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Summary of findings on the use of data in decision-making by local jurisdictions across the state of Michigan

A brief look at local officials’ reactions to the EVIP
What is 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 a few 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
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 Fall 2011!
  - Survey content developed in close partnership with MML, MTA, and MAC, and Advisory Committees of topic experts
What does the MPPS aim to do?

- 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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Who uses data and who doesn’t?

- **Cities**: 89% use either internal or external data, 10% do not use data about own or other jurisdictions, 1% don’t know.
- **Villages**: 72% use either internal or external data, 24% do not use data about own or other jurisdictions, 4% don’t know.
- **Counties**: 86% use either internal or external data, 11% do not use data about own or other jurisdictions, 3% don’t know.
- **Townships**: 61% use either internal or external data, 35% do not use data about own or other jurisdictions, 4% don’t know.
Who uses data and who doesn’t?  
-municipalities by population size -

(among all cities and villages)
Who uses data and who doesn’t?

-municipalities by region -

(among all cities and villages)
The “Yes” Track
Is data used formally or informally?

(among data-using cities and villages)
How are internal measures developed?

(among data-using cities and villages)
What sources are used for external measures?

(among data-using cities and villages)
Are performance data shared publicly?

(among data-using cities and villages)
Who supports performance management in cities and villages that use it?

(among data-using cities and villages)
How effective is data use?

- For use in negotiating with unions: 34% somewhat effective, 17% very effective
- Improving civic participation: 41% somewhat effective, 10% very effective
- For use in public relations: 42% somewhat effective, 10% very effective
- Improving management decisions: 64% somewhat effective, 23% very effective
- Identifying cost savings: 57% somewhat effective, 30% very effective
- Guiding budgeting decisions: 52% somewhat effective, 37% very effective

(among data-using cities and villages)
What problems have cities and villages faced in the use of performance measures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not a problem at all</th>
<th>Not much of a problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a problem</th>
<th>A significant problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to implement change</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to keep measures current</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to obtain external data</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to tie data to goals</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make sense of data</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(among data-using cities and villages)
Is performance management worthwhile?

(among data-using cities and villages)
Who is considering potential new uses of data?

(among data-using cities and villages)
The “No” Track
Who quit using data?

(among cities and villages that don’t use data at all)
Who supports performance management in cities and villages that don’t use it?

- Citizens: 17% somewhat support, 3% strongly support
- Business community: 14% somewhat support, 4% strongly support
- Employees: 10% somewhat support
- Managers: 14% somewhat support, 7% strongly support
- Council/Board: 21% somewhat support, 3% strongly support

(among cities and villages that don’t use data at all)
What problems would cities and villages expect in the use of performance measures?

(among cities and villages that don’t use data at all)
What problems would cities and villages expect in the use of performance measures?

(among all jurisdictions)
Is performance management worthwhile?

(among cities and villages that don’t use data at all)
Who is considering potential new uses of data?

(among cities and villages that don’t use data at all)
Key Findings from MPPS Fall 2011 Performance Management data

- 82% of cities and villages say they use data in decision-making, including 100% of the largest cities.

- But two-thirds of those only use data on an ad hoc basis.

- There is perceived widespread group support in jurisdictions that use data, indifference in those that don’t.

- Cost is only perceived as a problem for a fraction of jurisdictions engaged in performance management, but it’s huge for those not.

- Performance management generally believed to be worthwhile, even among most jurisdictions not engaged in it.
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Overview of the EVIP

- Program Goal: to incentivize local government policy change to “best practices” in three categories:
  1. Accountability and Transparency
  2. Intergovernmental Cooperation
  3. Employee Compensation

- Who is eligible for the EVIP?
  - 486 jurisdictions total – including 269 cities and 181 villages
  - Those that received greater than $4,500 in statutory revenue sharing in fiscal year 2009-10
Slim majority of local leaders are very familiar with EVIP, but many are not well informed

(among eligible jurisdictions)
Officials from smaller jurisdictions are less likely to know about shift to EVIP

(among eligible jurisdictions)
Smaller jurisdictions less likely to know whether they are eligible for EVIP

(among eligible jurisdictions)
Some confusion about EVIP among ineligible jurisdictions

- County: 47% correctly identify, 17% incorrectly identify, 36% don't know
- City: 84% correctly identify, 16% incorrectly identify, 2% don't know
- Village: 56% correctly identify, 5% incorrectly identify, 39% don't know
- Township: 43% correctly identify, 2% incorrectly identify, 55% don't know

(among ineligible jurisdictions)
EVIP Category 1: Accountability and Transparency
A core of local officials believe strongly in dashboards, but most have doubts about efficacy

(among all jurisdictions)
Most EVIP jurisdictions created dashboards, few ineligible jurisdictions have or plan to.

- **EVIP-eligible jurisdictions**
  - Produced dashboard: 81%
  - Not yet produced - planning one within next 12 months: 7%
  - Not yet produced - not planning to: 3%
  - Don't Know: 9%

- **Jurisdictions ineligible for EVIP**
  - Produced dashboard: 17%
  - Not yet produced - planning one within next 12 months: 50%
  - Not yet produced - not planning to: 25%
As an incentive program, the EVIP seems to be working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official says dashboard would be</th>
<th>Among EVIP-eligible jurisdictions</th>
<th>Among those not EVIP-eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very effective</td>
<td>90% produced a dashboard</td>
<td>15% produced a dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very ineffective</td>
<td>81% produced a dashboard</td>
<td>8% produced a dashboard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVIP Category 2: Consolidation of Services
87% of EVIP-eligible jurisdictions were already engaged in collaboration in 2010

(among eligible jurisdictions)
Most EVIP-eligible jurisdictions were also exploring new collaboration in 2010.
91% of EVIP-eligible jurisdictions certified for Category 2 EVIP funds

(among eligible jurisdictions)
Most jurisdictions not previously exploring collaboration did certify for Category 2 EVIP funds

(among eligible jurisdictions that were not planning collaboration)
Jurisdictions that “flipped” were eligible for more Category 2 EVIP funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-collaborating jurisdictions that &quot;flipped&quot; in 2012</th>
<th>Non-collaborating jurisdictions that did not &quot;flip&quot; to start collaborating in 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average EVIP funds jurisdiction received/would have received</td>
<td>$4,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(among eligible jurisdictions that were not planning collaboration)
EVIP Category 3: Employee Compensation
85% of EVIP-eligible jurisdictions plan to comply regarding changes to employee compensation

(among eligible jurisdictions)
Key Findings from MPPS Fall 2011 EVIP data

- Understanding of Michigan’s EVIP policy innovation is uneven among local leaders across the state.
- A core group of local officials believe strongly in efficacy of dashboards, but many are skeptical.
- Most EVIP-eligible jurisdictions were already engaged in collaboration and pursuing more prior to EVIP’s introduction.
- Nevertheless, eligible local jurisdictions are complying with EVIP requirements and thereby receiving associated funding.
Future MPPS survey content

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

Contact us at: closup-mpps@umich.edu
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