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Presentation Outline

- Overview of the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)

- Summary of findings on officials familiarity with and support for or opposition to PA 4
What is the MPPS?

- A Census Survey
  - Targeted respondents are the chief elected and chief appointed official in every single Michigan county, city, township, and village
  - Conducted twice per year
  - Administered both online and via hardcopy questionnaire
  - 60-70% response rate by jurisdiction... 72% in Spring 2012
  - Survey content developed in close partnership with MML, MTA, and MAC, as well as Advisory Committees of topic experts
What does the MPPS aim to do?

- Provide information to local leaders about peers across the state, spread best practices and grass-roots innovative solutions.

- Help inform policy discussions among state and local policymakers and other stakeholders with information about challenges and opportunities at the local level that is not available from any other source.

- Build a longitudinal data archive to allow tracking of fundamental changes.
Presentation Outline

- Overview of the Michigan Public Policy Survey (MPPS)

- Summary of findings on officials familiarity with and support or opposition to PA 4
  - Officials’ familiarity with the legislation
  - Support and opposition among different groups
  - Support and opposition to different elements of the law
Two-thirds of local officials say they are somewhat or very familiar with PA 4
Reports by officials on familiarity are unchanged from last year

2011

- Very familiar: 2%
- Somewhat familiar: 6%
- Mostly unfamiliar: 25%
- Completely unfamiliar: 16%
- Don’t know: 51%

2012

- Very familiar: 2%
- Somewhat familiar: 9%
- Mostly unfamiliar: 25%
- Completely unfamiliar: 14%
- Don’t know: 50%
Local officials are divided in overall support for PA 4
PA 4 support stronger among those more familiar with the law

- Mostly unfamiliar: 17% Support PA 4, 25% Oppose PA 4
- Somewhat familiar: 44% Support PA 4, 31% Oppose PA 4
- Very familiar: 56% Support PA 4, 39% Oppose PA 4
PA 4 support stronger among those from jurisdictions with public sector unions
PA 4 support stronger among those from larger jurisdictions

![Bar chart showing support and opposition to PA 4 in different population sizes.]

- Population <1,500: 24% Support, 36% Oppose
- Population 1,500-5,000: 38% Support, 28% Oppose
- Population 5,001-10,000: 51% Support, 25% Oppose
- Population 10,001-30,000: 54% Support, 21% Oppose
- Population >30,000: 68% Support, 18% Oppose
PA 4 support stronger among those from jurisdictions in the Southeast
PA 4 support stronger among appointed officials

- Elected Officials: 32% Support PA 4, 32% Oppose PA 4
- Appointed Officials: 20% Support PA 4, 60% Oppose PA 4

Support PA 4  Oppose PA 4
PA 4 support stronger among Republicans and Independents

- Democrats: 21% Support, 52% Oppose
- Independents: 44% Support, 32% Oppose
- Republicans: 45% Support, 21% Oppose
Beliefs about the law’s effectiveness
the factor most highly correlated with support

- Effective: 43%
- Ineffective: 24%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 19%
- Don’t know: 14%
Beliefs about the law’s effectiveness
the factor most highly correlated with support

- 83% of officials believe PA 4 will be very effective
- 9% of officials believe PA 4 will be very ineffective

Support PA 4  Oppose PA 4
Beliefs about the law’s effectiveness is the factor most highly correlated with support.

- **Democrats** who believe PA 4 will be very effective: 72%
- **Democrats** who believe PA 4 will be very ineffective: 19%
- **Republicans** who believe PA 4 will be very effective: 64%
- **Republicans** who believe PA 4 will be very ineffective: 12%
Looking at individual elements of PA 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM can reject/modify/terminate collective bargaining agreements</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM can recommend collaboration/consolidation of jurisdiction(s) or disincorporation</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM can set aside decision-making powers of local elected officials</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM can recommend sale/transfer/lease of local assets</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local official allowed to be appointed as EM</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings from
MPPS Spring 2012 data on PA 4

- Familiarity is mixed: only two-thirds somewhat or very familiar.

- 38% support PA 4 overall, 30% oppose it.

- Support and opposition associated with beliefs about effectiveness, also union presence, partisanship, and position.

- Power over bargaining agreements is the most popular element, while local officials as EMs is the least popular.
MPPS survey content

- Looking for past MPPS data, including crosstabs, questionnaires, and reports from all previous waves?

  http://www.closup.umich.edu

- Have ideas for future MPPS waves, including topics, specific items, new ways to distribute reports?

  contact us at: closup-mpps@umich.edu