Overview of MPPS survey program

Findings on local government officials’ views on a range of issues regarding their jurisdictions’ workforce from the Spring 2017 survey wave, including:

- thoughts on the public’s perception of gov’t employees
- employee pay and fringe benefit rates
- whether the size of the jurisdiction’s workforce is adequate for providing services
- personnel problems experienced, particularly recruitment and retention
- succession planning
The Michigan Public Policy Survey

• **Census survey** – all 1,856 counties, cities, villages, and townships

• **Respondents** – chief elected and appointed officials

• **Administered** – online and via hardcopy

• **Topics** – wide range, such as fiscal health, budget priorities, roads, public safety, economic development, intergovernmental cooperation, service privatization, employee policies, labor unions, environmental sustainability, Great Lakes, citizen engagement, much more.
MPPS is not a typical opinion poll

• 70+% response rates

• **Transparency**
  -- Questionnaires online
  -- Pre-run data tables online
  -- Sharing of (anonymized) datasets with other researchers

• **Expert advisors on questionnaire content**

• **Research partnership with Michigan local government associations**
  -- MAC, MML, & MTA

• **Borrowing from other proven sources such as NLC and ICMA**
How many local jurisdictions responded to the Spring 2017 MPPS?

1,372 local units total (74% of all statewide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Population Size</th>
<th>By Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>489 local units &lt;1500</td>
<td>149 in the Upper Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519 local units 1500-5000</td>
<td>226 in the Northern LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 local units 5001-10,000</td>
<td>259 in the Central West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 local units 10,001-30,000</td>
<td>240 in the Central East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 local units &gt;30,000</td>
<td>227 in the Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271 in the Southeast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who has employees?

Does your jurisdiction have any paid employees other than elected officials?

- 91% Any type of paid employee other than elected officials
- 8% No paid employees
- 1% Don't Know
Who has employees?

Does your jurisdiction have any paid employees other than elected officials? If so, which of the following type(s)?

- Jurisdiction has any paid employees: 91%
- Part-Time employees: 73%
- Full Time employees: 50%
- Seasonal employees: 38%
- Temporary / irregular employees: 24%
- Jurisdiction has no paid employees: 8%
Who has employees?

Does your jurisdiction have any paid employees other than elected officials? If so, which of the following type(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full Time employees</th>
<th>Part-Time employees</th>
<th>No paid employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County | City | Village | Township | Total
---|------|--------|----------|--------
100% | 97%  | 78%    | 68%      | 73%    
96%  | 85%  | 74%    | 30%      | 50%    
4%   | 8%   | 10%    | 10%      | 8%     

---
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What does the public think of your employees?

In general, how would you describe the public’s perception of government workers in your jurisdiction?

- Very positive: 31%
- Somewhat positive: 46%
- Neither positive nor negative: 11%
- Somewhat negative: 8%
- Very negative: 3%
- Don’t know: 0%
What does the public think of your employees?

In general, how would you describe the public’s perception of government workers in your jurisdiction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Somewhat positive</th>
<th>Neither positive nor negative</th>
<th>Somewhat negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townships</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What does the public think of your employees?

In general, how would you describe the public’s perception of government workers in your jurisdiction?
How have employee pay rates changed?

Indicate whether — in your opinion — there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year in pay rates for your jurisdiction’s employee wages and salaries.

![Bar chart showing the percentage change in pay rates from 2011 to 2017]

- **Greatly increased**
- **Somewhat increased**
- **No change**
- **Somewhat decreased**
- **Greatly decreased**

- 2011: 22% Greatly increased, 68% No change
- 2012: 28% Greatly increased, 65% No change
- 2013: 41% Greatly increased, 54% No change
- 2014: 49% Greatly increased, 49% No change
- 2015: 55% Greatly increased, 43% No change
- 2016: 51% Greatly increased, 47% No change
- 2017: 57% Greatly increased, 41% No change
How are employee pay rates changing?

Now, comparing your jurisdiction’s current fiscal year to the next fiscal year, please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take regarding employee pay rates.

% of jurisdictions increasing employee pay in the coming year, by population size
Are current employee pay rates appropriate?

Overall, do you consider your jurisdiction’s pay rate(s) for current employees to be too high, about right, or too low?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Too high</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who offers employee benefits?

Does your jurisdiction provide any fringe benefits (i.e., health care, dental, vision, life insurance, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction offers benefits to new hires</th>
<th>Jurisdiction offers benefits to current employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No full-time employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With full-time employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(among those with employees)
How are employees’ share of health care costs changing?

... please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take regarding employees’ share of premiums, deductibles, and/or co-pays on health insurance.

(among those who offer health benefits)
How are employees’ share of health care costs changing?

... please indicate which actions your jurisdiction has taken or is likely to take regarding employees’ share of premiums, deductibles, and/or co-pays on health insurance.

% of jurisdictions increasing employees’ share of health insurance costs in the coming year, by population size

(among those who offer health benefits)
Are current employee benefits appropriate?

Overall, do you consider your jurisdiction’s fringe benefits package(s) — or lack thereof — for current employees to be too generous, about right, or not generous enough?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Too Generous</th>
<th>About Right</th>
<th>Not Generous Enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How has local gov’t workforce size changed?

U.S. Census data on full-time equivalent local government employment

Local government average monthly pay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$3,856</td>
<td>$4,235</td>
<td>$4,449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>$4,090</td>
<td>$4,771</td>
<td>$5,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local government FTE employment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Michigan (thousands)</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S. (ten thousands)</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How has local gov’t workforce size changed?

Indicate whether — in your opinion — there has been a decrease, an increase, or no change from the previous fiscal year in the number of employees that work for your jurisdiction.

(among those who have employees)
How has local gov’t workforce size changed?

How does the overall size of your jurisdiction’s workforce today compare to its size before the Great Recession?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>&lt;=1,500</th>
<th>1,500-5,000</th>
<th>5,001-10,000</th>
<th>10,001-30,000</th>
<th>&gt;30,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significantly larger today</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat larger today</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same size workforce</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>today as before Great Recession</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat smaller today</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly smaller today</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Statewide total: 8% Significantly larger today, 59% Somewhat larger today, 17% About the same size workforce today as before Great Recession, 10% Somewhat smaller today, 6% Significantly smaller today, 6% Don’t know.
Is local gov’t workforce size adequate for needs?

Do you think that your jurisdiction currently has an **adequate size of workforce** to deliver desired services in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/management services</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Services</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public works &amp; services</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(among those who have employees in particular service areas)
Do you think that your jurisdiction currently has an adequate size of workforce to deliver desired services in each of the following areas?

**Fire services:**
- Cities: 78% Adequate, 21% Inadequate
- Townships: 80% Adequate, 19% Inadequate

**Police services:**
- Counties: 52% Adequate, 47% Inadequate
- Cities: 69% Adequate, 31% Inadequate
- Villages: 64% Adequate, 31% Inadequate
- Townships: 75% Adequate, 22% Inadequate

*(among those who have employees in particular service areas)*
Who has problems with recruitment?

In your opinion, how much of a problem for your jurisdiction’s government, if at all, is recruiting employees with the needed skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Category</th>
<th>A Significant Problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a Problem</th>
<th>Not Much of a Problem</th>
<th>Not a Problem at All</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide total</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Who has problems with recruitment?

In your opinion, **how much of a problem** for your jurisdiction’s government, if at all, is recruiting employees with the needed skills?
Who has problems with retention?

In your opinion, how much of a problem for your jurisdiction’s government, if at all, is retaining current employees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statewide total</th>
<th>&lt;1,500</th>
<th>1,500-5,000</th>
<th>5,001-10,000</th>
<th>10,001-30,000</th>
<th>&gt;30,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A significant problem</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat of a problem</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much of a problem</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem at all</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why problems with recruitment/retention?

Which of the following factors, if any, are contributing to your jurisdiction’s problems in recruiting and/or retaining employees?

- Shortage of qualified candidates: 70%
- Not providing competitive compensation: 46%
- Poaching (i.e., losing employees to other public employers or the private sector): 24%
- Work atmosphere: 8%
Larger MI jurisdictions’ particular challenges

In your opinion, how much of a problem, if at all, are the following personnel issues for your jurisdiction’s government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Issue</th>
<th>Total Adequate skillsets among current employees</th>
<th>Total Employee Morale</th>
<th>Total Turnover due to retirements</th>
<th>Total Transfer of knowledge from departing employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate skillsets among current employees</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Morale</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover due to retirements</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of knowledge from departing employees</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Don't know

A significant problem

Somewhat of a problem

Not much of a problem

Not a problem at all
While many jurisdictions have taken no formal actions, others have begun **formal succession planning** to ensure they have institutional knowledge and employee skills in place... Which of the following best describes your jurisdiction's status?

- Already enacted a formal succession planning process
- Currently developing a formal succession planning process
- Likely to develop a formal succession planning process in the next 5 years
- Unlikely to develop a formal succession planning process in the next 5 years
- Don't know

**Chart:**
- 38%: Likely to develop a formal succession planning process in the next 5 years
- 24%: Unlikely to develop a formal succession planning process in the next 5 years
- 12%: Currently developing a formal succession planning process
- 7%: Already enacted a formal succession planning process
- 18%: Don't know
While many jurisdictions have taken no formal actions, others have begun **formal succession planning** to ensure they have institutional knowledge and employee skills in place... Which of the following best describes your jurisdiction's status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Townships</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Already enacted a formal succession planning process**
- **Currently developing a formal succession planning process**
- **Likely to develop a formal succession planning process in the next 5 years**
- **Unlikely to develop a formal succession planning process in the next 5 years**
- **Don’t know**
Why not develop a succession plan?

Which of the following, if any, are reasons your jurisdiction is unlikely to develop a formal succession planning process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We don’t need a formal plan at this time</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not a priority for our jurisdiction’s leadership</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff time to devote to planning</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial resources for such planning</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internal expertise about planning</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(among those who said “unlikely” to develop)
Michigan Local Officials’ Views on Workforce Issues

Summary

- Among those jurisdictions with employees, 58% report increasing pay rates in 2017, while 57% predict they will increase pay rates in the coming year. Local officials indicate that most pay increases have been modest, and are expected to remain so.

- Despite a trend in employee pay increases since 2011, 25% of local officials say pay rates in their jurisdiction are too low today.

- Fewer jurisdictions are increasing their employees’ share of health care costs (29% doing so in 2017, compared with 43% in 2014).

- Most local officials believe their current workforce size is adequate to deliver services. However, 35% identify at least one service area where their workforce size is inadequate.

- Almost half (48%) of local jurisdictions report problems recruiting qualified employees. Contributing factors in these jurisdictions include a shortage of qualified candidates (70%) and lack of competitive compensation (46%).
The Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)

Web: www.closup.umich.edu
Email: closup-mpps@umich.edu
Twitter: @closup