Government Efficiency and Accountability Review (GEAR)

GEAR09 Board Meeting

July 11th 2018

https://gear.delaware.gov/
Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Old Business
   - Review/approve minutes
   - 2018 GEAR Board meeting schedule
   - GEAR team update
3. New business
   - GEAR team update
   - Progress reporting
   - Employee and public comments management
   - Governmental Accountability Act (GAA) revision
4. Deep Dive
   - Information Technology
   - Human Resources
5. Open Topics discussion -- Board
6. Public Comment
7. Adjourn
Old Business

Review/Approve Minutes from Prior Board meeting
Old Business

2018 GEAR Board Schedule

Tuesday, January 9, 2018
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
New Castle County

Wednesday, March 14, 2018
8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
Dover

Tuesday, May 15, 2018
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
New Castle County

Wednesday, July 11, 2018
8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
Dover

Tuesday, September 18, 2018
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
New Castle County

Wednesday, November 14, 2018
8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
Dover
New Business

GEAR Team Update

• GEAR website updates:
  – Focus Area updates
  – Publishing team 4-Blockers
  – Soon to add GEAR Dashboard

• Focus Areas activities:
  – Financial Services Delivery adds School Business Manager’s chairperson to team

• HCR94 requests GEAR to act on School District Consolidation task force recommendations

• Guidance/template for chartering continuous improvement ideas in development

• Kickoff GEAR Annual Report data gathering process
New Business

Progress Reporting Tracking

- 4-Blocker reporting template submitted two days before every GEAR Board meeting
- 4-Blockers posted to GEAR website before meeting
- Addresses our requirements for transparency
- Progress indicator required for each 4-Blocker
New Business

• Employee/Public Input tracking
  – Comments distributed to GEAR Board agency leadership
  – Agencies please triage/sort into categories:
    1. Important and actionable
    2. Informative but requires follow-up to determine if actionable
    3. General suggestion
    4. Not actionable

– Seeking best practices from other states
Governmental Accountability Act

• **Actions Taken:**
  – Approved by GEAR Financial Services Delivery Team (May 4, 2018) and endorsed by GEAR Board for submission to General Assembly (May 15, 2018)
  – Introduced as SB 263, co-sponsored by all members of the Joint Finance Committee (June 19, 2018)
  – Passed the Senate 19 Yes 2 Absent (June 21, 2018)

• **Current Status:**
  – Not considered by the full House. Need to start over in the next legislative session (January 2019)
2018 Deep Dive Order

Tuesday, January 9, 2018
Education
Information Technology

Wednesday, March 14, 2018
P3 – Public/Private Partnership
Financial Services

Tuesday, May 15, 2018
DHSS & Healthcare
Criminal Justice

Wednesday, July 11, 2018
Information Technology
Human Resources

Tuesday, September 18, 2018
Education, Financial Services
Criminal Justice

Wednesday, November 14, 2018
P3 – Public/Private Partnerships
DHSS & Healthcare
Deep Dive

Information Technology

Statewide IT Assessment Results
Focus Area: IT Efficiency

Statewide IT Assessment Results

11 July 2018
“Innovation is Delaware’s path to jobs and prosperity.”

Gov. John Carney
The State of Delaware engaged Excipio, a firm with IT Centralization (ITC) expertise to:

✓ Perform a detailed IT operations assessment

✓ **Evaluate key IT services** inclusive of those provided by DTI and by other State IT staff

✓ **Develop an IT centralization strategy**—an equitable, efficient, and innovative approach to delivering cost-effective IT services

✓ Optimize deployment of workforce resources

✓ Maximize opportunities for savings—potentially at least $10M
It’s all about change:

• The State must **leverage IT as a strategic asset** through enterprise planning, funding, and coordination

• State IT **staffing and funding** must be equitably **distributed** to deliver a consistent level of service

• **Standards** must be comprehensively developed by a multidisciplinary group and **strictly adhered to in order to reduce risk and cost**

• The State must leverage **technology and data across silos** for targeted services and improved digital government
The State of Delaware technology strategy:
• Legislation in 2000 (Created DTI)
• Executive Order in 2010 (IT Consolidation)

What is, and is not, working?

Information Technology Centralization (ITC) made great strides towards shared services but …

the initiative is *incomplete* and is based on an *unsustainable model*. 
## Strategic Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-Off Meeting</td>
<td>• Management</td>
<td>• Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Key staff from over 40+ agencies</td>
<td>• Key staff from over 40+ agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>• Compile background information – 80% client data</td>
<td>• Compile background information – 80% client data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In scope – technology operations</td>
<td>• In scope – technology operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Out of scope - applications</td>
<td>• Out of scope - applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>• On-site interviews with client resources</td>
<td>• On-site interviews with client resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agency review of data collection process</td>
<td>• Agency review of data collection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>• Objective business, technical, financial evaluation</td>
<td>• Objective business, technical, financial evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk assessment of client’s business (technology, partners)</td>
<td>• Risk assessment of client’s business (technology, partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation</td>
<td>• Joint review—agency validation of information provided</td>
<td>• Joint review—agency validation of information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategy and recommendations</td>
<td>• Strategy and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Additional agency validation of updated information provided</td>
<td>• Additional agency validation of updated information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Presentation</td>
<td>• Executive summary for senior management</td>
<td>• Executive summary for senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial metrics (ROI, cash flow statements, NPV, etc.)</td>
<td>• Financial metrics (ROI, cash flow statements, NPV, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Process and risk management recommendations</td>
<td>• Process and risk management recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technology Operations

- Agencies: 40+
- Personal Computers: 22,000+
- Storage/Backup devices: 140+
- Telephone Systems: 130
- Network Devices: 5900+
- Printers: 3200+
- Servers: 850+

Out of Scope (Not Reviewed):
- Applications, Security, IT Procurement, Program and Project Management.
Key Observations

- **Technology strategic governance lacking:**
  - Uniform oversight: Executive, Financial, Technical
  - Funding: multiple requests, similar solutions (missed opportunity for savings)
  - Security or regulatory requirements (reduce risk, enhance compliance)
  - Shared services model incomplete (missed economies of scale)

- **Shared services leveraged “as needed”:**
  - When agency resource shortages exist
  - Deep technical knowledge or solution design required

- **DTI project approval process is cumbersome:**
  - Process is “one-size-fits-all”
  - State often “works around” this process
  - Implemented solutions may or may not meet State standards
**Current Environment**
- Centralization strategy based on good intent
- Enterprise services (e.g., centralized email, network, DELJIS, ERP)
- Technical teams competent but placed in difficult structure.

**Significant Issues**
- Inefficient technology model
- Unenforced standards
- Outdated equipment
- Security risks
- Immature shared services model
- Overspending
Personal Computers (PC)

- Total of 22,000+ PC’s
- Current refresh policy is 5 years
- 10,000+ of PCs are older than 5 years
- 244 different models

“Similar issues were found in other technical operations areas including data centers, servers, mainframe, storage and networks”

### Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardware Manufacturers</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Yellow</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>&gt; 4 and &lt; 6</td>
<td>≥ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Findings

- Dell is 96% of the environment
- Non-Dell is primarily attributed to DoE, GIC, DHA (HP Lenovo, Apple, etc.)

### Recommendations

- The metric is based on a 3-year laptop and 5-year desktop refresh cycle
- The target should be 6-8 models per year across desktops, laptops, and tablets, which should result in 40 models on a five year refresh.

### Operating System Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green</th>
<th>All others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Within 1 year of end support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Out of extended support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96% is Windows 7, which ends extended support in January 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 XP instances are still in use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Focus</td>
<td>Hardware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Computer</td>
<td>$4,622,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainframe</td>
<td>$126,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servers</td>
<td>$3,022,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>$6,990,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backup/Restore</td>
<td>$210,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>$4,106,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Circuits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom</td>
<td>$932,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ops Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operations Cost</td>
<td>$20,010,488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“For transformation to be effective the State needs to also refocus its cultural priorities”
Where are we going in the future?

Tactical
- CapEx model
- High overheads
- Fixed cost models
- Insufficient resources
- Incomplete services
- Service provider

Strategic
- OpEx model
- Low overheads
- Consumption based
- Packaged solutions
- Service broker
**Future Strategy**

### Findings

#### Commoditized Services - Sourced
- Email, SharePoint, and Skype
- Desktop
- Mainframe
- Data Center
- Network

#### Strategic Services - Internal
- Policy, architecture, and security
- Application development and support
- Service desk knowledge
- Project/program management
- Vendor Management
- Agency IT Liaisons
- IT centralized fiscal planning and chargeback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Annual Savings with Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainframe as a Service</td>
<td>$ 2,296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop as a Service</td>
<td>$ 2,305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Center as a Service</td>
<td>$ 6,036,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network, Security, and Telecom</td>
<td>($ 493,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Service Desk</td>
<td>$ 1,090,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential Annual Savings with Contingencies**

$ 11,234,000
1. Implement a true shared services model:
   - Enterprise centralization plan of IT operations
   - Establish and enforce statewide standards
   - Service level agreements, Statements of work
   - Service Catalogue
   - Financial model

2. Establish/Reconstitute technology governance:
   - Define the representation
   - Agencies involvement
   - Centralization of funding and budgets
   - Security or regulatory requirements
   - Shared services model review
   - Project and exception approval process
3. Centralize all technical resources:
   - Single shared services organization
   - Leverage resources based upon skill sets
   - Strategic geographic locations for improved service
   - Enhanced knowledge base available to all agencies
   - Provide resources as a strategic service
   - Incorporate into Service Catalogue

4. Determine data center(s) strategy:
   - Should the State be in the data center business?
   - Leverage internal facilities at current level?
   - Exit facilities with financial or structural risk issues?
5. Evaluate and assess new technology strategies:
   - Hybrid shared services solutions
     - Commodities sourced
     - Strategic internal
   - Purchase and fund on an actual-use basis
   - Determine asset ownership
   - Ability to “turn off” services when not in use

6. Implement enterprise vendor management:
   - Centralize vendor, contract, and license management
     - Gains economies of scale
     - Reduces numbers of vendors
     - Increases value through increased vendor accountability
     - Mitigates risk of license violations
   - Savings through renegotiation often pay for centralization effort
What is needed from GEAR?

Support for recommendations and authority for initiatives:

Establish a GEAR Subcommittee to formalize IT Strategy, based on Excipio recommendations: Cabinet (OMB, DHR, DTI, DHSS, DSP, DELDOT), Courts, Agency IT (DOE, DHSS, DOL), Private Sector IT, Controller General, DELJIS

• Development of Shared Services Technology centralization strategy
• Design Technology Governance Structure
• Determine financial model for IT chargeback and investing a portion of captured savings through a technology innovation fund for continued improvement
• Identify budgetary and legislative changes necessary to effectuate adoption of a shared services model
Deep Dive

Human Resources
HUMAN RESOURCES DELIVERY

Presentation to the Government Efficiency and Accountability Review Board

Presented by Department of Human Resources
July 11, 2018
HUMAN RESOURCES DELIVERY – Overview

- Creation of Department of Human Resources
- Organizational Structure
- Those We Serve
- GEAR Priorities
  - Centralization
  - Recruitment and Retention
  - Statewide Benefits
  - Insurance Coverage
In July 2017, Governor Carney signed HB4 into law, creating the Department of Human Resources (DHR) which:

- Transferred human resources functions from the Office of Management and Budget to the Department of Human Resources
- Required the centralization of human resources – including budgetary, operational and regulatory changes necessary for implementation

FY19 epilogue mandates service level agreements be implemented no later than June 30, 2019 (SB 235, §107)
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Office of the Secretary

- Diversity & Inclusion
- Women’s Advancement & Advocacy
- Statewide Benefits
- Personnel Management
- Labor Relations & Employment Practices
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
THOSE WE SERVE

HEALTHCARE BENEFITS

125,000+
Employees, Retirees & Dependents

EMPLOYEES
16,000+
Executive Branch
Legislative Branch
Judicial Branch
Elected Offices

TRAINING

25,000

INSURANCE COVERAGE
for 56,000 Participants
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

GEAR PRIORITIES

- Centralize Human Resources
- Reset Recruitment and Retention
- Reduce Healthcare Operating Costs
- Reduce Workers’ Compensation Costs
CENTRALIZATION OF 16 EXECUTIVE BRANCH AGENCIES
HR CENTRALIZATION – Objective

❖ Best Practices for the Delivery of Human Resources Services

• Excellent Customer Service
• Uniform Policies, Practices and Procedures
• GEAR Principles
HR CENTRALIZATION – Where are we now?

People
- Job Function Survey
- Needs Analysis
- Service Level Agreement

Policies
- Identify
- Prioritize
- Revise
- Replace
- Add
- Implement

Processes
- Recruitment
- Onboarding
- Electronic Personnel Records
- Complaints & Investigations
- Timekeeping
# HR CENTRALIZATION – Next Steps

## People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Function Survey</th>
<th>Agency Profiles</th>
<th>Agency Visits</th>
<th>Draft Service Level Agreement</th>
<th>Execute Service Level Agreement</th>
<th>Transfer Agency HR to DHR</th>
<th>Welcome New Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size/Type of Agency</td>
<td>Budgeted Positions</td>
<td>Leadership Call</td>
<td>People – FTEs and Vacant positions</td>
<td>Finalize SLA details</td>
<td>Budget/Position Transfer (payroll)</td>
<td>Celebratory/Welcome Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td>Send SLA Template</td>
<td>Budget – funding and expenses</td>
<td>Determine Effective Date</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Unions</td>
<td>Agency Leadership meeting</td>
<td>Operations Service Expectations</td>
<td>Sign SLA</td>
<td>Timekeeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Needs</td>
<td># HR Positions</td>
<td>HR Staff meeting</td>
<td>Performance Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>DHR ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Data to Agency HR for Review</td>
<td># Agency FTEs</td>
<td>Facility Tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DHR Distribution Lists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Report</td>
<td>Retirement Eligibility</td>
<td>Needs Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule Ribbon Cutting Welcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Functions Survey</td>
<td>Fiscal Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target to Centralize Remaining Agencies by April 2, 2019**
HR CENTRALIZATION – Next Steps

Policies
Create matrix to track development, approval, and implementation, and document control - 9/2018

Processes
Onboarding System
• RFP - FY19
• Contract Award - FY20

e-Personnel File System
• RFP – FY20
• Contract Award - FY21

Electronic Centralized Timekeeping System
• eSTAR - FY20
HR CENTRALIZATION – Challenges

- Every agency is unique
- Mapping HR functions from decentralized to centralized approach
- Performance levels

- Responding to questions through the transition
- Funding sources of positions
- Two Leaders – Understanding that DHR agency staff will zealously represent the agency’s interests and needs
  - Centralized timekeeping systems
RECRUITMENT RESET
RECRUITMENT RESET – Objective

Develop a Best Practice for filling vacancies in the Shortest Time with Excellent Customer Service using Technology and GEAR principles.
RECRUITMENT RESET – Achievements

❖ Recruitment & Retention Pilot Proposals
  • Highly committed and aligned agency proposal teams
  • 4 Proposals
    o Pilot Presentations
    o Hard-to-fill and those with regulatory requirements
  • Action Plans Drafted

❖ Recruitment Technology/Employee Services Procedures
  • Process improvement in JobAps and Employment Services
RECRUITMENT RESET – In Progress

- Implement Pilot Proposals
- Mapping Recruitment Process
- Reduce Time-to-Fill
- Market to Increase Applicant Pool
RECRUITMENT RESET – Next Steps

- Establish Benchmarks for Hiring Process
- Implement Hard-to-Fill Action Plans
- Frequent Communication with Applicants
- Collaborative Marketing & Advertising Strategy
- Competitive Compensation Strategy
RECRUITMENT RESET – Challenges

- Increase Speed of Hiring
- Uniform Data Collection
- Enhance Customer Service
- Engage Applicants
- Address Non-Competitive Pay
RECRUITMENT & RETENTION

Total Compensation Study
RECRUITMENT & RETENTION
Total Compensation Study – Background

❖ 1986 Mid-Point Based Pay Plans
  • Mid-point: amount seasoned employee expected to be paid based on job market
  • Employees expected to reach midpoint within 5 years
  • Pay Plan was funded for 5 years; increases haven’t been consistent or predictable
  • Regular market surveys stopped in 2007

❖ 52 Collective Bargaining Agreements
❖ 8 Compensation Bargaining Agreements
RECRUITMENT & RETENTION
Total Compensation Study

- Compensation
- Benefits
- Classification
- Gender, Race, Ethnicity

Executive Branch
Legislative Branch
Judicial Branch
Elected Offices

Total Compensation Study
RECRUITMENT & RETENTION
Total Compensation Study

PART I
Competitive Wages and Pay Plans

+ 

PART II
Best Practices and Equity

= 

Competitive and Equitable Compensation and Classification
RECRUITMENT & RETENTION
Total Compensation Study - Timeline

4/11/18
1st RFP Work Group Meeting

4/25/18
2nd RFP Work Group Meeting
Finalize Draft RFP

2/1/19
Vendor Submits Part 2

2/22/19
Final Recommendations to Secretary Johnson

4/27/18
RFP to Secretary Johnson

5/2/18
Final RFP to Contracting

9/6/18 – 10/25/18
Vendor Submits Part I - Study

5/21/18
Contracting Posts RFP

7/16/18
Top Pick to Contracting

7/13/18
Final Vendor Selection

5/30/18
Vendors Questions

6/6/18
Responses to Vendors

5/10/18
4th RFP Work Group Meeting; Top 2 Vendors Present

6/19/18 Bids Opened

6/25/18
3rd RFP Work Group Meeting; Evaluate the Bids
STATEWIDE BENEFITS
STATEWIDE BENEFITS – Objective

Offer employees/retirees/dependents Adequate Access to High Quality Healthcare at Affordable Cost while promoting Healthy Lifestyles to Engaged Consumers.
STATEWIDE BENEFITS – Affordable Costs
State Group Health Cost Projections

5% long-term cost projection

FY2023 Exceed $1 Billion in Total Costs
## STATEWIDE BENEFITS – Achievements/In Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Objective</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Access</td>
<td>Robust provider network</td>
<td>Supporting primary care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Quality Healthcare – Produces Good Outcomes</td>
<td>19% increase in freestanding imaging utilization; 20% increase in ratio of urgent care to ER</td>
<td>Hospital quality &amp; safety information; transparency tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Costs</td>
<td>Co-pay reductions for urgent care and imaging</td>
<td>Co-pay reductions for lab; Centers of Excellence; cost transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Lifestyles</td>
<td>Enhanced care management programs and services</td>
<td>Focus on preventive care; Pre-diabetes &amp; Diabetes programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Consumers</td>
<td>Interactive &amp; targeted tools</td>
<td>Smart technology applications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Open Enrollment Employee Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEWIDE BENEFITS – Next Steps

- Integrate Centers of Excellence Network
- Explore Transparency & Consumerism Tools
- Evaluate Impacts of Health Policy and Legislation
- Support Advancement of Value-Based Contracting
STATEWIDE BENEFITS – Challenges

- Continuing to Educate & Engage
- Balancing Benefit Plans & Fiscal Responsibility
- Ensuring Compliance with Federal & State Mandates
INSURANCE COVERAGE
INSURANCE COVERAGE – Objective

Reduce the lost time days and incurred costs from workers’ compensation injuries.
INSURANCE COVERAGE – Background

- Self Insured
- 56,000 Participants
- Time Lost: 32,058 Total Lost Days in FY18
- Cost: $37.7 Million in FY18
INSURANCE COVERAGE – Achievements

- Reduced Lost Work Days from Average of 54 to 52
- Reduced Overall Cost Compared to Medical Inflation Rate
- Provided Monthly Safety Training to State Agencies
INSURANCE COVERAGE – In Progress

- Training: Safety & Risk Management Services & Incident Reporting
- Inspecting Properties for Safety
- Returning Employees to Work
- Communicating Results
INSURANCE COVERAGE – Next Steps

- Provide Safety Training to Executive Branch Agencies (100% Participation)
- Establish Statewide Safety Program
- Reduce Return-to-Work Time
INSURANCE COVERAGE — Challenges

- Safety & Loss Control Participant Engagement
- Non-Executive Branch Buy-in with Return-to-Work Program and Safety & Loss Control

Diagram:
- Participant Engagement
- Reduction in Lost Days
- Lower Incurred Costs
- Reduce Time to Return-to-Work
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
GEAR PRIORITIES

- Centralize Human Resources
- Reset Recruitment and Retention
- Reduce Healthcare Operating Costs
- Reduce Workers’ Compensation Costs
QUESTIONS?

Contact: Barbara.McCleary@state.de.us
• Open topics Discussion – Board

• Public Comment
Adjourn

GEAR
Government Efficiency & Accountability Review
Contact

Please direct any inquiries about the Delaware GEAR program to:

Jim Myran (james.myran@state.de.us)
Exec Director of Government Efficiency & Accountability Review (GEAR)
Department of Finance

Bryan Sullivan (bryan.sullivan@state.de.us)
Director of Management Efficiency
Office of Management and Budget
Budget Development and Planning