

Service Delivery Review: The Ontario Experience

MPA Research Report

Submitted to

**The Local Government Program
Department of Political Science
University of Western Ontario**

July 2006

**Kelly Stymiest
250109646**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of this research report is to evaluate the application of service delivery review approaches in Ontario local governments. It applies an empowerment-learning model to the current methods employed by local governments to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of services delivered to citizens. It examines the roles of senior management, elected officials and front-line staff in the completion of the service delivery review process and implementation. It is meant to provide senior management and elected officials who are considering the completion of a service delivery review within their organization with information on the methods used by other municipalities across Ontario as well as information on how staff can benefit from the review process.

A central hypothesis of this report is that administrative and political staff involved in the service delivery review process must utilize the concepts of the empowerment-learning model in order to provide the approach with a successful base from which to develop. That is, it is critical that municipal administrators have the support and commitment of council in conducting the review process, that the municipality integrates the concepts of innovation and continuous improvement into the organizational structure by supporting the continuous review of services and allowing for the empowerment of staff and that sufficient and accurate information is communicated to staff and citizens in order to keep them informed on the review process and allow for the rational judgment of decisions made by the municipality.

As society is continually changing, it is anticipated that Ontario municipalities will continue in their quest for continuous improvement. As identified in the recent report, Municipal Management Needs Assessment: Summary Report, municipal

administrators understand that monitoring, reviewing and improving the performance of programs and services will be an important management priority for upcoming years.¹ It is hoped that this research report will act as a tool for municipalities considering the performance of a service delivery review to provide them with information on what current practices are taking place across Ontario to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of services delivered to the public.

¹ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2006. Municipal Management Needs Assessment: Summary Report. Toronto, ON: Queen's Park Press

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION**
- II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**
- III. BACKGROUND**
- IV. SERVICE DELIVERY REVIEW**
- V. CITY OF BARRIE**
 - a. Background**
 - b. Service Delivery Review Process**
 - c. Service Delivery Review Current Status**
- VI. CITY OF BRANTFORD**
 - a. Background**
 - b. Service Delivery Review Process**
 - c. Service Delivery Review Current Status**
- VII. UNITED COUNTIES OF LEEDS & GRENVILLE**
 - a. Background**
 - b. Service Delivery Review Process**
 - c. Service Delivery Review Current Status**
- VIII. FINDINGS**
- IX. CONCLUSION**
- X. BIBLIOGRAPHY**

TABLE OF APPENDICES**APPENDIX A – Problems in Implementation****APPENDIX B – Service Delivery Review Process****APPENDIX C – Service Delivery Review Program Logic Model****APPENDIX D – Choosing A Delivery Method****APPENDIX E - City of Barrie Phase One Workplan****APPENDIX F – City of Barrie Staff Survey****APPENDIX G – City of Brantford Category 5 Services****APPENDIX H – City of Brantford Background Information Report Template**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Since the 1990's, municipalities across Ontario have been managing increasing budgetary constraints due to downloaded responsibilities, decreasing revenue sources, increasing operating costs as well as pressure for a decrease in expenditures. Additionally, municipalities are coping with demands from citizens for the provision of a wide range of programs and services and the level at which those services are delivered. In previous years, the response has been budget-cutting exercises which result in a reduction of services, an increase in property tax or user fees or the utilization of reserves. More recently, there has been increasing interest in the concept of performance measurement and other expenditure management techniques in an attempt to manage service delivery. Particularly, municipalities have been exploring the concept of service delivery reviews which aim to reduce the cost of service delivery while maintaining or improving the provision of services and service levels.²

In 2004, the Government of Ontario published a guide, A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers, which provided municipalities with information on how to approach a service review. The guide was based on an examination of municipalities' previous experiences in conducting a review of services as well as consultations with municipal administrators. This research report will use interviews with administrators, councillors and front-line staff as well as a review of relevant documentation to examine the process utilized by three Ontario municipalities in conducting a service delivery review and the impacts of the service delivery review on the organization employing an empowerment-learning model. It is proposed that

² Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Reviews for Municipal Managers. Toronto: Queen's Park Press.

successful service delivery review processes have the support of Council, allow for the participation of citizens and staff and are based on accurate and sufficient information on the current performance of the municipality.

2.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The goal of this research report is to apply an empowerment-learning model to the current methods employed by local governments to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of services delivered to citizens, specifically service delivery reviews. The empowerment-learning model will be used to examine the role of senior management, elected officials and front-line staff in the completion of the service delivery review process and implementation. The empowerment-learning model is characterized by the following features:³

- Empowerment of front-line employees
- Organizational learning capabilities that enables self-monitoring, self-correction and continuous improvement
- Citizen involvement
- Recognition of the role of elected officials
- Assistance in the demonstration by local governments of transparency, accountability and the creation of public value

The application of the empowerment-learning theoretical framework proposes that the service delivery review process will not only assist the municipality in improving the delivery of services to citizens but will also provide the municipality with intangible benefits such as those previously listed. These benefits are obtained as services are

³ Plant, Thomas., Carol Agocs, Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly & Janine Douglas. 2005. "From Measuring to Managing Performance". IPAC New Directions Report No. 16. Retrieved from http://www.ipac.ca/files/New%20Directions_16.pdf. pg 14

reviewed to determine their appropriateness to the organization and staff is enabled to identify and remove barriers to performance.

The empowerment-learning model follows a recent shift in local government organizations from a traditional bureaucratic model towards a post-bureaucratic model. The shift is based on increasing criticism of the traditional structure of government organizations for being too rigid and out of touch with the citizenry.⁴ The post-bureaucratic model addresses these concerns as it is citizen-centered and based on participative leadership in that the values of the community are reflected in the decision-making process. Further to this, employees are empowered through consultation initiatives and the creation of an environment of innovation and continuous improvement. In relation to the structure of the organization, departments are encouraged to become less rigid and incorporate their operations within the overall goals and vision of the organization. This can be accomplished, for example, through the alignment of departmental operations with the strategic priorities of the municipality. With the application of these characteristics and the movement towards a post-bureaucratic model, local governments are attempting to improve services and reorganize operations to reflect changing circumstances.⁵ This improvement of services is facilitated through the monitoring the change initiatives of similar local government organizations in the improvement of services and emulating successful practices.

It is evident through past attempts by local governments to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of services that this cannot result from a review of services alone. The characteristics of the post-bureaucratic model must accompany the service review in

⁴ Kernaghan, Kenneth, Brian Marson and Sanford Borins. 2000. The New Public Organization. Toronto, ON: Institute of Public Administration of Canada

⁵ Ibid

order to provide the municipality with increased performance and decreased expenditures. Service delivery reviews, through their implementation, should adhere to the post-bureaucratic model by providing front-line staff with the opportunity to become empowered through participation in the improvement of services. This is achieved by implementing the process as a bottom-up initiative and obtaining buy-in from staff for the review's successful completion. Additionally, service delivery reviews can provide municipalities with a chance to support continuous improvement, joint problem-solving, support for employee skill and development as well as the facilitation of ongoing communication between stakeholders in a local government – including elected officials, administrators, staff, unions and citizens. This is achieved as citizens and staff are given the ability to participate through surveys, questionnaires, participation in service review teams and committees as well as adopting an attitude of continuous improvement. Finally, service delivery reviews have the capability to assist municipalities in making the important link between the strategic priorities of the municipality and the operational performance.

3.0 BACKGROUND

Ontario municipalities have combined expenditures of \$25 billion in Ontario's economy each year. These expenditures allow for a variety of services to be delivered to citizens including fire and police, roads and transit, sewer and water, health protection, recreation, social services and land use planning and development, which encompass the majority of services consumed on a daily basis. The number of services required to be delivered by local governments has increased since the late 1990's due to services downloaded from the provincial government. As well, operating costs, such as labour,

maintenance and repairs, of providing such services have risen dramatically over the past fifteen years as revenue sources have been decreasing. Additionally, citizens have placed increased demands on municipalities for better quality services, receiving more value for their tax dollar and improved information on which that spending is based. These factors have led to a worsening fiscal situation for Ontario municipalities today.

In January of 1997, the Government of Ontario took part in a Local Services Realignment in which pecuniary responsibility for twelve services previously shared with the provincial government, including social programs such as social welfare, social housing and child welfare services, were downloaded to municipalities. The Province gave municipalities responsibility for half of social welfare clients being serviced at the provincial level and integrated them with municipally serviced clients through the creation of the 'Ontario Works' program. The new program was to be administered completely at the municipal level, which was also expected to finance 20% of benefit costs and meet progressive program requirements outlined by the province, such as job placement and retention services.⁶ Municipalities were also expected to finance 20% of disability benefits administered by the province, finance 20% of and administer child welfare services and contribute half of administration costs for all three programs.⁷ Through the Local Services Realignment, approximately \$3 billion in services were exchanged.⁸ In order for municipalities to have the ability to finance the increased responsibility for the delivery and administration of these services, the Province assumed financial responsibility for half of the costs of education normally funded through

⁶ Rodney Haddow. 2002. "Municipal Social Security in Canada" in Urban Policy Issues: Canadian Perspectives 2nd ed., ed. Edmund P. Fowler and David Siegel. Toronto: Oxford University Press, pp. 99

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Burke, John. 2005. "Ontario's Municipal Performance Measurement Program: Fostering Innovation and Accountability in Local Government" in The Government Finance Review (June)

property tax; however municipalities still faced an increase in expenditures with no matching increase in revenues.

Traditionally, the Government of Ontario has had limited influence on how local governments deliver their services. More recently however, due to the changes to the structure and fiscal responsibilities of Ontario local governments, the Provincial government has played an increasing role in assisting municipalities to improve the services they deliver. One such method is through performance measurement. The Municipal Performance Measurement Program (MPMP) was introduced in 2000 and was designed to strengthen local accountability by informing citizens about municipal service plans, standards, and costs as well as aid in the improvement of municipal services.⁹ MPMP requires municipalities to report annually to the Province and citizens on fifty-four measures of efficiency and effectiveness in twelve service areas including fire, police, roadways and land use planning. A handbook produced by the Ontario government on MPMP states, “the goals for local governments, on behalf of taxpayers, should always be to provide the best and safest services at the most efficient cost, with clear accountability. One way to ensure these goals is through the use of performance measurement”.¹⁰ MPMP acknowledges that there are several ways for a municipality to improve aspects of the efficiency or effectiveness of the services they deliver. The first way is to increase the effectiveness of service delivery by increasing the per unit cost. Secondly, a municipality can increase effectiveness while maintaining or decreasing the per unit cost. Thirdly, a municipality can maintain the level of effectiveness while

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2003. Municipal Performance Measurement Program. Toronto: Queen’s Park Press. pp. 4

reducing the per unit cost or finally, a municipality can reduce per unit costs while reducing effectiveness. It recognizes that increasing effectiveness while maintaining or decreasing per unit costs is the most preferable method of performance measurement.

A key feature of performance measurement and improving services is the sharing of results. Municipalities are encouraged to share their results among each other in order to emulate successful practices and allow for the discussion of service levels among municipalities. The focus on the sharing of results has led to the creation of the Ontario Municipal CAO's Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI) and the Ontario Center for Municipal Best Practices (OCMBP). The OMBI was created in 2000 to identify noteworthy municipal practices. The purpose of the initiative was the "identification and development of appropriate service specific performance measures, to capture performance data, and analyze and benchmark results in order to identify best practices of service efficiency and quality in Ontario municipalities".¹¹ The OCMBP was created in 2002 and aims to seek out and promote the best practices in municipal service delivery employing MPMP data. The Centre was an initiative of the Government of Ontario and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario with a mandate to support the evolution of performance measurement for Ontario municipalities.¹²

The Provincial government has also encouraged local governments to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the services it delivers through the enactment of the new Municipal Act in 2001 which included added initiatives for municipalities to improve service delivery. Section 224 of the Act requires a council to:¹³

(a) develop and evaluate the policies and programs of the municipality

¹¹ www.ombi.ca

¹² <http://municipalbestpractices.ca>

¹³ Municipal Act, 2001. Sec. 224 (1)

(b) determine which discretionary services the municipality provides

As well, the new addition of Section 300 requires annual reporting by municipalities to the public of service improvements. Section 300 states:¹⁴

A municipality shall, at least once each calendar year, provide notice to the public of,

- (a) improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of services by the municipality and its local boards; and
- (b) barriers identified by the municipality and its local boards to achieving improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of services by them

Similar to performance measurement initiatives, Section 300 is meant to increase transparency and accountability at the local government level, allow the municipality to monitor performance as well as assist other municipalities in improving performance through the sharing of information.¹⁵

The traditional response by local governments to manage worsening fiscal situations has been to increase revenues through seeking increased funding, increasing user fees or increasing taxes. More recently, municipalities have experimented with numerous expenditure management processes to find more sustainable approaches to manage fiscal challenges and improve efficiency and effectiveness including a reduction of services, the utilization of reserves or cherry picking. One such expenditure management process is a review of services delivered by the municipality which can include the prioritization of services as well as improving the services the municipality chooses to deliver.

¹⁴ Municipal Act, 2001. Sec. 300 (1)

¹⁵ Government of Ontario. 2004. Reporting to the Public on Service Improvements and Barriers. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario

4.0 SERVICE DELIVERY REVIEW

A service delivery review can be defined as “an evaluation process in which a municipal service is systematically reviewed to determine the most appropriate way to provide it”.¹⁶ Service delivery reviews help to manage spending and improve services through the provision of improved customer service and by operating more efficiently through expenditure management and evaluating performance. Therefore, service delivery reviews assess a service delivered by the municipality, establish desired outcomes and determine the most efficient and effective way to deliver that service.

Due to the financial challenges facing local governments, Ontario municipalities were looking for information on the best practices for making informed and strategic choices about the services they deliver.¹⁷ In order to provide municipalities with such information as well as better management tools with which to operate, the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) had a series of discussions with municipalities that had completed a service delivery review and other expenditure management processes, such as Toronto, Ottawa, Kingston and Middlesex County. In these discussions, MMAH discovered that municipalities were spending resources such as time and money on the processes but were finding frustration, anxiety, confusion and false starts.¹⁸ Such poor results were attributed to a lack of understanding of how to approach the

¹⁶ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers. pp. 3

¹⁷ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. “Frequently Asked Questions” Retrieved from www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts_1_21543_1.htm

¹⁸ Clifford, Curry. 2006. “Working with Local Governments to Improve Municipal Services”. Presentation made to the Pakistan Delegation (June)

analysis, a lack of information of the current performance of the organization as well as trying to do too much in the process by reviewing a number of services at one time¹⁹ (See Appendix A – Problems in Implementation).

The Ministry found common characteristics among municipalities that were successful in their service delivery reviews. Natasha Bartlett, Senior Policy and Program Advisor for Municipal Service Delivery with Ontario’s Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing stated,

“(Successful municipalities) have an evaluative mindset where they always try to look for ways to make things better. They dig deep into how a service actually operates, and to talk the staff closest to the work, in order to unlock every possible opportunity for improvement. They also make sure they have good information on the full cost and quality of the service to help them make smart decisions and allow accurate comparisons to be made with other service providers”.²⁰

Additionally in these discussions, MMAH found that motivated and knowledgeable staff, strong leadership, a management system that supports and encourages change as well as a recognition of the strategic priorities of the municipality combined with a realistic view of the municipality’s current performance is essential in order to achieve reduced costs, increased service levels and improved labour relations.²¹

For example, when the County of Middlesex reviewed the road maintenance of the County highways, not only did the County experience a 23% decrease in

¹⁹ Interview with Curry Clifford, Manager, Municipal Service Delivery Unit, Municipal Performance and Accountability Branch, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, June 7, 2006

²⁰ Norman, Donald C. 2005. “Creating Alternatives – Taking a Creative Approach to Service Delivery” in Municipal Monitor (May/June). Para. 4

²¹ Clifford, Curry. 2005. “New Product Available to CAMA Members to Improve Municipal Services and Better Manage Spending” in The Bulletin (January)

expenditures on maintenance cost per kilometer in the first four years but labour-management relations improved and a “can-do” attitude developed among staff.²²

Most importantly, MMAH found that municipalities which focused on a specific service in their review and did research on what methods were being used in other jurisdictions were most successful. For example, the City of Ottawa completed a service delivery review in the Department of Transportation, Utilities and Public Works. Before undertaking the review process, the City conducted a facilitation process with internal and external resources. External consultants met with the Senior Management Team at the City of Ottawa on several occasions to establish the service delivery review process. Additionally, the City employed internal resources such as Labour Relations, Finance, Information Technology, Legal as well as the City Auditor.²³ As a result of their efforts, the City developed a public-private partnership for streetlight maintenance and a 20% savings was realized in the first year which was projected as a savings of \$5-7 million in 10 years.²⁴

Based on the discussions with municipalities on attempts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery, MMAH decided to publish a guide in order to provide Ontario municipalities with information on tools for conducting a successful service delivery review. In the development of the guide, MMAH held two forums for municipal administrators which focused on the process used in the City of Ottawa and the City of Kingston. In December of 2004, A Guide to Service

²² Clifford, Curry and Natasha Bartlett. 2004. “Service Delivery Reviews” in Public Sector Management (15)2. Toronto, ON: Institute of Public Administration of Canada

²³ City of Ottawa. 2003. Competitive Service Delivery Review Manual: Department of Transportation, Utilities and Public Works

²⁴ Ibid

Delivery Review for Municipal Managers was produced by MMAH through a partnership between the Ministry, the Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario, the Municipal Finance Officers' Association of Ontario and the Ontario Municipal Administrators' Association. The guide provides municipal managers with information on how to proceed through the six stages in conducting a review as well as the components that assist in making the review a success. These stages reflect the logical decision-making processes that a municipality goes through to complete the review and provides flexibility so the review can be conducted in any municipality across Ontario²⁵ (See Appendix B - Service Delivery Review Process).

When considering the completion of a service delivery review, MMAH outlines components which are key to a successful review process. First, the engagement of citizens and staff is essential to ensure that the review helps to meet the goals and values of stakeholders. As well, the direction of the service review should be aligned with the strategic plan and priorities of the municipality. Finally, when reviewing services that the municipality delivers, it is important to consider the following questions:²⁶

1. Do we really need to continue to be in this business/service?
2. What do citizens expect of the service and what outcome does council want for the service?
3. How does current performance compare to expected performance?
4. Do the activities logically lead to the expected outcome?

²⁵ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. "Frequently Asked Questions" Retrieved from www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts_1_21543_1.htm

²⁶ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers. pp. 1

5. How is demand for the service being managed?
6. What are the full costs and benefits of the service?
7. How can benefits and outputs of the service be increased?
8. How can the number and cost of inputs be decreased?
9. What are the alternative ways of delivering the service?
10. How can a service change best be implemented and communicated?

The first stage of a service delivery review involves preparing for the review process including setting the framework and formal policy. In this stage, it is important for a municipality to address what is to be achieved in the service delivery review, who is to be held accountable for the ensuring the implementation of the review and what resources will be utilized in the review process.²⁷ Similar to MPMP, a service delivery review is meant to provide open and transparent communication with citizens and a process for this should also be formalized before the onset of the review. The first stage requires a municipality to select the services which will be reviewed. The techniques outlined in the service delivery review guide can be applied to an individual service or to a core services approach, however as demonstrated through MMAH's consultation process for the development of the guide, a service delivery review that focuses on a single service is most effective. In selecting services to be reviewed, MMAH suggests selecting services in which sub-optimal performance by the municipality will be least tolerated by citizens.²⁸ A public interest test can also be conducted by the municipality in order to determine which services should be reviewed. In this, the

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ Ibid

question of, “should the municipality continue to provide this service, and if so, what need or purpose does it fulfill” are addressed to determine how best to focus the municipality’s limited financial resources.²⁹

In determining the review approach and selected services, it is important for the municipality to align these initiatives with the strategic plan and priorities of the municipality to ensure that the outcome is beneficial to the municipality as a whole. As well, the municipality must determine whether or not the review will be conducted in-house or will be performed by an external contractor. If the municipality feels that it is important for the review to be conducted in-house, the availability of resources, including staff expertise and availability must be assessed. Additionally with an internal review, the guide recommends the establishment of a review committee to oversee the review process. If the municipality chooses to conduct the review by contracting the services due to lack of resources or objectivity concerns, both costs and procurement policies must be considered. The guide notes that successful reviews often result when someone who is familiar with the operations of the municipality is leading the review. However, it is noted that the success of the review can be assisted by someone external to the organization that can provide new approaches to the operations and can serve as an “honest broker”.³⁰

The second stage of the service delivery review involves the development of performance measures and asking the question, “What level of performance do we expect

²⁹ Ibid. pp 12

³⁰ Ibid. pp 14

from this service”.³¹ The development of performance measures is a three-step process in which the purpose of the service is defined, the desired outcomes are determined and the performance measures are selected. Defining the purpose of a service involves answering the questions of what is the service, who are the intended customers and why is the service needed. The establishment of outcomes is based on the desired effectiveness of services based on the satisfaction of citizens in using that service and finally, the development of performance measures should be based on the expectations of citizens towards that service. The guide makes reference to the SMART model in the development of performance measures which ensures that performance measures are smart, measurable, achievable, realistic and timed.

The third stage in the process involves understanding and evaluating the current performance of the municipality for services that are delivered to citizens.³² This involves the use of various evaluation tools in order to gather information to keep stakeholders informed with sufficient and accurate information. The first step is to determine how the current performance of the municipality compares to the established targets. This can be determined through existing measures such as MPMP data or through citizen surveys. The second step is the creation of a program logic model in order to determine if current outputs of a service are resulting in the desired outcomes (See Appendix C – Service Delivery Review Program Logic Model). This involves establishing what resources are going into the service and what those resources are meant to achieve, the process followed to achieve the desired results and what the outcome of

³¹ Ibid

³² Ibid

those processes are. Through a program logic model, methods to improving services are easier to identify.³³

The third step involves assessing the demand for the service and the level of service that is being delivered. As the demand for municipal services is continually on the rise, demand management must be utilized in order to maximize the resources of the municipality. Fourth, a cost-benefit analysis of the program should be undertaken to determine the costs and benefits of delivering the service at a certain level and assessing the risk of altering that level of services. The guide provides a tool for municipalities wanting to determine the present value of resources. Finally, an efficiency review should be performed which correlates the inputs and outputs of a service. This will also assist the municipality in obtaining a clear picture of the service to better determine efficiencies. These tools require those involved in the service delivery review to embrace an evaluative mindset.

The fourth stage of the service delivery review process involves assessing how to improve the performance of the current service delivery system. Two options are available to municipalities which include improving internal operations or considering an alternative service delivery method.³⁴ When improving the delivery of the service internally, the guide recommends using the program logic model discussed in the previous chapter to identify improvements on a step by step basis. To complete this, the municipality would illustrate the established outcomes previously determined on the top of the diagram and would illustrate the current performance of the municipality on the bottom of the diagram. Falling between the two illustrations would be the steps required

³³ Ibid

³⁴ Ibid

to move from the current state to the desired state. For this, the municipality needs to address three questions including:³⁵

- Are all the outputs necessary
- How are you managing the demand for your service?
- What have you learned from your cost-benefit analysis and efficiency analysis?

Many methods could be used to perform these steps including the management of labour costs, eliminating duplication, creating economies of scale through the sharing of services with surrounding municipalities and making the best use of new technology.³⁶ While making improvements to the service is important, the guide reminds municipalities to consider the costs of implementing the changes.³⁷

Alternative service delivery can be defined as, “the process of public sector restructuring that improves the delivery of services to citizens by sharing municipal functions with individuals, community groups, the private sector or other government agencies”.³⁸ Considering alternative methods for service delivery may include public-private partnerships, licensing, privatization or contracting out. The various options for alternative service delivery and their applicability to certain services is demonstrated in Appendix D. Numerous examples of the success of such a program have been documented by OMBI and OCMBP; however the Ontario government recommends that municipalities consider the costs of such a decision. For municipalities which choose alternative methods for service delivery, Curry Clifford, Manager of the Municipal

³⁵ Ibid. pp 37-39

³⁶ Ibid. pp 37

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ City of Winnipeg. 1999. “Policy and Framework for Alternative Service Delivery in the City of Winnipeg” as cited in Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers

Service Delivery Unit at the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing states that strong management skills are essential, which means “administering a contract to achieve the performance and results wanted, setting clear goals and targets, defining the scope, identifying risks and contingencies, providing appropriate incentives and more than anything, managing the relationship”.³⁹ The availability of such skills should be considered before the decision to provide services externally.

The fifth stage in the service delivery review process involves selecting a service provider if the municipality decides to provide the service out of house. This involves the circulation of solicitation documents, the evaluation of bids and proposals and the negotiation of a contract. Procurement policies should already be in place within the municipality to guide the process. The sixth and final stage of the service delivery review process involves the implementation of the review decisions, the monitoring and evaluation of those decisions and reporting on the results. The guide notes key components for the successful implementation of results. These include ensuring that the implementation has adequate resources, that an action plan is in place to guide the process and that strong leadership is guiding the implementation. Also important to consider in the implementation of review recommendations is the communication of change initiatives to staff and citizens as a main source of apprehension is due to the lack of information.⁴⁰

³⁹ Clifford, Curry. 2005. “Improving Municipal Services” in Municipal World (December). pp 18

⁴⁰ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers

1.0 CITY OF BARRIE

Background

The City of Barrie is located in Central Ontario on the outer ring of the Greater Golden Horseshoe area and has been labelled one of the fastest growing municipalities in Canada. With a population of approximately 125,000, Barrie's annual growth rate is projected at 5,000 people per year, growing 25% in 12 years, and has been identified as an Urban Growth Centre by the Ontario Ministry of Public Infrastructure and Renewal.⁴¹ Additionally, the City is experiencing significant growth in its industrial sector with continued expansion in the telecommunications, health and medical fields accompanying steady representation of plastics, retail and automotive sectors. The City has been searching for methods to manage the growth occurring in the City as well as address the increasing budget.

In the municipal elections of 2003, the City experienced a large turnover of political staff including six new City Councillors in a council of eleven, in addition to a new mayor. Along with the new political leadership came an attitude of renewal and change.⁴² In this was the belief that there was too much waste occurring in the municipality and it was time to become more fiscally responsible for the services the City delivers. In the Corporate Business Plan for 2004-2006, one of Council's Top Ten Strategic Priorities was to, "develop a comprehensive long-term financial management plan and manage finances proactively".⁴³ Through this initiative came the decision by

⁴¹ TkMC. 2005. Value for Service Delivery Review. Retrieved from http://www.city.barrie.on.ca/WCMAdmin/Images/wwwcitybarrieonca/PDF_Files/VSDR%20Final%20Report.pdf

⁴² Interview with Steve Trotter, City Councillor, City of Barrie, July 8, 2006

⁴³ City of Barrie. 2004. Corporate Business Plan: Top Ten Priorities for 2004-2006. Retrieved from http://www.city.barrie.on.ca/WCMAdmin/Images/wwwcitybarrieonca/PDF_Files/Corporate%20Business%20Plan%20September%202005%20Update.pdf

City Administration to “evaluate the businesses it is in, and ensure that the services and activities which the City is engaged in are critical, essential, or strategic to the social, economic and physical well-being of the community”.⁴⁴ The City committed to the performance of an efficiency audit which progressed into what is now known as a Value for Service Delivery Review.

Service Delivery Review Process

With approval from City Council to proceed with a review of the services, the City of Barrie looked to develop an approach with which to conduct the review. The City looked at other municipalities which had conducted a service review, particularly the City of Markham, to draw on their experience in preparing for the review process, as well as referenced the document published by Ontario government, A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers.⁴⁵ Additionally, the City had discussions with external consultants, TkMC, who were ultimately hired to perform their service delivery review in December of 2004. TkMC had performed similar efficiency audits in the City of Markham as well as the City of Ottawa based on methodology developed by the company for a core services review. In discussions with TkMC regarding the approach to the review process, the City shaped the methodology in order to address the specific concerns of the municipality.

In preparing TkMC for the service review, the City of Barrie established goals and principles to guide the process. The goals and priorities of the service review include:⁴⁶

- Validating program and deliverables

⁴⁴ TkMC. 2006. Value for Service Delivery Review.

⁴⁵ Interview with Rebecca James-Reid, Manager of Strategic Services, July 4, 2006

⁴⁶ Ibid. pp 6

- Validating work processes
- Being more accountable to citizens
- Linking to corporate strategic priorities to the extent that they are articulated
- Benchmarking against peer organizations
- Positioning for future innovation

Additionally, the process would be based on the following principles:⁴⁷

- Guiding and building management competencies
- Forward-looking and strategic
- Quantitative and qualitative review of the services and business practices that currently exist today, providing a report card of where the City stands with respect to service delivery and relative to peer municipalities

As the review would be conducted by an external service provider, the City found the statement of the goals, priorities and principles to be critical as they acted a reference point for the performance of the service review.⁴⁸

The review, as proposed by TkMC, would entail two phases. In Phase One, an internal audit would be performed by TkMC which would indicate how well the municipality is performing and allow for the identification of areas, services, and business processes that would benefit from further analysis. Such analysis of those processes would take place in Phase Two of the service review. Additionally, the City developed a Steering Committee comprised of Commissioners from each of the departments which would oversee the service delivery review process.

The first stage in Phase One involved the creation of a Project Charter which established an understanding of what was to be accomplished through the process, project

⁴⁷ Ibid. pp 6

⁴⁸ Ibid

activities, time frames and review points⁴⁹ (see Appendix E – City of Barrie Phase One Workplan). An initial meeting was held with TkMC and the Steering Committee which allowed for the confirmation of the reporting structure and Project Charter, the establishment of a protocol for the preliminary review of findings and problem resolution as well as the identification of key contacts within the municipality used for the retrieval of documents and arranging of interviews.⁵⁰ Additionally in Phase One, TkMC conducted a review of background material from the municipality including business plans, organizational charts, operating and capital budgets as well as workplace policies.

The second stage in Phase One consisted of information gathering which included 38 interviews with Council members, senior management, labour representatives, staff, and external stakeholders, as well as staff surveys, middle management focus groups, and a document review including MPMP data. The interviews and surveys focused on specific issues around the areas of organization and structure, policies and strategies and planning and decision-making in order to establish a focal point for TkMC for program analysis.⁵¹ The staff survey was distributed in electronic format to all full-time employees with a paper format available to those who could not provide electronic feedback (see Appendix F – City of Barrie Staff Survey). The survey received a response rate of 51% and served as an important opportunity for front-line staff to become involved in the service review process. The City of Barrie saw the inclusion of front-line staff as serving three main purposes:⁵²

1. Due to interaction with the public, front-line staff members are acutely aware of issues as perceived by the public

⁴⁹ Ibid

⁵⁰ Ibid

⁵¹ Ibid

⁵² Ibid. pp 15

2. Staff are aware of the details of work activity which, through their input, provides higher detail and greater accuracy
3. Front-line staff involvement provides greater validity as well as a greater sense of engagement in the service review process. The success of the Value for Service Delivery Review process will result in greater responsiveness to future improvement initiatives

For the focus groups, 45 employees participated which allowed for structured dialogue meant to provide TkMC with operational level insight into the services and operations undertaken by the City of Barrie.⁵³ Finally, MPMP data was used to benchmark the performance of the City of Barrie with comparator municipalities based on population size and tier characteristics. The comparator municipalities included the cities of Guelph, Cambridge, St. Catharines, Oshawa, Burlington, Vaughan and the towns of Richmond Hill, Oakville, Newmarket, Whitby and Pickering. The third stage in Phase One allowed TkMC to review and analyze the gathered information using qualitative and quantitative techniques as well as benchmarking methodologies to indicate common themes and develop summary findings on those services and programs which may be subject to further review. This included the benchmarking of mandatory services, the alignment of tasks and activities to the human resources utilized by the City as well as an assessment of City processes.⁵⁴ The fourth and final stage in Phase One was report development in which the final report was drafted.

In May of 2005, TkMC delivered their Phase One report to City Council. In the report, it was indicated that the services provided by the City of Barrie were provided at a relatively low overall cost, however, due to the commitment of the City to continuous improvement there were still areas in which the City could develop ways to provide

⁵³ Ibid

⁵⁴ Ibid

services better.⁵⁵ Ten recommendations were made to City Council in order to improve the current performance of service delivery. The ten recommendations include:⁵⁶

1. Optimize service delivery in the Community Services Division
2. Develop a change management strategy
3. Review the recommendations and develop a detailed implementation plan
4. Develop a citizen participation strategy
5. Develop governance development workshops for Council and Administration
6. Develop a customer relationship management plan
7. Develop a performance measurement system for all services built on an activity-based costing/accounting system
8. Undertake business process improvements
9. Develop a management training program
10. Develop a Project Management Office to define and manage the overall change initiative arising out of the Value for Service Delivery Review

With the presentation of the Phase One report to City Council, Council directed City Administration to begin immediate implementation of these recommendations.⁵⁷

Phase Two of the Value for Service Delivery Review would involve a review of the identified programs and services examining opportunities for improvement in organizational design, technology, partnering and alternative service delivery, efficiency and corporate process improvement. The City of Barrie focused on the first two recommendations made by TkMC in their Phase One report including a detailed analysis of the Community Services Department, which encompassed 80% of the municipality's

⁵⁵ Ibid

⁵⁶ Ibid

⁵⁷ City of Barrie. 2006. Value for Service Delivery Review Implementation. Presentation made to Staff (March)

resources and staff, as well as the development of a Change Management Strategy. In March of 2006, the City of Barrie presented to staff the implementation plan for the Phase Two of the Value for Service Delivery Review. In this meeting, the change initiatives that would be occurring within the municipality, specifically within the Community Services Department, were presented and the inefficiencies of the previous system were identified. Within this meeting, the City recognized that in correlation with the Value for Service Delivery Review, 30 new positions were created within the organization which presents new opportunities for the corporation and for staff.⁵⁸

Service Delivery Review Current Status

While in the early stages of implementation, the City of Barrie is beginning to see the impacts of the service delivery review on the organization. Throughout the process, the City has addressed the need for succession planning and a change in culture has been occurring as leadership change takes place.⁵⁹ Senior management is anticipating a dramatic cultural shift to occur within the municipality with the completion of the service review process.⁶⁰ It is projected that the Value for Service Delivery Review Phase Two implementation will be completed in 2008-2009, however, the attempt to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of services delivered by the City of Barrie is expected to spread throughout the organization. Recently, with the recommendation from City Hall, Barrie Police Services have committed to the performance of a service delivery review and are currently engaging consultants to conduct the review.

⁵⁸ Ibid. Slide 9

⁵⁹ Interview with Steve Trotter, City Councillor, July 8, 2006

⁶⁰ Interview with Rebecca James-Reid, Manager of Strategic Services, July 4, 2006

6.0 CITY OF BRANTFORD

Background

The City of Brantford is located in the southwestern area of the Golden Horseshoe and is widely known as the first site of settlement in Canada. With a population of 90,000, the City has been experiencing an increasing rate of development for both residential and commercial properties. Similar to the majority of Ontario municipalities, the City of Brantford has been experiencing a need to develop long-term solutions to manage fiscal challenges due to increasing operating costs and downloaded services. In the past three years, the citizens of Brantford have experienced large tax increases and both City Councillors and Administrators were looking for a way to prevent such tax increases from continuing.

In January of 2005, the City of Brantford City Council passed the following motion,

“That the CAO be directed to establish a service review process to provide for the ongoing evaluation of City services. Within the context of the annual budget preparation cycle, the CAO shall identify options for service delivery adjustments taking into account cost efficiencies, community needs and community impact”.⁶¹

The review of services would allow for the ongoing evaluation of City services, provide a long-term, sustainable solution to budget challenges as well as to fulfill the strategic priority of being fiscally responsible and ensuring efficient and effective governance. More specifically, the review would allow the City to examine the reason why it delivers

⁶¹ City of Brantford. 2005. Communication Plan. Retrieved from <http://www.city.brantford.on.ca/content/publishing.nsf/Content/Corporate+Service+Review>

specific services, how those services are delivered and whether or not the City should continue delivering those services.⁶²

In order to develop an approach by which to proceed with the review of services, the City consulted with the municipalities of Markham, Mississauga and Kingston who had previous experience with service delivery reviews. From these municipalities the City obtained information on the approach each municipality took in conducting the review, their experiences as well as the outcomes achieved.⁶³ Additionally, the City referred to the document, A Guide to Service Delivery Reviews for Municipal Managers published by the Government of Ontario which provided a valuable source to establishing the service delivery approach. The City believed that it was important to conduct the service review in-house as opposed to hiring external consultants as it would create ownership among staff involved in the process and management believed staff would be more honest with those who had knowledge of the processes. As well, the Senior Management Team felt confident that those participating in the review process had the necessary expertise of the operations of the municipality to successfully conduct the review. Finally, conducting the review in-house would assist in lowering the costs of the review process.⁶⁴

⁶² Ibid

⁶³ City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-001. (March)

⁶⁴ Interviews with Ronald Kaufmann, City Treasurer, Director of Finance and Gregory Dworak, Manager of Corporate Policy and Management Practices, July 18, 2006

Service Delivery Review Process

In April of 2005, the City Council adopted a ‘Made for Brantford’ approach for conducting the service delivery review. The service review would entail three stages which focused on the following questions:⁶⁵

- **Stage One:** What discretionary services should the City be providing?
- **Stage Two:** Of those discretionary services that the City is to provide, how should they be provided in the most efficient and effective way?
- **Stage Three:** Of the mandatory services that the City provides, how should they be provided in the most efficient and effective way?

In each of the three stages, work phases were established for the successful completion of the process.⁶⁶ In Stage One, the first phase involved establishing the purpose and principles of the service review, the development of the service review process which included the development of a Services Review Team as well as the methodology to be employed throughout each stage. The purpose of the service review as defined by Council was, “to establish a process to review all City services to ensure that the services provided by the City are undertaken in the most efficient and effective way to best meet the needs of the community”.⁶⁷ Additionally, the review would be based on the principles of openness, transparency, inclusion and accessibility in order to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to participate as well as stay informed on the purpose, progress and outcomes of the process.⁶⁸

It was anticipated that with the establishment of the Services Review Team, the development of the process and tools for data collection, the coordination of

⁶⁵ City of Brantford. 2006. Report No. CM 2006-024. (June)

⁶⁶ Ibid

⁶⁷ City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-001. (March). pp 5

⁶⁸ City of Brantford. 2006. Report No. CM 2006-024. (June)

communication with staff, the implementation of the communication plan and the proposal of the final recommendations to the City Council would take place.⁶⁹ As well, the Services Review Team would be responsible for overseeing the review process and was comprised of representatives from each Commission including the Chief Administrative Officer, two representatives from the Corporate Services Commission, a representative of the Social Services Commission as well as the Community Development Commission and three representatives from Engineering, Public Works, Parks & Recreation. With the establishment of the Services Review Team, a Communication Plan was developed for staff and the public which would keep both stakeholder groups informed on the current status of the process as well as provide continuous opportunity for input from both groups.⁷⁰

In Phase Two of the establishment of the service review process, the 189 services delivered by the City were identified and categorized into six categories including services the City is mandated to provide by the senior levels of government (Category 1), services which provide a core function to all organizations (Category 2), services which provide a core function to the municipality (Category 3), services which are highly desirable (Category 4) and those services which the City is not required to deliver (Category 5). Originally, the City had established six categories; however, as no services fell into Category 6, services which provided little or no benefit to the municipality, the category was removed from the process. A total of 88 services fell into Category 4 and 5 which make up the discretionary range of the continuum.⁷¹ In the third phase of Stage One, the Services Review Team gathered information on the 30 services which fell into

⁶⁹ City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-001. (March)

⁷⁰ City of Brantford. 2005. Communication Plan.

⁷¹ City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-005. (June). pp 4

Category 5 and they were prioritized through the use of a mathematical model employing the following criteria:⁷²

- **Financial Impact** – services with a large financial impact would receive a higher ranking
- **Impact on the Public** – services with a limited public impact or impact on a target group of clients would receive a higher ranking
- **External Services** – services which can be, or are, delivered outside of the municipality would receive a higher ranking
- **Relationship of the Service to the City’s Community Strategic Plan** – services with more relevance to the Strategic Plan would be given a higher ranking

The Director or Manager responsible for each of the 30 services in Category 5 completed a questionnaire based on the four criteria which served as the basis of the mathematical model (see Appendix G– City of Brantford Corporate Service Questionnaire). The responses were weighted as follows⁷³:

1. Degree of Financial Impact – 35%
2. Degree of Public Impact, if the Service is Discontinued – 20%
3. Degree that the Service could be Provided Externally – 10%
4. Degree of Relationship to the Strategic Plan – 35%

Through an analysis of this information, four services were identified which would proceed into Phase Four of the first stage including the Brantford Airport, the Farmers’ Market and the Arrowdale and Northridge Golf Courses.

In Phase Four, the four identified services would proceed through a consultation process. As identified by the City of Brantford, “a consultation process is a means of obtaining comments, opinions and/or views related to an issue from a specific group or

⁷² City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-001. (March). pp 6-7

⁷³ City of Brantford. 2006. Report No. CA 2006-002. (January). pp 4

the general public”.⁷⁴ The Services Review Team’s consultation process incorporated two main elements; information and structure.⁷⁵ Information ensured that those participating in the consultation process were provided with sufficient, accurate and comprehensible information in order to provide informed and beneficial comments, opinions and views regarding the four Category 5 services. This included the creation of a Background Information Report Template which provided participants in the consultation process with information on the following (see Appendix H– City of Brantford Background Information Report Template):⁷⁶

1. Introduction outlining the Corporate Service Review Initiative
2. History of the Service
3. Governance of the Service
4. Operational Details of the Service
5. Funding Sources for the Service
6. Benefits of the Service
7. Trends and Challenges Related to the Service
8. Asset Value of the Service
9. Impacts of Discontinuing the Service
10. Opportunities of Discontinuing the Service
11. Service Delivery Options

Background Information Reports were made accessible to the public in paper format at City Hall as well as electronic copies on the City website.

⁷⁴ City of Brantford. 2006. Report No. CM 2006-024. (June). pp 3

⁷⁵ Ibid. pp 3

⁷⁶ Ibid. pp 4

The structure of the consultation process made certain that the process was fair in that all groups wanting to participate had the ability to do so. Two consultation methods were employed by the City in order to ensure public input was balanced and City Council was not unduly influenced by groups in the community possessing a majority of resources. This decision was based on the following statement made in, A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers:

“Since the municipality exists primarily to satisfy citizens’ needs, critical areas of the review process will be informed by the views, preferences and expectations of citizens. Council needs to balance those opinions carefully, since the most vocal positions may not accurately reflect the views of council’s constituency”⁷⁷

The first consultation method to be utilized by the Services Review Team was a public meeting. A public meeting was chosen as it is “the primary venue for user groups to provide their input” as noted by Provincial methodology.⁷⁸ Three separate public meetings would be held to gain input on the services under review. The second consultation method involved a telephone survey as a means of obtaining input from the broader community. This method was selected as there is no risk of multiple submissions and provides a neutral approach to the consultation process.⁷⁹ Additionally, the telephone survey would allow for the municipality to evaluate how well the City is communicating information regarding the service delivery review to citizens.⁸⁰ A private research firm was contracted by the City to develop and administer the telephone survey as well as submit a report on the data to the Services Review Team. The survey would obtain input

⁷⁷ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers. pp 18

⁷⁸ City of Brantford. 2006. Report No. CM 2006-024. (June)

⁷⁹ Interview with Gregory Dworak, Manager of Corporate Policy and Management Practices, July 18, 2006

⁸⁰ Interview with Richard Carpenter, City Councillor, July 18, 2006

from 382 of 69,215 citizens over the age of 15 and would take two to three weeks to complete.

Beyond the consultation process, various activities were provided to stakeholder groups to participate in the service review process including:⁸¹

- Staff Information Sessions – hosted by the Commissions for their staff
- Departmental/Divisional Meetings – scheduled regularly
- Staff Updates – posted on the City of Brantford intranet, distributed through newsletters or payroll inserts
- Website – updated regularly
- Stakeholder Information Sessions – arranged for key stakeholders
- Council Meetings – through presentations and delegations

Service Delivery Review Current Status

In September of 2006, the City of Brantford will present its assessment of the Brantford Airport, the Farmers' Market and the Arrowdale and Northridge Golf Courses to City Council. The assessment will be based on the information collected in the fourth phase of the service review process. Those on the Services Review Team will recommend to Council whether the City should still be in the business of providing the service and if so, what improvements can be made to provide that service better. While the first phase of the service review focused on non-mandatory services delivered by the City, the City has plans to continue the review over the next several years until all services have been assessed. As such, the service review has been established by the City as an ongoing process which has been integrated into the City's annual operating and

⁸¹ City of Brantford. 2005. Communication Plan.

capital budgets.⁸² Additionally, the City of Brantford has used the beginning stages of the service delivery review process as the starting point for the establishment of a long-term strategic management approach to review its current status as a service provider to city stakeholders and manage the City's budget challenges.⁸³

Since beginning the review process, municipal administrators within the city have noted a cultural change that has occurred towards a more corporate environment, which the service delivery review has contributed to.⁸⁴ This shift has been attributed to the ideologies brought in with a new Chief Administrative Officer in recent years. The corporate ideology allows municipal initiatives to be seen as influencing the entire organization as opposed to departmental initiatives which impact merely the departmental culture. The corporate culture was noted by the municipal administrators as being a key feature of the service delivery review as it allows the process to be more objective and further the strategic priorities of the municipality by keeping the whole organization in mind.

7.0 UNITED COUNTIES OF LEEDS & GRENVILLE

Background

The United Counties of Leeds & Grenville (UCLG) serves as the upper tier municipality for ten member municipalities including the Villages of Westport, Merrickville-Wolford, the Townships of Rideau Lakes, Leeds & the Thousand Islands, Athens, Front of Yonge, Elizabethtown-Kitley, Augusta and Edwardsburgh/Cardinal as well as the Municipality of Grenville. Additionally, the County provides joint services to

⁸² City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-001. (March)

⁸³ Ibid

⁸⁴ Interviews with Ronald Kaufmann, City Treasurer, Director of Finance and Gregory Dworak, Manager of Corporate Policy and Management Practices, July 18, 2006

three separated municipalities. Covering a service area of 3,550 square kilometers, UCLG serves a population of 97,000. Due to its vast coverage, UCLG was drastically affected by the Local Services Realignment which occurred in the late 1990s. As a result of the Local Service Realignment, the expenditures of the County increased from \$20.4 million in 1997 to \$61.7 million in 2005 and the number of employees increased from 105 to 360.⁸⁵ With the 2005 budget process, the County discovered escalating costs of services on the property tax base. As a result, Council passed a resolution requiring county administration to review each line of the budget which led administrators in the direction of a service delivery review.

Service Delivery Review Process

With the decision to conduct a service delivery review, the County referred to the guide published by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing as well as did research on other municipalities that had completed a service delivery review. Resulting from this research, the County first established the approach to guide the service delivery review process. In the decision to conduct the service delivery review in-house or hire an external consultant to complete the process, UCLG opted to perform the review in-house with the option to contract external expertise on any particular piece of service. The decision to conduct the review in-house was based on the commitment of staff and Council to complete the review, the good working relationship between County administrators and Council, the presence of a strong management team as well as the acceptance of the review as a long-term process that would become part of the organizational culture. With this decision, the County accepted the fact that results

⁸⁵ Fournier, Stephen J. 2006. Service Delivery Review and Improvements: the Leeds and Grenville Experience. Presentation made to the Town of Ajax (March). Slide 5

would take longer to produce.⁸⁶ In the development of the process, the County conducted research by examining the approach used by other municipalities in the completion of a service delivery review. With this information, the Council took the following steps:⁸⁷

1. Establishment of the principles that will guide the approach
2. Establishment of the purpose of the review
3. Determination of the stages and phasing of the review
4. Development of the review structure
5. Establishment of the roles and responsibilities for those involved
6. Prioritization of services for review
7. The adoption of a work plan with key dates and expected accomplishments

With the stages for the completion of the review agreed upon, the County established a Service Review Committee. The Committee would be comprised of all members of the Governance and Finance Committee as well as the Joint Services Committee and would be responsible for overseeing the process and reviewing each operation of the municipality for efficiency, effectiveness, usefulness and sustainability.⁸⁸ Similar to the approach used by the City of Brantford, the United Counties of Leeds & Grenville began the process by categorizing the services ranging from mandatory to discretionary. Categories 1 and 2 included those services which the municipality was legislated to perform or fund. Categories 3 and 4 represented the services which provided a core function to an organization or municipality. Category 5 services were

⁸⁶ Ibid

⁸⁷ Ibid. Slide 14

⁸⁸ United Counties of Leeds & Grenville. 2005. Public Notices Page. Retrieved from <http://www.uclg.ca/en/publicnotes/index.asp>

determined to be those which were highly desirable to be provided by the municipality whereas Category 6 services were those that the municipality deemed to be nice to provide to citizens. Finally, Category 7 represented the services that provided the municipality and its citizens with little or no value.⁸⁹

Following the categorization of the services delivered by the County, the Services Review Committee identified services which will be reviewed first. Each of these identified services were reviewed using a standard review template based on the following principles:⁹⁰

- Principle 1 – Full costs for each service category must be generated using the Current budget and account structure for consistency and tracking Purposes
- Principle 2 – Full costs should be bundled into broad functional categories that Can be further broken down into line item accounts that make up the Service, as required through the review
- Principle 3 – Each service category will be defined in terms of,
 - Purpose statement
 - Performance standards
 - Success measures
- Principle 4 – A set of reliable comparators will be applied for comparison Purposes using appropriate unit cost measurements selected for each Service
 - The establishment of protocols for comparison

In reviewing the identified services, a staff consultation plan was developed which was comprised of multiple staff information sessions that provided staff with an overview of the service delivery review process, information on what the review was attempting to achieve, the current status of the review as well as information on the processes and

⁸⁹ Fournier, Stephen J. 2006. Service Delivery Review and Improvements: the Leeds and Grenville Experience. Slide 19-21

⁹⁰ Ibid. Slide 22-26

timelines involved. Additionally, within each division, staff were asked to address the following questions:⁹¹

- What do we do well?
- What can we do better?
- Are there things that we can do better without increasing costs?
- What should we stop doing or change?
- Are there efficiencies that we have overlooked or should put in place?

Once the first draft has been established, a public consultation plan will be put in place in order to receive feedback on services which directly affect them.

The review of identified services will be conducted in two phases. The first phase will involve a review of services which have the greatest financial impact on the municipality and which have the greatest opportunity to discover efficiencies. The second phase will involve a review of services that have lesser financial consequences on the municipality. As stated by the Chief Administrative Officer of the United Counties of Leeds & Grenville, Stephen Fournier, the decision to conduct the review in two phases was done as the, “basket of highly discretionary services is quite small and the impact on the levy is marginal, the most productive and effective approach is to focus on those services where cost-savings or improvements can be achieved”.⁹²

Service Delivery Review Current Status

The United Counties of Leeds & Grenville are currently in their final stages of collecting feedback and input from staff which is expected to be assembled in September,

⁹¹ Interview with Stephen Fournier, Chief Administrative Officer, July 28, 2006

⁹² United Counties of Leeds & Grenville. 2005. Public Notices Page. Retrieved from <http://www.uclg.ca/en/publicnotes/index.asp>

2006. Following that, divisional reports will be drafted resulting from the completion of the six stages of the review process decided upon by the County. Resulting from the County conducting a review, the quest for the continuous improvement of services has become engrained into the culture of the organization. The review is expected to become part of the annual budgetary cycle accompanying the continuous learning and education that has also resulted from the process.

8.0 FINDINGS

As demonstrated, municipalities across Ontario are using a variety of techniques to review services they deliver to citizens. Based on the need to conduct a service delivery review, the municipality may choose to conduct the review in-house or hire external consultants. Of the three municipalities examined in this research report, one of the municipality's opted to conduct the review entirely in-house, one chose to hire an external consultant while the third municipality performed the review in-house with plans to contract out areas requiring special expertise. Additionally, the approach taken to select which services to review varied among the municipalities from the categorization of all services delivered by the municipality to focusing strictly on services which required immediate review. As well, the role of both staff and citizens varied among the different approaches taken ranging from staff surveys and information meetings to public consultation techniques.

In the completion of the service review, municipalities have identified critical components to the service delivery review process. One such component is the commitment of council. The support and commitment of council for the process was identified by municipal administrators interviewed for this research report as being

significant due to the resources required to be invested into the completion of the process. Additionally, as council is responsible for making the final decision on recommendations, support of the process was presented as critical which can also present a challenge to the municipality which will be addressed in the following paragraphs. All three of the local government organizations studied in this research report recognized council members as champions of the service delivery review.

Another critical component of a service delivery review is the installment of the concepts of innovation and continuous improvement within the organization. In this lies the understanding that municipalities must continually look for ways to improve the services they deliver by examining internal processes as well as looking to other municipalities to discover what processes are being utilized in similar jurisdictions. Municipalities must also provide a structure in which the review process is continuous. With these initiatives, staff empowerment is permitted to develop as staff are provided with the forum and support to seek improvements out in the work they do on a daily basis and allow for efficiencies to be realized.

Some challenges were also noted by municipalities when completing the service delivery review. One such challenge is the application and implementation of the review findings. Completing the review process is not as important as the actions that result, however, due to the political environment of a local government organization, the decision of what to do with the findings can be a task in its own regard. The recommendations resulting from the service review may be difficult to pass through council as the discontinuance or reduction of a service delivered by the municipality may

have unwanted political consequences for council members representing the interests of their constituents. This could, in turn, affect the overall effectiveness of the review.

Municipalities must also be prepared to address the apprehension of staff regarding the review. As stated by Stephen Fournier, Chief Administrative Officer for the United Counties of Leeds & Grenville, regarding the review process, “you will have champions, you will have doubters and you will have others who watch to see what happens”.⁹³ In the interviews conducted for this research report, the importance of addressing the concerns of staff in the early stages of the process was emphasized. For example, in the City of Barrie, meetings were held for staff in the beginning stages of the Value for Service Delivery Review process in which staff were encouraged by Senior Management to ask questions and participate in the surveys. As well, union stewards working at the municipality were assured that jobs were not going to be lost in the review process.⁹⁴ Additionally, in the City of Brantford, staff members were assured that if positions were to be cut in order to increase the efficiency of the municipality, employment would be secured by finding positions in other areas or through attrition.⁹⁵ Actions such as these will assist the municipality in receiving buy-in from staff as well as gaining cooperation for review initiatives.

9.0 CONCLUSION

Municipalities across Ontario continue to look for ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of services delivered to the public. In June of 2006, MMAH published the Municipal Management Needs Assessment: Summary Report. The report was a

⁹³ Interview with Stephen Fournier, Chief Administrative Officer, July 28, 2006

⁹⁴ Interview with Ron Lemanczyk, Transit Technologist, July 6, 2006

⁹⁵ Interview with Greg, Martin, City Councillor, July 18, 2006

collaborative research project of MMAH, the Association of Municipal Managers, Clerks and Treasurers of Ontario, the Municipal Finance Officers' Association and the Ontario Municipal Administrators' Association to determine the informational and service needs of municipal managers in Ontario. The project surveyed and consulted numerous municipal managers representing the various sizes and types of municipalities across Ontario. Stemming from these surveys and consultations, MMAH found that there is a strong commitment among municipal managers to excellence, improvement and information sharing and that they are looking for more information and advice on how to manage organizational performance, how to manage people and how to manage money.⁹⁶ More specifically, 77% of respondents stated that monitoring, reviewing and improving the performance of programs and services was an important management priority for upcoming years.⁹⁷

A common factor among these findings is the need to manage effectively with a limited amount of resources. Although such a high number of municipal managers indicated a need for information on how to improve the services and programs the municipality delivers, approximately 50% had knowledge of the guide published and distributed by MMAH on how to conduct a service delivery review.⁹⁸ It is hoped that this research report can provide municipalities with supplemental information on how to plan and conduct a service delivery review as well as provide information on how processes are being performed in municipalities across the province to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of services delivered to the public.

⁹⁶ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2006. Municipal Management Needs Assessment: Summary Report.

⁹⁷ Ibid. Appendix A

⁹⁸ Interview with Curry Clifford, Manager, Municipal Service Delivery Unit, Municipal Performance and Accountability Branch, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, June 7, 2006

It is important to note that MMAH as well as municipal administrators and councillors surveyed in this research report stated that a municipality which is considering the performance of a service delivery review must be fully committed to the process as it requires an extended time period and numerous municipal resources. Additionally, it was suggested that the municipality considering the review consult the publication, A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers, as well as other municipalities that have gone through the service delivery process in order to discover with what method to approach the review and adjust that process to fit the unique characteristics of the organization in which the review will take place. Most importantly, when completing the review, it is important for those involved to be fair, open and objective in their assessment of the services delivered by the municipality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burke, John. 2005. "Ontario's Municipal Performance Measurement Program: Fostering Innovation and Accountability in Local Government" in The Government Finance Review (June)
- City of Barrie. 2004. Corporate Business Plan: Top Ten Priorities for 2004-2006. Retrieved from http://www.city.barrie.on.ca/WCMAdmin/Images/wwwcitybarrieonca/PDF_Files/Corporate%20Business%20Plan%20September%202005%20Update.pdf
- City of Barrie. 2006. Value for Service Delivery Review Implementation. Presentation made to Staff (March)
- City of Brantford. 2005. Communication Plan. Retrieved from <http://www.city.brantford.on.ca/content/publishing.nsf/Content/Corporate+Service+Review>
- City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-001. (March)
- City of Brantford. 2005. Report No. CA 2005-005. (June)
- City of Brantford. 2006. Report No. CA 2006-002. (January)
- City of Brantford. 2006. Report No. CM 2006-024. (June)
- City of Ottawa. 2003. Competitive Service Delivery Review Manual: Department of Transportation, Utilities and Public Works
- City of Winnipeg. 1999. "Policy and Framework for Alternative Service Delivery in the City of Winnipeg" as cited in Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Review for Municipal Managers
- Clifford, Curry. 2005. "New Product Available to CAMA Members to Improve Municipal Services and Better Manage Spending" in The Bulletin (January)
- Clifford, Curry. 2006. "Working with Local Governments to Improve Municipal Services". Presentation made to the Pakistan Delegation (June)
- Clifford, Curry. 2005. "Improving Municipal Services" in Municipal World (December). pp 17-19.
- Clifford, Curry and Natasha Bartlett. 2004. "Service Delivery Reviews" in Public Sector Management (15)2. Toronto, ON: Institute of Public Administration of Canada

- Fournier, Stephen J. 2006. Service Delivery Review and Improvements: the Leeds and Grenville Experience. Presentation made to the Town of Ajax (March)
- Government of Ontario. 2004. Reporting to the Public on Service Improvements and Barriers. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer for Ontario
- Kernaghan, Kenneth, Brian Marson and Sanford Borins. 2000. The New Public Organization. Toronto, ON: Institute of Public Administration of Canada
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2004. A Guide to Service Delivery Reviews for Municipal Managers. Toronto, ON: Queen's Park Press
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2006. Municipal Management Needs Assessment: Summary Report. Toronto, ON: Queen's Park Press
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2003. Municipal Performance Measurement Program. Toronto, ON: Queen's Park Press
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. "Frequently Asked Questions" Retrieved from www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts_1_21543_1.htm
- Municipal Act. 2001. Retrieved from www.e-laws.gov.on.ca
- Norman, Donald C. 2005. "Creating Alternatives – Taking a Creative Approach to Service Delivery" in Municipal Monitor (May/June)
- Ontario Centre for Municipal Best Practices. <http://municipalbestpractices.ca>
- Ontario Municipal CAO's Benchmarking Initiative. www.ombi.ca
- Plant, Thomas, Carol Agocs, Emmanuel Brunet-Jailly, Janine Douglas. 2005. "From Measuring to Managing Performance" IPAC New Directions Report No. 16. Retrieved from http://www.ipac.ca/files/New%20Directions_16.pdf
- Tindal, Richard C. and Susan Nobes Tindal. 2004. Local Government in Canada. Scarborough: Nelson Thompson Learning
- TkMC. 2005. Value for Service Delivery Review. Retrieved from http://www.city.barrie.on.ca/WCMAdmin/Images/wwwcitybarrieonca/PDF_Files/VSDR%20Final%20Report.pdf
- United Counties of Leeds & Grenville. 2005. Public Notices Page. Retrieved from <http://www.uclg.ca/en/publicnotes/index.asp>

INTERVIEWS

Curry Clifford, Manager, Municipal Service Delivery Unit, Municipal Performance and Accountability Branch, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, June 7, 2006

City of Barrie

Rebecca James-Reid, Manager of Strategic Services, July 4, 2006

Ron Lemanczyk, Transit Technologist, July 6, 2006

Steve Trotter, City Councillor, July 8, 2006

City of Brantford

Ronald H. Kaufman, City Treasurer, Director of Finance, July 18, 2006

Greg Dworak, Manager of Corporate Policy and Management Practices, July 18, 2006

Greg Martin, City Councillor, July 18, 2006

Richard Carpenter, City Councillor, July 18, 2006

United Counties of Leeds & Grenville


Stephen Fournier, Chief Administrative Officer, July 28, 2006

Nigel White, Director of Corporate Services/Treasurer, July 19, 2006

Wendy Chow, Case Presenting Representative, OPSEAU Representative, July 27, 2006

APPENDIX A – Problems in Implementation


Influencing Change (When Implementation Goes Astray)




This graphic is useful both for planning and for diagnosing problems that occur during the implementation phase.⁴⁶

APPENDIX B – Service Delivery Review Process

Flow Chart for Service Delivery Review



APPENDIX C – Service Delivery Review Program Logic Model




APPENDIX D – Choosing a Service Delivery Method

Service Delivery Method	May be Suitable When...	May Not Be Suitable When...
Direct Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has a statutory duty to provide the service or program or there are compelling practical, policy or user issues • No developed supply markets for the service or program exists • Impartiality and equity in the delivery of services are essential • Stability and continuity of delivery are required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well developed supply market for the service or program exists • There is a need to respond to rapidly changing circumstances
Purchase of Services (operation and maintenance OR management services)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New capital investments, assets or expertise are needed and are not available in-house • Service or program could benefit from a new approach or from a profit-making perspective 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service problems are small-scale • Private-sector interest in the service or program area is lacking • Concerns exist over the ability of non-municipal providers to deliver an adequate level of service

Service Delivery Method	May be Suitable When...	May Not Be Suitable When...
Municipal Business Corporations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service fits into eligible purpose for a municipal business corporation under regulations under s.203 of the Municipal Act, 2001 • Municipal Business Corporations can be supported by required business case analysis (see Section 203 regulations) • Similar considerations as Public-Private Partnerships in the case of Municipal Business Corporations that have shared equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipality is not prepared to meet the business case requirement • Project is of small value or needs to be in place quickly • Risks or costs are too high
Municipal Service Boards, Local Boards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as direct delivery of service or program but where delivery would benefit from a greater degree of arm's-length relationship to municipal government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct accountability to municipal council is important
Public-Private Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects are of significant capital expenditure and the municipality does not wish to commit the financial resources but the project is affordable to the municipality • Potential for revenue generation exists • Project cannot for practical reasons be delivered in-house • New capital investments (or assets) are needed and are not available in-house • Bringing in expertise, innovation and additional resources is necessary or beneficial • Municipality is prepared to share operational, financial and other risks and does not wish simply to procure the service • Municipality is willing to retain risks that the private sector cannot control, quantify or ensure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal or technical advice is not obtained first • The project is extremely complex, high-risk or needed evaluation expertise is not available • Project is of small value or needs to be put in place quickly • Ability to generate sufficient investment for the service or program in the future exists and there is a possibility of bringing in capital or expertise in another way • Project requires a solution that cannot be largely replicated and applied elsewhere by private-sector partner • Project faces significant risk of obsolescence • Demand for the outputs of the service cannot be practically managed • Risks are difficult to assess and manage

APPENDIX E – City of Barrie Phase One Workplan

Value for Service Delivery Review Project High-level Workplan



APPENDIX F – City of Barrie Staff Survey

BARRIE

Value for Service Delivery Review – Employee Survey

The City of Barrie has retained TkMC (Turnkey Management Consulting) to complete a Value for Service Delivery Review. The review will use both internal and external analysis, both qualitative and quantitative in nature to highlight service opportunities and create opportunities for different approaches to resource allocation. This survey will ask your opinion about where you work, the issues confronting the City, the services being provided, the culture of the organization and your suggestions for improvement.

This survey is an opportunity for employees to participate and add value to the information being collected from other sources.

The Review has the full endorsement of Council, Senior Administration, CUPE and the BPPFA. Your comments are being received directly by TkMC and shall remain confidential.

Note: There is no need to complete this paper survey if you have completed the survey on-line.

1. Commission

Please select the Commission that you are currently working for.

- Community Services
- Corporate Services
- Development Services
- Mayor and City Administrator's Office

2. Community Services

Please select the Department that you work for in Community Services.

- Commissioner's Office
- Fire & Emergency Service
- Leisure, Transit & Works Department
- Engineering Department

3. Corporate Services

Please select which Department you work for within Corporate Services

- City Clerk's Office
- Finance Department
- Human Resources Department
- Information Communications and Technology Department
- Commissioner's Office

4. Development Services

Please select the department you work for in Development Services

- Building Services Department
- Economic Development Department
- Planning Services Department
- Commissioner's Office

5. Issues and Services Provided

a) What do you feel are the MOST significant issues facing the City of Barrie today?.

Please select the top 5 issues you consider to be the most important.

- Achieving Council's Top 10 Priorities
- Managing growth
- Getting a "new deal" from government
- Relationships with other municipalities
- Communicating with the taxpayer
- Borders/boundary change
- Financial pressures of growth
- Stress on current road infrastructure
- Providing space at the landfill site
- Ensuring a safe drinking water system
- Ensuring there is a well functioning sewage treatment system
- Public safety
- Management of Assets (buildings, property, etc.)
- Environmental protection
- Downtown revitalization
- Revitalizing older neighbourhoods
- Attracting new business
- Creating jobs
- Lack of technology in work environment
- Succession planning for workforce
- Maintaining service levels
- Level of city staff resources
- Lack of revenue sources
- Supply of industrial land
- Supply of residential land
- Commuter rail availability
- Public transit
- Maintaining roads
- Other (please specify):

b) With respect to the City of Barrie Community Based Strategic Plan (Vision 2003 - 2023) is it clear to you as an employee of the City how your job/role fits into the overall plan including the expectations and accountabilities placed on you as an individual to help the City meet the strategic objectives outlined in the plan?

- Not clear at all
- Somewhat clear, but I would like some clarification on my expected role in meeting the City's objectives outlined in the plan
- I clearly understand my role and set of accountabilities in order to meet the City's objectives outlined in the plan

c) Please rate each service provided by the City of Barrie in the list below in terms of its level of importance to the City of Barrie and its citizens

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Information and Communication Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Human Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial Services i.e. taxation and budget management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Operation and Maintenance of Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance of Vehicles and Equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asset Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Municipal Law and Court Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design and Construction of Roads and Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Municipal Marina	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Barrie Transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Waste Water Treatment and Collection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building Permits and Inspection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recreation Programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clerk's Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Watermain and Sanitary Sewer Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance of Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Purchasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Traffic and Parking Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accounting Services i.e. payroll, accounting for local boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire Prevention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal and Real Estate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Snowploughing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roads Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
City Administrators Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning for Infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire Department Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d) Please rate the following services provided by the City of Barrie based on the how well the service is currently being provided today

	Service level below legislated/policy related targets	Service level meeting legislated/policy related targets	Service level exceeding legislated/policy related targets	Don't know
Planning for Infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
City Administrators Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance of Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accounting Services i.e. payroll, accounting for local boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Barrie Transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clerk's Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Traffic and Parking Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal and Real Estate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Operation and Maintenance of Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asset Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Snowploughing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Purchasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance of Vehicles and Equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design and Construction of Roads and Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial Services i.e. taxation and budget management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire Prevention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire Department Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Municipal Marina	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Municipal Law and Court Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building Permits and Inspection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Human Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information and Communication Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recreation Programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Watermain and Sanitary Sewer Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roads Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Waste Water Treatment and Collection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e) Please rate the following services provided by the City of Barrie based on the how well you feel the service is currently meeting the expectations of the citizens of the City of Barrie

	Below citizen expectations	Meeting citizen expectations	Exceeding citizen expectations	Don't know
Watermain and Sanitary Sewer Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building Permits and Inspection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Financial Services i.e. taxation and budget management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Asset Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recreation Programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design and Construction of Roads and Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance of Vehicles and Equipment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Municipal Marina	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning for Infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Snowploughing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information and Communication Technology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal and Real Estate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maintenance of Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Economic Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Operation and Maintenance of Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Waste Water Treatment and Collection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accounting Services i.e. payroll, accounting for local boards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Purchasing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clerk's Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Municipal Law and Court Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Barrie Transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Human Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Traffic and Parking Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire Department Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire Prevention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Roads Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
City Administrators Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Performance Measurement

a) Within your service area do you use Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) to measure the performance of employees, services, tools, technology?

- Yes
 No
 Don't Know

b) If you answered "YES" to the above question, please list and describe the performance indicators used in your service area in the space provided. If you answered 'NO' to the above question, please enter 'N/A' in the space below

Culture

Indicate the existing culture of the organization as you see it with respect to its solution orientation (i.e. the organization's consistency in developing and implementation a solution to problems/issues faced on a day-to-day basis).

	No Solution	Partial Solution	Complete Solution
Solution Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicate the existing culture of the organization as you see it with respect to its time focus (i.e. the organization's consistency in meeting deadlines on a day-to-day basis).

	Projects are never completed on-time	Projects are completed on-time some of the time	Projects are always completed on-time
Time Focus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicate the existing culture of the organization as you see it with respect to accountability structure (i.e. the organization's clarity of who is responsible for the outputs of a work group, division, Department etc.).

	No identifiable points of accountability	Diffused accountability and lack of clarity	Single point of accountability and clarity
Accountability Structure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicate the existing culture of the organization as you see it with respect to customer orientation (i.e. the organization's consistency in focusing and meeting the needs of the citizen/client on a day-to-day basis).

	Product or service orientation	Customer/citizen consulted sometimes	Customer/citizen centric
Customer Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicate the existing culture of the organization as you see it with respect to the City's current ability to generate value from the resources used to provide services to citizens (i.e. the organization's ability to use financial, human, and technological resources efficiently).

	Low Value - Inefficient use of resources	Moderate Value - Reduced efficiency with respect to the use of resources	High Value - Prudent use of resources
Public Value/Value for Money	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicate the existing culture of the organization as you see it with respect to its employee's allegiances (i.e. the alignment and loyalty of employees within their own work group or the corporate organization?).

	Business Unit/Portfolio	Culture Department Culture	Corporate Culture
Allegiance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicate the existing culture of the organization as you see it with respect to a team philosophy.

	Independent Direction	Corporate Direction	Council Direction
Team Philosophy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Opportunities for Improvement

Are there any opportunities that you believe should be pursued by the City to improve a process, increase revenue or result in greater efficiency? Please explain.

Thank You

Your participation in this survey is appreciated and you may be assured that your comments have been received, will remain with TKMC and will be used as part of the review.

APPENDIX G – City of Brantford Corporate Service Questionnaire

Corporate Services Review Questionnaire
Level Two – Detailed Information

Service Name: _____
 Department: _____
 Business Units(s): _____

Section 1
General Information

1. Briefly describe the purpose of the service _____

2. How many staff positions are involved in the service? Include only positions employed by the City and disregard any positions with outside agencies, contractors etc.

Full time positions: _____

Part time positions: _____

3. Estimate the percentage of each of the following customer groups who are users of the service:

Internal Customers

Internal Departments _____

Council _____

External Customers

Community-at-large _____

Other (specify) _____

Total **100%**

Please Explain:

Section 2
Financial Information

Please provide the following 2005 budget information:

1. Annual revenue produced by the service: \$ _____
2. What are the sources of this revenue?
 - i) Sales \$ _____
 - ii) Other user fees \$ _____
 - iii) Other revenue (specify) _____ \$ _____
 - iv) Other revenue (specify) _____ \$ _____
3. Annual expenses of the service: \$ _____
4. Net Cost of service or activity (Revenue – Expenses) \$ _____
5. What are the estimated capital needs for the service during the next five years?

2006	\$ _____
2007	\$ _____
2008	\$ _____
2009	\$ _____
2010	\$ _____
6. If City Council decided to no longer provide this service,
 - i) What portion of the expenses in (3) above would be eliminated and what portion of these expenses would remain?

3

- 1. \$ _____ Costs eliminated
- 2. \$ _____ Costs which would remain
- 3. \$ _____ Total (must equal (3 above))

ii) Would any assets used in providing the service be able to be sold?

- () Yes
- () No

iii) If the answer to (ii) above is yes, indicate what assets could be sold and approximately how much money might be realized by the City in the sale.

Short description of assets: _____

Approximate proceeds of disposition: \$ _____

Further Comments

If you have any further comments about the matters discussed in Section 2, make these comments in the space below.

Section 3
Impact on the Public

(a) If City Council decided to no longer provide this service, would there be a negative effect on the municipality or an adverse public reaction? Estimate the degree of the negative effect or adverse public reaction on a scale from one to ten, with one representing the minimum and 10 representing the maximum.

Negative effect or adverse public reaction

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Minimum										Maximum

Please Explain:

- (b) If City Council decided to no longer provide this service, would the entire municipality be affected by the elimination of the service, or would the primary effect of the termination of the service be on individuals and specific groups? Another way to approach the question is to consider whether the whole municipality is a customer for the service, or only some portion of the municipality. Estimate the degree to which the whole municipality is a customer of the service on a scale from one to ten, with one representing a service primarily catering to a small number of individuals and groups and 10 representing a service or activity that benefits the entire population of Brantford equally.

Effect on municipality as a whole

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Minimum										Maximum

Please Explain:

Section 4

Can the Service be done by someone else?

If City Council decided to no longer provide this service, would the service cease or would somebody else provide it? Another way to ask this question is, would the service be lost to the community if the City did not do it? One factor that might be considered in answering this question is whether the service is already provided by a private sector or as part of another public sector organization? Estimate the likelihood that somebody else would begin to offer the service if the municipality ceased to provide it on a scale from one to ten, with one representing that the service would certainly end if the municipality stopped performing it and 10 representing that the service would certainly be carried on by somebody else.

5

Probability that service would be done by someone else

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Improbable (service would cease)								Certain (service would continue)	

Please Explain:

Section 5How much does the Service relate to the City's Community Strategic Plan?

The Brantford Community Strategic Plan identifies four Goals, with each Goal having three to five associated Long-Term Desired Outcomes. It is important to know how services relate to these Goals and their associated Long-Term Desired Outcomes.

If, for instance, the purpose of the service is entirely dedicated to the achievement of one or more of these Goals, this is a significant fact that must be identified. However, it is more likely that only a portion of any particular service is directed to a Goal and its associated Long-Term Desired Outcomes. To assist you in your responses in this Section, you may wish to consider the Strategic Actions that are also outlined in the Community Strategic Plan.

- (a) To what degree does the service contribute to the Goal of "Economic Vitality and Innovation", which includes the following Long-Term Desired Outcomes:
- Brantford will have a strong diversified economic base that provides its citizens with excellent local job opportunities.
 - Brantford will be a business friendly community.
 - Brantford will be known as a leading centre for learning and innovation – supported by a comprehensive education system.
 - Brantford's downtown will be vibrant and successful – the hub for its citizens, students, businesses, visitors and government.
 - Brantford will be a proud city with a positive image.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
No relationship								Service is entirely devoted to this priority	

Please Explain:

(b) To what degree does the service contribute to the Goal of “High Quality of Life and Caring for all Citizens”, which includes the following Long-Term Desired Outcomes?

- Brantford citizens and visitors will enjoy a full range of well-supported and maintained arts, culture, sports and recreation facilities and programs.
- Brantford will be recognized as a healthy community – one that promotes and enables the well-being of its citizens, and supports access of all citizens to a full range of health and community services.
- Brantford will be known as a community with a social conscience – one that supports those in need (including for example children, youth, seniors, people with disabilities, and marginalized populations).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 No relationship Service is entirely devoted to this priority

Please Explain:

(c) To what degree does the service contribute to the Goal of “Managed Growth and Environmental Leadership”, which includes the following Long-Term Desired Outcomes:

- Brantford will be known as a city that manages growth wisely, makes optimum use of its infrastructure, and is a leader in infill and brownfield redevelopment.
- Brantford will be supported by well-developed and maintained transportation and servicing infrastructure (including roads, sidewalks, bicycle paths, trails, the airport, water and sewer systems, waste management, electricity distribution and telecommunications).
- Brantford will be well-served by quality local and inter-regional public transportation systems.
- Brantford’s natural and built heritage will be protected and enhanced.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 No relationship Service is entirely devoted to this priority

Please Explain:

(d) To what degree does the service contribute to the Goal of "Excellence in Governance and Municipal Management", which includes the following Long-Term Desired Outcomes:

- Brantford citizens will be engaged in, and informed about, their community and their city government.
- The City of Brantford will be known for its open, accessible and transparent government.
- Brantford will be recognized as a fiscally responsible and well-managed city that provides efficient and effective government services.
- Brantford will be characterized by strong community and intergovernmental partnerships.
- The City of Brantford will pursue excellence by being recognized as an "Employer of Choice" in the municipal sector.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

No relationship Service is entirely devoted to this priority

Please Explain:

APPENDIX H – City of Brantford Background Information Report Template

1.0 Introduction

- Basic introduction on Council’s direction for a Service Review.
- Information on the Service Review process.
- Wording the same for all services.

2.0 History

- A summary of when the City commenced the service.
- Identify any conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of this historical information.

3.0 Governance

- Outline the governance structure of the service including committees/boards (including members), and City Department(s) responsible for operations.
- Identify any conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of the governance structure.

4.0 Operational Details

- Summary the following under separate subtitles:
 - Location
 - Business Plan (summarize only the main points and note what the Business Plan is trying to achieve over the status quo or past practice/performance. Also indicate that the entire business plan document is available upon request)
 - Facilities
 - Infrastructure
 - Land Use Regulations (Official Plan/Zoning Bylaw)
 - Users/clients (Including residency of users/clients, if available)
 - Leases/special arrangements
 - Events/special functions
 - Economies of Scale
 - Promotion/User Satisfaction
- Identify any issues, problems, difficulties, conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of these operational details.

5.0 Funding

- Sources of Funding/Revenue (including users fees charged)
- Operating Budget (Past 10 years, current, and 3 year projections).
- Capital Budget (Past 10 years, current, 5 year projections).

- Capital Project Requirements (full disclosure to keep facility operating effectively).
- Reserve Funds (including current allotment in the fund, discussion on any funding shortfall for Capital Projects, ability to accumulate additional funds).
- Financial Scenarios (prepared by Finance Dept.)
- What would have to happen to make the service “tax levy charge free” – identify major issues only.
- Identify any conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of each of these funding or financial matters.

6.0 Benefits of this City Operated Service

- Provide a description of the estimated/anticipated benefits of the services such as economic development/promotion, social, health/recreation, affordability, convenience etc.
- Identify any conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of the benefits of this service being operated by the City.

7.0 Trends and Challenges

- Identify any trends and challenges affecting the service either locally, provincially or nationally such as:
 - Increase/decrease in users/clients
 - Continuance or discontinuance of government involvement or financial contribution in the service
- Identify any conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of each of these trends and challenges.

8.0 Asset Value

- Description of the asset value of all of the capital and operational facilities of the service.
- Identify any conclusions or implications that relate to or would result from the continuation of the service without change.

9.0 Impacts of Discontinuing the Service

- Summarize all impacts that the community would realize should the City decide to discontinue providing this service (including impacts to users or the community at large, could also be impacts as a result of the reduction or elimination of the “benefits” noted in Section 6.0).
- Identify any conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of each of these impacts of discontinuing this service.

10.0 Opportunities of Discontinuing the Service

- Summarize any opportunities that the community would realize should the City decide to discontinue providing this service (including benefits from a financial perspective [operating and capital budgets], realization of disposal of asset and possible alternative usage of the asset, etc.).
- Identify any conclusions or implications that affect the service through the analysis of each of these opportunities of discontinuing this service.

11.0 Service Delivery Options

- Identify any options to the “status quo” which Council could ask staff to consider in Stage 2 of the Service Review as an alternative to discontinuing the service or if Council were to ask for an exit plan as a result of this review (only include realistic alternatives [i.e. ones that would (not could) reduce the cost to the taxpayer]).

Appendices

- Provides an opportunity to attach any pertinent information related to the service.
- Any attached Information to be numbered consecutively as Appendix “A” etc.