

CORE FUNCTION ANALYSIS

To be completed at employee or unit level

This rubric can help assess which tasks or processes might be outdated, inefficient, or redundant, guiding efforts to streamline operations and focus on high-value activities. It is intended to spur discussion, at both the unit and divisional levels as well as across units and division, and can be adapted to better fit one's unit.

| Rubric Criteria | High (4) | Medium (3) | Low (2) | Very Low (1) |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Relevance to Unit's Core Goals and Objectives | Directly supports key goals | Supports some goals but not directly tied to key objectives | Only loosely related to unit goals | Does not support or align with unit goals |
| Risk Mitigation or Compliance Requirement | Critical to mitigating risk or meeting compliance requirements | Moderate impact on risk mitigation or compliance requirements | Low impact on risk mitigation or compliance requirements | No impact on risk mitigation or compliance requirements |
| Stakeholder Value¹ | Stakeholders (internal/external) see high value | Stakeholders see moderate value | Low perceived value from stakeholders | No value for stakeholders |
| Automation Potential | Task can be easily automated or streamlined | Task could be partially automated with effort | Task requires manual intervention with little automation potential | Task cannot be automated or streamlined, highly manual |
| Shared Service Potential | Task can easily be shared with another unit/campus | With some effort, task could be shared with another unit/campus | Would require substantial effort/change in practices to share | Not feasible to share task |
| Resource Consumption (time, money, etc.)² | Requires minimal resources and has high ROI | Requires some resources with measurable ROI | Consumes significant resources with minimal ROI | Consumes excessive resources with no clear ROI |
| Employee Engagement | Task is engaging and meaningful for employees | Task is somewhat engaging, but not motivating | Task is disengaging or monotonous for employees | Task is demotivating and adds no value to employee engagement |
| Impact on Employee's Productivity | High impact on improving efficiency or results | Moderate impact on productivity or workflow | Low impact; may be redundant or duplicative work | No impact on productivity; waste of time |

Total Score:

- **28–32 points:** Keep and improve (tasks may benefit from streamlining, optimizing, or automating).
- **21–27 points:** Review and consider eliminating or outsourcing (task may be redundant or not highly impactful).
- **14–20 points:** Consider eliminating or simplifying (task shows minimal value and could be streamlined).
- **Below 14 points:** Eliminate or automate immediately (task provides little or no value and consumes significant resources).

Another consideration is how the activity fits into the Stephen Covey time-management quadrants. Work that falls into Quadrant IV (not urgent/not important) should be carefully analyzed.

| | URGENT | NOT URGENT |
|---------------|---|---|
| IMPORTANT | Quadrant I <i>urgent and important</i> DO | Quadrant II <i>not urgent but important</i> PLAN |
| NOT IMPORTANT | Quadrant III <i>urgent but not important</i> DELEGATE | Quadrant IV <i>not urgent and not important</i> ELIMINATE |

¹ Stakeholder value can also mean impact on other areas if the work isn't done (stakeholder sees high value)

² High resource consumption/high ROI could be scored as a "medium" impact