

DECISION FRAMEWORK FOR DETERMINING HEALTH AND WELLBEING PRIORITIES

PRIORITY

DRAFT 4 YEAR GOAL

PRIORITY SCOPE

**INDICATIVE STRATEGIES
- INTERVENTION AREAS**

**KEY STAKEHOLDERS
CONSULTED**

**AUTHOR &
DEVELOPMENT
PROCESS**

CRITERIA	Criteria Definition	Score First Iteration	Comments and Justification	Final Score
Tier 1 Criteria	These factors are considered tier 1 as they play a more significant role in the consideration priority uptake and in strategic success	5 3 1		
A. Supported by data	<p>5 – Data comprehensively identifies the issues, defines the problem and the target groups</p> <p>3 - Several data indicators, indicate there is an issue, and defines some of the problem and some of the target groups</p> <p>1 - Limited data indicators available to identify the issue, but there is local expertise that has identified the issue</p>			
B. Feasibility to influence	<p>5 - Strong evidence supporting the ability of strategies at the local level to influence program outcomes/goal</p> <p>3 – Moderate evidence or emerging evidence supporting the ability of strategies at the local level to influence program outcomes/goal</p> <p>1 – Limited evidence supporting the ability of strategies at the local level to influence program outcomes/goal</p>			
C. Partner priority & commitment	<p>5 – Key partners required to achieve project outcomes have identified it as a priority in their strategic plan</p> <p>3 – Most key partners have identified this priority in a strategic plan or have provided commitment to working on it</p> <p>1 – Some key partners have identified this priority in a strategic plan or have provided commitment to working on it</p>			
D. Community capacity	<p>5 – Community is empowered, has a high level of readiness and a proven track record.</p> <p>3 – Community is willing, capacity is emerging/developing</p> <p>1 – Community willingness is low</p>			

CRITERIA	Criteria Definition	Score First Iteration	Comments and Justification	Final Score
E. Lead organisation capacity	<p>5 – Organisation has a clear understanding and willingness to take on the proposed role and has a track record in leadership, facilitation, advocacy and has identified key staff</p> <p>3 – Organisation has a clear understanding and willingness to take on the proposed role and either 1). A track record or 2). identified key staff</p> <p>1 – Organisation has neither a track record or identified key staff</p>			
F. Partner capacity	<p>5 – Partner agency has a high capacity in all five areas from willingness, experience, resources, governance and integrated leadership</p> <p>3 – Partner agency has moderate capacity in three to four areas from willingness, experience, resources, governance or integrated leadership</p> <p>1 – Partner agency has a low capacity in one to two areas from willingness, experience, resources, governance or integrated leadership</p>			
Tier 1 Score			Out of 30	

CRITERIA	Criteria Definition	Score First Iteration	Comments and Justification	Final Score
Tier 2 Criteria	These factors are considered tier 2 as their role in the consideration priority uptake and in strategic success is not as significant as tier 1	3 2 1		
Community priority	3 – Priority issue identified by the whole community during consultations in the last 12 months 2 – Priority issue identified by “at-risk” groups during consultations in the last 12 months 1 – Priority issue not clear			
Regional priority	3 – Clearly supported in the GSC regional strategic plan 2 – Priority likely to be a priority of other LGA’s within GSC 1 – Priority not currently identified in region			
Victorian Public Health Wellbeing Plan (VPHWP) Priority	3 – Is listed as a priority in the VPHWP 2 – Complementary to a priority in the VPHWP 1 – No association for priority in the VPHWP			
Victorian Gov’t priority	3 – Is listed as a Victorian Government priority 2 – Complementary to a Victorian Government priority 1 – Not listed or complementing a Victorian Government priority			
Federal priority	3 – Is listed as a Federal Government priority 2 – Complementary to a Federal Government priority 1 – Not listed or complementing a Federal Government priority			

CRITERIA	Criteria Definition	Score First Iteration	Comments and Justification	Final Score
Workforce capacity	<p>3 – Workforce has a clear understanding and willingness to take on the proposed role and has a track record in leadership, facilitation, advocacy and has identified key staff</p> <p>2 – Workforce has a clear understanding and willingness to take on the proposed role and either 1). A track record or 2). identified key staff</p> <p>1 – Workforce has neither a track record or identified key staff</p>			
Councillor support	<p>3 – Documented resolution of support</p> <p>2 – Discussions indicating council support</p> <p>1 – No discussions had or support notwithstanding</p>			
Funding opportunity	<p>3 – Resources available to gain additional funding</p> <p>2 – Policy and plans support additional funding opportunities in the future</p> <p>1 – No foreseeable funding opportunities are available</p>			
Cost to implement	<p>3 – Low level funding requirements: Funding could be achieved by re-orienting existing resources within the region</p> <p>2 – Moderate level funding requirements: Funding is just outside of existing resources and could be achieved with minor grants</p> <p>1 – High level funding requirements: Funding is significantly higher than existing dollars and could only be achieved with a major grant</p>			
Tier 2 Score			Out of 27	
TOTAL SCORE			Out of 57	