**Program Logic Models**

**Bush Grant Advisory Committee Vision Statement:**

Minnesota promotes food safety and economic development through a user-friendly food business regulatory system that is coordinated, reliable and efficient.

* **Entrepreneurs** of small and large food businesses successfully navigate Minnesota’s easy-to-understand, transparent and streamlined system. Operators obtain the appropriate licenses and certifications and produce safe food for consumers.
* **Regulators** from agencies across Minnesota (MDH, MDA, and delegated local agencies) freely share knowledge and work a timely manner with entrepreneurs of food businesses and with each other. Regulatory agencies are accountable and consistent and support education, outreach and the production and service of safe food to Minnesotans.

**8 Program Logic Models:**

* Short term:
	+ Workshop/Educational Opportunity for Food Entrepreneurs
	+ Simple, Visual Representation(s) of Regulatory Concepts (flow chart/idea tree)
	+ Joint Educational and Problem Solving Forums 2x per year in 8 locations in MN
* Medium Term:
	+ In-Depth Feasibility Modeling Research of Minneapolis 311 System
	+ Second Opinion Campaign
	+ Regional Food Safety Experts
* Long term:
	+ Implementing Statewide 311 System
	+ Statutory Changes

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Workshops/Educational Opportunity for Food Entrepreneurs - short term**
 |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** Hold workshops and trainings for food entrepreneurs with evolving curriculum based on agency and entrepreneur needs. |
| **Ask:** Funding is secured for workshop development. Regulatory experts, food entrepreneurs, and organizations representing food entrepreneurs commit to attending workshops; MDA/MDH and community organizations participate in planning and delivery of workshops. |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Funding (travel expenses, curriculum development, advisory committee)Pilot fundingLeadership & Management ExpertiseDesign & Communications CapacityOutreach documents Organizations willing to participate or hostMDA/MDH involvement – leadership and food safety expertiseFood entrepreneurs’ experienceCurriculum DesignSpaces (virtual/in-person) to meetEvaluation design | Establishment of workshop leadership positionsCreate a board of directors/advisory committee that includes MDA/MDH staff, members from targeted community, and organizations representing food entrepreneursTraining of educators with curriculumPresentation of educational curriculum to food entrepreneursContinuing updating of training/curriculumConduct EvaluationsTargeted outreach to start-up food entrepreneurs | Increased food entrepreneur knowledge - including on issues of food safetyReduced confusion around requirements on the part of food entrepreneurs | Food inspectors field fewer points of confusion. | Decreased number of site visits to problem establishments for inspectors MDA/MDH/Delegated Agency staff are better able to identify common problem areas for food entrepreneurs |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** Educational workshops will lead to effective food safety and licensing knowledge and implementation among farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators. | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on willingness of participants to engage by attending meetings and contributing during these meetings. Levels of fear around this topic will also affect project success. |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Simple, Visual Representation(s) of Regulatory Concepts (flow chart/idea tree) - short term** |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** Flowchart/idea tree allowing people to better understand the regulatory system so they can seek out needed information in the correct places. |
| **Ask:** Funding is secured for document development and project manager and business flow consultant are recruited. A work-group that includes MDA/MDH/Delegated Agency staff and food entrepreneur representatives is formed and tasked with creation of the document. Document is created and circulated among local foods community. |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Funding (project manager and business flow consultant)Communications expertiseDesign CapacityCommunication channels for new resourcesMDA/MDH/Delegated Agencies leadership – high-up staff people within agencies are assigned this project as part of job responsibilitiesWork-group team of MDA/MDH/Food entrepreneurs/Orgs Opportunity costs documentation Participation from the Minnesota Management and Budget office (MMB) to help with organizational development  | Work-group team meetings to create and revise document, clarify information.Identify and document food entrepreneur entry points into the regulatory systemHire business flow expert and project managerBusiness Flow AnalysisFlow chart/idea tree is designedOutreach campaign on communicating early with inspectors to be paired with this documentTell targeted groups about new resourceProvide inspectors with this resource to distribute to food entrepreneurs Continuing updating of documentSee if DEED would get involved, as they already have a “how to start a business” component | Increased food entrepreneur knowledge of who to turn to for licensing, food safety, and regulation questionsIncreased food entrepreneur knowledge - including on issues of food safetyReduced confusion around requirements on the part of food entrepreneurs | Food inspectors field fewer points of confusion. | Decreased time spent shuffling questions from food businesses at MDA/MDHShows the gaps in regulatory processes and where it needs to be improved (proof for need of Mpls 311) |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** The creation of a simple visual representation of regulatory concepts will increase knowledge and understanding of licensing and regulation system for farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators. | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on willingness of advisory committee members to engage by attending meetings and contributing during these meetings; it will also depend on the participation of the MMB. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3. Joint Educational & Problem-Solving Forums 2x per year in 8 locations in MN - short term** |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements in the FSMA and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** MDA/MDH/Delegated staff and food entrepreneurs located in 8 regions of Minnesota hold in-person meetings twice per year to share information, work out food safety solutions, and build relationships within the region. |
| **Ask:** Funding is secured for meeting facilitation. MDA/MDH/Delegated Authorities facilitate meeting attendance by food inspectors operating in the regions and by state-level staff where appropriate. MDH and MDA assist with developing meeting schedule and securing venues.  |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Funding to support travel, honoraria, food, etc. MDA/MDH/Delegated Authority leadership support for attendance by staff within the regionsCommitment from MDA/MDH/Delegated Authority staff with regions to attendMDH Food Safety Partnership existing meeting infrastructure opened to this forum 2x/yearMDH 8 regional offices opened to this forum 2x/yearMeeting coordination/facilitation team managed by Renewing the CountrysideSustainable ag & local food organizations, trade associations willing to assist with outreach communications, logistics, hosting (MISA, MFMA, SFA)Food entrepreneurs committed to attending | FSMA curriculum and educational materials createdTargeted outreach to food entrepreneurs to encourage attendanceTargeted outreach to regional MDA/MDH/Delegated staff to encourage (require) attendanceDevelopment of food entrepreneur case studies within regionsDevelopment or compiling of resource documents based on feedback from the regional meetingsOngoing revision of meeting design/content based on evaluation & feedback by attendeesMeeting agendas may include:\* Presentations by food entrepreneurs about their businesses (case studies)\* Panel discussions\* Q & A from the field\* Informal networking & discussion time\* Presentations by regional regulators re: food safety issues and best practices\* Problem-solving around licensing or food safety issues | Increased food entrepreneur knowledgeand inspector knowledge includingon issues of food safety and business practicesIncreased MDA/MDH/Delegated inspector and staff knowledge of food entrepreneur questions and concernsIncreased food entrepreneur knowledge and reduced confusion around licensing and food safety | Coordination/alignment among foodregulatory agencies within regionsApply increased knowledge of food safety (FSMA and state regulations) to business practices | Improved food entrepreneurperception/trust of MDA/MDH/Delegated AuthorityintentionsImproved MDA/MDH/Delegated Authority perception of food entrepreneur willingness to comply with food safety provisionsIncreased efficiency for food inspectorsfielding fewer points of confusion |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** A two-way dialog learning method will lead to effective FSMA knowledge retention and implementation among farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators. | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on willingness of participants to engage by attending meetings and contributing during these meetings. Levels of fear around this topic will also affect project success. |

|  |
| --- |
| **4. In-Depth Feasibility Modeling Research of Minneapolis 311 System - medium term** |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** Conduct a systematic study of the Minneapolis 311 System and create a feasibility report on how/if a similar statewide structure would occur. |
| **Ask:** Funding is secured and a researcher is recruited to conduct a feasibility study about the implementation of the Minneapolis 311 System on a statewide level. MDA/MDH/Delegated Agencies participate with this research. |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Funding (Staff, graduate researcher)ResearcherStaff to direct researcherMinneapolis 311 staff/program developers share information and adviceInformation expertise for designing studyIT ExpertiseInvolvement of Materials Management Division (MMD) in the MN State Office of Administration for external “look” at the agencies structure. | Study DesignDocumentation of existing inefficiencies in the systemConduct Business Flow AnalysisConduct studyQuality improvement and performance managementCreation of feasibility reportStaff bring researcher(s) up to speed on background information for projectStaff inform research direction | MDA/MDH/Delegated agencies understand pros/cons/likelihood of success to implement a similar model at state level | Stakeholders equipped to lobby for and implement statewide system | State legislator and governor have data on cost and parameters of implementation |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** An in-depth feasibility study of the Minneapolis 311 system will effectively determine if it can and should be implemented on a statewide level.  | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on the ability of the researcher to gain access to specific information, the level of involvement of the MMD, and the amount of information shared by the Minneapolis 311 staff and program developers. |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Regional Food Safety Experts - medium term** |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** Create positions throughout MN that farmers/food businesses trust to ask food safety-related questions and have adequate training/background to refer people appropriately. |
| **Ask:** Funding is secured and five new full-time Extension staff people are hired to operate out of existing regional offices. MDA, MDH and Delegated Agencies include these new educators in the existing agency educational structures so that they stay up-to-date on regulatory information.  |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Funding to hire new staff peopleCommunications CapacityResource/hosting organizationsResource documents MDA/MDH involvement – leadership, educational structures, and food safety expertiseFood entrepreneurs’ experience and engagementUniversity of Minnesota Extension involvement and support | Decide organization(s) to house positionsHire on staff membersEstablish job responsibilities and parameters for position Gain support from the Food Safety Defense Task Force Targeted outreach to start-up food entrepreneurs through the sustainable agriculture and local food network or organizations in Minnesota. Guide entrepreneur questions to related organizations as neededCollect existing and create new resource documents for food entrepreneursWork with regulators within the agencies | Increased food entrepreneur preparation to contact an inspector.Increased food entrepreneur knowledge - including on issues of food safetyReduced confusion around requirements on the part of food entrepreneurs | Efficient referral of entrepreneur questions due to collaboration between Licensing Liaisons & Regional Food Safety ExpertsFood inspectors field fewer points of confusion.Regional Food Safety Experts become part of the agencies’ learning management system | Faster turnaround time between concept and application approvalFood entrepreneurs have a information resource they trust and can learn from within their geographical region.  |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** The Regional Food Safety Experts will be effective, helpful trusted,, and sought out by farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators. | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on the willingness of organizations to house the positions and how responsive food entrepreneurs are to the outreach efforts.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. Second Opinion Campaign - medium term** |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** Second Opinion Campaign to educate food entrepreneurs with a list of options for next steps if faced with a denial from an inspector.  |
| **Ask:** Local food system organizations and agencies participate in creation and implementation of a statewide campaign that encourages food entrepreneurs to ask for a second opinion about licensing and regulatory rules. Needed funding is secured and agency-level infrastructure is identified or created to handle second-opinion requests. |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Funding Local food system organizations/communications and outreach capacityResource documents for food entrepreneurs MDA, MDH and Delegated agency infrastructure for handling second opinion requests | ID MDA/MDH/Delegated staff who will take on these job responsibilities and what department they’ll be housed inCampaign strategy identified, planned, and implemented Teach food entrepreneurs to get a second opinion by calling inspector’s supervisor, reaching out to MISA or RTC, or other organizations or food experts in MN. Targeted outreach to food entrepreneursWork with local foods organizations to enhance campaign’s visibility  | Increased MDA/MDH/Delegated inspector and staff knowledge of food entrepreneur questions/concernsImproved entrepreneur perception/trust of MDA and MDH inspector intentionsReduced confusion around requirements on the part of food entrepreneurs | Food inspectors field fewer points of confusion. | Efficient referral of entrepreneur food questions Elimination of “dead-end” result for entrepreneurs who struggled within inspector’s requirements.  |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** The Second Opinion Campaign will make a measurable impact on food entrepreneurs and food entrepreneurs needing to ask for a second opinion will always be efficiently helped.  | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on the success of the campaign and the willingness of food entrepreneurs to ask for a second opinion. Levels of fear around this topic will also affect project success. |

|  |
| --- |
| **7. Implementing Statewide 311 System - long term** |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** Using results of systematic study, set in place a statewide version of the Minneapolis 311 System |
| **Ask:** Stakeholders involved in the feasibility study in #4 determine if and how to implement a statewide version of the Minneapolis 311 system based on the results of that systematic study. MDA/MDH/Delegated Agencies participate in that determination. Major Legislative and other funding is secured for the implementation.  |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Research on City of Mpls system - to be completed earlier (listed under medium-term activities) to roll into this longer-term projectDocumentation from City of Mpls of their implementation of the systemFunding – MN Legislature/GovernorIT systems expertiseExperienced City of Mpls staffOther state modelsFood entrepreneurs’ experienceOrganizations’ experienceMDA/MDH involvement / leadershipSupport from Commissioners of MDA and MDH Design & communications capacity Leadership & Management expertiseMedia support and attention | Pilot project? Establishment of systems and leadership for both process management and food safety/regulatory expertiseAlign purpose with government goals and efficiency (for marketing to legislature)Connect goals of 311 system with goals of Minnesota Food CharterEstablishment of IT system for tracking casesTime tracking & accountability systemScripting & training for entry-point personnelContinual updating of system/scripting & trainingEstablish feedback loops: legislative updates, food entrepreneur input, training of inspectorsCommunication & Education campaign directed at public Identify supporters and gain their commitment to action/helping | Improved public perception of value of MDA and MDH inspectorsIncreased food entrepreneur knowledge - including on issues of food safetyReduced confusion around requirements on the part of food entrepreneurs | Reduced inaccuracies & repeat callsFood inspectors field fewer points of confusion. | Better experience for food entrepreneursMore efficient workflow for food inspectorsNo one gets lost in the system/timeliness of approvalsImproved food safety by having more entrepreneurs entering the regulatory system User experience improved |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** The implementation of a statewide version of the Minneapolis 311 system will create greater efficiency for regulators and better results for food entrepreneurs.  | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on willingness of agency staff and legislators to support the system.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **8. Statutory Changes - long term** |
| **SITUATION:** Farmers, food entrepreneurs, food system advocates, and regulators in Minnesota have difficulty navigating complex food safety requirements and in state and local rules and regulations. Moreover, there is a disconnect in understanding around food safety practices and business innovations among these groups at the regional level.  |
| **Summary:** Identify statutes that need to be changed and pursue those changes.  |
| **Ask:** MDA/MDH/Delegated Agencies assist in statutory language development and in evaluation of food safety risks/benefits and implementation costs/savings of statutory changes proposed by local food system stakeholders.  |
| **INPUTS** | **OUTPUTS** (Activities) | **OUTCOMES** |
|  | Knowledge | Actions | Conditions |
| Statute researcher Funding – MN Legislature/GovernorOther state modelsSupport from Commissioners of MDA and MDH Design capacity for writing new statuteMedia support and attentionMDA/MDH involvement – participation, food safety expertise, assistance in writing draft statute Support and knowledge from agencies, university, and nonprofit organizations (stakeholders) to aid in changing statute | Research statutory changesEstablishment of leadership positionsMDA and MDH assist in draft creation/writing of one licensing statute Identify supporters and gain their commitment to action/helpingSupporters pursue implementation of statutory changes within legislature and governor’s officeTraining of regulatory staff about new statutes Targeted outreach to start-up food entrepreneurs about statutory changes | Reduced confusion around requirements on the part of food entrepreneursIncreased clarity and knowledge of statutory requirements | Food inspectors field fewer points of confusion.Reduced inaccuracies & repeat calls | Increase in business start-upsBack-and-forth confusion between MDA and MDH eliminatedUser experience improved |
| **ASSUMPTIONS:** Statutory changes will create a simplified licensing and regulations system that will allow more food entrepreneurs to easily enter and succeed within the system.  | **EXTERNAL FACTORS:** The success of this project will depend on willingness of the agencies’ to participate in the statutory changes process, the involvement of supporters/lobbyists to push for change, and how the idea is received/perceived by government decision makers.  |