

	COMMITTEE RANK SCORING	MAXIMUM SCORING RANGE	
		Yes	No
<b>GENERAL ELEMENTS</b>			
GE 1: Is the service being reviewed considered a mission critical service of Utah State Government?	22	0	5
GE 2: Do other alternatives exist for providing the service?	63	25	0
GE 3: Could the State replace a provider if costs or performance proved unsatisfactory?	37	15	0
GE 4: Is there a significant level of political opposition to privatization of this service?	23	0	20
GE 5: Has this service been successfully privatized by other state or local governments? By the Federal government?	35	15	0
GE 6: Are there any known legal barriers to privatization?	63	0	25
GE 7: Are there any obvious risks to be considered with the privatization of this service?	57	0	25
GE 8: Does a vendor need access to confidential information?	21	0	5
<b>PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS</b>			
PE 1: Does this service currently utilize quantifiable and measureable performance measures?	35	15	0
PE 2: Would it be difficult to assess the performance of the privatized service?	39	0	15
PE 3: Would there be a high level of risk if a privatized service did not meet required performance requirements?	57	0	25
PE 4: Would the State be able to transfer liability to a service vendor in the case of poor performance?	31	15	0
PE 5: Would the State be able to reward or penalize any vendor or performance?	39	15	0
PE 6: Would it be difficult to construct a performance contract for this service?	29	0	15

<b>COST ELEMENTS</b>			
CE 1: Do the current costs for providing this service appear high?	57	25	0
CE 2: Does the percentage of fixed current costs appear to exceed 50%?	43	0	20
CE 2: Does the percentage of variable current costs appear to exceed 50%?	43	20	0
CE 4: Does State service cost appear to be higher than privatized costs?	57	25	0
CE 5: Would it be difficult to monitor service costs for a privatized service?	48	0	20
CE 6: Are the estimated costs of contract development appear to exceed 15% of the estimated annual savings?	23	0	10
CE 7: Are the estimated annual costs of contract monitoring less than 15% of the estimated annual cost savings?	29	15	0
CE 8: Would privatization have a positive impact on tax revenue?	23	10	0
CE 9: Are other State departments paying a part of this service?	29	0	15
CE 10: Is the estimated costs of employee lay-offs greater than 25% of the total cost savings if the service were to be privatized?	31	15	0
CE 11: Does the current State service have excess capacity that could be sold due to privatization arrangement?	21	5	0
CE 12: Does the current State service operate any facilities that could be shed due to privatization?	25	10	0
CE 13: Would staffing costs to be eliminated due to privatization be equal to or greater than the ratio of staffing costs to overall service costs?	45	20	0
<b>STAFFING ELEMENTS</b>			
SE 1: Are the potential impacts on State employees considered to be significant or out of proportion to potential gain from privatization?	37	0	15
<b>SUMMARY</b>			
Summary 1: How comfortable would you feel in privatizing this service?	28	15	0
Summary 2: Do you think service quality will improve? Or should improve?	51	20	0
Summary 3: Do you think costs will decrease? Or should decrease?	45	20	0
Summary 5: Are there other issues which cannot be scored but need to be considered?	24	0	10

<b>TOTAL MAXIMUM SCORE</b>		<b>525</b>	
<b>NOTES:</b>			
The scoring ranges represent maximum and minimum possible scores for an item. A scorer can use his or her discretion to award a score in between the ranges.			
Decisions can be made in two ways:			
If evaluating multiple services at the same time, then the total score can be used for rank-order			
If evaluating a single service, a suggested cut-off for consideration would be 65-75% of total score			
Items are color coded according to relative priority:			
Criterion	Committee Score	Evaluator Scoring Range	
High	57+	0-25	
Medium High	43-51	0-20	
Medium	28-39	0-15	
Low	23-25	0-10	
Very Low	21-22	0-5	