

IMWE-HOD-PAI

SUBJECT: Interactive Customer Evaluation (ICE) Feedback Analysis Report (4QFY11)

Purpose: To provide an analysis of the effectiveness of the ICE Program for 4QFY11 as shown through the usage rates, satisfaction percentages and employee/staff attitude ratings.

1. Data used to compile this report was extracted from the DoD online ICE database and reflects satisfaction ratings for Garrison and non-Garrison agencies. The report includes an overall analysis of 6,463 customer comments submitted.
2. The Garrison has maintained the effectiveness of the ICE Program; however, there was a 4% decrease in the number of comments submitted from 3QFY11 to 4QFY11 (Tab A). This decrease in itself is not significant in the overall analysis. There are many factors that could have had an impact on the reduction of feedback received.

a. Positive Findings:

1) The ICE Program continues to grow in the use of the program and participation from external agencies, specifically CRDAMC. CRDAMC has almost doubled the amount of feedback received over the past two quarters, which was enhanced by discontinuing participation in the "Strive for Five" feedback program.

2) Of the total Garrison feedback received, DPTMS contributed 34%. Additionally, DHR, DOL, Family and MWR and DPW represented 54% of the total Garrison feedback. Family and MWR experienced a 12% increase in total comments received this quarter, the biggest jump in total feedback of all Garrison service providers.

3) Of the "Big Five" directorates, three are in the green (85% -100%) for a satisfaction rating; Family and MWR and DPW are in the Amber. Family and MWR are at 82% (up 1% from last quarter) and have increased their satisfaction rating as well as number of comments received.

4) 86% of the total comments submitted for Fort Hood overall this quarter were positive in nature. Although this percentage is down 3% from last quarter, Fort Hood is still in the Green. The Garrison received an 89% satisfaction rating. These ratings signify that we are still maintaining a relatively high satisfaction rating and that our customers are primarily happy with the products and services we provide.

b. Negative Findings:

1) The ICE Program is designed to be an anonymous feedback process, which makes it difficult to address and resolve issues if the customer does not provide contact information. Resolution becomes even more complicated when all the information related to the situation is not stated in the ICE Comment. As with last quarter's analysis, this trend has remained consistent throughout the current quarter.

2) ICE is designed to be a feedback program for customer service related issues only. We continue to receive comments for various non-customer service related issues, primarily from employees of Family and MWR. Although these issues are important, they are not addressed through the ICE program, but are forwarded to the appropriate directorate/agency leadership for situational awareness.

3) A similar trend from last quarter shows that some service providers receive very little feedback, as indicated in TAB A. It's possible that these service providers do not promote the ICE Program and are not effective at soliciting feedback. Organizations that receive consistent feedback throughout the quarter indicate that they are effective at promoting the use of the ICE Program and soliciting customer service feedback.

4) As with the last quarter, a substantial amount of negative feedback was received by the housing division. The housing division is extremely effective at both promoting the ICE Program and receiving valuable feedback. Although they receive a substantial amount of negative feedback related to maintenance issues, they receive an equal amount of positive feedback related to the great customer service provided by the technicians who service the homes.

3. Comments regarding participation of agencies external to the Garrison: DeCA no longer participates in the ICE Program. Although the DeCA Zone 6 Manager initially agreed to provide their customer service related feedback in the form of YALs (Your Action lines), they have since stopped providing this feedback. We do have Army One-Stop kiosks at both commissaries and post exchanges; however, neither AAFES nor DeCA maintains them or promotes the ICE Program. We continue to receive ICE related feedback from AAFES on a weekly basis that comes from the regional office.

4. The following recommendations are provided to maintain or improve current customer satisfaction levels:

a. Continue to promote the ICE Program using Phantom Distro, the Sentinel, monthly newsletters, periodic customer service training (Family and MWR and the Civilian Leadership Development Program) and commander updates with senior leaders.

b. Promote a Customer Service Incentivization Program designed to educate customer service representatives on the importance of customer service related feedback.

5. Conclusion: Overall, Fort Hood continues to provide excellent customer service to our Soldiers and their Family members; however, with more emphasis on the promotion and use of the ICE Program, we can paint a clearer picture and gain a better understanding of customer expectations in order to provide priority services during this time of limited funding.

AUTHENTICATION: Mr. Dale W. Cowan

DATE: 27 October 2011