

CRITERIA	WEIGHT	VALUE	SCORE	
<b>Strategic Value</b>	<b>Select: 1 through 5</b>	<b>Multiplied by: 0, 3, 6, 9</b>	<b>Sample Project A Totals:</b>	<b>Sample Project B Totals:</b>
<b>Enterprise Business Alignment</b> <i>(are any of these true?)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meets a strategic business need (Governor, Agency, WTECB, or DOL)</li> <li>- Directly increases equity or accessibility</li> <li>- Significant Operational Effectiveness Improvement</li> <li>- Significant System Improvement</li> <li>- Significant Customer Experience Improvement</li> <li>- Significant Risk Mitigation</li> </ul>	<b>1 - Weak</b> - not part of a strategic initiative - minimally or indirectly affects a strategic plan or initiative  <b>3 - Moderate</b> - directly supports a strategy - moderately affects key strategies or initiatives  <b>5 - Strong</b> - directly supports a key strategy or initiative - directly supports a Level 3 project or initiative	0: none are true 3: one is true 6: a few are true 9: all are true	Weight: 4 Value: 6 Score: <b>24</b>	Weight: 2 Value: 6 Score: <b>12</b>
<b>Regulatory Compliance/Alignment</b> <i>(are any of these true?)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Governor's Initiative or Order</li> <li>- Mandate (legislative, federal, or state)</li> <li>- Audit Finding</li> <li>- Program/Policy Compliance</li> <li>- Supplemental Budget Request or Grant</li> </ul>	<b>1 - Weak</b> - not part of a legislative requirement  <b>3 - Moderate</b> - minimally or indirectly affects a legislative requirement  <b>5 - Strong</b> - directly affects a legislative requirement - directly required to support legislative compliance	0: none are true 3: one is true 6: a few are true 9: all are true	Weight: 3 Value: 3 Score: <b>9</b>	Weight: 5 Value: 3 Score: <b>15</b>
<b>Value to Customer</b> <i>(consumers or users of the service, product or data)</i>  Considers the number or scope of customers or users impacted (i.e. local, regional, or system-wide) and the level of positive impact for using the product/service. Customers could be citizens, internal agency users, other state/local agencies or other external stakeholders. Includes projects or initiatives that are funded through programs, grants, or other intergovernmental agreements.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improves timeliness or quality of service</li> <li>- Increases customer satisfaction, engagement, or participation</li> <li>- Improves equity and accessibility</li> </ul>	<b>1 - Weak</b> - minor annoyance or small benefit - provides little to no relief for customer pain points  <b>3 - Moderate</b> - impacts a limited base of customers - provides minimal to moderate benefit for those impacted  <b>5 - Strong</b> - solves major customer pain or provides significant benefit - provides great amount of relief and timely benefits - provides considerable benefits to a large number of impacted customers	0: no value to customer 3: low value to customer 6: medium value to customer 9: high value to customer	Weight: 3 Value: 6 Score: <b>18</b>	Weight: 4 Value: 3 Score: <b>12</b>
<b>Return on Investment (ROI) / Cost Avoidance</b> Solution ROI reduces cost in expenditures once implemented. Must have a way to measure ROI and the amount of cost that will be avoided due to implementation of the project, product or service.	<b>1 - Weak</b>  <b>3 - Moderate</b>  <b>5 - Strong</b>	0: ROI none or unknown 3: ROI gained over two biennia 6: ROI gained within two biennia 9: ROI gained in one biennium	Weight: 2 Value: 9 Score: <b>18</b>	Weight: 1 Value: 0 Score: <b>0</b>
<b>Leverage Potential</b> <i>(multiplier effect)</i>  The degree to which the solution can be leveraged as a shared or managed service across divisions, program, or policy areas.	<b>1 - Weak</b>  <b>3 - Moderate</b>  <b>5 - Strong</b>	0: no potential, isolated service 3: low potential 6: medium potential 9: high potential	Weight: 1 Value: 2 Score: <b>2</b>	Weight: 4 Value: 6 Score: <b>24</b>
<b>Committee Multiplier</b> <i>(multiplier effect)</i>  There is some other strategic value or business driver, recognized by this Committee, which adds weight and importance to this initiative and must be accounted for manually. (i.e. there may be a critical due date associated with a legislative mandate or contract)	<b>1 - Weak</b>  <b>3 - Moderate</b>  <b>5 - Strong</b>	0: no committee multiplier 3: low committee multiplier 6: medium committee multiplier 9: high committee multiplier	Weight: 1 Value: 0 Score: <b>0</b>	Weight: 5 Value: 9 Score: <b>45</b>
<b>Operational Effectiveness</b>	<b>Select: 1 through 5</b>	<b>Multiplied by: 0, 3, 6, 9</b>		
<b>Significant System Improvements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduces operational debt</li> <li>- Improves automation and decreases manual work</li> <li>- Increases visibility and fidelity of enterprise content and data</li> </ul>	<b>1 - Weak</b> - happens rarely or not urgent - only limited resources are currently utilized to perform the tasks or functions - alternate means to accomplish the task(s) already exist  <b>3 - Moderate</b> - reduces established "workarounds" or other administrative & functional debt - addresses periodic or recurring operational tasks and activities - positively impacts a moderate number of systems and users  <b>5 - Strong</b> - occurs often and by many people - removes manual workarounds or administrative debt - improves accuracy and fidelity of data	0: no improvement 3: low improvement 6: medium improvement 9: high improvement	Weight: 5 Value: 4 Score: <b>20</b>	Weight: 1 Value: 3 Score: <b>3</b>
<b>Reduces Operational Backlog</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Addresses issues with current or expected bottlenecks and/or backlogs in completing operational tasks</li> <li>- Improves capacity for taking on new work or timely completion of existing work</li> <li>- Improves accuracy or visibility of workload</li> </ul>	<b>1 - Weak</b>  <b>3 - Moderate</b>  <b>5 - Strong</b>	0: no reduction 3: low reduction 6: medium reduction 9: high reduction	Weight: 4 Value: 6 Score: <b>24</b>	Weight: 1 Value: 2 Score: <b>2</b>
<b>Estimated Effort</b>	<b>Select: 1 through 5</b>	<b>Multiplied by: 0, 3, 6, 9</b>		
<b>Organizational Effort</b> <i>(are any of these true?)</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Localized effort, primarily LWDB resources</li> <li>- Localized effort, primarily ESD resources</li> <li>- Effort requires resources primarily from one ESD Division</li> <li>- Effort requires resources from multiple divisions</li> </ul>	<b>1 - Weak</b> - minimal level of effort  <b>3 - Moderate</b> - moderate level of effort  <b>5 - Strong</b> - high level of effort	0: none are true 3: one is true 6: a few are true 9: all are true	Weight: 2 Value: 6 Score: <b>12</b>	Weight: 4 Value: 3 Score: <b>12</b>
<b>Enterprise Risk Management</b>	<b>Select: 1 through 5</b>	<b>Multiplied by: 0, 3, 6, 9</b>		
<b>Importance to Risk Mitigation</b> <i>(mitigating risks associated with security, safety, legal or any other risk related in loss)</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Would the agency, state, or its customers be exposed to a risk impact if the solution is not offered?</li> <li>- Is an existing service at risk?</li> <li>- Do other current services or products depend on it?</li> </ul>	<b>1 - Weak</b>  <b>3 - Moderate</b>  <b>5 - Strong</b>	0: no risk to enterprise if not offered 3: low risk to enterprise if not offered 6: medium risk to enterprise if not offered 9: high risk to enterprise if not offered	Weight: 3 Value: 3 Score: <b>9</b>	Weight: 5 Value: 6 Score: <b>30</b>
<b>Risk Rating</b>	<b>Negative to Positive</b>	<b>Multiplied by: 0, 3, 6, 9</b>		
<b>Reduces or Increases Risk</b> <i>(the level to which the solution improves or increases risk to the enterprise, in one of more of the below categories)</i>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal/Compliance risk</li> <li>- Financial/Fraud risk</li> <li>- Service Delivery risk</li> <li>- Security/Privacy risk</li> <li>- Customer/Staff Safety risk</li> </ul>	(-5) - resolves known risks (-3) - decreases risks (0) - neutral or not applicable (3) - potentially increases risks (5) - creates risk	0: none are true 3: one is true 6: a few are true 9: all are true	Weight: -1 Value: 3 Score: N/A	Weight: -4 Value: 3 Score: N/A
<b>GRAND TOTAL:</b>			<b>136</b>	<b>155</b>

TITLE	DEFINITION
<b>Executive Sponsor</b>	Executive sponsor name - who is authorizing the project or initiative to be funded & staffed; who signs/executes the Charter and has final decision-making authority and accountability for the initiative.
<b>Project Sponsor</b>	This is the project "owner" who is responsible for overall project execution/delivery. Can be a Program Manager, Business Unit or Operational Manager, Product Manager, Project Manager; or a program, division, or work-group (if a specific owner has not yet been named).
<b>Project Manager</b>	Responsible for day-to-day management of the project and all project artifacts; Reports to and takes direction from the project Sponsor on all things related to the project; Monitors project scope, budget, schedule, and quality against defined project objectives.
<b>Status</b>	<p><i>With the exception of the "Completed" state - Projects and Initiatives cannot change Status without governance committee approval.</i></p> <p><u>INTAKE</u> - a project or initiative submitted to governance for evaluation</p> <p><u>NO</u> - unsponsored by the governance committee; work will not be initiated on this project</p> <p><u>CANCELLED</u> - work that was previously approved but has been permanently cancelled, defunded &amp; unstaffed</p> <p><u>FUTURE WORK</u> -</p> <p>(1) work that may or may not be picked up at a later date; good idea, but not urgent now and will need to be reevaluated by the governance committee at a later date</p> <p>(2) placeholder for <i>approved</i> projects/work that is either not yet prioritized by the governance committee or is not yet ready to move to In Progress (i.e. large projects on the radar that will need to be staffed/funded at some point in future)</p> <p><u>BACKLOG</u> - work had once been "In Progress" but has since been deprioritized by the governance committee and moved to Backlog; will be revisited for prioritization later on</p> <p><u>SCOPING</u> -</p> <p>(1) for projects that have either been in-progress but need to be reevaluated for changes/expansion of scope;</p> <p>(2) or for projects that require more information in order to be prioritized by the governance committee - time, resources, budget, risks, priority evaluation is in process; will be brought back to governance for additional prioritization</p> <p><u>IN PROGRESS</u> -</p> <p>(1) work that is approved by governance goes immediately to "in progress"; authorized/sponsored by the committee, approved for resourcing</p> <p>(2) projects/initiatives that are approved, resourced &amp; staffed, actively being worked</p> <p><u>COMPLETED</u> - a project or initiative that has been fully completed and signed-off by project sponsors as closed</p>

<b>Scope Level</b>	<i>Scope level is advised by the project Sponsor &amp; Owner and confirmed by the governance committee. Requests to INCREASE scope must be submitted to the governance committee.</i>
	<p><u>1</u> - Small scope - minimal WorkSource system minimal impact; primarily local impact; minimal time, cost, risk</p> <p><u>2</u> - Moderate scope - moderate WorkSource system impact; impacts more than one LWDB; moderate time, cost, risk</p> <p><u>3</u> - Large scope - high WorkSource system impact; multiple LWDB or Regional impacts; high time, cost, risk</p>
<b>Priority</b>	<i>Priority is assigned by the governance committee. [These priority levels are currently being used by the ESD Agency PMO]</i>
	<p>Very High</p> <p>High</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Low</p> <p>Very Low</p>
<b>Health</b>	<i>Health is managed and assigned by the project owner. Risks that require governance action must be escalated to the governance committee.</i>
	<p><u>Green</u> - on target; no identified risk and no mitigation required</p> <p><u>Yellow</u> - one or more project measures are at medium risk; mitigation is being handled by project owners and may or may not need to be escalated to governance committee for decision making</p> <p><u>Red</u> - one or more project measures are at high risk; risks to be communicated to governance, and mitigation may need to be escalated to governance committee for decision making</p>
<b>Goal/Strategy</b>	<i><b>Under Construction:</b> see the PMO Results software for strategic "Goal" categories; build list for WS Governance.</i>
	<p><u>IOE</u> - Improve Organizational Effectiveness</p> <p><u>MCN</u> - Meet Customer Needs</p> <p><u>RTW</u> - Return to Work (jobs)</p> <p><u>Security</u> - Access Control, Threat Protection</p> <p><u>Compliance</u> - work must be conducted in order to comply with Legislative, Grant, Program or other requirements.</p>
<b>Start Date</b>	The date the project or initiative was approved by the governance committee and moved to In Progress.
<b>End Date</b>	The target or expected project/initiative end date. Includes Critical End Date, if applicable (i.e. date required to comply with legislative, contract, Program or Grant requirements, etc.)