

Operations and Infrastructure Example

To aid state agencies in preparing the Results section of their change item proposals, Results Management has created a series of examples for various types or genres of proposed change items. Please note that all examples are fictional and intended for training purposes only. The series of examples can be found at <https://mn.gov/mmb/budget/results-management/resources-for-state-agencies/>.

Each example includes the following:

- A brief description of the fictional program/project used for the example.
- The Results section from the change item template, complete with fictional agency responses for the example proposal. The instructions from the change item template are written in *Italics*.
- Additional directions are provided in the instructional guide as **comments** formatted in blue. The instructional guide can be found at <https://mn.gov/mmb/budget/results-management/resources-for-state-agencies/>.

Operations and Infrastructure Proposal

This specific example is most relevant for change items that are proposing **operations and infrastructure changes** (e.g., new construction, repair or renovation of existing infrastructure, building staffing and/or organizational capacity, etc.).

Funding will be used to provide grants to counties and Tribal nations to focus on climate adaptation and resilience planning. Local governments could utilize these funds for staffing, community outreach, or infrastructure projects. Based on the results of the Climate Collaborative Planning Survey, building staff capacity to manage and (?) coordinate climate planning efforts are likely to be the most common use of grant funds.

Results Section:

The Results section is intended to display the performance measures that will be used to assess the success, outcomes, and impact of the proposed change item. Please complete this section based on the current proposal with recognition that performance measures may change based on revision processes and final budget allocation. Examples of performance measures and a brief video with guidance for this section is available online at [Results Management Resources for State Agencies](#). Please contact the Results Management Team at MMB (ResultsManagement@state.mn.us) with questions and for support completing this section.

Part A: Performance measures (required)

1. *Describe the overall goal and expected outcome(s) of the programs and activities supported by the change item (1 to 3 sentences). How would we know that this change item was successful and over what period of time? This should align with the intended results noted in the rationale/background section.*

Through planning grants to local governments, an increased number of Minnesota counties and Tribal nations will have at least 0.5 full-time equivalent staff dedicated to climate planning efforts within three years. The outcome of additional staff capacity will be improved climate adaptation and resilience planning and coordination with other government agencies. The long-term outcome of climate planning is that more

Minnesotans live in places that are prepared for climate change, thereby ensuring that more Minnesotans are able to stay safe and healthy in their homes.

2. *Describe the evidence that exists that the proposed change item will achieve the expected outcome(s) noted above (up to a paragraph, include charts as applicable). Evidence can be in the form of professional and community knowledge, logic model, current performance measure data, prior evaluation, or evidence-based practices. Refer to the evaluation noted in proposal section. **If proposed efforts involve components of an evidence-based practice or were informed by a previously conducted formal program evaluation, fill out Part B.***

A dedicated staff person working at least half time on climate planning was identified through the Climate Collaborative Planning Survey as important to building climate planning efforts. Past and current climate grantees have shared that funding to implement new staff positions can be difficult to obtain without grants, increasing taxes, organizational restructuring.

3. *Using the table below and/or charts, include at least 3 quantitative (numeric) performance measures that will be used to assess the expected outcomes(s) of the change item. Types of measures include Quantity (how much was done?), Quality (how well was it done?), and Result (how are Minnesotans better off?). Examples of measures are available online at [Results Management Resources for State Agencies](#).*

Measure	Measure type	Measure data source	Most recent data	Projected change
# of grantees with at least 0.5 FTE of staff time dedicated to climate planning	Quantity	A question will be added to the Climate Collaborative Planning Survey	N/A	By 2027, at least 30% of MN counties will have staff that dedicate 0.5 FTE climate planning.
% of grantees reporting coordination with other government agencies	Quality	Climate Collaborative Planning Survey	In 2022, 30% of survey respondents reported coordinating	In 2027, 50% of survey respondents will report coordinating
% of MN counties have adopted climate resilience plans	Result	Climate Collaborative Planning Survey	In 2022, 20% of survey respondents reported having adopted a climate plan	In 2027, 40% of survey respondents will report having adopted a climate plan

4. Please describe any qualitative (narrative) measures that will be used to inform understanding of success. How will this information be collected? If successful, what change will you see in this data?

Agency staff will have site visits with each grantee to learn about success and challenges with climate planning. Narrative survey questions will be used to see changes in climate planning and resilience projects over time gathered through qualitative descriptions asking about what is different and how. Best practices for climate planning coordination shared by grantees will be shared with other grantees to increase awareness of other practices to try.

Part B: Use of Evidence

1. Have you previously conducted a formal quantitative or qualitative program evaluation that informed the contents of this proposal? If so, please briefly describe the evaluation.

The results of the Climate Collaborative Planning Survey were used to inform this proposal. This evaluation consisted of a survey sent to all local governments in Minnesota and was comprised of primarily yes/no questions that asked about barriers to climate planning and current efforts. The survey was completed in summer 2023 with a total of 65 responses.

2. Are you planning to conduct a formal qualitative or quantitative program evaluation related to this proposal? Indicate what kind(s) of evaluation you will be conducting. Select all that apply.

- No formal evaluation planned at this time
- Not yet determined
- Needs Assessment
- Process or Implementation Evaluation
- Summative Impact Evaluation (Randomized Control Trial (RCT) or Quasi-Experimental Design)
- Summative Evaluation other than an Impact Evaluation
- Other (please describe or link):

Part C: Evidence-Based Practices

If applicable, provide the following information on the evidence-based practices supported by the change item. The Results Team at MMB reviews change items to identify the proposals and agencies that support evidence-based practices. The definitions of evidence used by Results Management are available at <https://mn.gov/mmb/results-first/definitions-of-evidence/>. Resources to find evidence-based practices are available at <https://mn.gov/mmb/evidence/finding/>.

Evidence-based practice	Source
List the names of program or activity that are evidence-based and directly funded by this change item.	Provide a link to the clearinghouse or journal article that establishes the evidence for the change item.
N/A	N/A

For assistance identifying evidence-based practices that support the change item or for support in planning an evaluation, please contact the Results Team at MMB (ResultsManagement@state.mn.us).