

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 1 Proposal Title: Mandating Records Management

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project <i>supports the Mayor's priority goals</i>. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests <i>new and improved approaches</i> to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to <i>systematic, sustainable changes</i> in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project <i>reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes</i> , or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

Basic Idea -- create online training modules
for what is currently in person training.
• inc. eff.
• reduced risk of illegal

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

11/23/13
C. C. C. C. C.

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

___ Definitely consider funding

___ Maybe consider funding

☒ Do not consider for funding

___ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

Seems like they should be doing this as part of their routine service

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 2 Proposal Title: Ethene MelRevue

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements: • Project Description - o Scope of work - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes) - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public) - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline • Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative) - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing) - o Potential operational efficiencies - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes • Budget - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project) - o Leveraged funds - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source) - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

Remember to get record management practices top to bottom

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ☐ Definitely consider funding
☐ Maybe consider funding
☒ Do not consider for funding
☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

Early steps of concept. Many is better-revised
mergent a better.

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 3 Proposal Title: VICAC Agreement Consolidation

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

Control all city agreements in repository.

Every access
Efficiency

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ☐ Definitely consider funding
☐ Maybe consider funding
☒ Do not consider for funding
☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

Should be part of existing ongoing operations

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 4 Proposal Title: Private & PSS

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the “review criteria” specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented (“ready-to go”) and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ___ Definitely consider funding
- ___ Maybe consider funding
- ___ Do not consider for funding
- ___ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 5 Proposal Title: 311 Phase 2

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

Determine the best Cost Service Report System for 311

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

☐ Definitely consider funding

☒ Maybe consider funding

☐ Do not consider for funding

☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____.

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

Basically ready to implement Phase 2 of a 3 phase project.

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 6 Proposal Title: Community Risk Reduction

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

RFP

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

PFR req. for a program manager to do pilot program safety to reduce demand for emergency services. (Safety evaluate for home goods 3-6)

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

___ Definitely consider funding

___ Maybe consider funding

☒ Do not consider for funding

___ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 7 Proposal Title: PulsePoint

Initial Assessment Completed by: 1 Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

Smart Plan App re: Cardiac arrest

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

___ Definitely consider funding

☒ ___ Maybe consider funding

___ Do not consider for funding

___ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____.

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 8 Proposal Title: Target Computers

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project <i>supports the Mayor's priority goals</i>. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests <i>new and improved approaches</i> to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to <i>systematic, sustainable changes</i> in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project <i>reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes</i> , or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ☒ Definitely consider funding
☐ Maybe consider funding
☐ Do not consider for funding
☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 9 Proposal Title: Rent Well

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

•

I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

tenant education curvric
shiply obviously to ven paper
Expand rent will be big

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ☒ Definitely consider funding
☐ Maybe consider funding
☐ Do not consider for funding
☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

Stops overall to non-proj

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 10 Proposal Title: XVWL DATA Share

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

pilot XML data sharing program to allow Bureaus to export data from New Management Info system & upload data in HTB databases

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Assessment of Implementation Readiness	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ☐ Definitely consider funding
☒ Maybe consider funding
☐ Do not consider for funding
☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 11 Proposal Title: Onboard System

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

new outbouding process incorp. orlekh system
 Governor new E Learning

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Assessment of Implementation Readiness	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	5	(4)	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	5	4	3	(2)	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ☐ Definitely consider funding
☒ Maybe consider funding
☐ Do not consider for funding
☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

not clear diff bet onbary + onestats

City of Portland Innovation Fund – Initial Innovation Proposal Scoring Sheet
Drafted by City of Portland and Center for Public Service, PSU

Proposal ID #: 12 Proposal Title: LASEL PLWSPS

Initial Assessment Completed by: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: Please begin by reviewing the following submission criteria specified in the RFP. Then, please review and score each proposal against the innovation and readiness criteria in Sections I, II, and III. Then, please provide an initial funding decision and suggestions on next steps in Sections IV and V.

The RFP specified the following submission requirements:

- Project Description
 - o Scope of work
 - o Type of project (technology, consolidation of services, lean process improvement, redesigning business processes)
 - o Identification of potential challenges or obstacles
 - o Lead bureau and other groups impacted (bureaus, governments, customers, the public)
 - o Project timeline including start and end dates, major milestones, and risks to proposed timeline
- Project Outcomes (qualitative and quantitative)
 - o Potential cost savings or increased revenues (one-time and/or ongoing)
 - o Potential operational efficiencies
 - o Who benefits from the cost savings and/or efficiencies
 - o Performance metrics to track progress and expected outcomes
- Budget
 - o Total General Fund discretionary requested (split by fiscal year if requesting a multi-year project)
 - o Leveraged funds
 - o Return on investment timeline, if any, and confidence level of the projections
 - o Ongoing operations and maintenance costs (identify costs and funding source)
 - o Staff requirements (existing or new)

- All proposals must be approved by the bureau director prior to submission and include contact information for the project lead(s)

• **I. Overall assessment of the proposed project.**

Please assess the overall quality of the proposed project by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

	Overall Innovation Contribution of the Project	Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project supports the Mayor's priority goals. (See document provided by the Budget Office). • Create a culture of innovative thinking within bureaus • Implement lean process improvement and streamline business processes • Improve customer service and reduce costs per response • Collaborate with other governments and the private sector; consolidate or combine services • Look for both short-term and long-term impacts (i.e., proposals that produce immediate benefits and those that produce organizational change) • Address pressing City issues (e.g., homelessness, transportation) in new ways • Leverage technology	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project suggests new and improved approaches to how the City operates and provides service to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project will lead to systematic, sustainable changes in the way City government operates and provides services to the community.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project reduces or prevents future negative unintended outcomes, or has mitigation actions defined to prevent such outcomes.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

II. Assessment of the proposed project based on the "review criteria" specified in the RFP.

Please assess the proposed project if it meets the following 11 review criteria specified in the RFP, by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of the Project Towards Meeting 11 Review Criteria		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1.	This project provides a benefit to City government, other governments, and/or the community.	5	(4)	3	2	1	N/A
2.	This project will generate ongoing and/or one-time cost savings (e.g., General Fund discretionary savings will score higher).	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A
3.	This project shows promise of financial sustainability beyond the initial investment (e.g., maintenance fees are included).	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A
4.	This project leverages other sources of funds (e.g., grants, external stakeholders, existing bureau funds).	5	4	3	2	(1)	N/A
5.	This project should result in a positive return on investment within a defined period of time.	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A
6.	This project should result in operational savings for bureaus.	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A
7.	This project should lead to efficiencies resulting from lean process improvement.	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A
8.	This project should have positive impacts on customer service.	5	4	(3)	2	1	N/A
9.	This project should have positive impacts on stakeholders (i.e. those who benefit and those who are burdened by implementing the proposal.)	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A
10.	This project should have impacts on equity.	5	4	(3)	2	1	N/A
11.	This project is ready to be implemented ("ready-to go") and likely to result in quick outcomes.	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A

III. Plan for implementation and evaluation of the proposed project.

Please rate the proposed project on its implementation and evaluation plan by rating to what extent you agree or not agree to the following statements.

Assessment of Implementation Readiness		Strongly Agree 5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1	Don't know
1	There is a clear <i>plan for implementation</i> with a defined course of action for next steps and assigned roles.	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A
2	There is a clear <i>plan for measuring and evaluating the outcomes</i> of the project to determine whether it proves successful.	(5)	4	3	2	1	N/A

IV. Overall Feedback

Based on your review so far, what is your recommendation for this proposal at this stage?

- ☒ Definitely consider funding
☐ Maybe consider funding
☐ Do not consider for funding
☐ Other. Please provide specific suggested steps _____

V. Comments and Suggested Next Steps for the Proposal

Please provide your overall feedback on the proposed project. If you did not recommend this proposal to be evaluated further, please provide suggested next steps (e.g., rewrite and resubmit, meet with taskforce/CPS/Budget Office staff to further discuss the concept).

High prob for success