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Executive Summary

Master of Public Administration programs regularly teach students the value and best practices associated with a variety of progressive management tools such as strategic planning, performance measurement, and succession planning. This capstone uses a national sample of local government officials to examine local government characteristics (including geographic/physical features, and political-management activities) that may influence the adoption of each of these management tools. Findings indicate that the use of strategic administrator hiring practices, the presence of an appointed administrator with significant responsibilities, and the use of citizen surveys may have a positive influence on the use of progressive management tools.
Master of Public Administration programs across the country regularly teach students the value and best practices associated with a variety of progressive management tools. These tools, which include strategic planning, performance measurement, and benchmarking, are promoted based on their assumed ability to yield management benefits such as productivity improvement, fiscal efficiency, and responsiveness.

Professional organizations such as the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) and the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) similarly encourage members to adopt management tools in their organizations. For example, the ICMA publication *Managing Local Government Services: A Practical Guide* includes an entire chapter on “A Manager’s Toolbox” explaining productivity improvement tools such as benchmarking and performance based budgeting. This is in addition to progressive management tool references woven throughout the other chapters on specific government services/functions.

Scholars such as Theodore Poister, Gregory Streib, and Harry Hatry have found the reported use of specific progressive management tools by public sector organizations to be increasing during the past few decades. A variety of possible reasons for this phenomenon have been identified, including the notion of “Reinventing Government” that gained traction in the 1990s, the development and advocacy of such management tools in public administration academic programs, and external reporting requirements.

An interest in enhancing the professionalism within their organizations may be another reason more public sector agencies are reporting an increased use of progressive management tools. Facing a complicated set of political, economic and other realities, public sector organizations may find value in using tools that professionalize the way they conduct business. For example, strategic planning can allow an organization to strategically think about its mission, the goals its wants to accomplish, and ways to accomplish them. The alternative would be to manage based on a reactionary posture, which hinders the long-term development of any organization. However, as Theodore Poister has recently argued, to become truly professional and results-driven, organizations need to think about management tools holistically. Instead of looking at each tool separately (such as strategic planning without linking the plan to operations), they need to think about ways in which a variety of progressive management tools can be used together to cultivate and entrench a culture of accountability, effectiveness, and professionalism.

**Research Question/Purpose of Study**

With the increasing interest and advocacy of progressive management tools for their potential to create a more professionalized, responsive, and results-oriented government, how prevalent are they in practice? Specifically in the case of local governments, what do we know about the extent and type of progressive management tools jurisdictions are using? What insights can this information provide both researchers and practitioners? To begin addressing these issues, this capstone seeks to answer the following question:

*Which characteristics of a local government (including physical/structural features, and political/management activities) may influence its adoption of specific progressive management tools?*

**Methodology**

Survey data from the most recent triennial ICMA Survey of the Profession (2009) were used for this capstone. The survey, sent to 8,548 municipalities and counties across America during the summer of
2009, asked respondents a variety of questions grouped under the following major categories: services in their communities, financial crisis in the U.S., citizen engagement, and local government staffing.

The survey asked questions pertaining to the respondents’ use of certain progressive management tools. Responses were analyzed for general trends and statistical relationships (Pearson coefficients) between the reported use of progressive management tools and specific local government characteristics.

The progressive management tools examined are: presence of a strategic and/or long-range plan, linkage of the strategic plan to operations, linkage of the strategic plan to the budget, engagement in performance measurement and management, and presence of a succession plan.

Three types of local government characteristics are examined. Physical/structural characteristics include population, type of metropolitan area, geographical regions identified by the U.S. Census Bureau, and form of government. Governance characteristics include strategic administrator hiring practices, type of government executive, method of administrator appointment, and administrator responsibilities. Management characteristics include the use of citizen surveys, and use of specific progressive management tools.

One advantage of using the Survey of the Profession dataset is that it provides a large number of national responses (2,214) from local governments with a variety of characteristics. Furthermore, it provides additional information about the context in which specific management tools are used through responses to follow-up questions.

One limitation of using this dataset is that although ICMA sent the surveys out to a representative sample of local governments, responses slightly over-represent council-manager governments (perhaps more inclined to respond due to their loyalty to the ICMA). However, the overall response rates (between 20-30%) for other governments are not significantly lower than that of council-manager governments (around 30%). Also, it is important to remember the reported use of each management tool may be different (probably higher) than actual use/implementation of that tool.

Findings

Strategic Planning
Among all survey respondents, 57.2% reported having a strategic and/or long-range plan. The only governance variable with a statistically significant relationship to strategic planning is appointed administrators having the responsibility of developing and analyzing public policy alternatives. About 58% of jurisdictions where the administrator has this responsibility report having a strategic plan, compared to 44% of jurisdictions where the administrator does not have this responsibility.

Strategic Plan: Linkage to Operations and to the Budget
Only 41% of all survey respondents report linking their strategic plans to their operations, while 43% of respondents report linking their strategic plans to their budgets.
Governance variables with a statistically significant relationship to these practices include the use of strategic administrator hiring practices (with elected officials engaging in visioning or needs assessment before recruiting for the chief administrator position), the presence of an appointed administrator, and the administrator having significant policy, budget, and personnel related responsibilities. For each of these governance variables, local governments reporting it are more likely to link their strategic plans to their operations and budgets (with reported percentages between 67-77) than ones that do not report using the variable (reported percentages are between 48-58).

In terms of management variables, conducting citizen surveys, engaging in performance measurement and management, and having a succession plan are all practices positively correlated with having a strategic plan that is linked to both operations and the budget. This is particularly interesting because it seems to indicate that local governments that go beyond simply having a strategic plan by taking the step to link the plan to operations and the budget may also more be likely to use the other two progressive management tools. Perhaps these jurisdictions realize that in order to effectively implement the vision/strategy provided by strategic plans, the plans need to be operationalized. The step to link the strategic plan to operations and budget may also represent an interest in developing a professional and results driven organizational culture that uses a variety of progressive management tools and practices in concert with each other.

**Performance Measurement/Management (PMM)**

Only 38.8% of all survey respondents reported engaging in performance measurement and management activities. Reported use of PMM is significantly greater among local governments that have a population of over 10,000, and are governed by a council-manager form of government. Governance variables associated with PPM include strategic administrator hiring practices, the presence of an appointed administrator, the administrator having policy and personnel responsibilities, being responsible for making budget presentations to the entire council and having other budget responsibilities. Other management variables positively correlated with PPM include conducting citizen surveys and having a strategic plan linked to both operations and the budget.

**Succession Planning**

Of all management tools examined, this one has the lowest reported use with only 23.4% of respondents indicating having a succession plan. Although few jurisdictions reported using this tool, there are a few variables with statistically significant relationships to this practice. About 30% of jurisdictions with strategic administrator hiring practices report having a succession plan, compared to 19% of jurisdictions not using such hiring practices. Similarly, about 29% of the local governments with administrators having the full range of policy, budget, and personnel responsibilities report having a succession plan, compared to 16% of jurisdictions with administrators having none of these responsibilities. Other management variables positively correlated with succession planning are the practice of conducting citizen surveys, and having a strategic plan linked to both operations and the budget.

Table 1 below provides a summary of the key findings. The word ‘yes’ indicates that a statistically significant correlation exists between the specific local government characteristic and corresponding progressive management tool.
### Table 1: Local Government Characteristics Positively Correlated with Reported Use of Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>SP Linked to Operations</th>
<th>SP Linked to Budget</th>
<th>PMM</th>
<th>Succession Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointed Administrator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Strategic Administrator Hiring Practices by Elected Officials</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Having Key Responsibilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Citizen Surveys</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Linked to Operations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of PMM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of Succession Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion/Recommendations**

In general, it seems that none of these management tools is as prevalent as academic scholars and professional associations would perhaps like. However, several local government characteristics are associated with the reported use of these tools.

**Physical/Structural Characteristics**

Although most of these local government characteristics are ones over which elected officials and managers have no control, their relationship to progressive management tools may provide a few useful insights. For instance, jurisdictions with more than 25,000 people are more likely to report engaging in the overall lesser reported tools of PPM and succession planning than the smaller jurisdictions. This may reflect the need for additional staff/resources generated by the use of management tools, something smaller jurisdictions may not have access to. However, there are certainly smaller jurisdictions that also report using each of these tools. As an example, about 33% of jurisdictions with less than 25,000 people report using PMM, compared to more than 41% of the larger ones. This seems to point to other local government characteristics and environmental factors that may be positively influencing the adoption of specific management tools.

**Governance Structure**

Perhaps not surprisingly, local governments with appointed administrators are more likely to report using each progressive management tool (with the exception of strategic planning). Similarly, of jurisdictions that have appointed administrators, the more responsibilities they give their administrators, the more likely that jurisdiction is to report the use of progressive management tools. For example, 59% or more jurisdictions with administrators having at least four of six listed responsibilities are likely to report linking their strategic plans to their operations and to their budgets.
The relationship of governance variables to the use of progressive management tools presents an opportunity specifically for elected officials. If elected officials are genuinely interested in promoting a professional and results-driven organizational culture, they can help create expectations and policies that enable the organization to use a variety of progressive management tools in order to achieve its goals. For example, the council can empower administrators to make results-oriented decisions by giving them significant control over policy, budget and personnel decisions. Similarly, over the long term they can relax control on organizations’ financial and human resource management practices in exchange for holding them accountable for higher performance expectations using collective feedback from the progressive management tools. Finally, elected officials should themselves use the management tools to help make policy and to communicate these decisions to the public.

**Management Activities**

Management variables may be most relevant to local government executives wishing to adopt tools that complement other management tools. As an example, jurisdictions reporting the use of citizen surveys as part of their citizen engagement initiatives are also more likely to report using all management tools (except strategic planning). Perhaps the assumption of public accountability and feedback associated with the citizen surveys encourages these jurisdictions to use progressive management tools in an effort to be more professional and results-driven. Similarly, the reported presence of one management tool in a local government seems to increase the likelihood of having another tool. In order to create an organizational culture of professionalism and effectiveness, local government managers should therefore think about using a variety of complementary management tools in conjunction with each other. They should make the initiative to go beyond simply having a strategic plan and/or collecting performance indicators, and establish a strategic management and performance management mindset throughout the organization. They should work with a range of internal and external stakeholders to garner support, develop implementation strategies, and accountability mechanisms for each of the progressive management tool they are interested in using to promote greater organizational professionalism.

**Conclusion**

This paper has examined a few local government characteristics that are associated with the adoption of management tools. Although the reported rates for none of the tools are particularly high, the survey reveals several physical/structural characteristics and governance/management activities that are positively correlated with the adoption of each tool. These findings can be a starting point for elected officials and government managers interested in adding and/or expanding the use of specific management tools within their jurisdictions as a way to create more professionalize and results-driven organizations.

The presence of certain characteristics in a local government represents only one category of reasons that certain jurisdictions may be more likely to report using management tools than others. Local governments may be using these tools for other reasons, such as an appreciation of benefits (actual, anticipated, or perceived) that they receive from doing so. They may also continue to use specific tools, and perhaps be willing to try new ones, because they feel that they have had consistently positive experiences from using them in the past.
1. First published in 2007, edited by Carl W. Stenberg and Susan Lipman Austin

2. Details about their research and findings can be found in several scholarly articles, including:

3. The ideas associated with this movement are best explained by David Osborne and Ted Gaebel in their 1992 book Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector. The authors essentially advocate an ‘entrepreneurial government’ focusing on results, decentralizing authority, reducing/streamlining bureaucracy, and promoting competition both internally and externally.


6. A statistically significant correlation between the specific characteristics and reported management tools was represented by a p-value of 0.05 or less, meaning that there was less than 5% likelihood that the apparent relationship between the variables occurred by chance.
APPENDIX A

State of the Profession 2009: SURVEY TOOL

Dear Chief Administrative Officer:
ICMA is conducting its triennial State of the Profession survey. This information will be highlighted in the Municipal Year Book and on the website at icma.org. Please help us ensure the success of this project by completing the questionnaire and returning it to ICMA by Monday September 14th. You may complete the survey electronically at http://icma2009sop.questionpro.com. You will need to enter the URL into your browser exactly as it appears above.

Thank you for your participation.
Robert J. O’Neill, Jr.
Executive Director, ICMA

Services In Your Community
1. Which of the following services are provided by your local government? (Place a check in the box beside each service that is provided.)
The services can be provided but not delivered by the local government. For example, refuse collection may be provided by the city but delivered by a private contractor. In this case, the service is provided.
We are interested in the services that citizens may have daily interaction with, such as parks and recreation.
a. Police
g. Public works/engineering
m. Library
b. Fire (paid/volunteer)
h. Water/sewer
n. Buses/transit
c. Ambulance/EMS
i. Animal control
o. Schools
d. Cultural and arts
j. Courts
p. Social services
e. Community health centers
k. Inspection building/zoning)
q. Jails
f. Refuse collection
l. Parks and recreation
r. Other (Please describe)

2. Please indicate if any of the services listed below are fee-based by placing a check in the box beside the service. (For this survey, “fee-based” refers to services that are not funded through the local government budget but through fees that are charged to resident users on a per usage basis.)
a. Fire (paid/volunteer) – e.g., fees are charged per response
b. Ambulance/EMS – e.g., fees are charged per response
c. Parks and recreation – e.g., fees are charged for recreation activities, such as swimming
d. Community health centers
e. Other
2A. For services that are fee-based, how are they accessed by people who cannot afford the fee? (Check all applicable.)
a. Sliding scale  
b. Waiver of fee  
c. Voucher  
d. Other (Please describe)

3. In your opinion, which three of the following factors are the most important criteria used by citizens to evaluate the quality of life in their communities. (Please check no more than three options.)  
a. Overall economic vitality  
g. Employment opportunities  
m. Community’s physical appearance and design  
b. Tax/fee rates  
h. Transportation  
n. Community growth/no growth policies  
c. Open space  
i. Recreation activities  
o. Property/housing values  
d. Downtown vitality  
j. Community infrastructure  
p. Sense of community  
e. Environmental management  
k. Quality of schools  
q. Civic engagement  
f. Local govt. services  
l. Public safety  
r. Other (Please describe)

Financial Crisis in the U.S.  
4. To what extent is your local government affected by the financial crisis in the U.S. economy?  
a. Not at all b. Minimally c. Moderately d. Significantly e. Severely

5. What is your community’s current unemployment rate? ______

6. Approximately how many jobs have been lost in your community since January 1, 2008? (e.g., local industry has cut back jobs.) ______

7. How many homes within your community have gone into foreclosure since January 1, 2008? ______  
7A. What percentage of this of your total stock of homes? ______

8. As you prepare(d) your FY2010 budget, what is the anticipated budget shortfall for FY2010? (Enter zero if none.) __________  
8A. What is/was the anticipated shortfall as a percent of your general fund budget? _____ %  
8B. How does the anticipated shortfall compare to cuts made in the FY2009 budget? 1. Less 2. Same 3. Greater

9. Which of the following measures has your local government implemented to address the fiscal crisis?  
a. Increased existing fees for services  
g. Eliminated or significantly reduced travel budget  
m. Implemented targeted cuts in expenditures  
b. Added new fees for services  
h. Implemented furloughs for staff/ reducing the number of hours worked  
n. Laid off staff
c. Reduced services
  i. Frozen salaries
  o. Deferred capital projects
  d. Eliminated services
  j. Reduced salaries
  p. Revised union contracts to reduce pay or benefits
  e. Left vacant positions unfilled
  k. Eliminated or significantly reduced professional development budget
  q. Other (Please describe)
  f. Eliminated positions
  l. Implemented across-the-board cuts in expenditures

10. If your local government receives revenues from any of the following sources, how much of a percentage of decrease do you anticipate? (Enter zero if none.)

**Revenue source**
% of anticipated decrease
a. Sales tax
b. Property tax
c. Income tax
d. Fees from activities/services
e. Payments from the state
f. Impact fees
g. Interest from investments

11. What impact, if any, have changes in the local government bond market had on your jurisdiction? (Check all applicable.)
   a. Higher interest costs for bonds
d. No impact
b. Unable to issue bonds
e. Other (Please describe)
c. Higher interest rates or insurance costs for existing bonds

12. In response to financial conditions, please describe three revenue enhancements and budget reductions you have implemented.
a. Revenue enhancements
b. Revenue enhancements
c. Revenue enhancements
d. Budget reductions
e. Budget reductions
f. Budget reductions

13. Do you think that any of the changes you implemented represent a new way of doing business and will continue beyond the fiscal crisis? 1. Yes 2. No
13A. If you think that any of the changes you implemented represent a new way of doing business and will continue beyond the fiscal crisis, please describe those that will continue.
__________________________________________________________________________________________

14. Does your local government have a strategic and/or long-range plan? 1. Yes 2. No
14A. If yes, when was it developed?____________________
14B. If your local government has a strategic and/or long-range plan, have you revised it since the recession was recognized in December 2007? 1. Yes 2. No

14C. If your local government has revised the strategic and/or long-range plan since December 2007, who participated in the revision? (Check all applicable.)

a. Elected officials
d. Private economic development foundation
g. Citizen advisory board/commission
b. Chief appointed official/manager
e. Representatives from public schools, colleges, universities
h. Citizens and residents
c. Local gov’t staff (e.g., planning, econ. dev.)
f. Private business representatives other than Chamber of Commerce reps.
i. Chamber of Commerce
j. Other (Please describe)

14D. If your local government has a strategic and/or long-range plan, is it linked to operations? 1. Yes 2. No

14E. If your local government has a strategic or long-range plan, is it linked to the budget process? 1. Yes 2. No

15. Does your local government engage in performance management and measurement activities? 1. Yes 2. No

15A. If “yes,” how is the performance management and measurement information used?

1. Budget process
4. Compensation for employees
2. Strategic planning
5. Performance evaluations for employees
3. Inform citizens (e.g., annual report, newsletter)
6. Other (Please describe)

**Citizen Engagement**


16A. If “yes”, please identify the opportunities for citizen engagement by checking the box(es) below.

a. Council meetings
d. Citizen review boards
g. Neighborhood action committees/teams
b. Town meetings
e. Neighborhood meetings
h. Internet discussion forums or input forms
c. Ad hoc task forces or planning teams
f. Participation on boards or commissions
i. Other (Please describe)

16B. If “yes,” are the citizens provided with the resources necessary to solve problems and implement decisions? 1. Yes 2. No 3

16C. Which resources are provided to citizens?

a. Meeting space is provided
c. Consultants
e. Access to data, information, and reports
b. A budget
d. City staff are assigned to provide assistance
f. Other (Please describe)
17. Were citizens involved in decision making related to the fiscal crisis, such as decisions about how to allocate resources?  
1. Yes 2. No  
17A. If citizens were involved in these decisions, please describe their involvement:  
_________________________________________________________________________________________  

18. Are citizens and residents informed about upcoming council agenda items that affect them, such as fee increases or reductions in service? 1. Yes 2. No  
18A. If “yes”, how are they informed?  
a. Notices in newspapers  
b. Newsletter sent to all residents  
c. Email  
d. Local government website  
e. Cable TV channel  
f. Social networking, e.g., local government blog  

19. How does your local government engage residents/citizens who may not typically participate? For example, are there opportunities for the homeless to participate in discussions about community issues? Please describe.  
_________________________________________________________________________________________  

20A. If “yes,” which of the following best describes the surveys? 1. The citizen survey(s) focuses on general satisfaction information. 2. The citizen survey(s) focuses on specific services, such as refuse collection, parks and recreation, police and fire.  
20B. How often are the surveys conducted? 1. Annually 2. Bi-annually 3. Other: Please describe  

___________________________  

Local Government Staffing  
21. Does your local government have an appointed position for a chief administrator or city/county manager? (The title of the local government manager may be town manager, village manager, city or county administrator, etc.) 1. Yes 2. No  
21A. If “yes,” how is the position appointed?  
1. Entire governing body  
2. Nominated by mayor but approved and accountable to entire governing body  
3. By the mayor or elected executive  
4. Hired by mayor but approved by council  
21B. If “yes,” does the position have significant or primary responsibility for:  
Areas  
Yes  
No  
1. Developing and analyzing public policy alternatives  
2. Implementing adopted policies  
3. Preparing the operating and capital improvements budget  
4. Presenting the budget directly to the entire governing body  
5. Appointing key management personnel, particularly key administrative and financial staff  
6. Supervising key management personnel, particularly key administrative and financial staff  

___________________________
22. When recruitment begins for a new chief administrator or city/county manager, do your elected officials engage in pre-recruitment visioning or needs assessment to determine the skills required for the position? 1. Yes 2. No

23. Which of the following recruitment tools are used to select candidates for the position of chief administrator or city/county manager? (Check all applicable.)
   a. Executive search firm
   d. Advertisement in national newspapers
   g. Advertisement in professional magazines/journals
   b. Social media, e.g., LinkedIn
   e. ICMA Newsletter
   h. Announcement on local government website
   c. ICMA’s Job Center
   f. Advertisement in local newspapers
   i. Other (Please describe) 4

24. Which of the following recruitment tools are used to select candidates for department head positions? (Check all applicable.)
   a. Executive search firm
   d. Advertisement in national newspapers
   g. Advertisement in professional magazines/journals
   b. Social media, e.g., LinkedIn
   e. ICMA Newsletter
   h. Announcement on local government website
   c. ICMA’s Job Center
   f. Advertisement in local newspapers
   i. Other (Please describe)

25. Does your local government have a succession plan? (e.g., a set of strategies designed to prepare future managers to assume leadership roles within the organization when current staff retire.) 1. Yes 2. No

25A. If “yes,” whom does it include? (Check only one.)
   1. All staff 2. Only department heads and the CAO/manager 3. Only the CAO/manager

If you have a succession plan, please email it to surveyresearch@icma.org so we can share it with other local governments.

26. Does your local government have a code of ethics? 1. Yes 2. No
26A. If “yes,” whom does it cover? (Check all applicable.)
   1. All elected officials 2. Board and commission members 3. All staff members

27. Does your local government offer ethics training to employees? 1. Yes 2. No
27A. If “yes,” how often? 1. Annually 2. As needed 3. Other (Please describe:________________)

28. Does your local government enforce the code of ethics (determine violations and impose sanctions)? 1. Yes 2. No
28A. If “yes,” who has authority to enforce the code? (Check all applicable.)
   1. Ethics commission 3. Chief administrative officer 2. Responsibility is delegated to other staff 4. Governing board

Council Relations
29. Describe the relationship between you and the elected officials to whom you reported during the past year. (Check only one.)
a. Relationship improved  
b. Relationship remained the same  
c. Relationship worsened

30. Please indicate on the following scale your opinion of the effectiveness of your council, board, or commission as a decision-making body. Consider the speed and ease with which the members reach consensus, how well they work together, and the degree to which political and personality conflicts interfere. *(Circle only one number.)*

1
2
3
4
5

Highly effective
Moderately effective
Not effective
### APPENDIX B

Summary of Statistically Significant Relationships with Corresponding Pearson Chi-Square Coefficients  
(yes = such relationship exists with * = p< .05 and ** = p< .001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LG CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC INFO</th>
<th>PROGRESSIVE MANAGEMENT TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plan (Q14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHYSICAL/STRUCTURAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of LG</td>
<td>(UTYPE) 1 = city , 2 = county</td>
<td>No (1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>(UPOP) categories are: 1 = 500,000-1,000,000; 2 = 250,000-499,999; 3 = 100,000-249,999; 4 = 50,000-99,999; 5 = 25,000-49,999; 6 = 10,000-24,999; 7 = 5,000 - 9,999; 8 = under 2,500-4,999</td>
<td>No (18.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>(UMETRO) 1 = central (core city/county in MSA), 2 = suburban (other cities/counties in MSA), 3 = independent (not in MSA)</td>
<td>No (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Region</td>
<td>(UGRAPH) based on regional breakdown defined by the U.S. Census Bureau -- 1 = New England (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut), 2 = Mid-Atlantic (New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey), 3 = East North-Central (Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio), 4 = West North-Central (Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa), South Atlantic = 5 (Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida), 6 = East South-Central (Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama), 7 = West South-Central (Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana), 8 = Mountain (Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico), 9 = Pacific Coast (Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii)</td>
<td>Yes (27.07**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Government</td>
<td>(UFOG) 1 = Council-elected executive, 2 = Council-administrator, 3 = Commission, 4 = Town Meeting</td>
<td>No (5.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Staffing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q21) 1 = appointed administrator, 2 = no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (3.21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (58.41**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (56.05**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (195.43**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (11.80*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator Appointment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q21A) 1 = By entire governing body (even if mayor nominated), 2 = Hired by elected executive (even if approved by council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (1.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (1.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (1.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q21B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Related 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and analyzing public policy alternatives (as reported by respondents with appointed administrator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (9.51**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (4.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (1.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Related 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing adopted policies (as reported by respondents with appointed administrator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (5.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (5.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (5.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (3.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Policy Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = none reported (within ALL survey respondents), 1 = one responsibility, 2 = both responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (4.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (61.58**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (64.24**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (126.13**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (13.21**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Related 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing and approving CIP budget (as reported by respondents with appointed administrator)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (2.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (4.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (1.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (1.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Related 2</td>
<td>Presenting budget directly to governing body (as reported by respondents with appointed administrator)</td>
<td>No (2.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget Responsibilities</td>
<td>0 = none reported (within ALL survey respondents), 1 = one responsibility, 2 = both responsibilities</td>
<td>No (1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Related 1</td>
<td>Appointing key management personnel (as reported by respondents with appointed administrator)</td>
<td>No (2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Related 2</td>
<td>Supervising key management personnel (as reported by respondents with appointed administrator)</td>
<td>No (5.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel Responsibilities</td>
<td>0 = none reported (within ALL survey respondents), 1 = one responsibility, 2 = both responsibilities</td>
<td>No (3.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (out of 6) Responsibilities</td>
<td>0 = none reported (within ALL survey respondents), 1 = one responsibility, 2 = any two responsibilities, 3 = any three responsibilities, 4 = any four responsibilities, 5 = any five responsibilities, 6 = all six responsibilities</td>
<td>No (19.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Hiring Practices</td>
<td>(Q22) 1 = use of visioning/needs assessment to determine skills required for administrator position, 2 = no</td>
<td>No (5.593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Surveys</td>
<td>(Q20) 1 = conducted by jurisdiction, 2 = no</td>
<td>No (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Type</td>
<td>(Q20A) 1 = general satisfaction, 2 = about specific services such as refuse collection</td>
<td>No (.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>(Q14) -- relationship with other tools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked to Operations</td>
<td>(Q14D) -- relationship with other tools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked to Budget</td>
<td>(Q14E) -- relationship with other tools</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMM</td>
<td>(Q15) -- relationship with other tools</td>
<td>No (2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succession Plan</td>
<td>(Q25) -- relationship with other tools</td>
<td>No (.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Survey Respondent Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of municipalities/counties surveyed (A)</th>
<th>No. responding</th>
<th>% of (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,548</td>
<td>2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,000,000</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000-1,000,000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000-499,999</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-249,999</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-49,999</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-24,999</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-4,999</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Central</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic division</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North-Central</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North-Central</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South-Central</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South-Central</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>3,208</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of government</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor-council</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-manager</td>
<td>3,539</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town meeting</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative town meeting</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-administrator (manager)</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-elected executive</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>