



METHODOLOGY

The MAP Commission set broad criteria for developing and evaluating its recommendations. The evaluation factors are ordered into three groupings:

Management

- Eliminate duplication of effort
- Streamline organization structure
- Create a clear chain of command and defined span of control
- Look for opportunities to outsource or privatize
- Promote strategic planning across governmental entities
- Increase local governmental service coordination efforts
- Promote diversity and equal opportunities

Accountability

- Increase government responsiveness to citizens
- Increase open, clear and complete budgetary disclosure
- Establish relationship of service provision to revenue source
- Promote the use of activity-based accounting to clearly identify costs

Performance

- Eliminate unnecessary spending
- Improve efficiencies of county government activities
- Improve effectiveness of county government programs and services
- Ensure productivity of the workforce
- Ensure recruitment and retention of a quality workforce
- Reward employees for performance
- Focus on outcomes or results
- Improve the well-being of citizens

The Commission as a whole met generally every two weeks between February 2004 and July 2005. See Appendix 3 for a list of meeting dates. During the drafting of the task force reports, the meeting schedule was accelerated to weekly. Meetings continued into the summer of 2005 to pull a cohesive and comprehensive final report together to present to County Council and the public. The meetings were advertised and open to the public. Task Force meetings were held separately and independent of the Commission meetings.

The task forces and the commission utilized several methodologies in their work. As a whole, the Commission sponsored two extensive surveys: one of the entire County work force; and a second of the community at-large. The employee survey focused on work performance, management, communication, service quality, employee incentives, and asked for ideas on improving government service. Respondents totaled 766, providing valuable input.

The citizen survey was mailed to 15,000 households in a representative selection of areas across the County. In addition, it was available on-line. A total of 1,417 responses were received. Questions focused on perception of County services, changes desired, use of the County website, attitudes toward greater coordination of local government services, service areas needing greater attention, and demographic input from the respondents.

More information on the surveys, including reports and analyses of responses, can be found in the Appendix 4.

The entire commission met with the County's eight elected officials (those other than County Council). It heard presentations from staff of major departments. For informational purposes, it reviewed reports on studies with similar missions from around the country.

The MAP Commission organized into seven task forces to focus on the identified issues and to comprehensively address the broad spectrum of County services and operations. Individual task forces actively met with staff and external officials, and interviewed selected department heads. Two focus group sessions were held with employee leadership groups. Many reports, data compilations, planning documents and analyses were read and discussed. Perhaps most valuable were the open discussions and brain-storming within task forces, and among all commissioners.

The task force structure is as follows:

TASK FORCE

MEMBERSHIP

Government Organization and Structure

Stephen E. Gonzales, James V. Piet

This group looked at the organization charts of all departments, focusing on span of control and accountability. It met with department heads of major departments: public works, solid waste, sheriff, etc. Further, members met with representatives of local governments to explore coordination of services or cooperative agreements between local entities.

Human Resources

Robert E. Miller, Jr., Joan K. Ustin

The members met with the HR Department Head and the County Administrator, and evaluated input from an employee survey. Discussion focused on employee incentives, pay for performance, retention, affirmative action/diversity, and changing the workplace culture.

Public Safety

Charlotte Gillespie, Warren Moise

This group brought in community professionals to look at all aspects of public safety: law enforcement, emergency medical services, emergency management, radio communications, code enforcement. Members interviewed county staff and municipal service providers.

Transportation/Public Works**Kenneth Donaldson, Jr., Cary Chastain,
Keith Waring**

Members met with Fleet director (which falls under Internal Services Department); and with private sector dealerships and state fleet managers to get information on leasing vehicles and privatizing fleet maintenance. The group interviewed management from the Public Works and Solid Waste Departments. It reviewed the oversight structure of the Charleston Area Regional Transportation Authority.

Budgeting, Finance & Accounting**Gary McJunkin, James J. Kerr,
Keith Waring,**

This group reviewed material on the overall budget, and the budgeting process. It led discussion on the ramifications of a 'no new tax' mandate. It met with elected officials to hear their concerns with budget limitations.

Procurement, Outsourcing, Privatization**Cary Chastain, Mark F. Hartley,
Warren Moise**

Members met with Procurement officials, and reviewed nation-wide best-practices related to public-sector purchasing. Much discussion focused on activity-based accounting as a tool in evaluating outsourced or privatized service provision.

Facilities & Capital Asset Management**James J. Kerr, Robert E. Miller, Jr.**

This group met with the Facilities Management director, and reviewed long range facilities plans (joint effort of Facilities Management, Capital Projects, Building Services).

This page intentionally left blank.