

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY



3 0307 00015 9338

020551

# **The BIG ACCOUNTING**

## **Source Book**

**Internal & External Scores  
and Reviewer Comments**

**November 22, 2002**

JK  
6141  
.B53  
2002

This document is made available electronically by the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library as part of an ongoing digital archiving project. <http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/lrl.asp>

This source book for the Big Accounting was prepared as a background for the accounting summary. It is only being distributed to the 25 commissioners and a few Governor's office staff, with a couple of copies for the historical file.

The book includes the internal and external scoring summaries, and a transcript of the comments. Per our communication with reviewers, no individual scores or comments are identified.

Over 110 people from the outside and the inside helped us review our work on *The Big Plan*. For each initiative we report the ranges and average scores for external and internal reviewers. Each individual's score for concept, effort and results were weighted 20%, 25% and 55%, respectively. Then we averaged the scores for all outsiders and all insiders.

The overall score was computed by a simple averaging of the external and internal averages. That way outside reviewers were given equal weight, even when they were outnumbered by inside reviewers.

We found surprisingly little difference between outside and inside average scores. The biggest difference was 1.5 points, and the average difference was less than a tenth of a point. The internal score was higher for 13 initiatives, lower for 12, and on one the inside and outside averages were exactly the same.

This book contains all the comments that were submitted. For the public report, we picked out four to six that seemed to represent both the conversation at the accounting review, and the final score.

Office of Results Management  
November 22, 2002

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### The Best K-12 Public Education in the Nation

Ensuring the best public education for every Minnesota child through accountable funding, standard setting and committed statewide effort.

#### Overall Score - 6.0

##### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.3</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.3</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.3</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>6.3</b>

##### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 6.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>5.7</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>2.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>5.5</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 7.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>5.7</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>5.6</b>

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **The Best K-12 Public Education in the Nation - Reviewed October 2, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Communicate to the public, education community and parents. I think they would understand the agency objectives more clearly. Listening to the constituency – grass roots style with leadership follow through. Listening to the people who do the work in the districts.
- Results was seen as profile or not. We've not seen accountability and standards as the results.
- There is a disconnect between school districts and families. The average citizen still does not understand the Profile of Learning or school finance. What is the school district's true net revenue?
- It's a broad initiative, but the statement of goals was never clearly articulated. In the end, we landed on important principles that matched the Governor's intentions, but took too long to get them.

##### **Effort:**

- Great work efforts in the department but lack of resources can be a hindrance. Districts' declining enrollment is a big factor. What is the solution? Have we listened enough? How can we get the legislature to work with us on this?
- Lacked good governor leadership. Strong components, not pulled together.
- The effort and plan are sound.
- CFL is under resourced generally. Later departmental collaboration was attempted but not consistent.

##### **Results:**

- Lots of new and relative changes in the department. Some helpful to education and the districts. How do we work with the legislature in a convincing manner? What changes do we see in the districts?
- Good strategic results but didn't show up in acclaimed performances.
- At risk children must be identified early (kindergarten/1<sup>st</sup> grade) and provided systematic, explicit and intensive instruction to close the achievement gap for low socio-economic and minority students.
- Defending and sustaining the Profile of Learning a huge accomplishment itself.
- More accomplishments in important areas than expected.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Early political intervention saved profile.
- Lt. Governor Mae Schunk interpreted standards to teachers.
- Profiles are about system reform.
- Politicians and unions have made it a football.



## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- MCA/ accountability systems need work.
- Alt. comp 13 a home run.
- Process of defining beliefs and then charting a Big Plan was refreshingly new for state government. The process produced clear goals on which to focus. Therefore early on the administration earned high marks. However, the two-way discussion which led to the plan deteriorated and became one-way, forfeiting the political capital you'd gained earlier...The result was complete alienation and isolation of this administration's leadership role. The tragedy is that all the Lt. Governor's work to build grass roots connections through her visits, listening posts and summits was diminished as well.
- Seems that this was not clear understanding of goal in district. Also, K-12 felt uninformed about education initiatives. Bright staff, including commissioner. But, no auctioneer "conviction" here. Commendable confrontation with unions.

### Effort:

- I am deeply disappointed by lack of interagency cooperation.
- The administration's biggest and longest lasting impact was the national focus it put on special education funding. The Governor set off a debate which elevated a long hidden problem.
- Reforming teacher pay can have a similar lasting effect.
- Amazingly many parts of the Big Plan succeeded even without a political party to help legislatively.
- Excellent effort on graduation standards. ESEA readiness MAEF was outstanding. Good conference on alternative pathways.

### Results:

- Education finance reform occurred at exactly wrong time.
- Additional dollars in first year but no new revenue later.
- The great tax reform gains which included more fairness in education funding have been eroded by the diminishment of state education revenue. Until that problem is solved the overall gains elsewhere in the Big Plan are lost or diminished.
- As we look to the future workforce, the biggest and most critical need is to close the learning gap with investment in early childhood education. The Governor's personal views are out of step with proven education data which shows that every dollar invested early produces bigger gains. The education establishment was let off the hook and in the long run, our competitiveness nationally and internationally was set back.
- Education finance was a disaster this last session. People were so angry. Graduation standards may die – despite significant teacher time. Crisis of confidence in department.

- Commissioner's "advocacy" role needs to be clear.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Make access to telecom by children and families a priority.
- More education resources to younger children.
- Make sure the commissioner understands his/her leadership role.
- Shore up education revenue
- Keep the pressure on special education
- Expect results from the system but lead by example. You (Governor and commissioner and administration) are part of the system. The takeover mandates that.





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Improving the Competitive Position of Rural Minnesota

Working with rural communities to help them compete economically in the state, nation and world – through building workforce capacity, telecommunications infrastructure and other development factors.

### Overall Score – 6.4

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	3.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.4

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	3.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.0

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	6.3

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.3

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.0

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	6.5

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

# Improving the Competitive Position of Rural Minnesota - Reviewed October 14, 2002

### Inside Reviewers Comments

#### Concept:

- This concept has evolved and needs to continue to evolve the regional centers concept. How can regional centers help improve economy/quality of life for rural areas.
- The struggle/conflict with telecom is not easily explained.
- The breadth and depth of agency cooperation could be more...more known by staff.
- Priorities were well documented as a result of 2000 Rural Summit.
- The strength of the initiative is its span...it influenced thinking in many areas (following on the early Listening Post work).
- I'm not sure what "competitive" means in this context - with Metro, or with national?
- This is an initiative that resonates well with residents throughout the state.
- It took too long to get our arms around a definition of what this initiative should be about.
- Multifactoral/inter-connected work

#### Effort:

- Significant progress has been made. Although economic decline has been a set back. There are many engaged rural/regional center leaders willing to partner with the state on these issues.
- This has always been known to be an important initiative. Governor's involvement at Rural Summits was important.
- Look for ways to give or hand-off the effort to regional partners for each of the priorities.
- Various efforts throughout Big Plan. Although they seem diffuse.
- Got off to a strong start but faltered in terms of inter-departmental collaboration, especially in the area of telecom.
- The shining point of this initiative was the rural summits (esp. the first 2 years). There was real consensus around a set of important priorities to assure on going competitiveness...and to the degree that consensus had an impact on state agencies and non-government partners, we've affected a good direction.
- Really diffuse.
- Raised awareness.

**Results:**

- Results are fuzzy. Products have been produced (Biz links, MNn Pro) but hard to determine effect. What about an increasingly diverse population in rural Minnesota?
- It is obvious some steps were taken. Maybe results showing hard numbers with growth etc, should help identify clear results.
- Develop ways for Minnesota SCU and other regional partners to take responsibility for results.
- Not agreement on measurement of results.
- The success of changing to and acknowledging regional priorities helped achieve success. More work to be done, especially legislative activity on telecom.
- There is hope here, but not strong evidence of a commitment to objectively use data/indicators to measure economic strength throughout the state.
- Is rural Minnesota more competitive?
- Technology/telecommunication - web and show progress
- Transportation fell off.
- Are measurers measures enough?
- Telecommunications is outreach.
- Shape budget around regionalization.
- Hard to tell what we're trying to do. Struggling with the measures - not just agriculture.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- The initiative is very broad in scope. Anything that cannot be reduced to a personal or community level often goes right by the average citizen.
- Well grounded, community input sought and clearly influenced the initial concept and stated goals.
- Clear to us.

### **Effort:**

- New approach to planning and work plan were great - can it be an ongoing method of obtaining info and feedback from around the state? Very good to see interdepartmental cooperation.
- Not sure of actual time/effort of involvement by other agencies but inter-departmental collaboration is key to success because this needs to be an integrated approach.
- I see good effort, although some of what needs to happen needs to continue into the future with the next administration.

### **Results:**

- Still work to be done in all areas, but progress has clearly been made.
- Not sure of legislative activity, but the legislature needs to show more understanding and leadership.
- Good start - hope it stays on track.
- Rural vitality is a two decade (much more!) process. Expecting results over 4 years is terrific - good start.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- More work with MNSCU to encourage broadband application tech transfer and business curriculum - help business make more use of technology and increase their valuation of the technology.
- Important that the future not be set aside or ignored for the urgent! The process to balance the budget should be done while fully understanding the vision for the future.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Light Rail Transit

Successfully building - on time and on budget - the first light rail line in the state's transit system as a key step in providing more diverse options to address our growing transportation problems.

### Overall Score – 8.9

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.4

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.3

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	8.6

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.7

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	9.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.3

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.3

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	9.2

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Light Rail Transit - Reviewed November 13, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- Designed quickly and opportunistically.
- Hard to tell if concept/initiative is:
  1. to complete construction or
  2. to build another part of multi-modal transportation system to improve traffic congestion in traveled corridors economic development, and etc.
- Excellent work on setting vision and common understanding.
- Initiative is clearly understood.
- Citizens have mixed understanding of what the real value of LRT will be when open and operating.
- The strength of Governor Ventura's challenge of "riding a train before the end of his first term" capitalized on the tremendous history of the Hiawatha Line and set an inspirational goal that is an imperative for a project of this size.

##### Effort:

- Some lack of collaboration at the start.
- Much leadership from various parts of administration.
- Sounds like inter-departmental collaboration has improved.
- A little rocky early on, but came together well. Not a lot to be done about legislative agendas on North star.
- Some pains from initial project but many lessons learned internally and by public and community that will make next project easier.
- All elements of success came together: public input; gubernatorial challenge; strong singular legislative message; good state/fed/local; partnerships; and internal administration collaboration.

##### Results:

- On time, on budget and pulled together around a vision.
- Some drawbacks in land use and business planning.
- Performance indicators – measures of completion.
- Section on lessons learned will be essential for future.
- Good session.
- Early turf ward and local government confusion led us off target for a while.



- Proof is in the fact that the project is well on its way to completion and opening.
- No better results than being “on time/in budget” and seeing physical a progress in the ground.
- Met all three results from signed indicator agreement.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Not enough park and ride.
- New governor should pick up early on this.
- Keep going! Need to get future development going immediately to get full benefits of multi-model system. Need extreme reworking of bus routes to match changes in demographics and to be in synch with LRT.
- New administration should start on central corridor immediately.
- Lesson learned on Hiawatha should be formally reviewed and incorporated into future transit ways.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- The idea and goals were very clear. The efforts in planning of land use were somewhat less clear, but major effort was given to follow-up and catch-up.

### **Effort:**

- Initial collaboration between multiple departments was shaky.
- Sound commitment by the governor, MnDOT and Met Council. It was a team effort. Sometime too competitive, but all were on board to complete the challenge.

### **Results:**

- Close to but not there yet ... the fleet of distributor buses to meet LRT in downtown Minneapolis to connect LRT to the convention center and office district.
- Project is on time and budget. Progress is clear to the public and will maintain momentum.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Should be dialogues on how to plan future transit projects.
- In Portland, OR, Tri Met does everything. Here MnDOT builds it and the regional railroad authorities are the advocates. In addition, MnDOT does commuter rail and Met Council does busing. Should we have one single agency?
- Complete North Star Corridor.
- Start work on Central Corridor.
- Increased early coordination between MnDOT and Met Council is essential and needs to be goal of the new administration.
- Start preparing now for the next LRT line.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Growing Smart in Minnesota

Communities making smart decisions about open space, development, transit and housing, so that they can be shaped by choice, not by chance.

### Overall Score – 6.5

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>3.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>5.2</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>3.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.8</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>3.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.4</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>6.3</b>

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>6.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>7.0</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>4.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.7</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.7</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>6.7</b>

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Growing Smart in Minnesota - Reviewed October 21, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Concept evolved into more metro and more restructuring.
- "Demonstrate on the ground" not clearly described.
- Started statewide – shrank by default.
- In the metro area, Smart Growth gets a 7 or 8 score. Outside of the metro area, Smart Growth is viewed as antigrowth. Met Council is off to a great start, but there is not connection between the metro area and where the state will grow in the next 30 years.
- This was the most challenging part of the Big Plan. I was part of the early effort to articulate it. My observation is that the effort was dropped. This presentation was about the Met Council. The initiative was supposed to be cross-agency.
- Need a better definition, goals.
- Needs to be meaningful to average citizens.
- Good strategy planning.
- Concept consulted thoroughly. Encompassed operational reform at Met Council. Establishment of high performance goals, alignment of principles with other executive departments.

##### **Effort:**

- 2030 restructuring projects
- Citizens engagement great.
- LRT
- Metro area only.
- This is an evaluation of how well the Met Council has done. I think we've missed an opportunity to incorporate these principles into the operations of other agencies and have a significant impact statewide.
- Clearly a Met Council priority.
- Key resources have been committed.
- Need to move beyond seven-county area.
- A huge attitude swing.
- Cities in metro area engaged.
- Progress in transit, polluted land clean-up, housing production (placement of affordable units metro wide), and bus ridership increases. Admirable progress in four years.

**Results:**

- Better agency
- Some of the ground success in rail restructuring
- No statewide effort – depresses score.
- Best council in 20 years (but still slow at implementation.
- This measures the results of the Met Council. I would measure the results very differently if evaluated the administration as a whole.
- LRT on track, bus ridership up.
- Town centers a good start.
- Good progress on brownfield's.
- 2030 plan is a major positive step.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- The process takes time to implement. Education of the public and others will shorten the timelines.
- The goals are exceptional and clearly the area has benefited by the leadership of the Met Council to help the area understand "Smart Growth."
- The goals were well stated. The goals could be more defined without the detail. Smart Growth is co-opted

### **Effort:**

- There is always room for improvement. Good leadership. Now we need to find visionary elected official.
- I agree that the citizens are more fully activated when they are given choices. The excitement for this effort has moved forward because of the involvement of the stakeholders.
- The goals are good but the amount of funds to implement are too limited.

### **Results:**

- The Met Council is partnership with cities, counties, financial organizations, state agencies, developers, non profits have created excellent models in the metro area. We need more money so that we can leverage these resources in the private sector to create even more. "Integrated Smart Growth."
- Not detailed enough.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Training and examples for the leaders to alter their behavior of "we're always done it this way."
- Dollars from the legislature in bonding bill.





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Partnerships for Affordable Housing

Leveraging the state's resources and influence to increase the supply of affordable housing necessary for economic growth.

#### Overall Score – 8.6

##### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>9.0</i>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>8.8</i>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>6.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>7.8</i>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> <i>(20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<i>8.3</i>

##### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>9.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>9.3</i>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>8.7</i>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>8.7</i>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> <i>(20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<i>8.8</i>

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Partnerships for Affordable Housing - Reviewed September 11, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Well thought out, came from campaign sentiment. Early and consistent governor support.
- It makes a lot of sense.
- Some of the more subtle benefits of increased leveraging of non-state resources may not be apparent to many citizens. The goal of increased production was mostly the consent of group.
- Very very clear ..as succinct and specific as any Big Plan initiative.
- Stuck with "the achievable" – and what the state ought to be doing in this area.

##### **Effort:**

- Worked the legislative well on added dollars. Could have pushed harder on employer/business?
- There have to be more reasons why legislation was so difficult to pass.
- Seized opportunity to make headway. Tremendous lead agency and interagency work!

##### **Results:**

- Strong leverage, unit increase, savings. Less success in regulatory relief.
- Again- legislature? The bottom line for dollars is fantastic. Hopefully it will be a least maintained.
- The legislative activity and the attraction of more business money on the weakest portions of performance.
- Excellent. Only missed some "bully pulpit" opportunities.

##### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Study and propagate quality standards for housing statewide, not just local.

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- I am not sure if all outside parties i.e. citizens or elected officials clearly understand the 'economic growth' objective.
- The concept is well thought out and was combined with an implementation plan that did produce positive results. Leveraging funds was more successful and easier to understand.
- Very clearly stated. All parties knew the direction the agency was headed.

### Effort:

- Leadership at MHFA and participants was excellent.
- Rural Minnesota did see significant investments – employers and business have participated in local planning effort that is directly related to state leadership.
- It's difficult because many funders and agencies have varying goals. Tried very hard to stay focused on quality housing construction. Removal of barriers mostly achieved.

### Results:

- Governor/legislative activity on funding was excellent. Property tax reduction was short lived and affordable overall housing operating costs are again increasing. Production and integration of affordable housing into developments and community is becoming accepted and expected.
- Increased housing supply and investment very successful – removal of barriers and reduction of costs much less successful. MHFA initiative on LIHC and bonding critical and highly successful.
- Legislature did not always back-up proposals. Increasing tax credits and requiring employer focus was huge.

### Suggestions for the future:

- Continue to work on property tax/assessed value increase.
- Bring together the industry and institutions to build a better Minnesota house. Not necessary more expensive, but more weatherproof and environmentally healthy.
- Continue to push for cooperation in funding and planning with communities for housing. Use the carrot of state funding and leadership to get cities and counties to promote smart housing and affordable housing.
- Continue to work on the removal of institutional barriers. Continue to support diverse investments and players in affordable housing. More work on local tax assessment and valuation is necessary. Do not remove point system that encourages local commitment and employers support and investment.
- Very dedicated people at the agency. A little more overlap of some functions. Ex. A closing could be held up for days because the particular person working

on it goes on vacation or has a family emergency. The summer RFP greatly reduced the time it takes to get a product under construction.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

# Multimodal Transportation To Get People and Goods Around Statewide

Making Minnesota more competitive and more livable, through expanding and improving multiple modes of transportation.

## Overall Score – 5.8

### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>9.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>9.2</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.7</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>2.0 to 7.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>4.3</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> <i>(20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>5.9</b>

### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>9.0</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 6.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>5.7</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>2.0 to 7.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>4.3</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> <i>(20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>5.6</b>



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

# Multimodal Transportation to Get People and Goods Around Statewide

- Reviewed August 13, 2002

### Inside Reviewers Comments

#### Concept:

- Focus groups, surveys, telephone work: seeking citizen input was excellent.
- The 2020 multimodal vision was inspirational and right on. Collaborative with Metropolitan Council/MN DOT and set the course and tone.
- Good points about governor's effort to "create" a constituency on "multimodal."
- Multimodal still has an emphasis on "better roads." Has the public really changed their attitudes over the last year?

#### Effort:

- Concerned about lack of credibility of MnDOT/Metropolitan Council in the House of Representatives increasing divisiveness of transition in the House discussions. Governor made conscious decision to not make this the same priority in 2001 and 2002...how does that factor in?
- Poor understanding in the legislature of vision and barriers! Systems blocked service.

#### Results:

- Big results within some really big constraints (budget woes; changed priorities; legislative short-sightedness).
- Very political issue – in very political legislative session in 2002.
- Have attitudes and willingness for collaboration really gone backward? Some individual successes, but did not move the state as a whole.

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- Multimodal vision within moving Minnesota
- ABC Initiative
- Created a concept that has been picked up and can easily be sold...ABC's best part of transportation's Big Plan. Recognition of freight and focus on who's the customer helpful in moving transportation forward.

### Effort:

- Transportation issue was clearly a priority of the administration however it was probably unrealistic to think that one year (2000) was going to get it done.
- Difficult in advancing transportation agenda post 2000 due to other administration priorities.
- Need to communicate results better to legislators. What will this mean to legislative districts? Need to show results.

### Results:

- Transportation has been well received and is now a high priority for the people of Minnesota. This administration has been a good steward of this system. It did not, however, make major progress on relieving the backlog in transportation needs left over from the 90's.
- Need to communicate results better to legislators. What will this mean to legislative districts? Need to show results. Win on LRT may have hurt future multimodal efforts.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Telecommunications as Economic Development

Expanding Minnesotan's opportunities by making tomorrow's telecommunications connections available and affordable for all.

#### Overall Score – 4.0

##### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 6.0
<i>Average score</i>	4.9

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	3.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.1

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	2.0 to 6.0
<i>Average score</i>	3.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	4.3

##### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	1.0 to 5.0
<i>Average score</i>	3.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	1.0 to 5.0
<i>Average score</i>	3.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	1.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	4.0

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	3.6

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Telecommunications as Economic Development

- Reviewed October 22, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- Unfortunate disconnect within the administration on the initiative's goals.
- Too much change too soon.
- Need narrow focus. Start with common ground between regulatory focus and industry.
- Initiative crafted as an economic development agenda but seems to have morphed into a regulatory strategy.
- Statement is reasonably clear, but topic obscure and everyone acknowledged that public doesn't understand or care.
- This was not an initiative that was done with a lot of public involvement. In retrospect, this was a mistake to take on so soon without a lot more thinking.

##### Effort:

- Impressive dedication by Commerce folks, but ownership should have been much more broadly shared.
- Internal resources allocated. Collaboration, listening posts, etc. among stakeholders –including agencies –poor.
- Lots of energy, some collaboration.
- Did not engage industry.
- Perception that department ascribed Qwest problems to all the rest of industry.
- Legislative efforts apparently a complete failure. Focus changed to administrative and legal. Needed stakeholders were not included.
- This issue was given lots of attention and resources. Problem was the initiative itself was not what tried to do.

##### Results:

- Should never regret getting the conversation started.
- Incremental progress, at best.
- PUC efforts are being effective. But results have been severely limited due to the animosity generated in the industry sector.
- Appears that minor gains in competition occurred but not as a result of the administration.
- No legislature.
- Qwest blows off fines.
- Doesn't look like goals were met.

- The initiative presupposed certain issues. We have pursued the larger goal – retail competition – through other means.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Focus on common ground expressed at conference – everyone agrees that reform/change is imminent in the 271 relief (Qwest, RBOC's), access charges and competition in local service areas. This realization indicates there is a common ground for Commerce and industry to plan, shape and manage the inevitable in a collaborative fashion.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Commissioner Bernstein mentioned several times that the public doesn't really understand telephone and they then are not able to understand why reform is necessary and what the true effects of removing impact subsidies would be.
- Education of consumers was/is still needed. For example, the civic importance of access to telecom services and quality of life.

### **Effort:**

- Too many resources were devoted to this initiative. Once the legislative effort started, the administration should've devoted resources elsewhere.
- There is a need for the state to help educate local policymakers on the impact of changes to regulation or settlement agreements.

### **Results:**

- Insofar as the department's been instrumental in securing penalties and service assurances via mergers and for negotiations that has been a plus. They have had less success with other initiatives.
- There is more awareness of the need for telecom/advanced services at reasonable prices.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Go slowly. Manage change and gain cooperation.
- Continue support for local telecom initiatives.
- Help cities address new forms of competition (OVS system/limited cable franchises)





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### **Living Human Rights and Respect**

Protecting human rights, engaging the growing diversity of Minnesota, and serving every citizen equally.

#### **Not evaluated**

*This plan developed more as an operating value than a program initiative, so we did not evaluate it as we did the others.*



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Reliable Energy and Consumer Choices

Providing consumers with access, reliability and competitive pricing; while encouraging renewable energy sources and the development of a responsible infrastructure for energy generation and transmission.

### Overall Score – 6.9

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.1

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.1

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	7.1

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.3

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.7

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	6.6

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Reliable Energy and Consumer Choices

- Reviewed October 22, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- Began as a pro- competition agenda and moved to affordability, reliability sustainability – not really.
- Good shift of position on deregulation to keep on time with economic and political realities. Inter-agency “choice” that changed from provider under deregulation goals to energy source under small consumer priorities seems accurate.
- Beyond the most general statement, the area is too technical to be well understood. Objectives, were clearly defined and appropriate at the time they were stated. Enormous changes since the goal was articulated hurt its premise and the administration adapted quickly and appropriately.
- Clearly stated but not well communicated to commissioners at the Commission (PCA). Not all state employees, as they do their jobs in the energy field, are aware of these policy objectives.
- Initiative did not originally focus on what was important to Minnesotans. “Deregulation” was not the pressing issue – affordability and reliability are.
- Five clear objectives. Affordability and reliability remain central at all times.

##### Effort:

- Policy didn’t get in the way of reality.
- Seeking input.
- Worked hard, listened hard and fought hard.
- Changed a lot of staff, but to what result?
- Very high level connection and involvement.
- Excellent improvement from previous administration. Tremendous improvement on agency involvement, citizen participation and ability to take part in discussions and cleaner energy policy and goals.
- Improved on work with other agencies but need to improve and have this done further in advance of major policy decisions.
- The commissioner provided outstanding personal focus to this initiative, and also assured that staff could adequately support the work. The State Energy Planning Report is an outstanding example of interagency cooperation between Commerce and PCA. Agencies also collaborated very well on the energy bill.
- Adequate time and money (leadership etc.) but not good inter-departmental collaboration with the commissioner (PUC).

- Considerable effort, resources and collaboration to get to where we are today.
- Initiative too narrowly assigned. Nonetheless, there was good communication with the involvement of stakeholders.

**Results:**

- More affordable? No
- More reliable – reliability is doubtful for future.
- Tremendous improvement on agency involvement, citizen participation and ability to take part in discussions and cleaner energy policy and goals.
- In respect, the energy bill provided more up to date policy on more issues than any energy bill in a couple of decades. Implementation is well underway. It will be at least 2-3 years before performance results will really be able to be used to evaluate its effectiveness.
- To get legislation passed the end result isn't always clear. PUC has difficulty carrying out the intended policies of the 2001 Energy Reliability.
- Mainly legislative and program.
- In the end, a "plan" was not only achievable but the preferable path for policy makers. Therefore, while some of us would have liked to see broader progress, this represented a fair achievement.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Statutory goals and/or portfolio standards for renewable energy.
- Power Plant siting process could be further streamlined but significant progress was made in the 2001 bill.
- To the degree the PUC carries out policy, it looks to statutes i.e. low cost reliability etc. not to the policies set by Department of Commerce. This creates a disjuncture in carrying out their policies.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

#### **Comments:**

- Focus on customer choice early in the administration was somewhat misguided. Other points of emphasis, particularly on renewable and infrastructure development were exactly as forged.
- The policy became more a function of the national debate on energy than a solution to Minnesota's energy problems. The policy in the early days of the administration was more suited to our state and should have been pursued.
- Department did well at communicating its plan proposals, seeking public input (all stakeholders) and reporting back results and final plan.

### **Effort:**

- Many well intentioned initiatives and responsiveness to public input. However, initiatives in some cases were not sustained or were subject to political forces that might have been resisted.
- The department, at all levels, committed adequate resources and statewide delivery on initiative.

### **Results:**

- Successes include: CIP reform emphasis on renewable , 345 line.
- Failures: No RPS. Weak support for Metro Emissions Reduction Project (Xcel Energy).
- Progress on distribution generation and CIP; jury is still out on transmission and generation; the final policy is too narrow to give businesses sufficient comfort on both reliability and price.
- The department has developed resources/information for all stakeholders to review.





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Ensuring an Information Highway that Leaves No Community Excluded

Enabling all parts of Minnesota, including rural areas, to participate equally in the modern information age and the opportunities offered by the digital economy.

### Overall Score – 6.3

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>3.0 to 7.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>5.0</i>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>3.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>5.8</i>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>4.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>6.7</i>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<i>6.1</i>

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>3.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>6.8</i>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>6.5</i>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>6.3</i>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<i>6.4</i>

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### **Ensuring an Information Highway that Leaves No Community Excluded** - Reviewed September 30, 2002

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Not clear whether this is about wiring, or actual use. Is wiring the right technology? Strategic focus on business, education, and public safety. Changed outcomes to suit poor results. Seemed to come to this.
- Initiative is well conceived and vital! This is a tough concept for the public to grasp. Administration tried hard but not sure if it was too successful.
- The initiative shaped-up very late in this administration. Once public-private partnerships developed, and the state clarified its role in ensuring an information highway that leaves no community excluded, the direction, strategies and actions became clearer.
- Difficult message to formulate for common understanding. Much progress and receptivity to date. Much more to be done.
- Never clear; remains cloudy; still confused. Mission statement filled with bureaucratic pabulum - instead of clear, succinct statements/goals.
- Education, collaboration infrastructure and pushing internet with session.

##### **Effort:**

- Lots of activities, but don't appear coordinated. Emphasis on a small office.
- Ventura did push the message.
- Money - this initiative is expensive! Administration put a lot into this and did the planning and the consensus building but did not receive any legislative support.
- Collaboration between agencies and between the public and private sectors started out a bit shaky but greatly improved in the last year. I think that the TEB was an important tool in bringing the right folks to the table.
- The majority of effort has been here --necessary as prelude to specific strategies.
- Scattered. Took too long to cut away Connecting Minnesota and get refocused. Never fully capitalized on door provided/opened by Rural Summits.
- Small projects, individual effort and scattered effort. Affordability. Once the broadband is up will people use it? Especially to its fullest extent?

**Results:**

- Whole infrastructure development has not been met.
- Did not meet affordable goal.
- Mostly on effort with a fair amount of actual success. This is an incremental initiative. We are further down the road but still a ways to go before reaching the destination.
- We've made great strides with access, but, particularly for schools, still have a ways to go with ensuring affordability. There's also still a lot of education that should occur to improve results in terms of getting these networks into gap areas.
- Good progress on raising and sustaining the debate; slower progress on specific initiatives as learning curve is surmounted.
- Surprisingly good results for such an ill defined initiative.
- Hard to comment on results with efforts. Lesson: Need committed business leadership and need strong state leaderships. \$100 million. Public/public collaboration in the middle of 2000.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- I think the Department of Administration has much work to do in order strengthen their relationship with the legislature. Until that is done the laudable goals of this initiative will continue to languish in the credibility gap of administration.
- Continued collaboration.
- Continue to inject ideas into the mix - Internet Initiative, Broadband Access Act - to keep the debate alive and find a consensus.
- Work more collaboratively on regulatory reform.

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- The concept is clear and unambiguous. The administration has “sold” the concept statewide. Good job.
- The initiative was extremely broad and took on a perspective of solving ‘world hunger.’ Unfortunately, time was not maximized while focus was being brought to the initiative. Once focus occurred progress occurred.
- This is an exciting initiative. It must be continued in the next administration.

### Effort:

- The effort was disjointed and uncoordinated. Early on there appeared to be a strong regulatory effort. However in the past two years the collaboration emphasis has been much clearer and productive.
- Not clear that any state government activity had that much effect on infrastructure deployment. Wouldn’t it have happened anyway? Not all departments cooperated. CFL was absent from any leadership role in educational infrastructure.
- The efforts of the commissioners and director truly drive the initiative. Most of the progress occurred in the last year when collaboration between private and public sector accelerated.
- The financial problem must be addressed. Communities must be given the resources to fund their initiatives in a way that it does not impact negatively other budget lines.

### Results:

- Deployment has greatly increased; as has competition. There is more work to be done, but I did not expect full deployment in 2002.
- The growth in broadband is exceptional. Legislative activity is virtually non-existent.
- Much work needs to be done but we have come an enormous distance in a short period of time.

### Suggestion for the future:

- Funding must be addressed. Private/public partnerships are critical.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Transitioning from Welfare to Self-Sufficiency

Helping low-income people become truly independent – through their own efforts, and with appropriate public support.

### Overall Score – 7.9

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.7

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.5

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.8

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	7.9

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.3

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.7

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	7.8

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Transitioning from Welfare to Self-Sufficiency - Reviewed October 17, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- I love that this is "self-sufficiency" and not "work." It immediately leads away from stereotypes.
- I would encourage the development of more indicators of "life after welfare" rather than the caseload data. The longitudinal studies may be the best vehicle for this.
- Good philosophy. Somewhat unclear about what we really wanted in terms of specific outcomes.
- The TANF debates helped to focus the efforts. Not sure, however, that the many conversations among a wide cast of participants were understood beyond the folks closest to the work at DHS (though valuable).
- Truly independent – poverty
- Prevention

##### Effort:

- This is tough to establish a work plan.
- Cabinet Task Force on self-sufficiency
- TANF investments – 2000 & 2001 sessions
- Unprecedented effort to take a holistic approach to families and non-categorical, flexible approach regarding counties.
- DHS should be commended on its solid development of interagency efforts and the parallel impact that has resulted in more effective working relationships at the local level.
- Collaboration, working with communities, and culture change.
- Inter-departmental collaboration was exceptional, and key to the successes in this initiative...the cooperation may have been unprecedented in state government.
- Community culture change
- Community ownership of issues – 5500 people predicted to hit 60-month limit; turned out to be 1500.
- Don't abandon priorities.

##### Results:

- I know how successful this program is nationally. I hope its momentum can continue and improve locally.
- Unprecedented effort to take a holistic approach to families and non-categorical, flexible approach regarding counties. Current self-sufficient sub-

cabinet work on TANF recommendation for 2003 legislature continues to reflect good themes discussed above.

- Good results. After we finally figured out what we were looking for.
- Higher than other states.
- TANF – use and strategy
- “Left us alone” Helped us leverage & counties”
- Allowed community groups to be effective.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Maintain the investment in prevention as a component of the initiative.
- Maintain recognition of tribal sovereignty and your work with community based organizations and populations of color as well as association with MDH “Health Disparities Initiative.”
- Community responsibility and personal responsibility



## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Easily understood/well articulated. Purpose and goals are clear.

### **Effort:**

- More resources have been devoted, the lessons learned would indicate a need for continuing to add and focus existing resources.
- Not able to sustain the initiative unless additional funding is provided. The "rainy day" fund is depleted and unless tough decisions are made, client service will suffer.
- Inter-departmental collaborating and access were excellent.
- Local intervention grants were extremely important - well run - but needed further and would be important to continue.

### **Results:**

- I am impressed by the results. I know the effort from all involved. On the ground we have worked hard.
- More efforts on existing clients and using health plans for mental health and other social barriers.
- Yes, with caution as to the nature of today's population not being able in my opinion to sustain these results.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Continue the involvement with community directly. Allow us to be our own mediator as well as developer of our own resources.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### A Health System for the Next 50 Years

Building on Minnesota's excellent health system to make sure that it reaches all citizens, and provides them with opportunities for better health.

### Overall Score – 7.0

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.4

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.1

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.9

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	6.8

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.3

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.3

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	7.1

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

# A Health System for the Next 50 Years

- Reviewed September 16, 2002

### Inside Reviewers Comments

#### Concept:

- 50 years – too big – intimidating goals didn't pull people into discussion. Purpose well stated.
- "50 years" was probably misstated. Hard for public and interest groups to engage.
- Title was not helpful and vision developed does seem to resonate.
- Outline is broad enough to take into account the scope of the problem with goals stated at the outset and provided license for staff to work creatively inside and outside of administration.
- Placement in "self sufficient people" so appropriation intentional in changing the mentality . . . yet didn't receive the marketing follow-through necessary.
- Stayed big (too big) too long. Good to see the number of meetings in development.

#### Effort:

- Inter-departmental work well done. Good connection with "outside."
- Considerable effort was increased, much actually happened on an incremental basis.
- This needed to be a staff team's full-time focus instead of one among many projects. Also have learned that analytic resources should not be the "process" staff – different rules and skills. Need dedicated staffing like the last Health Care Commission had.
- Sound planning seems hard to do with such a broad initiative.
- Good work at HPC and coordinating agendas. Lost opportunity in using Governor's visibility and engaging public.
- Liked the "stealth" approach. Maybe should have made disparities the one and only goal.

#### Results:

- We have just begun. Many processes at Department of Health are in place. Focus must remain on results.
- Solid legislative proposals advanced. Gives us things to work off of in the future.
- It seems that what could be done with the legislative occurred.
- Big changes in nature of the debate. Modest legislative successes and a tough time to make case.

- Better than expected.

**Suggestion for the future:**

- Public engagement. The time is getting better to make the case and will need broader support.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- The concept was so broad that most people didn't conceive of what was envisioned – didn't see a problem to be fixed. The timing was right for those within the system, but the public wasn't there yet.
- The challenge is that the concept is abstract and that is extraordinarily difficult to get out to the "people" successfully.

### **Effort:**

- Interdepartmental coalition was excellent and much time was devoted to planning.
- MDH/DHS leadership has been excellent.

### **Results:**

- Again the time wasn't quite right, but will be soon!
- Ventura Administration was an astute observer of the system and its problems. A good effort and public perception. Public perceive Minnesota Health Department as a credible source of information.
- Good success with health disparities and the kids. Much more needs to be done in the health system and infrastructure.

### **Suggestion for the future:**

- Keep the dialogue going.



## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Insisting that Parents PARENT**

**Advocating policies and programs that clearly define state government's limited role in raising our children, and helping parents to accept their first and greatest responsibility.**

### **Not evaluated**

*This plan developed more as an operating value than a program initiative, so we did not evaluate it as we did the others.*





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Independent Living

Allowing Minnesotans with limitations to live as independently and as self-sufficiently as possible.

### Overall Score – 8.1

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.7

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.7

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	8.5

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.3

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.3

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.8

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	7.7

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### **Independent Living** **- Reviewed October 17, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- We have done a good job of outreach and communicating these issues/goals of initiative, to raise awareness and educate. However, the services needed by persons are so tailor-made and choice must be addressed so that the "system" itself is quite complex and difficult for citizens to fully understand.
- Independent Living is a concept that is easy to understand, but how to achieve within available resources?
- There need to be measures about the quality of life in the community not just focus on de-institutionalization.
- The initiative is clearly described. I think the challenges are not well known.
- Defined as independence and options. Could have also addressed.
- Ultimately there was a good, strong direction and path set forth, but remained vague too long. Never had clarity of direction for non-elderly, persons with disabilities.
- Expand opportunities.

##### **Effort:**

- A great deal of planning was done that provides a good foundation for many of these efforts (e.g. Project 2030). These efforts have been high priority for staff and other resources. Meaningful inter-department collaboration is growing; we feel especially good about mental health collaboration and Project 2030 and LTC Task Force work.
- Great example of inter-departmental collaboration.
- Within available constraints -- financial primarily -- clear vision has made efforts more focused and productive.
- 2030 Task Force and Mental Health Initiative.
- Focus on 2030 effort was exceptional. Tremendous interagency cooperation. Long-term care task force work was outstanding. Good legislative accomplishments.
- All this despite labor force shortages.
- Future resources in jeopardy.
- How could this agenda be more overtly connected with Smart Growth?

**Results:**

- We have had good success, made progress and more needs to be done.
- Where to go from here? How to prevent sliding back resources, money and interest. Maintaining interest/momentum will be a challenge.
- I don't know what legislative initiatives were not successful, but the Task Force (Long-term care) and the 2001 funding are great accomplishments.
- Steady and outstanding results. Lingered question about how much was a result of consumer demand.
- Not only progress in data, but remarkable attitude shifts as well. Bravo! Really impressive progress in just four years.
- SPMI – length of stay for census will increase
- Less disabled in facilities - decentralizing vs. discharge
- Consumer expectation and demand is changing.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Need more involvement by “Joe Public” in this topic. Can't be interest of government only.
- Recognize “elder-friendly” communities.
- Connect with Smart Growth

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Well thought out and implemented. Based on very positive results.

### **Effort:**

- Results speak for themselves. Unfortunately resources drive results.
- Excellent progress and resource commitment. Need greater coordination with DES/DHS in employment issues. Many federal grants missed due to this.

### **Results:**

- Good start, but areas related such as housing options, transportation, support for informal networks and community as a resource need to move forward.
- Good indicators. What about increased support housing for people with disabilities under 65?

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Continued focus on flexibility and consumer control over MA dollars.



## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Assuring Lifelong Learning for Work and Life**

**Driving to assure that accountable, effective educational opportunities are available to all adult Minnesotans.**

#### **Not evaluated**

*This plan developed more as an operating value than a program initiative, so we did not evaluate it as we did the others.*





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Tobacco Settlements Endowments: Improving Health Status for All Minnesotans

Carefully investing the tobacco lawsuit settlement in the long-term health of Minnesota's children, by helping them make smart choices for their future success.

#### Overall Score – 9.0

##### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.8

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	9.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.4

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	9.2

##### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.8

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.5

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	9.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.0

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	8.8

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### **Tobacco Settlements Endowments: Improving Health Status for All Minnesotans - Reviewed September 16, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Wonderful acceptance of result indicators at inception. Who else knows exactly what indicators must be met? Accountable.
- Consistent youth/community-led strategy.
- The initiative does not fully explain the elements for youth and U of M programs.
- Built coalitions and expectations early. Public involvement – youth summit! Really built on the Governor's core "beliefs."

##### **Effort:**

- Consistent follow thru and political support at Minnesota Health Department.
- Coordination with MPAAT? Not mentioned.
- Important to keep the comprehensiveness of the strategy even as funding amounts to get revisited.
- Really top notch. Of course, boatloads of money certainly helped.!

##### **Results:**

- Big time results in many areas.
- Great dialogue of accountability.
- This initiative sets a new performance standard in public health for what to measure and how.
- Good baseline. Good tracking. Imperative to long-term success.

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- Bottom line prevention programs decrease health care costs to state.
- Bottom line health care workers that are trained equals an investment in healthy Minnesota.
- This concept has been successful in initiative that works and needs to be sustained.
- A breakout concept faithfully supported.
- The tobacco endowment is difficult to understand from an outside perspective (the flow chart). There are still questions from legislators, media, general public that do not understand the difference between "tobacco settlement" and "tobacco endowment."

### Effort:

- Yes, adequate resources and support. However, I think that the initiative needs to grow in support from the Minnesota Health Department staff and not only the commissioner.
- Nice to have a well funded effort with high bar goals and expectations for success.
- The Health Department spent a lot of time and attention rolling out the initiative.

### Results:

- Legislative activity exceeds expectations.
- Passed adequate legislation
- Created a great plan.
- Performance measures are on track for results promised.
- We are well on our way. Don't pull the rug out now!



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Rein in Rulemaking and Excessive Regulation

Establishing a new rulemaking philosophy and process involves stakeholders and citizens early to gain the broadest possible perspective on need, reasonableness, clarity and enforceability.

### Overall Score – 7.0

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.4

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.4

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.0

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	6.4

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	7.6

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Rein in Rulemaking and Excessive Regulation - Reviewed October 10, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- The Rulemaking Task Force stimulated public knowledge and interest in rulemaking. But without a vehicle like that to communicate to the public, most citizens will forget about purpose and goals.
- Not sure whether the focus was on reducing burden or making the process more open/fair.
- Initiative based on the right concerns and balanced. Clearly articulated reasons for doing this.

##### **Effort:**

- Keep the Governor's Office review process, but only if adequate resources are devoted.
- Good planning measures (9).
- Under-staffed governor's office attention (5).
- Good plan. Departments did cooperate. Effective collaboration with the legislature to make meaningful statutory progress.
- Mixed Governor's office involvement.
- How can we create more sensible rules?
- Could you track how often it comes up in hearings?

##### **Results:**

- Some results have been achieved.
- Probably held our own on burden. Good start on process.
- Good indicators, but inadequately tracked ...or at the least, insufficient information for effective reporting.
- Timeliness of review process
- 2 variances and 2 petitions files.
- Universal waivers not easily developable.
- Data -base of agency on rules.
- More authority on guidance and bulletins.
- Interpretations are more strictly applied.
- A more fair burden.
- Keep veto procedure for Governor.

##### **Suggestion for the future:**

- Interpretive notices are a good idea and should be added to the statute.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Better publication of initiative and results may be helpful.
- Could be more fully disseminated/publicized, however.

### **Effort:**

- Good staff follow through.
- Great resources devoted to initiate task force then tapered down to not enough resources.
- The Rule Task Force was a good experience for the regulated community and the recommendation did become law.

### **Results:**

- Rules legislation passed. Governor's Office more involved than ever in rulemaking.
- Small progress but progress none-the-less.
- Governor's veto authority, rule variance procedure and ALJ procedure for unadopted rules are all important improvements to Minnesota law.

### **Suggestion for the future:**

- Catalog and publish resources.





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Single House Legislature

Setting a new vision for legislative governance in the next century, and trusting the voters to make the decision.

### Overall Score – 4.1

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.8

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 6.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.8

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	2.0 to 5.0
<i>Average score</i>	3.2

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	4.4

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.5

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	3.0 to 5.0
<i>Average score</i>	4.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	1.0 to 4.0
<i>Average score</i>	2.5

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	3.7

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Single House Legislature - Reviewed September 18, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- While many of us might agree that a Single House is a better system, the general public never was convinced of the need for a completely new system. Many legislators also believed that other solutions existed to solve the problem raised.
- Concept didn't include practical benefits for citizens. Exactly how would it make legislation better, or correct abuses? The public never got why this was important. The concept developed as it went . . . not up front, nor did it have the clarity it needed early enough.
- So what would be different? Why is this so abstract?
- Well done.

##### Effort:

- While staff and stakeholders put in considerable effort in 2000 and 2002 to pass a single house bill, the governor did not commit to making single house his top priority. If the governor had personally worked over the undecided in 2000, we might have had a different result.
- Governor bashed instead of schmoozing legislature.
- Too weak internally; surprisingly strong external forces. Tremendous commitment on part of Dean Barkley, but rest of the cabinet given a by.
- Bringing in lobbyists was hard.
- Grassroots – rather than a media proposal. Why in the interest of a legislator? Became a governor's initiative not a top priority. Special interests opposed the bill.
- Governor just wanted it on ballot.
- Needed a \$ million in media.
- Needs more public.
- Sound planning was done by the governor. Workplans were not followed through.
- No appropriate inter-departmental collaboration occurred.

##### Results:

- We achieved a great deal of media attention and editorial support, but we did not reach any of our 3 goals.
- Some committee votes, but no floor vote.

- Despite not achieving a ballot amendment, the public education was/is important!
- No bill passed. Just a couple of committee votes.
- We could have done it.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Well done.
- It is clearly stated but only if one understood it beforehand

### **Effort:**

- Sound planning was done by the governor. Workplans were not followed through.
- No appropriate inter-departmental collaboration occurred.

### **Results:**

- We could have done it.
- Progress was made on the issue that should not be overlooked. Maybe the performance indicators were too high.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### A Tax System That Makes Sense

Building a tax system that is more fair, simple, understandable, and predictable for citizens.

### Overall Score – 8.5

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>6.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>8.4</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>8.8</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>8.2</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>8.4</b>

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>6.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>7.5</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>8.0</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>8.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>9.0</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>8.5</b>

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### A Tax System that Makes Sense - Reviewed September 5, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- Strong listening to citizens, but didn't figure out clear simple translations soon enough.
- Context: well on track ..if next governor continues in the same direction. Clear public input and legislative buy-in is essential.
- "Catchier" communication of goals, policy planning. Governor added immeasurably to public profile and alternative means.
- Department/Commissioners downplay unnecessarily the degree to which the concept was planful and deliberate. They were sensitive to who would be involved in shaping the effort and exhaustive in early consultation. In addition, they ultimately chose to bite off something aggressive yet achievable.

##### Effort:

- Hard work - with legislature and with public. Started with focus on a bill.
- All baseline work is not available for future work and comparisons.
- Clear credibility of department commissioner was essential.
- Extremely hard work by dozen of DOR staff; good culmination from other agencies and outside partners.
- The work was tireless. It was comprehensive – with citizens, legislators, involving of the entire administration, use of Governor, complete through Dept. of Revenue, etc. effort always focused around the citizen principles.

##### Results:

###### Comments:

- Strong reform in property tax and in service. Sales tax was a disappointment.
- Clearly all indicators show progress toward goals.
- Perhaps achieved as much as practically possible; but still work to be done in sales tax and income tax simplification.
- Performance indicators looking good.
- Legislative activity (success up against great odds!)
- Great where we focused. The "price of government" and progress on most of goals is admirable for a 3 year effort. In addition, the state has been set up with other visionary ideas and goals that will undoubtedly be revisited down the road. Accomplishments considerable especially in historical context.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Good theory, well grounded – difficult politics!
- Internally well stated but very difficult to explain in “English” so that the general public can understand it.

### **Effort:**

- Wonderful out reach – access and sensitivity.
- Seems well done.

### **Results:**

- Great accomplishments!
- Within scope of administration effort. Results were very good.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Broader communications effort in mailing, web pages on facts and achievements.
- Should strive for simplification of language as part of communication strategy.





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Active, Engaged Citizens

Increasing voter turnout to help improve citizen participation, and to rebuild trust between elected officials and citizens.

### Overall Score – 8.7

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.4

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.8

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	8.7

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.7

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.7

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	8.7

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Active, Engaged Citizens - Reviewed October 16, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Could have expanded objectives to include other than Voting percentages.
- This is a very simple initiative and goal - voting percentages.
- Simple, clear goal, possibly more narrow than it needed to be, but, nonetheless, very clear.

##### **Effort:**

- Extremely, unprecedented Governor's office activity.
- The Governor's Office partnered with many civic organizations to reach the 70% voter turnout goal. The Process and plan were well defined and our office worked with many partners to follow through on action items and events.
- Appropriate use of governor and staff time. Excellent leveraging of external activists. Stayed on message and on track with a quality plan.

##### **Results:**

- Strong in the areas targeted. Good process results as well. Perhaps not replicable in another administration.
- We met 2 or 3 targets and were quite close to reaching our 70% goal in 2000.
- 69.4% is nearly perfect to a 70% goal. Precinct breakdown of governor's impact uniformly positive.

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Suggestions for the future:

- It is important for policy makers to reach out to constituents and provide issues about civic engagement. I would encourage the next governor to continue being active in increasing youth voter participation. While I believe that the next governor will have to tailor the message and campaign differently, it is important for the governor to reach out to citizens who are not as engaged as they could be.
- I would encourage the next governor to continue these efforts. Although Ventura was seen as the governor who secured The Youth Vote. All elected officials from, all party affiliations, need to continue to encourage young people (and all citizens) to be civically engaged. Active citizenship does not need to be seen/should not be seen as a partisan effort. The more people and organizations can have elected officials support community efforts the closer people will feel to government and its processes. I appreciate the efforts Governor Ventura made in this area.
- The goal was very narrowly defined. Which is fine, but active citizenship and civic engagement encompasses more than just voting. Perhaps the goal could be more broadly defined with more areas of emphasis.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### State Departments: Best Bang for the Buck

Increasing the efficiency of government and the quality of its services, and obtaining the best value for every taxpayer dollar spent.

### Overall Score – 7.6

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.1

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.3

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.8

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	7.0

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	9.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.5

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	8.2

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### State Departments: Best Bang for the Buck - Reviewed September 11, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- Well thought out and grounded in Governor's commitment.
- Not fully committed to employees and public communication.
- The results management piece is core to state government operations and very well defined. The flexibility/accountability strategy might have gone further if we had focused more on what outcomes we're after - playing up the accountability piece.
- Clear definitions/objectives.
- Would rework concepts and create clearer definitions/opportunities. Department results website goes a long way in communicating results, effectiveness.
- Statements could be worked to ensure intended understanding.
- Thanks to PSG and assistance in whittling this down to a few key projects, really ended up addressing things most important to RESULTS, MANAGEMENT, AND BUDGET INNOVATION.

##### Effort:

- Should we actually track cost-effectiveness more in performance results.
- Flexibility and shared services could be forced through budget.
- Little room for improvement here. The four staff agencies have built strong relationships and the weekly peer meetings have elevated their collective status with the program agencies.
- To the extent that leaders only could devote part-time effort to this, it took away from potential results.
- Still need another champion in flexibility/accountability.
- Good documents to work from, but more focus needed in future from Office for Results Management.
- Lack of dedicated resources didn't move along as quickly and completely.
- Maybe most important is the transition to four staff agencies accepting the responsibility for the 4 Governing Magazine categories and achieving a stronger sense of cohesiveness about overall state management.

##### Results:

- Highly variable by department and goal.
- A lot of good results and opportunities to institutionalize results management.

- Results are in place and are working. There is lots of additional potential, however.
- Still more work to do, but some good success to build on.
- Agencies particularly influenced by performance indicators.
- Weak on legislative success . . . but the strength of results management is tremendous.



## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- Emphasize service.
- Maintained strong relationships with constituents ... and the governor's office.
- Congrats in defining the initiative, purpose and goals clearly.
- It makes a big difference.

### Effort:

- Used sound planning and process.
- Effective use of "communication" – internal and external.
- Great in some areas.
- Lacked follow through in others.

### Results:

- Maintain the inertia, regardless of administration.
- Emphasized the "why" of change.
- I think given the short time frame, the results have been appropriate. Grand work has been laid.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Reforming “Politics As Usual”

Reforming the structure of the legislature, our legislative process, and the campaign finance system.

#### Overall Score – 5.1

##### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>4.0 to 9.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.1</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 7.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>6.3</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>3.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>5.2</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>5.7</b>

##### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 5.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>5.0</b>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>7.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>7.5</b>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>2.0 to 4.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<b>3.0</b>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	<b>4.5</b>

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Reforming "Politics as Usual"

- Reviewed September 5, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- Well thought out but not clearly translated to public.
- The overall goal should be recast to make government more accessible to citizens - - in the belief that that will result in better decisions.
- We had good plans. Not enough pressure from governor to get future reform done.
- Concepts are worthy, but these are such "inside" issues that most citizens don't completely understand the problems we were trying to address.
- Bold concepts that were advanced with more publicity than ever before.
- Was not clearly stated until too late. Actually, however, where finally ended was a good articulation and based on a common understanding of well understood problems.

##### Effort:

- Created the legislation, but didn't do the political trade-offs to make it happen. Prodding of legislators.
- Leadership is essential. If the issue is not a high priority it might not be worth pursuing.
- We had good plans. Not enough pressure from governor to get future reform done.
- Legislative reform a #4. CFL a #6. Redistricting a #8. Workplans and collaboration was good, but these issues were not top priorities.
- Good job but difficult to sustain high effort for extended period of time.
- Spotty. Very intensive efforts on redistricting paid off. Remarkable job of getting in touch with legislature. Good outreach to legislature ...better than many areas.

##### Results:

- Strong on redistricting but very limited on other goals.
- The changes are still worth pursuing because they will lead to better decision.
- Some success. Redistricting big success. Soft money a big loser. Getting money moves up to post primary a big victory.
- Legislative Reform a #4; CFL a #5; and redistricting #8.
- "Our" successes should not be looked on as defeats but "valuable lessons learner" of what to do differently in a new administration.
- Good indicators selected to track for state - however, typically moving in the wrong direction.

- Excellent redistricting success ...and a couple important spots of success with remarkably little energy exerted. Clearly, more to be done.

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- Some good concepts – not enough work to explain them – even many legislators were unaware of many of the initiatives.
- The administration needed to make a bottom-line case to the public why these initiatives were needed and what they hoped it would accomplish.

### Effort:

- Good planning, background work done by staff was excellent. However it was not high enough priority by Governor in speeches, letters and visibility.
- Good efforts to make change and plan for it – change was derailed by vested interests.

### Results:

- Big obstacles – strong clout of opponents make progress very difficult.

### Suggestions for the future:

- A future agenda needs to be more focused, better defined and one needs to move quickly. A better job to isolate opponents and go over leadership appeal to the public to pressure the leaders and opponents.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Electronic Government Services Initiative

Making sure that citizens can get information and do business with the state on computers, at any time and from any place.

### Overall Score – 4.7

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	2.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.6

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	3.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	2.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	4.9

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	5.0

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.3

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	2.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	2.0 to 4.0
<i>Average score</i>	3.3

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	4.4



## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Electronic Government Services Initiative - Reviewed September 30, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Did not stress the urgency - our slipping position relative to other states - or the cost and savings duplications.
- We've had some success getting agencies "on board" with this initiative, but very limited success selling it to the legislature. We need to do a better job of explaining how the foundation work will help deliver the results we're all after.
- Clarity of purpose and understanding is readily achievable. Acceptance and prioritization is more difficult.
- Should have/could have been clear - never was. Way too long in development.
- Did not quantify services - online business volume expectations .
- Yes, but a broader reach of message and rationale needed.
- Not generally understood.

##### **Effort:**

- Didn't evaluate cost savings. Too much on back room efforts not enough effort on sales.
- Inadequate understanding at the legislative level.
- Inadequate commitment of resources.
- Lots accomplished with resources available. Need clear performance indicators. Need more persuasive legislative initiative/effort.
- I agree that our structure for identifying technology project priorities and funding is problematic. We need to tie funding requests to outcomes and cost savings to improve our chances for success in the legislative budget process. Still need better coordination among agencies.
- The only downside to the effort is the need for more money, more diverse and deeper leadership.
- Spinning wheels. Never involved broad enough groups early enough. Inadequate resources. Reluctant legislature.
- Resource not adequate to move agenda fast enough.

**Results:**

- Not tracking the number of services as a strong goal. Are we really evaluating the ease of use. Poor results compared to what could have happened. Lots of infrastructure results.
- We clearly aren't keeping up with other states and nations. We need to communicate that this is a priority and a way to deliver on public policy goals, not just another project competing for funds.
- High marks on all counts, but much work left on legislative knowledge, acceptance.
- Never discussed. Indicator agreement spelled out six indicators - instead presentation focused on process steps.
- Results - Board, fund and architecture outputs.
- Below par overall - especially in key areas such as economic developments for example on the web.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- I think the Department of Administration has much work to do in order strengthen their relationship with the legislature. Until that is done the laudable goals of this initiative will continue to languish in the credibility gap of administration.
- Institutionalize this process!
- Keep, improve, enhance Technology Enterprise Board and Technology Enterprise Fund - critical to continued effort.
- Must resolve funding issue - a dedicated 2% of each agency budget perhaps.
- Keep, improve, enhance integrated Project Office effort, for accountability and performance.
- Employ a "best practices" methodology and map progress.
- Consider executive order - and specific involvement by governor - on EGS delivery.
- Build E-learning expertise.

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- Need clearer strategy and stronger communication plan to get broader support and understanding.
- I think it's hard for most to understand the absolute criticality of putting infrastructure in place first - infrastructure including both technology and appropriate process. The PMO and North Star portal are very strategic.

### Effort:

- Many good initiatives, limited money, results not at an acceptable level.
- Planning was done well, but inadequate appropriated resources have stifled execution.
- The funding was totally inadequate! In spite of funding sound planning was done. I was impressed with the progress in collaboration, both with state agencies and the public sectors.

### Results:

- Minnesota needs to "get up to speed" in electronic government services.
- On a "results per dollar appropriate" - this initiative would be a "10." Administration had little success in making this a priority for legislators when the state had "extra" money - now it will be even tougher.
- Progress was good. I saw an increase in momentum - must not be lost.

### Suggestions for the future:

- Citizens League report on E-Government in next 90 days has opportunity for new ideas to move EGS further.
- Think about structure of cabinet/initiatives to push EGS faster.
- High marks for being willing to assess administration's own initiatives.
- Somehow, the administrations legacy may be to find some way to force this imitative to the forefront, place on the next governor's agenda and compel legislative attention too.
- Maintain TEB, but add other constituents that have a vested interest - K-12 representation, etc.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Trade: Tapping the World's Interest in Minnesota

Converting the world's interest in Minnesota into increased trade and business opportunities for Minnesota companies. As a state we now compete not just with states like Wisconsin and Iowa, but with countries like Finland and Argentina.

### Overall Score – 8.0

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.1

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.6

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	7.8

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.5

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	9.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.5

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.0

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	8.1

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Trade: Tapping the World's Interest in Minnesota - Reviewed September 3, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Need to develop network of businesses. Electronic version.
- It would be interesting to see more state employees engaged with the China buttons. I wore mine.
- "World Competitor"
- There is opportunity to continue raising citizen awareness of the importance of trade – take the discussion out of the board room and into the living room so people better understand the benefits.
- Initiative was better conceived than what was presented. Could have been much more crisp in laying out hard outcomes we were after, and in which world markets.

##### **Effort:**

- More regional awareness programs regarding the WTO services has to be done for these services to gain momentum.
- Strength in planning . Staff abilities and business partnerships are well documented.
- DTED is top notch in these areas. I cannot fully speak to intergovernmental collaborative well.
- Local world competition meetings push networking and mutual support.
- Increase publicity for small business.
- Would always love to have more resources, but we've leveraged everything available.
- Interruption in department leadership didn't help. Missions were impeccably planned and executed... more concerned about "the rest" of what Trade Office doing beyond missions.

##### **Results:**

- By comparison to other administration this initiative is head and shoulder above, but the real test of its worth will come with whether it is sustained into the future.
- Develop model that shows return on investment through participation of businesses that participated in trade missions.
- This, as stated by DTED, is a long-term project, but it appears DTED staff know what needs to be done.
- Trade progress is strong. Quantified results on trade missions are still out.

- Need to increase legislative awareness and support.
- Believe the results exist, but was not shown. No private business expansion anecdote – why not?

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- It was clear that exports to PRC were the focus. A given knowledge master with delegation was a major benefit.
- Regarding MTO – please return the emphasis as a “facilitator” and “problem solver.” The Trade Office has done an excellent job of personalizing their assistance, it translates into word of mouth and referrals.
- China Trip allowed companies to become more vigorous in protecting intellectual property – patents and legislation.

### **Effort:**

- Strongest factor – very professional flexible, well organized mission. The MTO provided timely, strategic and detailed support to small Minnesota companies.

### **Results:**

- Great accomplishments!
- Within scope of administration effort. Results were very good.
- Remember to factor in longer term benefits. Don't expect results overnight. Communicate with the public through the “non-political” channel of the businesses who have been helped.
- China Trip logistics/trip on organization – costs were reasonable; Governor's influence to bring dignitaries was done well.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Broader communications effort in mailing, web pages on facts and achievements.
- Simplification of language as part of communication strategy.
- China Trip: Provide marketing specific information of: (a) List of Europe/USA companies currently manufacturing in Pharmaceutical and equipment makers; (b) list of developing Prc med technical device and markets e.g. medical disposables.
- Provide specific information on (a) Trade shows – work specific INTW and (b) trade publications etc.





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Agriculture: Competitive Anywhere in the World

Making our farm families competitive through lowering their cost of production, and adding value to Minnesota products, and developing new market opportunities, both domestic and foreign.

### Overall Score – 6.8

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.8

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	3.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.7

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	6.0

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.2

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	7.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.4

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.2

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	7.5

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

# **Agriculture: Competitive Anywhere in the World**

**- Reviewed October 2, 2002**

### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

#### **Concept:**

- Is the competition between farmers in Minnesota a barrier that needs to be addressed?
- Elevating the profile of agriculture a real plus.
- Plain and simple.
- Lower production costs vs. Increased value added.
- Initiative was well conceived. Performance measures were too broad.
- There could and should have been a clear checklist of things that would make Minnesota agriculture more competitive (exports, tax structure, infrastructure, and etc.) and clear description of what to do/change. Never delineated.

#### **Effort:**

- Adequacy of resources to this effort is unclear but leadership of Commissioner and Governor is obvious.
- Good planning
- Better collaboration between agencies and use of farm cabinet could have occurred.
- I think that to have a meaningful impact on the world competitiveness, this will take substantially more money, staffing and cross agency efforts. I also think MDA was too often moving forward alone. Need to bring other agencies in early to build unified effort.
- Strong trade mission, work, MN certified and marketing advice.
- Efforts seemed to lack strong coordination.
- Tremendous amount of internal department work to define mission – still too many. Inadequate resources devoted to things like MNCERT (most cutting edge idea to come out of department in past four years).

#### **Results:**

- Results are mainly anecdotal but trade missions have been well reported and successful.
- Very good measurements, program modifications and legislative success/expertise. Could again increase inter-agency communication/efforts earlier in process.
- Actual advances not wide.
- Hard to know. None presented in presentation and no report of performance measures developed by MDA division.

- Are farmers more competitive/less competitive?

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Need more visibility of support for Agriculture and livestock.
- Enhance transportation of agricultural products via water (Soo Locks and Mississippi River, rail and truck.
- Farmers are competing with each other; instead of collaborating to compete against other countries.
- Build the transportation infrastructure to support agriculture.
- Agriculture is holding it's own and feels more part of our future.
- Traceability - Push high end differentiated products.
- Can we track total number of farms? And/or farmers?

## Outside Reviewers Comments

### Concept:

- Minnesota Department of Agriculture has accordingly identified parameters except traceability and IP opportunities and concerns.
- The mission statement and it's goals address our needs/concerns very clearly.
- The initiative is clear and should be easy to understand, but, I didn't know much about the initiative until today. (Need more outreach about the initiative.)
- Mission statements aren't proactive enough - "assist" is not a bold, visionary word. Unclear as to who the "customer" is. Is it community groups only?

### Effort:

- More money attributed to info/education on agriculture and livestock importance to way of life and value to the Minnesota economy.
- Minnesota Department of Agriculture has been exceptional; restructuring Ag marketing service to be pro-active and responsive to changing trends.
- The Department of Agriculture has done an excellent job addressing ag issues. The leadership has a hands-on understanding of the industry and that shows in the efforts extended.
- Appears to be good, although I don't have much info on this part.
- Not enough information given to determine how this has been received and acted upon internally, but seems like it was taken very seriously. Ag is hard, because there are so many external forces outside the state's control

### Results:

- Extremely ambitious. Time and limited resources only obstacle.
- Organic agriculture is probably better off today, but conventional agriculture, particularly mid-size farms are struggling.
- Again, difficult to succeed in what is a global environment. I'd like to see more emphasis on smaller scale, community-based efforts.

### Suggestions for the future:

- External factors will influence Minnesota agriculture's contribution to Minnesota economy, transportation, South American agriculture and etc.
- More PR work for the livestock industry.
- Help in bringing more of the retail money back to the farm.
- Transportation issues in rural Minnesota need more in agency attention.
- Help protecting Ag Zones.
- Increase focus on alternative agriculture (Organics, small-scale on farm processing, new crops, direct marketing.).
- I think the idea of doing an evaluation is great. Thanks for doing it!
- Work more closely with Trade and Economic Development on small business strategies.

- Health insurance issues for farm families so spouse doesn't have to off-farm job just for health insurance.
- Raise the transport issues more publicly so public understands land lock challenge.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Developing the Workforce of Tomorrow

Making sure Minnesota has a well-trained and flexible workforce that allows us to be quickly responsive to new opportunities.

### Overall Score – 5.6

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.4

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.7

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	5.6

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	6.0

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	3.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	4.3

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	5.1



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Developing the Workforce of Tomorrow - Reviewed September 18, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- The actual goals are not easily understood.
- Well articulated values and goals.
- Still not enough buy-in from state employees and a need for greater citizen understanding.
- Could have had more clarity sooner. In some respects, took too long to get to consensus. Speaks somewhat to the bureaucracies here.

##### Effort:

- I do not believe all parties were truly invested, making the initiatives difficult to support for others.
- Clear, but not concise for average citizen.
- Legislature success impeded by Governor. Strong local effort.
- The work on coordination within the Workforce Centers was great – other initiatives, especially legislative support didn't coalesce.
- A lot of cross agency and cross partnership was obviously sound.
- Amazing cooperation and collaboration despite historic silos – internal and external to administration. Really long hard effort to rethink strategies and move ahead, despite narrow thinking of state legislature.

##### Results:

- Results valuable, but stood far short of expected/desired outcome of customers/public.
- Process results – but not legislative. Did not discuss real customer outcomes.
- While there are a lot of successes – it could have been even more successful with legislative buy-in and support.
- You know why a 7- Because real progress has been made in delivery of services and there is a new FRAMEWORK/FOUNDATION in place from which to spring.

##### Suggestions for the future:

- Big Plan – “Plan” is the hot bottom item. Are we in an anti – planning environment? Should the marketplace determine success alone?
- Regional planning on the horizon and important.

- What does it mean to be strategic? Can we arrive at implementing enough vision for the state's advocates to come together in order to slough off the past.
- Clarify rationale for pursuing merger of DTED/DES. Most could be accomplished w/o a merger and on a much faster timeframe.
- Get employers more involved.
- Work harder on legislative buy-in price.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Could have been state more clearly and sold better to legislators.
- The system is still too complex for general citizens and employers to understand. Some communication pieces from the administration are very good but not well known or distributed. Employers and business community must be a bigger part of the solution.

### **Effort:**

- Weak legislative relationships.
- Minnesota is still without a workforce development system that has coordinated planning, policy development and evaluation that is independent of agencies running the programs.
- Lots of good planning done that holds much promise. The reluctance for change in Minnesota is problematic, not only in government but the private sector as well. We're the "land of 10,000 further studies!"

### **Results:**

- Legislative scorecard.
- All of the above.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- Strong, hands-on gubernatorial leadership
- Focus on coming skilled workforce shortage
- Continue this performance review and measurement.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### The Best Climate to Grow Business

Helping Minnesota business – especially high-growth, high-wage industries – continue to prosper in a supportive business environment.

### Overall Score – 6.9

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>7.3</i>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>6.0 to 10.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>7.3</i>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>6.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>6.8</i>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	<i>7.1</i>

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>7.0 to 8.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>7.5</i>

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>5.0 to 7.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>6.0</i>

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	<i>6.0 to 7.0</i>
<i>Average score</i>	<i>6.5</i>

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	<i>6.6</i>

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **The Best Climate to Grow Business - Reviewed September 3, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- The initiatives are out there, but and can be hard to find, even from within the system.
- Good emphasis on start-up, high growth, high wage. Should more clearly identify the "deficient" areas in climate.
- This is a very fundamental concept that seems to be well understood. The challenge is continuing to "brand" Minnesota and our strengths.
- Good principles considered ...but not really specific enough.

##### **Effort:**

- It appears that there can be more done to inform the public of efforts, assistance, etc.
- Strong strategic perspective. Good retail follow-up with business. Should do more to exploit partnerships with education and telecommunications.
- Resources of time and money are never enough but certainly leadership attention has been substantial.
- One of our biggest strengths has been the high quality research that has helped lead these initiatives.
- Too many platitudes; not enough specifics. No mention of collaboration with Dept. of Revenue on tax reform initiative. Appreciate new attention to workforce development. Good interdepartmental collaboration; skeptical about external group cooperation/collaboration.

##### **Results:**

- All performance indicators have been impacted by recession.
- Much more needs to be done at the legislative level to make these initiatives a reality.
- The tough economic climate has hampered some results, but overall significant progress has been made.
- External indicators helpful here. Survey of businesses served ...assist in changes to business strategy.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Focus should be on all companies. Level the playing field instead of specific subsidies.





## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Commercialization of New Technologies

Maximizing Minnesota's access to technology and the commercialization of new technologies through the Biomedical Innovation and Commercialization Initiative.

#### Overall Score – 5.4

##### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.8

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.8

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	2.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	4.8

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	5.7

##### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	4.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	6.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	5.0 to 8.0
<i>Average score</i>	7.3

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	1.0 to 7.0
<i>Average score</i>	3.8

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score (20%, 25% &amp; 55%)</i>	5.1

## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Commercialization of New Technologies - Reviewed September 23, 2002

#### Inside Reviewers Comments

##### Concept:

- Overall outcome was articulated, but structure was not.
- Well articulated with an internal crowd; not successful with key stakeholders (i.e. legislature and private sector).

##### Effort:

- Structured to small? Too narrowized?
- Planning seemed to be very intense in the beginning and on going always evolving.
- Good, but could have been better. Kept too narrow (DTED alone). Even at the University, could have been broader.

##### Results:

- Stronger relationship between DTED and University. Good start was unusual.
- Stop and start – but actually better than expected. Greater resources devoted to initiating BICI and doing fundraising may have helped.

##### Suggestions for the future:

- Construct this more broadly – more generic.
- Deal size might have been too small.
- Economic Development is needed now than before.
- Hire executive early

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- These are tough stories to tell – the process is complicated and requires patience and persistence – not amended to sound bites.

### **Effort:**

- Excellent planning.
- Good cooperation among departments, not with legislature.
- Gave an “8” for the amount of time allotted to this project.
- Continue discussion for creation of seed fund – possible more generic approach.

### **Results:**

- Never executed.
- May be too narrow to create a political constituency.



## THE BIG ACCOUNTING

### Jesse “The Tourism Governor” Ventura: Promoting Minnesota, Promoting the Industry

Capitalizing on Minnesota’s natural attractions – including its Governor – to welcome visitors and show them why Minnesota is worth visiting and investing in.

### Overall Score – 8.9

#### Inside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.0 to 9.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.4

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.9

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	6.5 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	8.4

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	8.5

#### Outside scores

<b>Concept</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.0

<b>Effort</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	8.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.0

<b>Results</b>	
<i>Range of scores</i>	9.0 to 10.0
<i>Average score</i>	9.3

<b>Total Score</b>	
<i>Average weighted score</i> (20%, 25% & 55%)	9.2

## **THE BIG ACCOUNTING**

### **Jesse "The Tourism Governor" Ventura: Promoting Minnesota, Promoting the Industry - Reviewed October 14, 2002**

#### **Inside Reviewers Comments**

##### **Concept:**

- Very clear, easily understood. This helped to create clear direction.
- Return on investment is not a three year process and this level of professional focus must carry over to new administration or our investment will not be totally returned.
- Could have better quantified our aspirations.
- I don't think it could be more clearly stated. At the same time, I don't believe DTED/MOT fully understand the intent and bottom line of the initiative.
- Was straight forward concept.
- Well accepted by public.
- Good projects, good efforts. Office of Tourism never completely embraced or articulated the specific objectives possible with this unique opportunity to use Jesse.
- Tourism comparable to agriculture. Use Jesse to make things more competitive.

##### **Effort:**

- Good use of opportunities as they occur.
- Strong commitment of dollars and governor's time.
- Creative steps to respond to September 11 crisis.
- Excellent work to reposition message.
- Exploited key strengths i.e. Governor's celebrity.
- This would be a ten if more money were available but then what is enough? I don't think you ever get to ten.
- Strong advertising, PSA effect, especially with limited budget.
- Inter- departmental was not touched on. I think MOT's work plan was followed through, but not the intent of the initiative.
- Tourism was the best example of creativity and flexibility following September 11.
- In many ways, the tourism industry came to life with a Governor that so naturally promoted and sold this state. Effort of industry as a whole was very, very impressive.

**Results:**

- Difficult to measure outcomes.
- Data presented was positive, however, only a slice of the impacts.
- Did obtain increase in funding.
- Great ads.
- This score of 8 could go up with time.
- Great success in using governor. Legislature still doesn't get it.
- I would have like numbers on Industry impact.
- Amazing results for 2001, due to hard work and willingness to refocus message and resources.
- Numbers look good...despite industry-wide setbacks of recent years.
- Best creative campaign. Return on investment 8 billion to 9.7 billion
- Greater Minnesota has done better.
- Smashing Success.

**Suggestions for the future:**

- Strive to develop better outcomes.
- Continue to use Governor Ventura if he is willing after January 2003.
- Haven't made case to legislature on the MOT.
- Cultural heritage – emotional impact.

## **Outside Reviewers Comments**

### **Concept:**

- Very impressed with the fact it was so clearly spelled out from the start.

### **Effort:**

- Great effort – not enough money.
- Based upon only money, I would have rated a number 5. Everything else would have been a number 10. I gave a number 9.
- Also impressed with leadership and commitment to the cause.

### **Results:**

- Given the resources, it was outstanding by performance indicators.
- I would have rated number 10 except for legislature. I gave a number 9.
- Certainly the numbers indicate the success in spite of September 11 and a difficult economy. Legislative activity needed a bit of help but not through any fault of this office.

### **Suggestions for the future:**

- We need to make the case that Tourism dollars are a “no brainer” investment in our state. Every \$1 invested brings \$4.60 in just TAXES.
- We need to create the performance based funding model similar to Missouri.