

Utah Benchmarking Project Charter

August 22, 2014

The charter purpose is to define the nature of the Utah Benchmarking Project and otherwise identify its project mission and deliverables including but not limited to: partnerships and authorizations, project funding, stakeholders, public and private access to information and deliverables, measures of success, Benchmarking Committee—membership and management, and Project tasks and deadlines.

Project partners can initiate work to update or amend this Charter at any time. Formally, members of the Committee will update or reaffirm the Project Charter annually.

Philosophy and Purpose

The *philosophy* behind the *Utah Benchmarking Project* is—to enable comparison between and among local governments (defined as cities and towns) processes in an attempt to discover best practices that, once imported, will improve operations. Benchmarking for Utah’s participating local governments will help in their efforts to provide the most appropriate level of service to their constituencies at the lowest possible cost while achieving the best possible efficiencies of effort.

The *purpose* of the *Utah Benchmarking Project* is—to provide local governments with a service delivery management tool that supports their decision-making processes in strategic planning and accountability.

Deliverables and Measures of Success

The project *deliverables* are:

1. BYU—an annual report or data products (tools and techniques) that focuses on trends and patterns to include the identification of efficient/effective “best practices”. BYU will submit to the Chair a letter of intentions, deliverables and measures of success.
2. University of Utah—the collection of benchmarking data, input of data to the online system, resolution of data issues with UCMA Benchmarking Committee oversight and the provision of access to members to the online system. Additionally, it is facilitation of Utah Benchmarking meetings and to maintain and ensure adherence to the Charter. University of Utah will submit to the Chair a letter of intentions, deliverables and measures of success.

3. Committee members—identify and share with UCMA and other stakeholder’s best practices in the employment of benchmarking data and reports and otherwise demonstrate how these best practices assist in the management of local governments. Prior to UCMA and/or ULCT conferences, Committee members will submit to the Chair a letter of intentions, deliverables and measures of success.
4. Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT)—collection of dues and the financial accounting of these monies; contacts local governments to “market” UCMA Benchmarking products and services and to resolve member problems; and to manage and maintain the City Clusters. The ULCT will submit to the Chair a letter of intentions, deliverables and measures of success.

Committee membership and specifically, the Committee Chair, is responsible to judge the quality of deliverables and otherwise take actions to ensure the quality of deliverables.

As applicable, deliverables must be relevant, contain accurate information that local governments find useful and identify trends and patterns. The Committee identifies efficient/effective *best practices* and measures success by effectively informing stakeholders of these *best practices* (via reports or other means of communications such as an email blast or conference presentation). The Committee also measures success by initiating discussion specific to policy issues of interest.

Other measures of success include:

- Provide deliverables in an efficient and effective manner (measure by Committee membership and recipient feedback/survey systems).
- Perform task(s) and meet task(s) deadline due dates (see Tasks and Deadlines section of this Charter).
- Quality of task(s) outcomes (quality measurement by Committee membership and recipient feedback/survey systems).
- Reports and other communications are accurate and useful (recipient feedback/survey systems).
- Best practices or on-going guidance is to develop examples of how to use benchmarking data and reports to assist in the management of a city or town (i.e., ready examples present at the September ULCT and November UCMA Conferences).

Partnerships Responsibilities and Authorizations

The Project *partners* are:

- Utah City Management Association (UCMA)
- Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT)
- Brigham Young University—George W. Romney Institute of Public Management
- University of Utah—Center for Public Policy & Administration
- Utah State University

The Benchmarking Committee and specifically the Committee Chair responsibilities are to:

- Authorize all work and payment of invoices.
- Respond to/resolve issues that may come into play.
- Account for the quality of deliverables as identified by the measures of success.

Data Subcommittee

The Data Subcommittee responds to any issues or questions that arise associated with deliverables. The Data Subcommittee Chair is Richard Manning and Committee members include Mark Christensen and Matt Dixon.

Ownership of Work

Information, report products and services that generate from this work are proprietary and owned by the ULCT.

City Clusters

City clusters are up-dated every five years. The cycle begins with the December 2012 recommendations. The next recommendations are due December 2017.

Stakeholders

Project *stakeholders* include local governments, elected officials, staff and managers of local government organizations and indirectly residents that have an interest in Project deliverables and enhanced organization performance through the project outcomes.

Access to Deliverables

Only participating local governments have direct ***access*** to the annual report deliverables. However, other stakeholders may have access to select deliverables and the extent of access to these deliverables (beyond the annual report) is determined by the Committee Chair and/or the Assistant Chair. Currently online access to benchmarking data will only be granted to committee members and dues paying participating cities.

Each participating city will receive a password to access online data. The password is good for one year at a time, during the year for which cities have enrolled in the project. Their password is deactivated upon withdrawal from the project.

Project Revenues and Expenses

The ULCT is responsible for the collection of Project dues and the expenditure of these funds for the project. ULCT maintains the dues in a separate account from other ULCT resources and uses that account to pay authorized project expenses. Any money remaining in the account after any given year of service will be retained for future use by the benchmarking project. The ULCT will prepare a current accounting/report of all dues and payments for each Benchmarking Committee meeting.

Project ***revenues*** are assessed to each participating local government. Each participating local government is assessed \$500 annual fee. Participating local governments are provided access to the proprietary data sets that are not public (cost of service can be amended by the partners at anytime). Participating cities will be invoiced in October of each year.

Project ***expenses*** are in payment of the deliverables and administrative support (see project deliverables outline of page one of this document).

Benchmarking Committee—Membership and Management

- ***Membership***—will consist of one or more members from each Project partner and members from local governments. Member appointment is by invitation and approved by the Chair (in consultation with current Committee membership). Each member serves a one-year term and once appointed, a member can voluntarily agree to serve an additional year or years.

A member is removed from the Committee if the member's city withdraws from the benchmarking project, if the appointing organization withdraws the appointment or for good cause such as a failure to participate and otherwise fails to contribute to the purpose of the Committee.

Committee membership consists of:

- UCMA (we encourage the UCMA Executive Board appointment to be three years).
The current member is: Matt Dixon
- ULCT (ULCT appointment). The current member is: Nick Jarvis
- University of Utah Center for Public Policy & Administration (CPPA appointment).
The current members are: Ken Embley and Sara McCormick
- Brigham Young University George W. Romney Institute of Public Management (Institute appointment). The current member is: Rex Facer
- Utah State University. The current member is: Neil Abercrombie
- GFOA (we encourage the GFOA appointment to be three years). The current member is: TBD
- Local government members representing participating cities and towns (appointment by invitation). The current members are:
 - Richard Manning—Orem City
 - Mark Christensen—Saratoga Springs City
 - Galen Rasmussen—Bountiful City

Management—roles and responsibilities:

- **Committee Chair**—is the UCMA Executive Board appointment (and must be a member of the UCMA Executive Board). This position is responsible to lead the Committee in realizing the purpose of the benchmarking project. The current Chair is: Matt Dixon.
- **Committee Assistant Chair**—is a Committee Chair appointment (and approved by Committee membership). This position is responsible to assist the Committee Chair, University Partners, and Committee members in their duties, responsibilities and assignments. The current Assistant Chair is: Nick Jarvis.
- **University Partners**—are BYU's George W. Romney Institute of Public Management; Utah State University; and the University of Utah's Center for Public Policy & Administration. The collective roles are to provide facilitative services, collect and analyze benchmarking related data, prepare and present benchmarking reports, and provide other Project related products or services.
- **ULCT**—is to provide services such as periodic city "cluster analysis," manage project revenues and expenses, promote the Benchmarking Project, work to help resolve problems that may arise with member local governments, and when appropriate, assist with data work.
- **Local Government members**—provide advice, make recommendations, and as needed, perform work in order to realize the purpose of the benchmarking project.
- **Ad hoc Committees/Projects**—may be created to address a specific need.

Tasks and Deadlines

The intent of the following is to describe key Project process tasks and identify related deadlines required to effectively and efficiently provide Project products and services. This Task and Deadlines listing begins September of any given year and ends the following August.

<i>Project Tasks</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>	<i>Deadlines</i>
Benchmarking project committee meeting	CPPA	Mid September
Project best practices or on-going guidance presentation at Fall ULCT Conference (Committee members)	Committee Members	Mid September
Report on efforts to recruit new cities.	Committee Members	October
Invoice municipalities for services	ULCT	October
ULCT provides CPPA a list of member cities	ULCT	End of October
Data collection and begin entering external data from web sources	CPPA	November through February
Best practices or on-going guidance presentation at Fall UCMA Conference	Committee Members	First Friday each November
Send an email to cities to start entering survey data	CPPA	Early November
Cities begin to enter survey data	Cities	Early November
Prepare municipal survey	CPPA	Early November
Distribution of municipal survey's and subsequent reminders to enter survey data on line mid-December and early January	CPPA	Mid November to mid January
Update city cluster at a five year cycle beginning 2012 or as directed by Committee membership	ULCT	December of assigned year

Tasks and Deadlines (continued)

<i>Project Tasks</i>		<i>Deadlines</i>
Benchmarking project committee meeting	CPPA	Mid January
Municipal survey's completed and returned	CPPA	Early February
Contact the Tax Commission reminding them of need for all tax data by first of March	CPPA	Early February
As appropriate, the ULCT will provide finance, UT-2, data to the University of Utah to upload into the database.	ULCT	Mid February
Cities review their data for accuracy	Cities	Late February
Obtain preliminary data from Tax Commission	CPPA	Late February
Cities review all of their data in Utah City Data for accuracy	Cities	Late February
All external data is uploaded	CPPA	Late February
Send email to cities noting that data will be considered final	CPPA	Third week of February
Data is pulled to begin the analysis for the Spring report	CPPA	Last of February
Data is final for downloads and benchmarking comparisons	CPPA	First of March
Prepare Project reports	BYU	Mid March
Verify accuracy of project reports	BYU	Mid March
Distribute Draft Report to Participating Cities for review of Data and provide opportunity to proof data prior to report printing	BYU	End of March

Tasks and Deadlines (continued)

<i>Project Tasks</i>		<i>Deadlines</i>
Print and otherwise prepare reports for April UCMA Conference	BYU	Early April
<i>Deliverable</i> —annual report of survey results that focuses on trends and patterns to include the identification of efficient/effective “best practices”	BYU	April
April UCMA conference presentation	Committee Members	April
ULCT Spring Conference presentation	Committee Members	Mid April
Annual reaffirmation or adjustments to Project Charter	CPPA	May
Benchmarking project committee meeting	CPPA	Mid May
Invoice for services rendered	ULCT, CPPA & BYU	End of May
Obtain final Benchmarking data from Tax Commission	CPPA	June/July
<i>Deliverable</i> —begin work on annual follow-up summary report of one specific local government policy issue, and otherwise initiate discussion specific to a policy issue of interest	Committee Members	July