of the Bureau of Purchasing and Contracts (Purchasing) in order to ensure that all applicable purchasing policies were followed. Purchasing advised the OIG to submit a sourcing project on My Florida Market Place (MFMP) and that the OIG needed to obtain bids from three different vendors. The OIG worked with purchasing to upload the sourcing project in MFMP. The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) was selected as the vendor.

### *Training*

The training was conducted in the Auditorium of the Neil Kirkman Building. The course was split into two, two day classes that took place on May 31, 2016 to June 1, 2016, and June 2, 2016 to June 3, 2016. The class on May 31, 2016 and June 1, 2016, was

comprised primarily with staff from the Division of Motorist Services, with approximately one-third of the participants representing other divisions within the Department. The class on June 2, 2016 and June 3, 2016, was comprised primarily with staff from the Florida Highway Patrol, with approximately one-fourth of the participants representing other divisions within the Department. The students were broken up into six groups of five members per class. The training was conducted in three phases: the first phase was introduction, pretest, and mapping, the second phase covered tools for analyzing processes, and the final phase was a group project.

During the first phase, the class took a pre-test and discussed information gathering methods, reasons for process mapping, techniques for creating process maps, and determining the necessary level of detail. During the pre-test, the majority of participants ranked their familiarity with course topics as not very familiar. After the pre-test, members were trained to look at processes from both the organization's perspective and from the customer's perspective. Once instructed on the topics in this phase, members created process maps using case studies provided by the instructor and their own processes.

The second phase concentrated on analyzing processes, members were trained to review each step of the process looking for ways to prevent errors and failures, eliminating non-productive/non-value added steps, combining processes, and eliminating bottlenecks.

The final phase of training was the group project. During this phase, members developed a presentation that discussed a current work process and how they could improve that process. The presentation required students to utilize all of the skills they had learned throughout the training and apply them to their daily work processes. The class was concluded with a post-test.

## ***Results of Training***

To review and evaluate the effectiveness of the Training, we reviewed the instructor provided class summary and post-tests. Additionally, we interviewed seven random class participants to determine the effectiveness of the training.

During the pre-test, members were asked to rank their familiarity with the course topics on a scale of 1 (not very familiar) to 5 (very familiar). The majority of participants ranked their familiarity with most of the topics as a 1.

At the end of the course, students took a post-test and were asked to rank each topic covered in the class from 3 (covered very thoroughly) to 1 (not very thoroughly). The highest possible total score, adding together all of the topic scores, that the course could receive was a 36.

30 members attended the first class, 27 submitted a post test, and 4 of the post-tests did not include a numeric score for the topics. The second class was attended by 30 members, 28 submitted a post-test, and 1 member did not include scores on the post-test. The post-test revealed the following:

- The average total score for both classes combined was 30.3;
- The topic with the highest average score for both classes combined was Process Mapping Benefits; and
- The topic with the lowest average score for both classes combined was the Process Profile Worksheet.

During interviews, members discussed the training's effect on their work. The majority of the members stated they conducted some type of process review prior to the training, but it usually was an ad hoc, informal process. All members explained they are incorporating the techniques learned into their offices. Many of the participants have already built maps of their processes and are using their newly acquired skills to review and improve their business models.

A few of the interviewees explained, they were working with or would work with other members that did not attend the training and train them on the topics/skills covered during the course. All members interviewed advised they would recommend the training to other members of the Department. Suggestions offered included smaller classes comprised of members from the same organizational function, and more review and preparation prior to the class.

## Conclusions

- Members are using the skills learned to evaluate their business models and establish improved processes; and
- Class members are working with other Department personnel to train them on the topics covered.



## **Purpose, Scope, and Methodology**

---

The purpose of this engagement was to document the process of identifying, procuring, and facilitating training that provided Department members with appropriate tools and techniques to evaluate and improve Department processes.

The methodology included:

- Reviewing applicable Florida Statutes and Florida Administrative Code;
- Reviewing applicable Department policy and procedures;
- Reviewing the sourcing documentation;
- Reviewing the class summary;
- Reviewing the post-test; and
- Interviewing applicable Department management and staff.

## Distribution, Statement of Accordance, and Project Team

---

### Distribution

Terry L. Rhodes, Executive Director  
Diana Vaughn, Deputy Executive Director

### Statement of Accordance

Section 20.055, Florida Statutes, requires the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles' Inspector General to review, evaluate, and report on policies, plans, procedures, accounting, financial, and other operations of the Department and to recommend improvements. This consulting engagement was conducted in accordance with applicable *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* published by the Institute of Internal Auditors and *Principles and Standards for Offices of Inspector General* published by the Association of Inspectors General.

### Project Team

Engagement conducted by:  
Sean Shrader, Auditor

Under the supervision of:  
David Ulewicz, Audit Director

Approved by:

  
Julie M. Leftheris, Inspector General