

PRIORITY RANKING OF REQUESTS

PURPOSE OF SECTION

The *Priority Ranking* process is a method to formulate the County's functions and programs considered most important to reaching service goals and objectives in the current fiscal year. It determines what goods and services will be delivered and to what service group and at what cost. It is useful in the translation of broad objectives into reasonable and practical operating guidelines.

A formal priority-setting system demonstrates an attempt to incorporate rational and professional objectivity into a resource allocation process. Criteria are established to measure the likelihood of goals and objectives being met with the requests. Different programs and options are then identified and rated. This provides policy makers information needed to determine the final allocation of resources.

Using this process allows for more objectivity, since the criteria is tangible and quantitative. Evaluation to ultimately conclude with a priority ranking list is as follows:

- 1) Assess and measure each request on established criteria
- 2) Rank each option by criticalness to fund.
- 3) Use the ranking to determine which options are the best fit for the fiscal year budget.

Of course, systems achieve varying levels of success and require annual modifications to meet the best results. Some modifications to the criteria were implemented for fiscal year 2009-10.

CRITERIA

FY2009/10: Budget Review Team Priority Rating Points				
Rating Factor	Max Pts	Analysis		
		Low points	Medium points	High points
Strategic Plan	15	Indirectly addresses a goal or objective	Directly addresses a goal and objective, but not a strategy	Directly addresses a goal and objective and strategy
Cost (high to low)	15	3 yrs: 0-\$45k, \$46-\$90, \$91-\$130, \$131-\$175, \$176-\$220, \$221-\$265, >\$265k		
Core Values	10	a: Customer Service\satisfaction b: commitment to learn\change\improve c: teamwork\cooperation\communication d:focus on results e: safety		
Return on Investment	20	10 - 40% documented financial return for the County	41 - 99% documented financial return for the County	100% or more documented financial return for the County
Service Level Impact	15	To expand service	No significant Impact\maintains status quo	To avoid reduced service level
Documentation of Resources Needed	10	Minimal detail	Credible detail	Concrete detail
Documentation of Results Expected	10	Minimal metrics	Credible documentation	Concrete metrics
Dept's Priority	5	Top, 2nd, 3rd, 4th		
Total Points	100			

PRIORITY RANKING OF REQUESTS



CRITERIA (CONCLUDED)

The criteria listed on the previous page are used to rate and rank all department requests with impact on the general fund. A brief description of each criteria is provided below.

- Strategic Plan (15) – does the request directly address a County Strategic Plan *Goal, Objective and / or a Strategy*; the strength of addressing those goals, objectives and strategies and the consistency with the County’s current direction?
- Cost (15) – The associated costs over a three year period.
- Core Values (10) – does the request directly address promoting one or more of the County’s five Core Values?
- Return on Investment (20) – does the request directly address an increase in productivity; creation of new revenue generation; or potential future cost-avoidance (limited emphasis)?
- Service Impact (15) – how services to the customer would be impacted in three criteria: 1) improve or enhance services, 2) maintaining status quo and 3) deter an undesired reduction of service levels?
- Documentation of Resources Needed (10) – documentation of the resources needed and how the resources are to be accounted for.
- Documentation of Results Expected (10) – documentation of the results expected.
- Department priority (5) – Prioritized by respective department head.

Note: There were 30 requests beyond the departments’ status quo operations that were rated at a total single year dollar amount of \$2,663,707.

EXPLANATION

The following pages display the results of the Budget Review Team’s (BRT) prioritizing of all department requests. The ranking process applies a uniform set of criteria to score the measure of each department’s request for additional General Fund resources. The process is applied to requests for additional personnel, new projects or programs, new supplies and services, capital outlay and any transfers as a result of other program shortfalls.

The process was applied to requests that are General fund related; it is in this fund that there is the most competition for a limited amount of resources.

Once all the departments’ requests are rated, they are placed into a table from the highest total score to the lowest. A cut-off line is drawn. This line is established based on the amount of resources available both on-going and one-time in nature. Those requests falling above the line are included in the Recommended Budget.

A request falling below the line does not signify that it should be deemed unimportant or without merit. It is the case of not enough resources available to meet all requests.

The following schedule shows the priority ranking as a result of applying this rating system. A running total column is off to the right to show the total amounts of the programs requested. At the far right is a total column that shows a running total in relation to where the line fell; ie what the cost is to move the line upward or downward.



PRIORITY RANKING OF REQUESTS

FISCAL YEAR 2009-10 DEPARTMENT REQUEST PRIORITIES - BY TOTAL SCORE GENERAL FUND, and GENERAL FUND RELATED

Projects scoring 47 points or more are included in the Recommended Budget

The Budget Review Team scored the Departments' requests based on the factors shown below. Descriptions of the factors appear in the summary.

ID#	Department	Description	Strategic Plan	Cost	Core Values	Return on Investment	Service Level	Documentation Resources	Documentation Results	Priority	Cost (Illustrative)	Total Pts.	Running Total
1	Public Defender	Capital Atty (FTG)	15	0	4	15	7	7	7	5	128,456	60	128,456
2	Public Defender	Legal Secretary III (FTG)	15	6	4	10	7	7	7	3	43,577	59	172,033
3	Fiduciary	Indigent burial Specialist	15	9	4	10	4	3	7	5	54,749	57	226,782
4	Superior Court	Collections Specialist	10	6	4	15	4	8	7	2	46,446	56	273,228
5	Superior Court	Executive Assistant	7	12	4	0	10	8	7	5	20,688	53	293,916
6	Juvenile Court	Time Keeping System	4	15	8	3	4	7	5	5	7,978	51	301,894
7	Sheriff	Deputy	15	6	6	0	15	3	3	1	56,466	49	358,360
8	Assessor	Appraiser I	12	9	4	6	4	4	3	5	51,301	47	409,661
9	Sheriff - Medical Examiner	Part time Medical Examiner Investigator	4	12	8	0	11	3	3	5	38,130	46	447,791
10	Superior Court	Web-Based Collection Services	10	15	4	5	3	5	3	0	36,660	45	484,451
11	Assessor	Appraiser I	12	9	4	5	3	4	3	3	51,301	43	535,752
12	Assessor	Appraiser I	12	9	4	4	2	4	3	2	51,301	40	587,053
13	Sheriff	Deputies (4 - Traffic Safety)	15	0	6	0	12	2	2	2	379,065	39	966,118
14	Superior Court	Computer Technician	1	9	6	0	5	8	7	3	50,192	39	1,016,310
15	Superior Court	Laptops	4	15	4	0	4	6	5	0	1,900	38	1,018,210
16	Assessor	Appraiser II	12	9	4	3	1	4	3	1	55,331	37	1,073,541
17	Sheriff	Deputies (8 - Priority Response)	15	0	6	0	4	3	3	5	754,759	36	1,828,300
18	Assessor	Vehicle	1	15	4	0	7	2	7	0	20,000	36	1,848,300
19	Assessor	Vehicle	1	15	4	0	7	2	7	0	25,000	36	1,873,300
20	Legal Defender	Legal Office Supervisor	8	3	4	3	5	3	3	5	66,484	34	1,939,784
21	Legal Defender	Legal Secretary III	8	6	4	3	4	3	3	3	54,584	34	1,994,368
22	Superior Court	JAVS & Courtroom Electronics	4	15	4	0	5	4	1	0	6,000	33	2,000,368
23	Sheriff	Deputies (6 - Reduce violent crime)	15	0	6	0	4	2	2	3	568,597	32	2,568,965
24	Legal Defender	Legal Secretary III	8	6	4	3	3	3	3	2	54,584	32	2,623,549
25	Adult Probation	Furniture	0	15	2	0	7	4	0	1	8,038	29	2,631,587
26	Superior Court	Diskkeeper software	1	15	2	0	2	4	3	1	3,240	28	2,634,827
27	Public Defender	Travel	0	15	2	0	5	2	2	2	3,000	28	2,637,827
28	Superior Court	Storage Area Network	1	15	2	0	2	4	3	0	21,560	27	2,659,387
29	Constable 2	Travel	0	15	2	0	2	0	0	5	2,420	24	2,661,807
30	Constable 2	Computer/printer	0	15	2	0	2	0	0	3	1,900	22	2,663,707