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Background:
An Overview of CLOSUP

- The Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy (CLOSUP) was founded at the Ford School of Public Policy in 2001

- A small research center with a core staff of 4 permanent employees and additional research staff and faculty working on a wide variety of research projects, events, & courses

- The Center’s primary mission is to conduct and support applied academic research that informs local, state, and urban policy issues, both in Michigan and beyond
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

- **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 (Spring and Fall)
  - Administered online for ~5/6 of the sample, via hardcopy questionnaire for ~1/6 of the sample
  - 60-70% response rate by jurisdiction
  - Survey content is developed in close partnership with MML, MTA, and MAC, as well as Advisory Committees made up of topic experts
Michigan Public Policy Survey: Overview

- Goals for the Survey Program
  - Fill the critical information gap about challenges and opportunities at the local level.
  - Provide information to local leaders about peers across the state, spread best practices and grass-roots innovative solutions.
  - Provide a voice for local-level concerns to policymakers in Lansing, foundations, community organizations, etc.
  - Build a longitudinal data archive to allow tracking of fundamental changes.
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MPPS Fall 2011 questionnaire

- Who uses internal and/or external data to help their jurisdictions’ decision making?

- Among those who do:
  what kinds? how extensively? how effective is it? who supports its use? what problems has the jurisdiction faced in doing performance management?

- Among those who don’t:
  are they considering it? how would they by likely to use it? what assistance would they need to institute it? who would support its use? what problems would the jurisdiction face in doing performance management?

- Dashboards and Citizen’s Guides
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Nearly 6 in 10 Michigan localities overall use internal data, 4 in 10 use external data
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Nearly 6 in 10 Michigan localities overall use internal data, 4 in 10 use external data
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MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Nearly 6 in 10 Michigan localities overall use internal data, 4 in 10 use external data

[Bar chart showing usage in different regions: Upper Peninsula (56% internal, 32% external, 38% neither), Northern Lower Peninsula (52% internal, 34% external, 32% neither), West Central (60% internal, 40% neither), East Central (48% internal, 39% neither), Southwest (62% internal, 46% neither), Southeast (71% internal, 14% neither).]
The “Yes” Track
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Two-thirds of data-using jurisdictions report doing so on an ad hoc basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Use on ad hoc basis</th>
<th>Use formally for some or all programs</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1,500</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,501-5,000</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-30,000</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30,000</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Nearly half of all cities have been using performance measures longer than 5 years

![Bar chart showing the percentage of cities using performance measures by type and tenure](chart.png)
Workload measures most extensively used, effectiveness and citizen satisfaction slightly less so
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:
Most Michigan jurisdictions develop their internal performance measures themselves

- 78% Developed in-house
- 12% Designed by consultant
- 17% Patterned after available model
- 6% Assistance from member organization (e.g., MML, MTA, MAC)
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Michigan jurisdictions gather their external measures from a variety of sources

- US Census Bureau: 65%
- MI Treasury: 42%
- MAC: 13%
- MML: 54%
- MTA: 29%
- Regional organizations: 22%
- Private organizations: 73%
- Informal exchanges: 73%
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:
Officials say performance measures generally effective, particularly at guiding decisions & cost savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</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>
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

A majority of jurisdictions share their performance data publicly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officials report overall support for performance management from key groups

- Employees
  - Strongly support: 9%
  - Somewhat support: 26%

- Business community
  - Strongly support: 11%
  - Somewhat support: 31%

- Citizens
  - Strongly support: 12%
  - Somewhat support: 32%

- Managers
  - Strongly support: 19%
  - Somewhat support: 28%

- Council/Board
  - Strongly support: 31%
  - Somewhat support: 46%
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:
Four in ten officials cite ‘ability to change’ as a problem in their use of performance data

- **Ability to change**: 16% Not a problem, 32% Not much of a problem, 31% Somewhat of a problem, 8% A significant problem
- **Ability to keep measures current**: 16% Not a problem, 34% Not much of a problem, 29% Somewhat of a problem, 6% A significant problem
- **Ability to tie data to goals**: 19% Not a problem, 36% Not much of a problem, 25% Somewhat of a problem, 5% A significant problem
- **Ability to analyze data**: 22% Not a problem, 39% Not much of a problem, 23% Somewhat of a problem, 3% A significant problem
- **Ability to obtain data**: 19% Not a problem, 34% Not much of a problem, 25% Somewhat of a problem, 4% A significant problem
- **Costs**: 17% Not a problem, 35% Not much of a problem, 20% Somewhat of a problem, 7% A significant problem
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Three in four local officials feel performance management worthwhile for them and others

- County: 80% worthwhile for your jurisdiction, 77% worthwhile for local governments in general
- Township: 70% worthwhile for your jurisdiction, 69% worthwhile for local governments in general
- City: 88% worthwhile for your jurisdiction, 77% worthwhile for local governments in general
- Village: 77% worthwhile for your jurisdiction, 74% worthwhile for local governments in general
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

22% of jurisdictions plan to expand performance management in next 12 months
The “No” Track
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Only 17% of non-users say they engaged in performance management in the past

* among the 28% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Plans for new data use in the future depend on jurisdiction size

* among the 28% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

**Not much support or opposition to performance management among key groups**

* among the **28% overall** who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

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 28% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Only 1/3 of non-users think performance management would be worthwhile for them

* among the 28% overall who said they do not currently use any kind of data in decision-making
Dashboards and Citizen’s Guides
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Some support for the effectiveness of local government performance dashboards

- Accountability and Transparency:
  - Very effective: 10%
  - Somewhat effective: 32%
  - Somewhat ineffective: 5%
  - Very ineffective: 8%

- Jurisdiction Performance:
  - Very effective: 8%
  - Somewhat effective: 28%
  - Somewhat ineffective: 6%
  - Very ineffective: 9%

- Ability to Benchmark:
  - Very effective: 10%
  - Somewhat effective: 35%
  - Somewhat ineffective: 5%
  - Very ineffective: 8%
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

Overall, cities and villages most likely to report creating a performance dashboard

- County: 24% (Produced dashboard - generally satisfied), 8% (Produced dashboard - dissatisfaction), 5% (Not yet produced - planning one), 5% (Not yet produced - not planning to), 2% (Don't Know)
- City: 68% (Produced dashboard - generally satisfied), 20% (Produced dashboard - dissatisfaction), 19% (Not yet produced - planning one), 15% (Not yet produced - not planning to), 4% (Don't Know)
- Village: 40% (Produced dashboard - generally satisfied), 15% (Produced dashboard - dissatisfaction), 10% (Not yet produced - planning one), 15% (Not yet produced - not planning to), 5% (Don't Know)
- Township: 7% (Produced dashboard - generally satisfied), 16% (Produced dashboard - dissatisfaction), 26% (Not yet produced - planning one), 2% (Not yet produced - not planning to), 2% (Don't Know)
MPPS Fall 2011 Wave preliminary findings:

EVIP-eligible jurisdictions most likely to report creating a performance dashboard

* among the 486 jurisdictions eligible for the EVIP statutory revenue sharing program
Key Preliminary Findings from Fall 2011

- A significant majority of jurisdictions across the state 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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Current and future MPPS survey content on benchmarking & performance management

- Types of questionnaire items?
- Targeted to specific jurisdiction types? (counties only? counties and cities?)
- Other survey topics?
- How should MPPS data and reports be analyzed and disseminated?
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