

HMIS Governing Board, Policy and Prioritization Committee
Possible ICA Project Request Ranking Tool

draft 8/11/17

Project Number:

Project Name:

Requestor:

Item	Area	Description	Desired Benefits	Scoring Range	Top Score
1	Client Benefits	Goal Realization	<i>Proposal supports the goal of reducing homelessness.</i>	6= Proposal significantly improves a program's or area's effectiveness to reduce homelessness 3= Proposal's effect on effectiveness is moderate 0= Proposal is not homelessness-related or does not improve effectiveness	6
2	Client Benefits	Scale of Impact	<i>Projects that provide potential benefit to a larger group of clients are preferred.</i>	4=Project benefits all clients 2=Project benefits some clients 0=Project benefits a single clients	4
3	Client Benefits	Client Experience	<i>Proposals that improve the experience of clients (including issues of equity and human dignity & respect) are preferred to those that degrade their experience.</i>	4=Improves client experience 0=Neutral to client experience -4=Degrades client experience	4
4	System Impacts	Impact on HMIS Performance or Availability	<i>System performance improves speed of HMIS and avoids downtime.</i>	1=Improves system performance or availability 0=Neutral to system availability or performance -1=Risks system availability or performance	1
5	System Impacts	Impact on Data Quality or Availability	<i>We want high quality data to be easily accessible from HMIS. Data quality considerations include completeness of data, accuracy of information, and ability for corrections</i>	2=Improves data quality or availability 0=Neutral to data quality or availability -2=Risks data quality or availability	2
6	Resource Effectiveness	User Experience	<i>Simplifying HMIS for end users, making training for new staff easier, and reducing the cost and training to current users.</i>	2=Proposal improves user experience 0=Proposal is neutral to user experience -2=Proposal degrades user experience	2
7	Resource Effectiveness	State System Administrator Operational Impact (post-implementation)	<i>State System Administrator (SSA) operational resources are limited. Projects that result in reduced <u>future</u> operational support demand are preferred.</i>	2=Proposal decreases future SSA operational demand 0=Proposal is neutral regarding future SSA operational demand -2=Proposal increases SSA future operational demand	2

Possible ICA Project Request Ranking Tool

draft 8/11/17

Project Number:

Project Name:

Requestor:

Item	Area	Description	Desired Benefits	Scoring Range	Top Score
8	Resource Effectiveness	Duplication of Effort/Workarounds	<i>Many CoC and agency workarounds or duplicate data entry processes exist today. Projects that eliminate this waste saves agency time, effort and resources.</i>	2=Eliminates workarounds or duplicate work 0=Neither eliminates nor creates workarounds and/or duplicate work -2= Creates need for workarounds or duplicate work	2
9	Strategic Benefits	System-wide Planning and Performance	<i>Proposals that help funders plan for better service delivery, improve CoC-wide performance, and evaluate program effectiveness are preferred.</i>	2= Enhances ability to plan and evaluate homeless response system performance 0= Neutral to planning, homeless response system performance, service delivery -2= Detracts from planning and evaluating homeless response system performance	2
10	Strategic Benefits	Mandates and Compliance	<i>Proposals that are meant to satisfy state or federal mandates or guidance are more urgent.</i>	2=Proposal significantly improves ability to meet broader mandates or compliance needs 1=Proposal somewhat improves ability to meet broader mandates or compliance needs 0=Proposal is not related to a mandate or compliance need	2
11	Final Criteria	System Admin Estimated Level of Effort	<i>Capacity of System Admin resources are limited. A project that consumes less resources is preferable.</i>	Non-scored item: Make notation of Person hours in comparison to other projects being ranked *To be assessed by SSA, not requestor	
Highest Possible Score					27

Possible ranking process:

- 1 ICA first scores the specific pending projects, scopes out the time and resources needed, and reports the rankings to P&P.
- 2 For projects that ICA feels require more guidance, another review by P&P, or that are close in the rankings, ICA suggests the P&P committee collectively discuss and score projects. The intent these would be few and not contentious.
- 3 The final (unscored) criteria that could "break the ties" is the time and resources required.
- 4 ICA and P&P would report all the final decisions to the HMIS Governing Board, and only where there were major disagreements or lack of a decision would P&P ask for a Governing Board on any specific project.
- 5 The above steps would first be undertaken for known projects in the "queue" that would be limited or cut based on the final ICA budget.
- 6 New projects would start by the requestor filling out a form to ICA describing the project and its benefits related to the descriptions in the ranking tool.
- 7 ICA and P&P would follow steps 1-4.