

HWS Prioritisation matrix and scoring framework

This scoring framework enables Healthwatch Southwark to score the short list of priority workstreams by evaluating initiatives based on their alignment with the organisation's mission, values, strategy and decision-making principles. It relies on the team's on-the-ground expertise and skill development to guide impactful, relevant projects. This framework also ensures that the board takes a supportive approach to the organisation's outputs.

Decision Factor Score (1- low to 5-high), criteria detailed below	Proj A	Proj B	Proj C	Proj D	E&V visit	E&V visit	E&V visit	E&V visit
Relevance to Role and Responsibilities								
Public Interest								
Potential for Impact and/or outcomes								
Need for HWS Involvement								
Risk Management								
Resource Requirements - people and financial								
Strategic Alignment								
Overall score								

HWS Prioritisation matrix and scoring framework

Scoring criteria

1. Relevance to Role and Responsibilities

- 5: Strongly aligns with Healthwatch Southwark's statutory remit and core responsibilities.
- 4: Aligns well with the organisation's role, though not central to its remit.
- 3: Moderately aligns with Healthwatch's responsibilities; could contribute to the mission indirectly.
- 2: Somewhat relevant but may fall outside core areas.
- 1: Low relevance; unlikely to impact Healthwatch Southwark's primary mission.

2. Public Interest

- 5: Topic is of high interest to the Southwark community, based on direct feedback, surveys, or recent public input.
- 4: Considerable public interest, though it may not be the top issue for most residents.
- 3: Moderate interest; some local community members have expressed concern.
- 2: Limited public concern or only a specific subset of the community is impacted.
- 1: Minimal or no public interest identified.

3. Potential for Impact

- 5: Expected to significantly impact policy, practice, or community health outcomes.
- 4: Can achieve meaningful changes but may be limited in scope.
- 3: Potential for moderate impact, with clear but constrained benefits.
- 2: May yield some benefits, but impact is likely low.
- 1: Limited or uncertain potential for measurable impact.

4. Need for HWS Involvement

- 5: Healthwatch Southwark's unique role makes it the best organisation to address this issue.
- 4: Healthwatch involvement would be beneficial, though another organisation could also address it.

HWS Prioritisation matrix and scoring framework

- 3: Other groups could potentially handle this issue, but HWS could still add value.
- 2: Limited need for HWS involvement, as others may be more suited.
- 1: Minimal or no need for HWS involvement, with other organisations better positioned.

5. Risk Management

- 5: Low risk; issue is straightforward with clear oversight and low potential for negative outcomes.
- 4: Minor risks identified, manageable with existing protocols.
- 3: Moderate risks; would require some additional resources to manage.
- 2: Significant risk factors, requiring careful planning and oversight.
- 1: High risk, with potential for substantial negative consequences if not handled well.

6. Resource Requirements

- 5: Minimal resources needed, making it highly feasible within current budgets and staffing.
- 4: Low resource requirements; manageable with slight adjustments.
- 3: Moderate resources required, possibly needing budget allocation or additional staff time.
- 2: High resources required; may strain budget or staffing.
- 1: Very high resources required; potentially unfeasible with current capacity.

7. Strategic Alignment

- 5: Strongly aligns with Healthwatch Southwark's strategic priorities and long-term objectives.
- 4: Aligns well with strategic goals, but not a top priority.
- 3: Somewhat aligned, though may be secondary to core objectives.
- 2: Limited alignment with strategic priorities; less relevant to current focus areas.
- 1: Minimal or no alignment with strategic priorities.