

MEMO TO: Mayor John Marchione and Members of the City Council

FROM: Mike Bailey, Finance and Information Services Director; 425.556.2160

DATE: November 5, 2013

SUBJECT: **STAFF REPORT: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT REPORT AND NEXT STEPS**

---

**I. DESCRIPTION:**

During this past summer the City engaged an intern who is working on her Master's Degree in Public Administration with the Evans School of Public Policy at the University of Washington. She did a comprehensive look at the City's past survey and community engagement efforts, interviewed city staff, and researched best practices. She documented her findings and recommendations for the City's next steps in the attached report.

The relevant recommendations include:

- Annual Citizen Survey (rather than biennial)
- Focus Groups
- Performance Management
- Citywide Staff Forum
- Guiding Principles
- Outreach Inventory
- Future Action

Pursuant to the recommendations in the report, staff has developed a scope of work for a request for proposal (RFP) for a community survey to be conducted before the end of the year.

At the November 5, 2013, City Council meeting, staff will present the highlights from this report, the status of the RFP, and the plans for using the community survey results.

**II. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Community Engagement and Performance Measurement
- B. Request for Proposals
- C. 2011 Performance Measure Related Survey Questions

CITY OF REDMOND

# Community Engagement and Performance Measurement

---

Needs, Recommendations, and Next Steps

Katie Escudero

9/17/2013

## **Table of Contents**

### **1. Final Report**

- I. Introduction
- II. Community Engagement Needs
- III. Methodology
- IV. Best Practices Key Takeaways
- V. Performance Measurement Recommendation
- VI. Community Engagement Recommendation
- VII. Implementation Timeline

### **2. Appendices**

- I. Midterm Memo
- II. Annotated Bibliography
- III. Research Companies Service Comparison
- IV. Community Engagement Guiding Principles
- V. Community Engagement and Survey Inventory

## **I. Introduction**

The City of Redmond has a strong connection with and commitment to the community it serves. By working to become a high performing organization, aligning the budget to community priorities, and employing multiple citizen feedback mechanisms, the City demonstrates this commitment. Redmond's challenge is to align the existing community attitudes data and engagement efforts with performance measures that assist in data-driven decision making. Currently, the citizen survey data is mostly used for the budget process but not consulted for other strategic or management decisions. Community engagement efforts are individually led by the departments and not tied to particular organizational goals or needs. Therefore, I recommend conducting an annual citizen survey accompanied by a biennial focus groups and a performance management system. These recommendations ensure that the data is current and meaningful while staff members are encouraged to regularly evaluate their performance and goals. For other community engagement efforts, I recommend adopting organization-wide guiding principles that lead staff in careful planning and follow-through when interacting with citizens. I then conclude by presenting some next steps in defining the City's engagement goals. A similar investigation as I have led with the survey should take place in order to set goals and define the City's overall community engagement needs before adopting solutions or new technologies.

In this report, I outline the City's community engagement needs, describe the methodology and research used to prescribe a solution that meets those needs, present the recommendations, and conclude with ideas for implementation.

## **II. Community Engagement Needs**

The City of Redmond seeks to align its community engagement efforts in order to meet two organizational needs:

### **1. Measurement**

The City needs consistent, timely data points to track its performance as graded by its citizens. This data is currently provided by the Biennial Citizen Survey that measures the citizenry's satisfaction with services, the City's plans, budgeting, and the overall community. However, Redmond needs more regular data that can be directly applied to performance measures along with qualitative feedback to inform activities.

### **2. Engagement**

The City strives to engage its residents in a variety of ways. Currently, community engagement efforts include community meetings, advisory committees, classes and activities, events, direct services, and social media. There are a large number of efforts underway, as captured in Appendix V, that are mostly uncoordinated and have the potential to oversaturate the community. The City should align engagement activities to create meaningful, lasting, two-way dialog with the citizens. By doing so, staff has a common goal

and purpose ensuring that citizens are hearing a united message from the City and are engaged in an intentional, sustainable way.

### **III. Methodology**

To grasp the measurement and engagement needs of the City of Redmond, I first sought to understand how the City plans and manages its activities. I reviewed various City documents such as the biennial budget, biennial survey reports from the past three cycles, the dashboard measures, and the City's priorities. Once I had a broad understanding of the City's planning and budgeting activities, I arranged meetings with each department to understand how they use the survey results, other ways they survey their customers or citizens, and any additional engagement activities. An overview of these findings is presented in a midterm memo, attached as Appendix I.

Upon understanding the challenges and needs pertaining to measurement and engagement, I researched best practices. A cumulative annotated bibliography is presented in Appendix II. A summary of the most salient lessons from the research is shared in the next section.

Finally, I took the lessons from the best practices research and applied them to Redmond's needs. The recommendations that follow have been created out of this process.

### **IV. Best Practices Key Takeaways**

In this section, I highlight some key takeaways from the best practices research. These lessons are incorporated throughout the report and here I simply reference those that are particularly informative of Redmond's goals. The annotated bibliography found in Appendix II provides a full review.

- **From the Literature**

- A scientific survey is the only way to acquire representative, quantitative opinion data.<sup>1</sup>
- Surveys measure how many whereas focus groups answer what and why.<sup>2</sup>
- Rock Hill, NC is a city of similar size that provides a case study of how a municipality is using the combined strategy of surveys and follow-up focus groups. This strategy is effective in encouraging staff to reflect on and use the results from both collection methods.<sup>3</sup>
- A performance measurement system should be used as a learning tool, not as a punitive measure.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Hayden

<sup>2</sup> Hochstein

<sup>3</sup> Hasbargen

<sup>4</sup> Kavanagh

- A strong champion, ideally someone in a leadership role, is essential to the success of a performance management system.<sup>5</sup>
- Performance Management Elements
  1. Planning process that sets priorities
  2. Public engagement process
  3. Budget process
  4. Measurement
  5. Accountability mechanisms
  6. Data management mechanism
  7. Process for analyzing and reporting on performance
  8. Process for performance information to drive improvement<sup>6</sup>
- Community engagement efforts should follow five steps:
  1. Define the intent or objective
  2. Determine who should be involved to provide that information
  3. Pick the method that best fits the objective
  4. Share the findings
  5. Repeat<sup>7</sup>
- A recent report on community engagement acknowledges there are opportunities to use technology but cited more research is needed to fully understand its uses. The report concludes that technology should not fully replace face-to-face interaction.<sup>8</sup>
- Hosting community forums where citizens are already regularly meeting, such as a church or school, is one of the most effective ways to garner citizen participation.<sup>9</sup>
- **Other Municipalities**

According to a recent International City/County Management Association (ICMA) report, 60% of local governments with a population of 50,000 and above report usage of a citizen survey.<sup>10</sup> This method appears to still be the preeminent solution to gathering representative attitudinal data on a city's population. In Washington, a number of Cities employ a citizen survey. Below are just a few examples from neighboring jurisdictions.

  - Biennial: Bellevue, Shoreline
  - Annual: Yakima
  - Once: Walla Walla
  - By department or need: Seattle

---

<sup>5</sup> Sanger

<sup>6</sup> National Performance Management Advisory Committee

<sup>7</sup> FLT Consulting

<sup>8</sup> Hoene

<sup>9</sup> Moulder, Hoene

<sup>10</sup> Moulder

## V. Performance Measurement Recommendation

- **Annual Citizen Survey**

I recommend that Redmond continue to conduct citizen surveys using random sampling methods best conducted by an experienced research company. According to the best practices research, this method is still the most effective way to gain an understanding of a city's performance rating by the community it serves.<sup>11</sup> Only a random sample citizen survey provides a representative sample of the population. A comparison of prices and services provided by various research companies can be found in Appendix III.

By conducting the survey annually instead of biennially, the City gains more timely data by which to measure its performance. This data aids in strategic decision making while demonstrating the City's accountability to its citizens.

- **Biennial Focus Groups**

One sentiment that echoes across the organization is that the survey data is interesting but not particularly useful for a staff member or manager's activities or decisions. They communicate wanting to know why something is graded as it is or what influences one's view of a particular service. This information does not come through in the quantitative, measurable data provided by a survey. A follow-up focus group or series of focus groups can provide the qualitative story behind a particular measure. These focus groups can also provide an opportunity for the City to hear from hard to reach populations such as non-English speakers, businesses, and commuters. By pairing these two methods, the City has a full picture of its performance containing measurable data points and qualitative feedback that can inform management and strategic decisions.

- **Performance Management**

Redmond has the tools and systems in place to effectively make decisions from a data-driven standpoint. The challenge is to encourage a more widespread use of these tools in order to best manage the City's resources and activities and ultimately affect outcomes. I recommend the adoption of a performance management system that encourages data driven decision making and planning to achieve the City's goals. This recommendation bolsters the current logic model exercises by institutionalizing accountability to outcomes. The adoption of a performance management system can take years and often requires a large cultural change with a strong leader at the helm.<sup>12</sup> From my observations, Redmond has the right environment to adopt such a system. The City's history of innovation and effectiveness, the executive leadership's commitment to performance, and the staff's acceptance of logic modeling are examples of this environment. An organization-wide implementation of a system is beyond the scope of this report but I do provide some first steps towards such a plan:

---

<sup>11</sup> Hayden

<sup>12</sup> National Performance Management Advisory Commission

- **Citywide Staff Forum**

Most City initiatives are introduced to the directors then trickle down to manager and frontline staff sometimes followed by trainings. I recommend holding a citywide meeting where performance measures, budgeting by priorities, surveying, the high performing organization framework, and process improvement are tied together to demonstrate how these various efforts work together to create an effective organization. This meeting provides an opportunity to introduce performance management and symbolically begin a new way of managing for results.
- **Quarterly Performance Review Meetings**

These meetings provide an opportunity for staff to share the data they collect, reflect on the citizen survey data, and probe deeper into trends and comparisons that arise from the annual survey. The meetings should be comprised of the Mayor and/or other City leadership, department directors, and division managers. By holding reoccurring meetings, staff is accountable to the data and encouraged to look more closely at the results in relation to management decisions and actions.
- **Communication**

Redmond is an accountable, high performing, well-run government organization. This message should be communicated to the citizens through the regular reporting of performance data. The dashboard can be shared on the website along with what is being done to improve services. Communication has two purposes: first, it shows that the City is transparent in its performance and consistently strives to improve. Second, communicating results ensures that staff is looking at and accountable to the data.

## **VI. Community Engagement Recommendation**

In order to create a coordinated engagement strategy, I recommend that the City first define its engagement goals. Strategies, tools, and activities should follow from the goals. In the meantime, I recommend these first steps towards creating a citywide engagement plan:

- **Guiding Principles**

One best practice that Redmond can adopt in the short-term is adopting guiding principles for community engagement. These principles provide standards for engagement activities and serve as criteria by which to grade current efforts. The Communications Working Group can add to or edit the proposed principles, as found in Appendix IV. These principles are adopted from the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation. They echo common understandings from and beliefs of leaders in the community engagement and collaboration field.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation

- **Communications and Outreach Inventory**

The City has a number of ways that it engages with its citizens. The Planning Department regularly communicates with the various neighborhood groups. Parks and Recreation administers quarterly questionnaires to its users. I suggest that these various outreach opportunities are recorded in a citywide inventory that is shared across departments. The inventory serves two functions. First, it ensures that departments are planning and coordinating with one another when goals and audiences overlap. Second, the inventory serves not only as a repository of this knowledge but also a management tool of citywide engagement. By having one location where this knowledge lives, staff can ensure that they are not oversaturating a certain constituency group or missing opportunities to more smartly engage through existing channels of communication. In Appendix V, I have started compiling all of the existing activities and communications into an inventory. The detailed information provided by Planning should serve as an example of the type of information produced by each department. Representatives on the Communications Working Group should continue filling in the details on these various efforts.

- **Recommendations for Future Action**

As mentioned, this report just begins to delve into the engagement goals and needs of Redmond. I recommend a deeper analysis of citywide and department engagement goals before employing any new tools or systems. The use of an outside consulting firm could be beneficial to this planning process. They can also evaluate current efforts (in a similar way that the survey is evaluated in this report) and their ability to reach those stated goals. Many staff members express concern that efforts might be duplicated or that citizens could be oversaturated with information because a citywide strategic plan is not in place. The Communications Working Group should put in place such a plan.

## **VII. Implementation Timeline**

I outline below a tentative implementation schedule of my recommendations. The survey is the first piece to accomplish as it informs the upcoming budget process and the other recommendations found in this report.

- **Mid-September 2013:** RFP process for a research company
- **Late September 2013:** Communications Working Group Forms
  - Edit and adopt community engagement guiding principles
  - Share guiding principles with departments
- **October 2013:** Communications Working Group adopts inventory and establishes its uses
  - Build on the activities listed in Appendix V
  - Decide how to set engagement goals: outside consultant or internal review?
- **Mid-October 2013:** Conduct survey
- **January 2014:** Survey Data and Performance Management Rollout

- The release of the survey data provides an opportunity to introduce performance management
  - Hold a performance review meeting to discuss survey findings
  - Determine if a separate working group should form to transform the survey findings into an action plan<sup>14</sup>
- Publish and share survey results along with the dashboard
  - Website
  - Local media
  - Existing citizen forums or groups

---

<sup>14</sup> Hayden

# Appendix I

## Midterm Memo

To: The City of Redmond  
From: Katie Escudero  
Re: Community Engagement and Performance Measurement Activities  
Date: August 1, 2013

---

The City of Redmond has a strong connection and commitment to the community it serves. By working to become a high performing organization, aligning the budget to community priorities, and employing multiple citizen feedback mechanisms, the City demonstrates this commitment. Redmond's challenge is to align the various department-administered feedback mechanisms and community engagement efforts into one coordinated voice.

Before prescribing a city-wide policy or tool, I have first compiled the various measurement and engagement activities along with the departments' views of the current tool, the Biennial Citizen Survey. I present two distinct categories of community involvement: performance measurement and engagement. Under each section, I present the various department activities of measurement or engagement. Then, I conclude with general feedback received about the survey.

### **Performance Measurement**

The Biennial Citizen Survey provides a broad look at the community's satisfaction with various City functions. From interviewing staff representatives from each department, I have learned that this broad look is helpful in noting large, city-wide trends but does not provide the in depth data they need to augment programs or plan future activities. To garner this information, the departments have collected supplementary data in the following ways:

- **Online Questionnaires and Surveys**
  - Fire and Police: Public Safety Strategy Survey; Ideascale
  - Parks and Recreation: Every 6 years the major planning document is being updated; quarterly online survey for Parks
  - Planning: on various themes; right now four surveys are being circulated (for example, Vibrant Neighborhoods)
- **Community Meetings**
  - Planning
  - Parks and Recreation
- **Point of Service Surveys**
  - Finance: signature survey and paper survey
  - Fire: following issuance of a permit via a website survey; following classes or trainings
  - Human Resources: following training sessions
  - Planning: counter survey

- Parks and Recreation: user surveys; following classes or trainings
- **One on One Engagement**
  - Fire and Police: on patrol and personal follow-ups (in person or over the phone) with customers
  - Human Resources: citizen representation on various boards
  - Parks and Recreation: Park Ambassadors receive feedback when out in the field; citizen boards and commissions
  - Public Works: informal interaction when in the field
- **Complaints**
  - Finance: Council complaints
  - Fire: track complaints to Department

## **Engagement**

The original thrust for a citizen survey was to engage the community in the budget process and to assist in prioritizing the City's activities and future plans. I learned that data from the survey is often tied to a budget offer but deeper engagement and qualitative information is needed to guide programs and activities. Some of the engagement efforts presented below are intended to incorporate citizens into these plans while others simply inform the community.

- **Mailings**
  - Finance: bill stuffers
  - Parks and Recreation: individual project listservs
  - Public Works: mail out information before a project begins in a particular neighborhood
- **Events**
  - Fire: trainings, classes; free home safety check; station tours; safety messages; Pancake Breakfast
  - Parks and Recreation: arts forums; classes; staffing booths at community events
  - Police: National Night Out; charitable events; classes; trainings
- **Meetings**
  - Parks and Recreation: community meetings; user group meetings; community conversations
  - Planning: community meetings on various themes; private requests for meetings (Senior Centers, neighborhood councils, etc.); Planner in the Park
  - Police: Neighborhood Watch
- **Social Media**
  - Parks and Recreation
  - Planning: neighborhood pages on Facebook
  - Public Works: Twitter; drive customers to frequently updated website

## **Additional Feedback**

- **Timing:** As the survey is designed now, most departments agreed that it is being administered often enough. Some noted that the large trends do not change swiftly enough to yield a yearly city-wide survey. A few noted that annual would be preferred.
- **Ideas and Recommendations**
  - Allow respondents to list priorities in terms of values or interests
  - Provide opportunities for qualitative feedback following a question
  - Align survey with performance measures
  - Use social media to administer surveys for particular departments (respondent gets to choose who they give feedback to)
  - Assign a different theme each time the survey is administered in order to receive deeper data
- **Other Comments**
  - Concern that a large portion of the population is being missed because of language barriers
  - For many, point of service surveys get them the information they need about their direct customers
  - Questions are too broad and general to inform strategic plans or department processes
  - Survey is unhelpful if respondents have not interacted with that particular department
  - Lacks in any meaningful follow-up or change as staff does not know why someone is dissatisfied
  - Need to learn more about the various subgroups and ensure Redmond is reaching them: the tech and business community, cultural communities, various ages, and those living in poverty

The needs, comments, and current engagement activities summarized here inform my research on best practices and creating a city-wide, coordinated plan for performance measurement and community engagement.

## Appendix II

### Annotated Bibliography

Allen, Laura, and Amanda Thompson. (2011). *Measuring Community Engagement*. Retrieved from [http://bookstore.icma.org/Measuring\\_Community\\_Engagement\\_P2192.cfm?UserID=9823606&jsessionid=4e3094565fd875417a63](http://bookstore.icma.org/Measuring_Community_Engagement_P2192.cfm?UserID=9823606&jsessionid=4e3094565fd875417a63)

#### Key Takeaways:

- A guide to developing an evaluation of engagement efforts
- 5 key practices that ensure successful engagement
  1. A citizen-centric vision of governance
  2. A strategy with definitive goals
  3. Tailored services and communications to meet user needs and preferences
  4. Aiming for success with improved service quality
  5. Measure results

Cohn Berman, Barbara J. (2005). *Listening to the Public: Adding the Voices of the People to Government Performance Measurement and Reporting*. Retrieved from <http://www.fcny.org/fcny/cgp/ReportsandPublications/listening/>

#### Key Takeaways:

- An example of a series of focus groups to develop performance measures and receive citizen input on how the government is meeting those performance measures. New York City.

FLT Consulting for the State Auditor's Office. *Communicating with Citizens – Tip Sheet*. Retrieved from <http://www.sao.wa.gov>

#### Key Takeaways:

- 5 Steps to Healthy Public Participation
  1. Know what you want
  2. Know who can provide the information you want
  3. Pick your method to match the objective
  4. Share your findings
  5. Do it again
- What you can do now
  - Adopt core values for public engagement
  - Adopt plain talk guidelines
  - Develop a public engagement guide

- Things to note
  - Not every issue requires full public engagement
  - Note that pick your method is the 3<sup>rd</sup> step not the 1<sup>st</sup>
  - Asking for public participation after you have already reached conclusions is about the worst thing you can do for public confidence

**Hasbargen, Kira. *Engaging Citizens in Rock Hill, South Carolina's Strategic Planning*. Retrieved from <http://icma.org/Documents/QuestionAnswer/Document/10314>**

#### **Key Takeaways:**

- Follow-up survey data with focus groups to obtain qualitative data from the residents.
- During a planning retreat, city leadership reviewed the survey and focus group results next to department performance data in order to compare performance with public perception and satisfaction.
- Three important lessons:
  - Reflect on the data to understand how it reflects in citizen comments, the trends, and comparison with neighboring jurisdictions.
  - Discuss the data by providing structured opportunities to discuss the results and next steps.
  - Share the data with staff, elected officials, residents, and the media to inspire greater transparency and accountability.

**Hayden, Shannon Elissa, Thomas I. Miller, and Michelle Miller Kobayashi. (2009) *Citizen Surveys for Local Government: A Comprehensive Guide to Making them Matter* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Washington, D.C.: ICMA Press.**

#### **Key Takeaways**

- Exhibit 1-2: the continuum of reliable public sentiment (citizen survey being the most reliable)
- Focus groups can provide a better understanding about citizen motivations and preferences
- Present data in a trend line, tracking past years' performance and current results to understand if service delivery is improving or worsening
- Three keys to using survey results
  1. Create an organizational structure to review the results
  2. Engage staff in action planning
  3. Link citizen survey data with performance measurement systems
- Communicating findings:
  1. Convene briefings of survey results and the action plan for all staff members
  2. Post the full report on the web
  3. Post the staff action plan on the web

4. Create a regular web report to show new programs or policies that intend to address survey findings are implemented
- Web surveys tend to have low response rates and attract those who are more opinionated and critical of government
  - Mixed mode research can skew the results as self-administered surveys tend to produce more candid results while interviewer-administered generates more positive data
  - When some groups are unlikely to participate in a traditional survey, conduct a focus group; community or faith based groups can assist with the recruitment

**Hochstein, Madelyn. (2008). *Tips from a Market Researcher*. Retrieved from <http://interscience.wiley.com>**

### **Key Takeaways**

- Surveys answer how many whereas focus groups answer what and why
- Focus groups are valuable when they follow-up a survey and help explain the statistics
- Only surveys produce hard numbers
- The key to successful research is to first define the objectives of that research
- Avoid doing just one focus group as it can be misleading; number can be determined by budget
- The best way to garner a truly representative sample is by telephone survey combined with techniques for hard to reach populations

**Hoene, Christopher, Christopher Kingsley, and Matthew Leighninger. (2013). *Bright Spots in Community Engagement: Case Studies of U.S. Communities Creating Greater Civic Participation from the Bottom up*. Retrieved from <http://www.nlc.org/find-city-solutions/city-solutions-and-applied-research/governance-and-civic-engagement/democratic-governance-and-civic-engagement/bright-spots-in-community-engagement>**

### **Key Takeaways:**

- In Austin, the city government designed a community engagement strategy *with* the community through a variety of avenues including advisory committees, attending meetings already taking place (such as PTA), and Speak Week (30-40 meetings were held in various locations around the Austin that week).
- Chicago's participatory budgeting model is led by citizen committees who work collaboratively with the government to come up with budget proposals then present these to various citizen groups for feedback. Budget proposals were then placed on a ballot for a vote.
- Few in the case studies would recommend having technology fully replace face to face interaction

**International Association for Public Participation. (2006). *Public Participation Toolbox*. Retrieved from [http://www.dvrpc.org/GetInvolved/PublicParticipation/pdf/IAP2\\_public\\_participationToolbox.pdf](http://www.dvrpc.org/GetInvolved/PublicParticipation/pdf/IAP2_public_participationToolbox.pdf)**

**Key Takeaways:**

- In-person surveys such as focus groups provide traceable data and reach a broad, representative public but can be expensive
- Internet surveys or polls are generally not statistically valid, do not control for geographic location, and results can be easily skewed
- Mailed surveys and questionnaires are best for general attitudinal surveys. Response rate is low and can be expensive when seeking statistically valid results.
- Telephone surveys or polls are also best for general attitudinal surveys. They provide a higher response rate than mail surveys but can be expensive and more labor intensive.

**Kavanagh, Shayne C. (2013). *Lessons from Performance Measurement Leaders: A Sample of Larger Local Governments in North America*. Retrieved from <http://www.gfoa.org/downloads/GFOAResearchCalgaryPerformanceManagementJune2013.pdf>**

**Key Takeaways**

- Respondents noted that the following elements are key to success in performance measurement efforts:
  - Chief executive support
  - Regular performance review meetings, for example quarterly
  - Use the system as a learning tool, not punitive measure
    - If punitive, this incentivizes false results
    - Do not track irrelevant data; departments should work with the central office to set useful measure actually used for management
  - A centralized performance measurement coordinating authority or office
    - Research suggests better situated outside of the budget office so the system is not seen simply as a budget tool but a management tool
    - Departments are still responsible for their own data analysis
- “The leader should articulate a vision for how performance measurement will be used and what it will achieve. Successful models from other jurisdictions are often helpful to make the vision more tangible for followers.” (page 12)
- The most impactful action to generate support in measurement is a regular review meeting with departments, the chief executive, and all parties in the same room
- Measures should include both summary level information along with operational data that is useful to the departments

- One on one help and on the job training are adequate in ramping up staff capabilities; a formalized training is not needed for performance measurement success
- Involve staff
  - Example: Maricopa County Transportation Department developed a scoreboard of key measures that is presented to the entire department through meetings and large posters situated throughout the physical office. A Monday morning performance meeting with division managers is also held to review the measures.
  - Look behind measures with quality analysis techniques such as process mapping
- Departments tend to prefer efficiency and service quality measures to outcomes

**King County. (2011). *Community Engagement Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/equity/toolsandresources.aspx>**

**Key Takeaways:**

- Develop guidelines and standards for engagement for use by all agencies
- Continuum of community engagement (*see document for visual reference*)

**Moulder, Evelina R. (2010). *Citizen Engagement: An Evolving Process*. Retrieved from [http://icma.org/en/icma/knowledge\\_network/documents/kn/Document/301649/Citizen\\_Engagement\\_An\\_Evolving\\_Process](http://icma.org/en/icma/knowledge_network/documents/kn/Document/301649/Citizen_Engagement_An_Evolving_Process)**

**Key Takeaways:**

- Host meetings where citizens regularly meet: churches, schools, neighborhood groups, etc.
- More than 60% of municipalities with a population of 50,000 and above administer citizen surveys
- Figure 4.3

**Moynihan, Donald P. and Sanjay K. Pandey. (2010). *The Big Question for Performance Management: Why Do Managers Use Performance Information?* Oxford University Press.**

**Key Takeaways:**

- Performance information use can be largely determined by organizational culture and environment
- Performance systems should be designed to appeal to a sense of public service instead of a reward structure
- Access to and integration of performance information into the larger system leads to greater usage of performance data
- A more innovative, open, and risk taking professional environment encourages the use of performance information

**National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation. (2010). *Resource Guide on Public Engagement*. Retrieved from [http://www.ncdd.org/files/NCDD2010\\_Resource\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.ncdd.org/files/NCDD2010_Resource_Guide.pdf)**

**Key Takeaways:**

- **Core Principles for Public Engagement**
  1. Careful planning and preparation
  2. Inclusion and demographic diversity
  3. Collaboration and shared purpose
  4. Openness and learning
  5. Transparency and trust
  6. Impact and action
  7. Sustained engagement and participatory culture

**National Performance Management Advisory Commission. (2010). *A Performance Management Framework for State and Local Government: From Measurement and Reporting to Management and Improving*. Retrieved from [http://www.gfoa.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=1793&Itemid=1](http://www.gfoa.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1793&Itemid=1)**

**Key Takeaways:**

- Performance management is an “ongoing, systematic approach to improving results through evidence-based decision making, continuous organizational learning, and a focus on accountability for performance.” (page 3)
- “7 Principles of Performance Management”
  1. A results focus permeates strategies, processes, the organizational culture, and decisions
  2. Information, measures, goals, priorities, and activities are relevant to the priorities and well-being of the government and community
  3. Information related to performance, decisions, regulations, and processes is transparent – easy to access, use and understand
  4. Goals, programs, activities, and resources are aligned with priorities and desired results
  5. Decisions and processes are driven by timely, accurate, and meaningful data
  6. Practices are sustainable over time and across organizational changes
  7. Performance management transforms the organization, its management, and the policy-making process” (page 8)
- Performance management typically includes the following elements
  1. A planning process that sets organizational priorities
  2. A process for engaging the public
  3. A budget process that allocates resources by priorities
  4. A measurement process that supports the whole system

5. Accountability mechanisms
  6. Mechanisms for collecting, organizing, and storing data
  7. Process for analyzing and reporting performance data
  8. Process for performance information to drive improvement
- Celebrate success during the implementation of the system and be sure to communicate that across the organization; this assists with adoption
  - Four elements that are key to managing and testing operational strategies
    1. Accurate and timely data shared by everyone at the same time
    2. Regular and frequent meetings to encourage learning
    3. Follow-up and assessment
    4. A problem-solving model that fits the organization's needs

**Sanger, Mary Bryna. (2008). *From Measurement to Management: Breaking through the Barriers to State and Local Performance*. Public Administration Review, Special Edition.**

**Key Takeaways:**

- Performance measurement holds value in planning activities, budgeting, and restoring accountability in the citizens' eyes
- According to a GASB survey, fewer than a third of cities and counties reported distribution of performance data in a public report to citizens
  - Primarily prepared for the mayor, the governor's office, or the city manager
- A strong champion within government is essential to the success of a performance measurement system, especially one in a position of power
- Des Moines: example of integrating community engagement with data collection through the use of their ComNET system. Citizens are given computers to measure neighborhood conditions that were then communicated back to City computers and the data then reorders service priorities.
- Baltimore: CitiStat performance management system with biweekly meetings of the mayor and department heads to review data of trends across time and geography. Model system for accountability.
- 311 call system for citizens to report needs
- A successful introduction of performance management requires a committed leader with skill who instigates culture change and provides managerial investment in the system
- PerformanceStat: a leadership strategy that involves ongoing meetings with the chief executive and his or her leadership team. During the meetings, agency heads use data to analyze their department's performance, follow-up on previous efforts to improve performance, establish future objectives, and evaluate the overall performance strategy.
  - In the cases analyzed, using incentives, sanctions, feedback, coaching, and learning opportunities deepened staff capacity and leadership

**State Auditor's Office. *Performance Measurement Self-Assessment*. Retrieved from <http://www.sao.wa.gov/PerformanceCenter>**

**Key Takeaways:**

- An evaluation tool used to measure an organization's performance measurement practices.
- Measures:
  - How the organization chooses what it measures
  - How the organization ensures the quality of its data
  - How the data is transformed into information
  - How the organization uses performance information

**Van Ryzin, Gregg G. (2008). *Validity of an On-Line Panel Approach to Citizen Surveys*. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 32 (2), 236-262.**

**Key Takeaways:**

- On-line research panels are made up of volunteer respondents who have signed up to participate in web surveys (used as a proxy for volunteer-type questionnaires submitted by the various departments to their user lists)
- Issues
  - Coverage bias
  - Important missing subpopulations such as the elderly and low-income households
  - Attrition
  - Not able to achieve what a random sample does

**Willet, Brian. (2013). *Managing with Data*. State Auditor's Office. Retrieved from: <http://portal.sao.wa.gov/PerformanceCenter#/address?mid=6&rid=18356>**

**Key Takeaways:**

- Evidence of Performance Management
  - Management
    - Planning documents linked to measures
    - Limited number of relevant measures balanced across multiple perspectives
    - Written policies and procedures for defining and updating measures
    - Frequent and regular performance review meetings by decision makers
    - Easy to understand charts and graphs that show performance over time
    - Process improvement efforts related to performance and priorities
  - Communication
    - Performance information on website
    - Reports that show performance and what is being done to improve
    - Feedback methodology (internal and external)

## Appendix III

### Research Companies Service Comparison

	<b>Elway Research</b>	<b>EMC Research</b>	<b>National Research Center</b>
<b>Survey Cost</b>	waiting for RFP	\$16,000 to \$38,000	\$16,300
<b>Methodology</b>	phone and online	phone survey	mail and phone survey
<b>Sample Size</b>	determined by need	400 to 600	400 plus returned mail surveys
<b>Focus Group Cost</b>	waiting for RFP	\$8,500	N/A
<b>Biennial Focus Group?</b>	Yes	Yes	No
<b>Customizable Survey Tool</b>	Yes	Yes	Somewhat
<b>Recommended By</b>	Athena	Parks and Recreation	N/A
<b>Contact Name</b>	Stuart Elway	Ian Stewart	None

## Appendix IV

### Community Engagement Guiding Principles<sup>15</sup>

#### 1. Careful Planning and Preparation

- The design of the process serves a clearly defined goal and meets the needs of the participants.

#### 2. Inclusion and Diversity

- Participants reflect the diversity of stakeholders in the community of interest.

#### 3. Collaboration and Shared Purpose

- Encourage collaboration in all steps of the engagement process: design, recruitment, and implementation.

#### 4. Openness and Learning

- During both the engagement process and in evaluating the process. Review, evaluate, and innovate engagement.

#### 5. Transparency and Trust

- Be clear and open about goals and provide a public record of activities and outcomes.

#### 6. Impact and Action

- Ensure that the engagement effort can make a difference and communicate that message to participants.

#### 7. Sustained Engagement

- Each engagement effort is intentional and linked to organizational goals.

---

<sup>15</sup> Adopted from the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, *Core Principles for Public Engagement*. <http://ncdd.org/rc/item/3643>

## Appendix V

### Community Engagement and Survey Inventory

Department	Activity	Timing	Purpose
Finance & IS	Signature Line Survey	with service	Customer Service
	Point of service survey	with service	Customer Service
	Budget community engagement	biennial	Input
Fire	Online point of service survey, permits	with service	Customer Service
	In-person follow-up	per case	Customer Service
	Trainings	ongoing	Informational
	Station tours	ongoing	Informational
	Pancake breakfast	annual	Informational
	Public safety survey	once	Customer Service
	Home safety checks	goal of 1000 annually	Customer Service
HR	Citizen representation on boards	ongoing	Accountability
Parks and Recreation	Point of service survey, classes	with service	Customer Service
	Community meetings	per case	Input
	Survey for major planning document	6 years	Input
	Park amabassador in person feedback	ongoing	Input, customer service
	Online satisfaction survey	quarterly	Input
	Social media sites	ongoing	Informational
	Citizen boards and comissions	ongoing	Input
	User group meetings	ongoing	Input
	Focus group	once	Input
	Community conversations	per case	Input
Planning*	Project listservs	ongoing	Informational
	Point of service survey, licensing	with service	Customer Service
	Requests for meetings	per case	Informational
	9 online surveys in 2013	per case	Input
	Neighborhood Network	Annual	Input
	Neighborhood Plans	6 years	Input
	Historic Program	per case	Informational
	Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Code Amendments	several times a year	Input
Comprehensive Plan Annual Docketing	Annual	Input	
Police	Citizen Academy	Annual	Informational/Input
	Public safety survey	once	Customer Service
	Ideascale	ongoing	Input, customer service
	Classes	ongoing	Informational
	Outreach events	ongoing	Informational
	Point of service survey, classes	with service	Customer Service
	National Night Out	Annual	Informational/Input
Public Works	Informal interaction on patrol	ongoing	Input, customer service
	Project specific mailings	per case	Informational
	Informal interaction in person	ongoing	Input, customer service
	Twitter	ongoing	Informational

\*see next page for more detailed information from Planning

**Appendix V Supplement**  
**Long Range Planning Community Engagement Efforts**  
*July 17, 2013*  
*Prepared by Jeff Churchill*

	<b>How we use the data</b>	<b>Typical methods</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
<b>Biennial Citizen Survey</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reporting to city leadership, community (via Community Indicators, e.g.)</li> <li>- Program changes</li> <li>- Policy changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Every two years</li> </ul>
<b>Neighborhood Network</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Understanding neighborhood priorities</li> <li>- Improve connections with neighborhoods</li> <li>- Program changes</li> <li>- Policy changes</li> <li>- Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In-person (Derby Days, meetings, e.g.)</li> <li>- Electronic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annually</li> </ul>
<b>Neighborhood Plans</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing neighborhood vision, policies, and implementation priorities</li> <li>- Improve connections with neighborhoods</li> <li>- Program changes</li> <li>- Policy changes</li> <li>- Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In-person</li> <li>- Electronic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Every six years (1-2 neighborhoods per year)</li> </ul>
<b>Historic Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improve connections with community</li> <li>- Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In-person</li> <li>- Electronic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On a regular basis</li> </ul>
<b>Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Code Amendments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop policy or code recommendations</li> <li>- Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In-person</li> <li>- Electronic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Several times per year</li> </ul>
<b>Comprehensive Plan Annual Docketing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing work program</li> <li>- Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mail</li> <li>- Electronic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annually</li> </ul>
<b>Citizen Academy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improving connections with community</li> <li>- Program changes</li> <li>- Policy changes</li> <li>- Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Electronic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annually</li> </ul>

## **Examples of Long-Range Community Engagement Efforts**

### Typical, for example a straightforward Comp Plan or Zoning Code Amendment

- Legal notice in newspaper
- Notice via e-newsletters (GovDelivery)
- Public hearing
- Notice of environmental review (SEPA)
- Planning Commission / City Council web page notice

### Enhanced, for example a major Comp Plan or Zoning Code Amendment or other significant event

- Mailed letter or post card
- E-newsletters
- Press release / media engagement
- Social media announcements
- RCTV announcement
- Big white signs in the community
- Announcement on City web site home page
- Email to City staff (for City-initiated proposals)

### Custom, for example targeting a specific issue, neighborhood, or group

- Dedicated web page
- Planner in the Park
- Posters
- Citizen advisory committee
- Community meeting / workshop / open house
- Surveymonkey / questionnaire

## Request for Proposal.

The City of Redmond is seeking proposals from qualified consultants to conduct a survey of selected community members (both city residents and businesses), to prepare a report of survey findings, and related work (such as conducting focus groups to follow-up on survey results).

### **Scope of Work**

The City has identified the following minimum tasks and schedule for this work:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Schedule</b>
1. Review, Refine and Develop Survey <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Review city report entitled "Community Engagement and Performance Measurement"</li><li>b. Review draft survey questions developed by City of Redmond</li><li>c. Recommend refinements to survey questions</li><li>d. Develop survey instrument using "best practices"</li><li>e. Meet or teleconference with City representative as necessary to develop survey</li></ol>	No later than November 8
2. Conduct Survey <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>f. Draw representative survey sample within Redmond city limits large enough to provide reliable analysis of subgroups</li><li>g. Conduct survey using a variety of methods as agreed to by the city (to specifically include use of technology)</li></ol>	No later than November 29
3. Prepare Report on Survey Results <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>h. Provide a preliminary report with comparisons to previous survey results where applicable</li><li>i. Prepare a final written report of survey results in electronic form. Include a description of survey methodology, an executive summary and detailed analysis for the overall respondent population and for relevant subgroups</li><li>j. Present summary of results to the Redmond City Council</li></ol>	Prelim Analysis – no later than December 13  Final Analysis – No later than January 3
4. Potential Follow-up Work to Survey Findings <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>k. Based on survey results, the City may engage consultant for additional work such as facilitation of focus groups, interviews with key stakeholders, and related tasks</li><li>l. The need and scope of such work will be determined in a timely manner by the City</li></ol>	To be determined

### **Response Requirements & Format**

All costs for developing proposals in response to this RFP are the obligation of the Consultant and are not chargeable to the City. All proposals and accompanying documentation will become property of the City and will not be returned. Proposals may be withdrawn at any time prior to the published close date, provided notification is received in writing to the below listed City agent. Proposals cannot be withdrawn after the published close date.

**Response Requirements:**

1. Executive Summary & Overall Project Approach - Summarize your firm’s qualifications and special expertise in performing the type of services identified in the City’s scope of work. Provide a description of your understanding of the scope, approach to be used and confirmation of your commitment to meet the City’s desired survey timetable.
2. Pricing Methodology - Provide fully loaded pricing for each of the first three (3) tasks identified in the scope of work along with grand total for this work along with hourly rates for any additional work which may be completed under task four (4).
3. A list of references (including contact name and telephone number) of at least three (3) completed or current projects within the last four years of this size and nature. Municipal references are desirable but not required. The City reserves the right to contact references without prior notification.
4. Proposals must be made in the official name of the firm or individual under which business is conducted (showing official business address) and must be signed by a person duly authorized to legally bind the person, partnership, company or corporation submitting the proposal. A corporation must indicate place and date of incorporation.
5. The City requires three (3) printed response copies, unbound, and not exceeding four pages (double sided) in length. Company sales literature may be attached to the response and do not apply against page count.
6. A statement to the effect that respondent understands and agrees to obtain a City of Redmond business license as a requirement for performing these services. A city business license application can be found at:<http://www.redmond.gov/insidecityhall/finance/buslicense/apply.asp>
7. A statement indicating the number of calendar days the proposal shall be valid for (the City’s minimum number of days is 60).

**Selection & Award**

All interested individuals are requested to provide a response containing all required elements herein to the City of Redmond at the stated address by the deadline given.

The City intends to enter into an agreement with the Consultant who provides a proposal that, in the opinion of the City, best meets all of the below listed evaluation criteria (receives the highest score) as determined by the City’s selection committee.

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	
Survey Approach & Understanding	50%
Proposed Fees/Costs	40%
References (relevant examples of recent survey work of similar size and nature)	10%

Upon selection of a Consultant, the City intends to enter into an agreement using its standard, Consulting Services Agreement which shall be used to secure these services. A copy of this document is attached, as Attachment A, and shall be incorporated into this RFP by this reference.

The City of Redmond reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, and to waive any irregularities or information in the evaluation process. The final decision is the sole decision of the City of Redmond, and the respondents to this formal request have no appeal rights or procedures guaranteed to them.

## 2011 Performance Measure Related Survey Questions

1. **How satisfied are you overall with the services provided by the City of Redmond?**
  - Range: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure
2. **How good of a job do you think Redmond City Government does at keeping residents informed of City issues and decisions?**
  - Range: A Very Poor Job – An Excellent Job; Don't Know/Not Sure
3. **How do you rate your overall sense of connection to the Redmond community?**
  - Range: Not At All Connected – Very Connected; Don't Know/Not Sure
4. **In the last 12 months, about how often did you:**
  - a. Volunteer your time to some group or activity in Redmond
  - b. Attend a City sponsored meeting
  - c. Participate in a City recreation program
  - d. Visit a City park
  - e. Talk to or visit with immediate neighbors
  - f. Engage in conversation with or contact a City of Redmond elected official
  - g. Visit one of the City's Facebook pages
  - Range: Not in the Last 12 Months – 3 or More times a Month; Don't Know/Not Sure
5. **How strongly do you agree or disagree with this statement: “The City provides leadership in seeking solutions to regional issues.” (Such as transportation/transit, water resources, social services, and court and jail services.)**
  - Range: Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree; Don't Know/Not Sure
6. **How safe do you feel walking alone in your neighborhood at night?**
  - Range: Very Unsafe – Very Safe; Don't Know/Not Sure
7. **How safe do you feel walking alone in downtown Redmond at night, such as after a dinner or a movie?**
  - Range: Very Unsafe – Very Safe; Don't Know/Not Sure
8. **Does your family have a plan in case of disaster?**
  - Yes, No, Don't Know/Not Sure
9. **Does your family have an emergency supply kit for at least three days?**
  - Yes, No, Don't Know/Not Sure
10. **How satisfied are you with the City's ability to keep major roadways open during severe weather events?**
  - Range: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure
11. **Please indicate how satisfied you are when traveling to, from, and within Redmond using each of the following methods:**
  - a. Traveling on foot
  - b. Traveling on bicycle
  - c. Traveling in a carpool or vanpool
  - d. Traveling on a bus
  - e. Traveling alone in your car
  - Range: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure, Not Applicable

**12. Infrastructure: Please indicate how satisfied you are with each.**

- a. The City's maintenance efforts regarding pothole repair
  - b. Sidewalk trip hazards
  - c. Street sweeping
  - d. Roadway markings (striping, buttons, turn-arrows, crosswalks)
  - e. City buildings other than schools
  - f. Maintenance of parks, trails, and open spaces
- Range: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure

**13. How satisfied are you with Redmond's recycling program?**

- Not at all Satisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure

**14. Think of Redmond's park system, how satisfied are you *overall* with the quality of the parks, trails and open spaces in Redmond?**

- Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure

**15. How satisfied are you with the recreation programs and services in Redmond?**

- Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure

**16. Within the last two years, have you attended or participated in any of the following events or programs? For each event/program attended, please indicate how satisfied you are.**

- a. Derby Days (Redmond summer festival)
  - b. Redmond Lights (Redmond winter festival)
  - c. Eggstravaganza (Easter egg hunt)
  - d. Arts in the Parks (summer concert series)
- Range: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure

**17. How satisfied are you with the range of entertainment, services, and retail businesses available in Redmond?**

- Range: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied; Don't Know/Not Sure