



# Start Right Selection™ Assessment

## Self-Assessment Questionnaire

This self-assessment helps business and IT leaders evaluate how effectively their organization selects, values, and prioritizes initiatives before committing scarce resources.

Rate each statement using the scale below. Add your scores in each category to see where you stand.

A higher score indicates disciplined, transparent selection practices that focus on the work that matters most; a lower score suggests capacity overload and decision fatigue.

### Rating Scale:

1: Rarely/never true | 2: Occasionally true | 3: Sometimes true | 4: Usually true | 5: Consistently true

## 1. Strategic Fit and Intent

- \_\_\_\_\_ Each proposed initiative is clearly linked to one or more strategic objectives.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Strategic objectives are well defined and understood by the leaders making selection decisions.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Selection discussions focus on outcomes and organizational value rather than preferred solutions.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Initiatives that lack strategic relevance are challenged, deferred, or removed from consideration.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Leadership agrees on what success should look like before approving work.

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 25

### Maturity Guide:

21–25 = **Strategic Selector:** Initiatives consistently trace to strategy and expected outcomes.

16–20 = **Guided Selector:** Strategic intent is visible in most decisions, but not always tested.

10–15 = **Inconsistent Selector:** Strategic fit is discussed unevenly or after the fact.

<10 = **Opportunistic Selector:** Initiatives move forward because they are available, popular, or urgent.

### Get in touch.

info@norveld.com

1-607-272-7091



## 2. Value and Trade-Off Awareness

- \_\_\_\_\_ Expected benefits are discussed using consistent criteria across competing initiatives.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Financial and non-financial value, such as service quality, risk reduction, compliance, and user impact, are explicitly considered.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Decision-makers acknowledge trade-offs between competing initiatives before approving new work.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Opportunity cost is considered—what will not be done if this initiative proceeds.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Value assumptions are questioned and validated during selection, not simply accepted from the business case.

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 25

### Maturity Guide:

**21–25 = Value-Focused Investor:** Value is defined, tested, and compared consistently across initiatives.

**16–20 = Informed Investor:** Most value discussions are disciplined, though some assumptions remain informal.

**10–15 = Intuitive Investor:** Value is discussed but often without consistent evidence or comparison.

**<10 = Reactive Investor:** Initiatives are approved without a clear understanding of value or trade-offs.

## 3. Capacity and Capability Awareness

- \_\_\_\_\_ Resource capacity is realistically assessed before initiatives are approved.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Leadership recognizes when teams, systems, or business units are already overloaded.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Capability gaps, dependencies, constraints, and risks are identified early in the selection process.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Initiatives are sequenced to match available capacity and the organization's ability to absorb change.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Decisions are revisited when capacity or capability assumptions change.

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 25

**Maturity Guide:**

**21–25 = Capacity-Aware Organization:** Selection decisions reflect realistic capacity, capability, and change limits.

**16–20 = Capacity-Conscious Organization:** Most capacity issues are visible before approval.

**10–15 = Capacity-Blind Organization:** Constraints are often discovered only after work begins.

**<10 = Overcommitted Organization:** Initiatives routinely exceed available resources and organizational capacity.

#### 4. Prioritization and Portfolio Discipline

- \_\_\_\_\_ A consistent process is used to rank, select, and sequence initiatives across the portfolio.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Short-term urgency is balanced against long-term strategic value.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Dependencies, timing, and competing demands are reviewed before initiatives are approved.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Portfolio limits are enforced instead of allowing every approved idea to become active work.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Projects are periodically re-scored or re-evaluated to ensure priorities still reflect current needs and conditions.

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 25

**Maturity Guide:**

**21–25 = Disciplined Portfolio Manager:** The portfolio is actively balanced for value, timing, and capacity.

**16–20 = Managed Portfolio:** Priorities are generally structured, with occasional exceptions or overrides.

**10–15 = Static Portfolio:** Approved initiatives are tracked, but rarely compared or rebalanced.

**<10 = Chaotic Portfolio:** Priorities shift reactively, and everything appears equally important.

#### 5. Governance and Decision Transparency

- \_\_\_\_\_ There is a defined forum for selection decisions with clear decision rights and accountability.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Decision criteria are documented, understood, and applied consistently.

- \_\_\_\_\_ The rationale for approving, deferring, or rejecting initiatives is documented and communicated.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Governance has the authority to stop, defer, or re-scope work when value assumptions no longer hold.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Post-implementation reviews compare actual outcomes with expected value and inform future selection decisions.

Score: \_\_\_\_ / 25

**Maturity Guide:**

**21–25 = Transparent Decision Governance:** Decisions are consistent, traceable, and defensible.

**16–20 = Structured Governance:** Governance exists and is usually followed, but transparency varies.

**10–15 = Informal Governance:** Some structure exists, but decisions depend heavily on individuals.

**<10 = Ad Hoc Governance:** Decisions are undocumented, inconsistent, or politically driven.

**TOTAL SCORE (All Categories):** \_\_\_\_ / 125

**Overall Discovery Readiness Levels:**

**105–125 = Strategic Selector:** Selection is fully integrated with strategy, value, capability, priority, and governance.

**80–104 = Capable Selector:** A sound foundation exists; refining trade-offs, capacity discipline, and adaptability will improve results.

**55–79 = Developing Selector:** Some structure exists, but selection discipline is inconsistent across the organization.

**<55 = At-Risk Selector:** Initiatives are likely to be selected through urgency, convenience, or politics, creating significant value leakage.

### Interpretation & Next Steps

This assessment helps identify whether stronger project selection discipline is needed before moving into project planning. Lower or uneven scores may reveal lack of strategic alignment, hidden influences, and political pressure that can weaken project and portfolio value.

Our Start Right Selection™ engagements deliver practical, actionable results you can use immediately.

Ready to start? [Schedule a Conversation >](#)