

ICMA Certificates in Performance Management: Examples of Process Improvement



Jurisdictions may take varying approaches to improving their internal processes, from focusing on the methods of collecting and analyzing performance data to conducting efficiency studies, dedicating additional resources, or enhancing the profile of performance as part of the organizational culture. Here are a few examples.

Fort Worth, Texas: The city’s “Lean Leaders Cohort” used an approach that reviewed processes in terms of (1) problem statement, (2) current state overview, (3) analyze the problem, (4) determine and validate root cause, (5) brainstorming—suggested solutions, (6) quick wins, (7) project saving and measures, and (8) insights and next steps. See [Process Improvement, Fort Worth, Texas](#).

Bettendorf, Iowa: Bettendorf continues to improve the data collection and analysis process to make performance measurement a repeatable, valuable management tool:

- Emphasizing the importance of data-driven decision making to staff and city council
- Including a performance management training session at biannual employee training
- Compiling and publishing a report of benchmarks and corresponding citizen survey results.

Johnson City, Tennessee: In the past year, Johnson City has started pushing performance management in the form of departmental dashboards, which were reviewed with the Primary Coordinator (PC)/Budget Office staff and subsequently shared at open public meetings with the Board of Commissioners (meetings

are televised). Previously in the budget office, one employee was the PC and served to assist in performance discussions.

The 2016 budget included an additional person in the budget office (management analyst) to assist with the performance management program. The budget manager was reclassified and is now titled “Director of Budget and Performance Management” at the city manager’s request to meet the direction/instruction of the Board of Commissioners to be able to demonstrate to our management and citizenry that Johnson City is measuring performance and as a result is taking steps to improve efficiency and address gaps in performance to better serve our citizens.

San Mateo County, California: The county has established six performance improvement teams and a Lean process improvement cohort of ten employees who intensively trained in Six Sigma practices. The county’s Health System has a Leap Institute, which manages performance through continuous process improvement initiatives. See the Lean process video “[Improving Access to Care at San Mateo Medical Center](#).”

Since earning a Certificate of Excellence from ICMA in 2016, the county has developed a [Community Vulnerability Index](#) (CVI) that aims to demonstrate the geographical distribution of the overall vulnerability of the residents of the county. The CVI combines standard values of seven separate indicators collected from the United States Census Bureau's American Community Survey to illustrate combined indicators of poverty. The CVI is mapped at the census tract level, providing detailed information on communities of approximately 4,000 people.

Utilizing census data also allows the county to see trends over time, with the current iteration of the index comprised of the years 2010-2016. The seven indicators include (1) no health insurance coverage, (2) education--high school or higher, (3) Supplemental Security Income, (4) gross rent as a percent of income--households spending 35% or more, (5) poverty, (6) unemployment, and (7) disability.

The vision of CVI is that it is an additional tool that can be used to determine resource allocation to better serve the residents and clients in need. By partnering with county departments to obtain aggregated data by census tract regarding where the clients the county serves live and the services provided and overlaying this information with readily available census data, the county will continue to find better ways to break down silos, collaborate, and more directly target service delivery to the most vulnerable residents.

In addition, the county continues to focus on LEAN/Continuous Process Improvement and has completed some exciting projects with excellent outcomes—most recently a process improvement event that brought together the Sheriff’s Office (including jail staff), Probation, Correctional Health Services, Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, and the Human Services Agency to better coordinate in- and out-of-custody programming, information sharing, and coordination of services to better prepare inmates for re-entry into the community, improve self-sufficiency, and reduce recidivism. The key to this project, which continues to be a work in progress, is data sharing.

Bellevue, Washington: For the first time, budget development focused on performance metrics related to each proposal and the impact on the outcomes they are intended to achieve. We provided proposal writers and results teams with specialized training on metrics, goals, and target-setting. In conjunction with our What Works Cities engagement, we made public commitments to using data to inform decision-making, launched an open data portal, and engaged the leadership team in clarifying targets for citywide priorities, routinizing analysis and discussion of performance data, and involving council in evidence-based strategic planning.

Raleigh, North Carolina: This year the city implemented a measure validation process for measures included in the strategic plan. The focus was on documenting measure definition, intent, and collection methodology. Each of the 70+ measures had a customized form that was completed by appropriate staff. Here's an example:

Measure Validation and Results Submission Form		
Key Focus Area: Growth and Natural Resources		
Objective (not applicable for Community Measures): Facilitate improvements to the built environment that preserve and create neighborhoods of choice.		
Measure Name: Percent change in number of unsafe or unfit structures		
Data that should be provided to BMS: Number of unsafe or unfit structures		
Target: N/A	Unit of Measure: Raw Number	
Measurement Formula: $((y2 \text{ number of unfit/unsafe structures} - y1 \text{ number of unfit/unsafe structures}) / y1) * 100 = \text{percentage change}$		
Data Source(s): Data entered into Softnet Database program; supplemented with Excel workbook	Frequency Data Available: Monthly/Quarterly	
Rationale for Target: N/A		
Data Contact Person: Ashley Glove, Housing Inspector Admin., Housing & Neighborhoods	Person Reporting Data to BMS: Ashley Glove, Housing Inspector Admin., Housing & Neighborhoods	
Notes/Comments: Unfit - residential; unfit for human habitation (usually); Unsafe - also designated by UDO (Chapter 11); pertains to any type of structure (e.g. residential, commercial, etc.)		
Prior Year Data – Historical Data		
Prior Year	# of Unfit/Unsafe Structures	Comments
Current Data		
Reporting Period: July 1, 2016 through October 31, 2016		
# of Unfit/Unsafe Structures	Status	Comments
Reporting Period: July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017		
# of Unfit/Unsafe Structures	Status	Comments