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Background:
The Development of the MPPS

- Problem: information gap in the policymaking process
  - Great deal of data available on Michigan’s citizens
  - Certain amount of data available on Michigan’s businesses
  - Lack of data on Michigan’s local governments and public officials

- Solution: new ongoing survey program focused on local government and local government leaders
Michigan Public Policy Survey: Overview

- **Census Survey** - every Michigan county, city, township, and village
- **Respondents** - the chief elected and chief appointed officials
- **Timing** - twice per year (Spring and Fall)
- **Administered** - online and via hardcopy questionnaire
- **Response rate** - 70%+ response rate by jurisdiction
- **Topics** - wide range, such as fiscal health, budget priorities, economic development, intergovernmental cooperation, employee policies, labor unions, state relations, environmental sustainability, citizen engagement, much more.
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The initial filter question:
Do you use data?
68% of Michigan localities overall use some kind of performance data
68% of Michigan localities overall use some kind of performance data.

- Population <1,500: 48% Jurisdiction uses internal data about own operations, 39% Jurisdiction uses external data about other jurisdictions, 24% Neither
- Population 1,501-5,000: 57% Jurisdiction uses internal data about own operations, 42% Jurisdiction uses external data about other jurisdictions, 28% Neither
- Population 5,001-10,000: 74% Jurisdiction uses internal data about own operations, 49% Jurisdiction uses external data about other jurisdictions, 14% Neither
- Population 10,001-30,000: 73% Jurisdiction uses internal data about own operations, 68% Jurisdiction uses external data about other jurisdictions, 10% Neither
- Population >30,000: 87% Jurisdiction uses internal data about own operations, 79% Neither
68% of Michigan localities overall use some kind of performance data
The “Yes” Track
Two-thirds of data-using jurisdictions report doing so on an ad hoc basis.
Nearly half of all cities have been using performance measures longer than 5 years.
Internal workload measures most extensively used, effectiveness and citizen satisfaction slightly less so.
Most Michigan jurisdictions develop their internal performance measures themselves.

- Developed in-house: 78%
- Designed by consultant: 6%
- Patterned after available model: 12%
- Assistance from member organization (e.g., MML, MTA, MAC): 17%
Michigan jurisdictions gather their external measures from a variety of sources.
Officials say performance measures generally effective, particularly at guiding decisions & cost savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For use in negotiating with unions</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For use in public relations</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving civic participation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding compensation decisions</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding overall strategic planning</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding individual program planning</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving communication with council/board</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving program quality</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving accountability and transparency</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving management decisions</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying cost savings</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding budgeting decisions</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officials report overall support for performance management from key groups

- Employees: 9% Strongly support, 26% Somewhat support
- Business community: 11% Strongly support, 31% Somewhat support
- Citizens: 12% Strongly support, 32% Somewhat support
- Managers: 19% Strongly support, 28% Somewhat support
- Council/Board: 31% Strongly support, 46% Somewhat support
Four in ten officials cite ‘ability to change’ as a problem in their use of performance data.
Three in four local officials feel performance management worthwhile for them and others.
The “No” Track
Plans for new data use in the future depend on jurisdiction size

* among the 29% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
Not much support or opposition to performance management among key groups

* among the 29% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
Cost the biggest anticipated problem for jurisdictions not engaged in data use

- **Ability to change**: 4% Not a problem at all, 25% Not much of a problem, 28% Somewhat of a problem, 14% A significant problem
- **Ability to keep measures current**: 4% Not a problem at all, 21% Not much of a problem, 30% Somewhat of a problem, 15% A significant problem
- **Ability to tie data to goals**: 8% Not a problem at all, 22% Not much of a problem, 30% Somewhat of a problem, 11% A significant problem
- **Ability to analyze data**: 7% Not a problem at all, 22% Not much of a problem, 31% Somewhat of a problem, 13% A significant problem
- **Ability to obtain data**: 5% Not a problem at all, 21% Not much of a problem, 34% Somewhat of a problem, 11% A significant problem
- **Costs**: 3% Not a problem at all, 11% Not much of a problem, 33% Somewhat of a problem, 30% A significant problem

* among the 29% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
Only 1/3 of non-users think performance management would be worthwhile for them

* among the 29% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
Key Findings on Local Performance Management

- A significant majority of jurisdictions across the state of Michigan are currently doing performance measurement and management
  - However, a majority of those who do performance measurement report it is ad hoc rather than formal or systematic

- Among those that are not currently doing performance management, few are planning to start new activities
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