

To: Russ Webb, Chair
From: Steve Williams, Chief Operating Officer
Date: October 1, 2016
RE: Trust Authority staff comments
DRAFT RFLOI - Organizational Assessment

Background

The Trust (Authority Office, Land Office, and Board of Trustees) is seeking a third party to conduct an organizational assessment of the Trust as a whole entity. The Request for Letter of Interest (RFLOI) is an initial, informal process to gather information prior to deciding whether to move forward with a formal Request for Proposal (RFP). The intent is not to be definitively prescriptive, rather to provide the requisite framework to allow entities with expertise in the field to inform the Trust on how they might execute an organizational assessment and its related cost. It is important to note this information, as well as any other information gathered, does not preclude the Trust from adjusting or further defining a scope of work and deliverables for a formal RFP. Nor does it require the Trust to move forward with a RFP. Finally, the RFLOI process does not pre-qualify or preclude entities from participating in a Request for Proposal if one is ultimately solicited.

On September 23, Trust staff provided trustees a draft Request for Letters of Interest for comment and feedback. All Trust Authority Office staff were provided the opportunity to review the draft RFLOI and provide their comments and feedback. Below are the summarized staff comments and feedback received. Some of the comments and feedback could be easily incorporated to amend the draft language (e.g. redefining the minimum number of years of experience, gathering feedback from beneficiaries and other stakeholders, implementing a 360 assessment tool). Other comments and feedback, would require further discussion (e.g., requiring an entity to have expertise in organizational evaluations and health care reform).

Scope of Work and Deliverables

- 1) The RFLOI requires an analysis of existing statutes. Any recommendations by the contractor requiring amendment(s) to current statutes could open a Pandora's Box of grief for our beneficiaries. While the recommended amendment(s) might be benign or propose desired efficiencies – once the legislative process begins – the final statutory product could diminish the Trust's ability to serve its beneficiaries. It would be great if the contractor's recommendations were within the existing state statutes.

- 2) Recommendations and statutes – If statutory change is contemplated it would be helpful for the entity to develop (a) set of recommendations that can be implemented within the existing statutory framework; (b) set of recommendations that would require statutory change for implementation; and (c) a narrative describing the reasoning for each option, inclusive of its advantages and disadvantages.
- 3) Review and provide recommendations for maximizing the impact of grant dollars. Research how other organizations apportion investments across different levels of the system (e.g. % to beneficiaries versus systems change), address risk and innovation, forge new partnerships with national foundations, leverage funds to propel change, etc.? Or perhaps this is implicit with the bullet re conducting a detailed examination of existing functions.
- 4) A review the investment strategies from different foundations in terms of performance would be a good idea.
- 5) The RFLOI notes the Trust just celebrated its 20th anniversary, but it doesn't refer to the need for strong succession planning with the founding CEO's planned retirement in the next few years. Including recommendations for supporting the organization's succession planning and thinking about the role and value of the Trust in a post-founder world might be helpful.
- 6) Review and analysis of the organizational culture(s) that helps or hinders fulfillment of our mission- these are different for both entities. The contractor cannot assume they are the same. What aspects of the board culture that helps or hinders fulfillment of our mission.
- 7) Review of board performance is a key component of this, which should include a 360 approach for a true and unbiased assessment.
- 8) It is important for the contractor to gather beneficiary input in this process, in addition to staff and other key external stakeholders.

Minimum Qualifications

- 1) The minimum qualifications seem low. It would be nice to get a national organization with deep expertise in organizational evaluations and health care reform. Since much of our work with beneficiaries is focused on the intersection of health care and criminal justice reform/social determinants, an entity with deep familiarity in the functions necessary to support statewide reform/transformation may be better able to speak to our organization's functions, priorities, focus, etc. For example, we talk a lot about the value of our time (in addition to funds) and it might be helpful to have recommendations that articulate the role and value add of our time and our money over the next ten years juxtaposed with the stages of reform.

Other Comment on Process

- 1) Recommend, as a whole, there is discussion to determine which areas of organizational improvement identified by a selected contractor are most important and should be prioritized.