

FY 2019-20 & FY 2020-21 COIT Budget - Structured Scoring Rubric

Criteria	Poor - 1	Mixed - 2	Good - 3	Excellent - 4
Strategic Value (Goals, Impact)	Largely about convenience, not strategic. Not tied to a goal. Project replicates old process, or legacy technology features.	Focused department goals only. Does not consider ICT or Mayoral priorities. Minor transformative value to operations or services.	Mayoral and ICT goals clearly influence project objectives. Project largely promises department specific changes, but could be an example.	Alignment with Mayoral, ICT, department goals. Supports "One City" approach. Project needed to accomplish strategic goals.
Project Benefits (Users, Measures)	End users not clearly defined. Vague notion of how they will benefit. No method to measure benefits. No plan to iteratively improve.	User benefits focused on employees. No clear connection how public will benefit. Basic measures provided, unconvinced measures will be used to improve service.	Project is orientated to address a specific need/problem. End user will clearly benefit. Established methods to incorporate measures and improve.	Project is designed to transform service experience. User issues and journey well understood. Current state measures already being used to inform design.
Financial Benefits (Savings, Fund Match)	No analysis of projected ongoing costs, staffing requirements. 100% COIT supported.	Some backup for cost estimates & ongoing costs. Unclear if there will be savings, if any. Dept will provide 1-50% funds.	Strong project cost estimates and realistic ongoing costs. Projected savings can be captured. Dept will provide 50% of funds.	Project has clear sense of costs and identifiable savings. Savings can be redirected to support future efficiencies. Dept will provide 50% of funds.
Regulatory Compliance & Risk Management (Policy, Security)	No Regulatory Requirement. No consideration for security. Unsure if sensitive data will be on system.	No Regulatory Requirement. Unclear how department will conduct risk assessment. Loose understanding of data sensitivities.	Regulation exists, but satisfied by other means. Security practices established. Working understanding of how to classify and protect data.	Project is required to satisfy regulatory requirement. A leading example of how to incorporate new technology and protect systems and data.
Architecture & Development Plan (Dev Methods, Sharing)	100% custom development. Business separated from IT. Technology to be built by outside the business. Siloed solution for department only.	User research/testing only done to satisfy COIT requests. Unconvincing the "business" will own the project. Data sharing only if asked.	Department consulted DT and designing architecture to align with other departments, and user needs. Will form sharing agreements.	Project is central to promoting shared architecture. Multiple depts actively coordinating. Design will be iterative to meet business needs.
Department Capacity (Planning, Staffing, Change Management)	Identified the solution before understanding the problem. No dedicated staff to support build, change management. No capacity for another project.	Light understanding of alternative solutions. Did not coordinate with other depts. Has put some thought into promoting adoption.	Conducted thorough scoping of market alternatives, and existing solutions in the City. Have an established practice to manage projects, change management.	Conducted specific user research/testing in the scoping phase. Clear understanding of problem and available solutions. Department already engaging in change management.

COIT Budget - Scoring

Criteria	COIT Notes	Score
Strategic Value (Goals, Impact)		
Project Benefits (Users, Measures)		
Financial Benefits (Savings, Fund Match)		
Regulatory Compliance & Risk Management (Policy, Security)		
Architecture & Development Plan (Development Methods, Sharing)		
Department Capacity (Planning, Staffing, Change Management)		
TOTAL		