

Prioritizing projects at dd williamson



Introduction Case Analysis D. D. Williamson created a list of 78 projects which needed to be prioritized, organized, and selected. The company used a four step method to rate each project: 1) Establish criteria for prioritizing projects. 2) Weigh each criterion. 3) Refine the list of projects. 4) Rate each project on each criterion and total ratings. To give team members control over the ranking of projects, each member was asked to write three different criteria on three Post-it Notes. These Post-it Notes were divided into similar item groups and each group was named.

This process established the important criteria for selection. The criteria were used to determine how well each project would fit into the strategy of the company (Kloppenborg, 2009, p. 35). To weigh each criteria group, the team members assigned each group a score. More important groups were given a score of 10, less important groups a score of 6 to 9, the least important groups a score of 5 or less. Criteria that were scored at 6 or higher were used to assess each project and criteria of 5 or lower were reserved for further ranking later in the process.

Criteria are weighted in order to help place the projects in order of importance as they are aligned with the goals of the company (Kloppenborg, 2009, p. 36). After the criteria were established and weighted, the list of projects was refined. Projects that were listed out as individual projects but were really one project happening concurrently in different locations were discovered and the list was changed to reflect this, reducing the number of projects on the list.

There were also projects added to the list that had not been formally identified as projects earlier. The criteria helped to determine which projects could initially be considered projects and which projects could be removed from the list. The projects on the list were reviewed to discover which were considered most important and rank the rest. The projects considered most important were immediately placed on the top of the importance list, and the rest went through the scoring process to be ranked in order from most to least important.

The projects were then rated according to the criteria that had been established earlier. Each project was rated to see how well it fit into each individual criterion, one at a time. All team members participated in the scoring, and agreement needed to be reached on how to score each project before scores were recorded. If project scoring required a lengthy decision, that was set aside for a different time so that team members could get through this process fairly quickly (Kloppenborg, 2009, p. 36-37). This entire process was recorded into a spreadsheet.

How the projects were ranked, how each project was scored on each criterion and the calculation of the weighted scores were all recorded on the spreadsheet. The team had prioritized 62 projects total throughout this process. Since the projects had already been ranked in order of importance, it would be easy for the team to hold a future meeting to assign resources and timelines to the projects at the top of the list (Kloppenborg, 2009. P. 44-45). The prioritization of the projects was a very important task for D. D. Williamson's global operating team to complete.

Although the task seems time consuming, it will save the team time in the long run because projects are rated in importance long before they are scheduled to begin. The weighting process allowed the team to discover where each project would fit into the SWOT analysis, and how each project would further the strategic objectives or otherwise benefit the company. The company uses a database to identify their potential projects. The database is used to keep track of daily work and project work. This tracking helps to highlight things that need to be improved during daily processes.

The very large list of 62 potential projects gives the company a wide range of choices in selecting which projects to complete. This helps to ensure that the most important issues that need to be worked on will be addressed in the timeliest fashion (Kloppenborg, 2009, p. 32-33). D. D. Williamson chooses to use a scoring model in project selection. This seems to be the most efficient way for the company to prioritize and select projects. Major problems arising with this process would be the potential for lengthy discussions revolving around project selection and prioritization.

The rating process helps to eliminate much of the discussion, but there may be some sticking points where additional criteria will have to be used to decide on issues. Recommended Actions In addition to the continuing use of the database and prioritization and selection process, it is recommended that D. D. Williamson use the lower weighted criteria to help make decisions when a stalemate has been reached when discussing potential projects. The additional criteria can help team members to quickly address concerns about potential projects.

If the potential projects are ranked well in the highly weighted criteria, the lower weighted criteria can be used to further break down the project and determine if it is a good fit. The last recommendation is creating mandatory criteria. In addition to moving the most highly scored projects to the top of the list, mandatory criteria can ensure that necessary projects are not overlooked. These mandatory criteria can include issues like government regulation, safety issues, and security issues (Kloppenborg, 2009, p. 36). The mandatory criteria will fast-track projects that must be completed.

Conclusion D. D. Williamson has a great project selection process in place. While many other companies use personal preference or whims to make project decisions, D. D. Williamson carefully considers which projects fit best into the company's strategies and which will best help further the interests of the company. With a few minor additions to the process, D. D. Williamson can continue to make great project selections and maintain a competitive advantage in their market. References Kloppenborg, T. J. (2009).

Contemporary project management (pp. 27-45). Mason: South- Western Cengage Learning.