

MULTI-CRITERIA / MEANS ENDS DECISION MATRIX FOR STRATEGIES TO MANAGE COMMUNITY ISSUES

The multi-criteria decision matrix, also called a preference matrix, helps to compare a small number of alternatives against multiple criterion. The matrix or comparison table consists of rows identifying the options to be considered and columns to reflect the factors to be evaluated and measured and if needed, weights to show the importance of each of these factors. Each course of action is scored on each factor, either yes or no; scores are tallied and high rated options are selected. Failing the initial clarity or risk analysis criteria is sufficient to reject the course of action from consideration. The breadth of impact questions help the reviewer to consider the ends to which the project tends; the effort criteria ask questions regarding the means of completion, so together the question get at means and ends analysis for a project.

CLARITY

Unclear - Recommendations that are not expressed in a way that a clear, workable course of action is obvious, generally because the suggestion is actually a goal or objective and not a strategy. (Additional clarification from the stakeholders may be required.)

Actionable - Recommendations that are expressed or written in a way that presents or suggests a clear, workable course of action and therefore may be appropriate move forward on considering the additional criteria (below).

STRATEGIC RISK ANALYSIS

Suitability – This asks the question of whether it is *reasonable* to act on the strategy. Reasonable to act here implies that the project under consideration is not too broad or complex to undertake (complexity); has a time horizon that is achievable by the end of the fiscal year; is of a scale such that a single organization can undertake.

Feasibility - This gauges the organization's *capability* to act on the recommendation, for the organization that undertakes the project, considering the competitive environment, operations requirements, and, knowledge of the required level of resources.

Acceptability - This test is used to determine the organizational *will* to act on the course of action, again for the organization that undertakes the project, and considers organizational capacity, costs, performance, and timing issues.

BREADTH OF IMPACT

Local – Completion of the course of action proposed would have benefit for a particular neighbor or city, thus it is provincial in nature and in benefit,

Regional – This type of recommendation that is important to, and almost exclusively affects, the region, and therefore should be handled strictly by organizations within the region, with or without facilitation assistance from the planning partners.

State - This is a recommended action that has significance beyond the region, and deserves to be resolved in a systematic fashion across regions or across a state (or could be resolved more efficiently at a state level) using programmatic administrative or legislative actions.

National - This is a recommendation that has significance beyond a state’s borders and can only be (or is most efficiently) handled by inter-state compacts.

SPONSOR ASSIGNED

Partner - These are projects that are clearly within the realm of responsibility of one of the planning partners, the partner can and should ‘advance’ the project through its own existing capacity and resources.

Team-Based – These recommendations transcend the scope of any one partner’s ability to get it done and would require a team-based effort. Team efforts might be configured as a partner collaboration or a partner in combination with an external organization.

External - These are recommendations that should be referred to an outside institution, other than planning partners. The planning partner may broker assistance but the idea is to refer this project and move on.

EFFORT

Research - The planning partners, (based on their determination that a recommendation was ‘unclear or imprecise’ as discussed above), will conduct additional clarification tasks including research if necessary to achieve the appropriate level of clarity required.

Facilitation - The planning partners (based on their determination that a recommendation is primarily regional in nature, and lacking general transferability) assists the region to work with existing regional organizations to solicit and encourage their commitment as sponsors.

Broker - The planning partners (based on their determination that a recommendation is outside the scope of their responsibilities of economic development organization) will work to seek out external organizational sponsors at the regional, state, or federal level.

Grants Writer - In those cases where either internal funding is identified and appropriate, or the project is eligible for a discretionary, external grant, the planning partners would assist with the development and packaging of a grant application.

Technical Assistance - For those recommendations that have potential to improve practices or build professional capacity throughout the state, the partner will provide direct technical assistance as required to bring the course of action to completion.

Goal:	Clarity		Risk		Breadth			Sponsor			Effort				Priority					
	Clear	Unclear	Suitability	Acceptability	Local	Regional	State	National	Partner	Team-based	External	Research	Facilitation	Broker	Grants Writer	Technical Asst	Top Priority	Potential	Non priority	
Program, Project, Policy, Rule:	C	U	S	F	A	L	R	S	N	P	T	E	R	F	B	G	T	T	P	N