



LCCMR 2024 Strategic Planning: LCCMR Goals and Strategies

July 31, 2024



Agenda Item 04

Strategic Planning Focus



- Communications and Outreach
- Proposal Solicitation, Review, and Recommendation Process
 - Evaluation Criteria

Work To Date



- Communications and Outreach
 - Presentation and discussion at January 8 meeting
 - Drafting of potential goals and strategies based on member discussion
 - Discussion of draft goals and strategies at January 23 meeting
- Proposal Solicitation, Review, and Recommendation Process
 - Subject Matter Expert Survey
 - Presentation and discussion at June 26 meeting
 - Development of options for subcommittee consideration

Evaluation Criteria: Establishment and Use



- Traditionally have been established and included in the strategic plan.
- Traditionally have been included in the request for proposals (RFP).
- Used by staff to provide members a score for their consideration before selecting proposals that will move forward to presentation.
- Presented to the public as the criteria used by the LCCMR to select and recommend proposals.

Evaluation Criteria: Expert Survey



- Only 43% of experts agreed with the following statement:
It is clear how the LCCMR evaluates and selects projects to recommend for funding.
- 27% disagreed with this statement.
- Lowest rated statement among subject matter experts.

Evaluation Criteria: Purpose/Intent



The intent of evaluation criteria is to provide a transparent and consistent standard to evaluate proposals and their fit with priorities.

- Communicates factors the LCCMR will be considering in evaluating proposals.
- Helps applicants determine if their project is the right fit and would be competitive for ENRTF funding.
- Helps the LCCMR get better proposals that are focused on LCCMR priorities.
- Helps ensure proposals include relevant information.
- Helps staff score proposals in an objective way that is helpful for members.
- Helps applicants understand why proposals may or may not be recommended for funding.

Standard practice for grantmaking organizations.

Developing New or Revised Criteria



Evaluation criteria will only meet the purpose and intent if they reflect the actual considerations members are using when deciding which proposals to select or recommend.

What are the two or three most important considerations for you when determining which proposals you think should be funded?

Current LCCMR Evaluation Criteria



- **Funding Priorities:** Responds to RFP funding priorities.
- **Multiple Benefits:** Delivers multiple benefits to Minnesota's environment and natural resources.
- **Outcomes:** Identifies clear objectives likely to result in measurable, demonstrated, and meaningful outcomes.
- **Knowledge Base:** Contributes to the knowledge base or disseminates information that will benefit other efforts.
- **Extent of Impact:** Results in broad, long-term impacts of statewide, regional, or local significance.
- **Innovation:** Employs or demonstrates innovative approaches to more effectively and efficiently solve specific environment and natural resources issues.
- **Scientific/Technical Basis:** Reflects current scientific and technical knowledge, standards, and best practices.
- **Urgency:** Addresses an issue for which immediate future action is urgent and critical to avoid undesirable consequences.
- **Capacity and Readiness:** Demonstrates capacity and readiness for efforts to be managed and completed in timely, accountable, and effective manner.
- **Leverage:** Leverages collaborative partnerships and additional efforts, resources, and non-state funds.

Evaluation Criteria: Staff Analysis



- Do the current criteria accurately reflect the most important factors members consider in evaluating and selecting proposals?
- Do the criteria provide applicants insight into why their proposal was or wasn't selected for funding?
- Do the current criteria imply that all criteria are weighted equally and apply to all projects?
- Are some of the criteria redundant?
- Do some criteria combine multiple factors that would be better considered separately?
- Are the current criteria presented in a manner that implies they are the only factors considered in evaluating and selecting a proposal?

LCCMR Goals and Strategies: Expert Survey



Experts indicated that the weakest areas in the LCCMR process are:

- It is clear how the LCCMR evaluates and selects projects to recommend for funding. (43% agreed/27% disagreed)
- The LCCMR process for recommending funding from the ENRTF is fair and transparent. (40% agreed/22% disagreed)
- The LCCMR's process from proposal submission to fund availability is timely and efficient. (59% agreed/20% disagreed)

Specific comments related to:

- Political nature of process
- Use of evaluation criteria
- Providing feedback to applicants not funded
- Length of time between proposal submittal and availability of funding
- Accessibility of process to all potential applicants
- Currently prohibited or generally ineligible expenses