



# Roadmap to Outcomes: Final

Effective Government

*Spring 2017*



**Effective Government** is cooperative and proactive. It is efficient, but not at the expense of authentic community participation and input, and it also ensures equitable access to information, services, and decision making. It is the alignment of goals and resources across the City.

### Why is this Goal of Effective Government Important?

- This goal ensures that the City is not only efficient but effective in the programs and services it offers, while striving to develop a diverse workforce that reflects the city population as a whole.
- In an Effective City Government, residents find value in what the City has to offer. By improving the processes of City projects and programs, we hope to obtain a high level of satisfaction for both internal and external “customers” of the City.
- City functions that may be included in this Citywide Goal range from broadening access to City Hall, increasing opportunity for input in the legislative process, and rethinking the structure of government as our City becomes larger, more complex and increasingly diverse.

### Equity Statement

An effective government works to eliminate disparities that people of color and people of low income face in accessing government information, services, and participating in decision making.

### Common Themes

How will Madison operate within the next ten years? How will we lead (not just manage) the changes for Effective Government? One of the first lessons learned was that leading and managing are two very different but important skills. The City of Madison has a great number of people managing many things very well. However, strategic leadership is a critical skill, one that needs to continue to be developed within the City.

The team identified that efficient government does not necessarily mean effective government. We should not overemphasize efficiency at the expense of excluding certain communities or people. We also found that it is very important that sustaining programs on an ongoing basis is vitally important for consistently achieving the best outcomes for our residents.

Another theme discussed was the number of new city initiatives that are tied to an incumbent, only to be set-aside when a new executive is elected. The team felt that maintaining city stability within its leadership, services and operations is key to the success and growth of a vibrant community. The team also thinks that the City should

closely and carefully review the structure of the Common Council and committees and the impact that structure has on the effectiveness of government services to its residents.

The city needs to develop and implement a strategic vision as to how we achieve all outcomes identified in this process. Too often, government structures, systems, and processes fail because of a lack of role clarity and authentic community engagement. Sometimes a process becomes too arduous for the public to follow, due to incremental changes over time that are never or very rarely evaluated. Furthermore, our culture has become reactive versus proactive. Managers are often putting out an immediate “fire”, addressing a new political mandate, or managing a workplace crisis instead of strategizing with their teams. Government across all levels should regularly evaluate how it operates. Operational structure and design should be a top priority to ensure Effective Government.

We must allow employees to make decisions on their own based on a shared set of core values. We achieve better outcomes when those closest to the process are involved in decision making. This needs to be done within the context of adequate public input and discussion.

The most common reoccurring theme was directly related to our internal city culture. Specifically, the effectiveness of city government is directly impacted by our interactions and relationships with one another. Relationships drive effectiveness -- between managers and staff, executive and legislative, the public and city services and between city agencies.

We discussed how employees tend to follow the behaviors or the communications styles set by their leaders. This tends to generate a “we have always done it this way” attitude, which in turn stifles change. Our goal should be to have a culture that is open to new ways of doing business, evaluating itself and continuously improving.



## Outcome 1: Effective, Streamlined City Processes

*Why This Outcome Matters:* The City should continuously try to improve the levels of internal and external satisfaction. Time to complete a process is important to both City employees and the public they serve.

Indicators: 1. Time Saved  
2. # of Process Improvement Projects Implemented  
3. Level of Internal and external satisfaction

Data Source: 1. MUNIS for time saved  
2. Accela for some development related items (permits, land use, etc.)  
3. Separate tracking of process improvement projects  
4. Public and internal satisfaction surveys regarding public input

### Contributing Issues

Positive	Negative
Culture of efficiency and effectiveness	City ordinances
Interest in dialogue and active communication between and among individuals; increase opportunity for adding voices to the democratic process through variety of channels, particularly for communities of color and low income communities.	Levels of review
IT Systems and City Website	State laws
More access to services	Public / Internal satisfaction not tracked (Ensure we are reaching communities of color and low income communities)
	Costs may increase due to adding satellite offices and staff, cultural change
	Cultural change for staff and elected officials; size of Council

### What Works

- LEAN practices
- Dashboards
- Review Committee structure
- Streamlined hiring practices
- Various survey methods to track internal/public satisfaction
- City of Boston [City Hall to Go](#): Mobile City Hall truck which offers a variety of services from across departments. The mobile City Hall truck can also be requested to attend events throughout Boston.

- Satellite locations:
  - City of Chicago Clerk’s Office, has three locations
  - Madison County, Alabama has six locations – permitting and licenses, tax collection
- Provide input on legislation by providing online input
- [Utilizing a People-Centered Approach to Engagement](#)
- Telephone Town Hall Meetings, [Fort Lauderdale, FL](#)
- Centralized Communications Office – City of Austin, TX, Boulder, Co.
- Establish mechanisms to ensure all programs, services and initiatives are designed and contribute directly to our outcomes.
- Size of Council – see table below

**SIZE OF CITY COUNCILS IN SELECTED NORTHERN CITIES  
POPULATION BETWEEN 200,000 AND 600,000**

	CITY	2016 POPULATION	SIZE OF COUNCIL	POPULATION PER COUNCIL MEMBER
1	Milwaukee, WI	600,155	15	40,010
2	Sacramento, CA	490,712	8	61,339
3	Omaha, NE	443,885	7	63,412
4	Minneapolis, MN	410,939	13	31,610
5	Cleveland, OH	388,072	17	22,827
6	Pittsburgh, PA	304,391	9	33,821
7	St. Paul, MN	300,851	7	42,978
8	Toledo, OH	279,789	6 + 6*	46,631 279,789*
9	Lincoln, NE	277,348	4 + 3*	69,337 277,348*
10	Buffalo, NY	258,071	9	28,674
11	Madison, WI	248,951	20	12,477
12	Spokane, WA	213,272	6 + 1*	71,090** 213,272*
13	Des Moines, IA	210,330	4 + 2*	52,582 210,330*

\* Represents members of the Council elected at large.

\*\*The Spokane Council has 3 districts with 2 members from each district. The Council President is elected at large.

If representation in Madison were raised to the lowest representation on the list (Cleveland), the Council would consist of 11 members.

If representation in Madison were raised to the average of cities other than Madison (excluding at large representatives), the Council would consist of 5 or 6 members (248,951/47,025).

### Partners

- All City agencies
- All City employees
- Common Council
- Community at large
- People who use City Services
- University of Wisconsin-Madison, including:
  - UW – Business School
  - LaFollette School
  - Others
- Private Sector – American Family Lean / Six Sigma Effort
- State Government
- What Works Cities
- Government Alliance on Race and Equity

### Outcome 2: Develop a diverse workforce that effectively serves an increasingly diverse population.

*Why this Outcome Matters:* The demographics of city employees should match those of the City at large to provide the best service to all.

- Indicators:
1. Self-reported racial demographics of City employees in all functions and job levels match the racial demographics of the city population.
  2. Internal/external customer service survey
  3. Demographics of all managers

- Data Source:
1. MUNIS employee reports
  2. Department of Civil Rights Affirmative Action Plan
  3. Census Bureau
    - Job Family Availability Numbers
    - City of Madison Demographics

(See examples of data on following page)



Overall Employee Demographics Compared To City Population				
Reported EEO Race	Count of EEO Race	City employees currently	City population 2010	Difference
AMERICAN INDIAN	32	0.90%	0.04%	0.86%
ASIAN	91	2.56%	7.40%	-4.84%
BLACK	304	8.57%	7.30%	1.27%
HISPANIC	128	3.61%	6.80%	-3.19%
OTHER RACE	64	1.80%	3.10%	-1.30%
UNKNOWN	15	0.42%		0.42%
WHITE	2914	82.13%	78.90%	3.23%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3548</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>103.54%</b>	

Data Source: U.S. Census and City of Madison Finance Department, Payroll Division

### Current demographics of City of Madison Employees

City-Wide Job Family Availability											
The Annual Placement Goals are determined with an underutilization analysis of incumbency and relevant labor market availability of qualified women or people of color (known as minorities in the past). All selection decisions are made in a nondiscriminatory manner and a placement goal is not justification for selecting an individual based on their protected class. Source: Permanent Employees & US Census 2010 EEO Data Tool Madison, WI (MSA)											
	Total # of Employees	# of Women Employees	Women Incumbency	Women Goal*	Availability Met?	Difference to goal (+/-)	# of Racial Ethnic Employees	Racial Ethnic Incumbency	Racial Ethnic Goal*	Availability Met?	Difference to goal (+/-)
1 - Officials & Administrators	77	24	31.17%	43.90%	No	-12.73%	5	6.49%	6.20%	Yes	0.29%
2 - Professionals	449	199	44.32%	53.80%	No	-9.48%	57	12.69%	9.80%	Yes	2.89%
3 - Technicians	143	30	20.98%	50.80%	No	-29.82%	12	8.39%	10.80%	No	-2.41%
4 - Protective Workers	952	217	22.79%	28.10%	No	-5.31%	185	19.43%	8.10%	Yes	11.33%
5 - Paraprofessionals	183	134	73.22%	57.90%	Yes	15.32%	31	16.94%	9.00%	Yes	7.94%
6 - Administrative Support	509	342	67.19%	62.00%	Yes	5.19%	87	17.09%	8.20%	Yes	8.89%
7 - Skilled Craft Workers	477	49	10.27%	6.30%	Yes	3.97%	49	10.27%	5.90%	Yes	4.37%
8 - Service Maintenance	612	108	17.65%	43.30%	No	-25.65%	166	27.12%	13.40%	Yes	13.72%
TOTAL	3402	1103					592				

Data Source: Department of Civil Rights Affirmative Action Plan

### Current demographics of City of Madison Department Heads

1400	STREETS	8719	1019	SPECIAL WORKER-19-H	HR	M	WHITE
1000	ASSESSOR	8721	K004	CITY ASSESSOR-21	FP	M	WHITE
1100	ATTORNEY	8721	K001	ATTY CITY-21	FP	M	WHITE
5000	BUILDING INSPECTION	8721	K002	BLDG INSPECT DIV DIR-21	FP	M	WHITE
1200	CIVIL RIGHTS	8721	K008	CIVIL RIGHTS,DIR-21	FP	M	BLACK
1300	CLERK	8721	K005	CITY CLERK-21	FP	F	WHITE
5200	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	8721	K009	COMM DEV DIV DIR-21	FP	M	WHITE
5300	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	8721	K010	ECON DEV DIV DIR-21	FP	M	WHITE
4000	ENGINEERING	8721	K011	ENGR CITY-21	FP	M	WHITE
1500	FINANCE	8721	K012	FINANCE DIR-21	FP	M	WHITE
3000	FIRE	8721	K013	FIRE CHIEF-21	FP	M	WHITE
4100	FLEET SERVICES	8721	K014	FLEET SERVS SUPT-21	FP	M	WHITE
4100	FLEET SERVICES	8721	K014	FLEET SERVS SUPT-21	FV	M	WHITE
1600	HUMAN RESOURCES	8721	K015	HUMAN RESOURCE DIR-21	FP	M	WHITE
1700	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	8721	K028	IT DIRECTOR-21	FP	M	WHITE
5000	LIBRARY	8721	K017	LIBRARY DIRECTOR-21	FP	M	WHITE
3500	METRO TRANSIT	8721	K025	TRANS GENERAL MGR-21	FP	M	WHITE
3000	MONONA TERRACE COMM CONV CTR	8721	K018	M.T. DIRECTOR-21	FP	M	WHITE
5100	PARKS	8721	K027	PARKS SUPT-21	FP	M	WHITE
5400	PCED OFFICE OF DIRECTOR	8721	K020	PLAN DEVELOP DIR OF-21	FP	F	WHITE
5500	PLANNING	8721	K021	PLANNING DIV DIR-21	FP	F	WHITE
3100	POLICE	8721	K022	POLICE CHIEF-21	FP	M	WHITE
4400	STREETS	8721	K024	STREETS SUPT-21	FP	M	WHITE
4500	TRAFFIC ENGINEERING	8721	K006	CITY TRAFF ENGR/PKG MGR-21	FP	M	WHITE
2100	TREASURER	8721	K007	CITY TREASURER-21	FP	M	WHITE
3600	WATER	8721	K026	WATER UTIL GEN MGR-21	FP	M	WHITE

Data Source: City of Madison Finance Department, Payroll

### Contributing Issues

Positive	Negative
Community engagement	Not embracing 'citizenship:' we have more focus on providing services than encouraging people to have ownership in their government
Population is becoming more diverse	Need another way to seek community input besides attending meetings
Recruitment strategies	Can diversity be seen within the City?
Workplace culture	Workplace Culture (seniority)
Equity analysis of HR hiring process	
Retention-onboarding/mentorship/career ladders	

### What Works

- Using equitable hiring tools and racial equity and social justice [impact analysis](#)
- Clear (not coded) language in job descriptions
- Removal of unnecessary educational requirements for jobs (e.g. a college degree for a job that does not require that level of academic skill)
- Money for public information/relations



- Fostering and developing leadership (training, benefits for employees)
- Tracking employee demographics over time
- [Public Sector Jobs: Opportunities for Advancing Racial Equity](#) (Government Alliance on Race and Equity)

### Partners

- All City agencies, especially Human Resources and Civil Rights
- All City employees
- Common Council
- Government Alliance on Race and Equity
- Community at large
- Madison Municipal School District
- Madison Technical College
- Community organizations that serve communities under-represented in city employment
- Former City of Madison interns