

Management Accountability Framework
2008–09

Area of Management 12
Effectiveness of Information Management

Evaluation Methodology
Lines of Evidence 1 and 2 (IM)
Lines of Evidence 3 and 4 (ATIP)

Introduction

Area of management 12: Effectiveness of Information Management

Effectiveness of Information Management (IM) is one of the areas of management within the Stewardship component of the Management Accountability Framework (MAF). The statement for Stewardship is “The departmental control regime (assets, money, people, services, etc.) is integrated and effective, and its underlying principles are clear to all staff.”

Responsibility for IM in the MAF

Two divisions of the Chief Information Officer Branch of the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat are responsible for the MAF Effectiveness of Information Management indicator:

- **Information Management Division (IMD), Indicator Lead**—Responsible for assessing lines of evidence 1 and 2 and ensuring that all lines of evidence are evaluated to arrive at a final departmental assessment.
- **Information and Privacy Policy Division (IPPD)**—Responsible for assessing lines of evidence 3 and 4 and providing input to final departmental assessment.

For 2008–09, the individual lines of evidence for Effectiveness of Information Management are similar to MAF V; however, evidence required for MAF VI also includes the following departmental activities related to IM awareness:

1. corporate governance for IM;
2. management of information and records to meet program and service outcomes, operational needs, and accountabilities;
3. statutory and regulatory requirements of the *Privacy Act* are met (including sound management practices with respect to the handling and protection of personal information and consistent public reporting on the administration of the Act); and
4. statutory and regulatory requirements of the *Access to Information Act* are met (including consistent public reporting on the administration of the Act).

Evaluation Methodologies and Evidence—Lines of Evidence 12.1 and 12.2

Sources of Evidence—General

MAF ~~focuses~~**focuses** on those aspects of management that are evidenced through existing oversight and reporting activities. The following sources, among others, may be used to inform an opinion on the state of management in departments:

- Estimates (Annual Reference Level Updates, reports on plans and priorities, and departmental performance reports);
- reports of financial and non-financial performance information through the *Management, Resources and Results Structure Policy*, Memoranda to Cabinet, Treasury Board submissions and records of decisions;
- reports of other Officers of Parliament, e.g. the Auditor General of Canada;
- ongoing engagement of departments in the form of consultations, advice, and discussion of Treasury Board submissions; and
- participation in various forums and committees.

As a result of the developing nature of Government of Canada IM strategies and activities, evidence is not yet incorporated into existing documentation and activities; other sources of

evidence therefore, need to be identified and referenced in assessments. To reduce the reporting burden, departments may provide copies of existing documentation that provide the required information or indicate where information exists (and is still valid) in documentation already provided to the Secretariat either through the previous round of MAF (Round V, 2007) or the GC IM Initiatives Inventory.

Sources of evidence may include the following:

- IM or IT strategies, frameworks, or implementation plans;
- departmental governance documents;
- IM-related policies, strategies, implementation plans, action or work plans, reports, and guidelines;
- Treasury Board submissions;
- communication plans;
- websites;
- training or awareness plans or materials;
- terms of reference, agendas, membership, records of decisions for committees;
- departmental business processes or procedures and performance management agreements; and
- audit results.

Departments must use and reference the most informative, concise, and convenient source of evidence. The specific reference within provided documentation should be clearly notated against the applicable line of evidence for which it should be used.

Instructions for Lines of Evidence 12.1 and 12.2:

Please respond to each question in the questionnaire (tables) presented on the following pages. The unshaded cells are for your input; the shaded cells are for your information.

Multiple possible sources of evidence are suggested in the following pages; however, no more than 10 pieces of evidence should be provided.

Some questions in the following questionnaire (for lines of evidence 12.1 and 12.2) require only a Yes or No response; others may require a more complete narrative response.

Please do not embed documents within the questionnaire. Documents should be uploaded separately, with appropriate references (document name, page reference) within the questionnaire.

1. Corporate Governance

Please provide evidence to demonstrate that corporate governance structures include IM in their business outcomes and that IM is being governed and integrated into the department’s planning, approval, management, operational, and evaluation activities.

1.1. Have IM accountabilities, roles, and responsibilities been assigned?

1.1.1 Has an IM Senior Official (IMSO) been designated?

Response	Yes/No
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided
n/a	n/a

1.1.2 Has the name been submitted to the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (Information Management Division, CIOB)?

Response	Yes/No
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided
n/a	n/a

<p>1.1.3 Have IM accountabilities, roles, and responsibilities been formally established <i>throughout the department</i>, including the following:</p> <p>a) For integrating IM requirements as a part of the approval, development, implementation, evaluation, and reporting of departmental policies, programs, services, and projects?</p> <p>b) In corporate-wide governance or approval committees ?</p> <p>c) In policy area(s) to evaluate, adopt and implement GC-wide IM policy instruments; or to develop department-specific IM policies consistent with the GC IM strategy and policy instruments?</p> <p>d) Have IM roles and responsibilities been made available in departmental directories and service listing(s)?</p>	
<p>Possible Sources of Evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans, controls, or instruments used to ensure that IM roles and responsibilities are included in existing or during the development of new or re-engineered business processes Governance documents (committee structure in chart form, terms of reference, membership, mandate, meeting schedule) Position title(s), placement in the organization chart(s), and work descriptions for positions assigned with IM accountabilities, roles and responsibilities Communication plans; extracts from intranet pages or directories
<p>Response</p>	<p>Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:</p>
<p>Page or Section Reference</p>	<p>Evidence Provided (maximum 5) Please provide electronic file name and title of document.</p>

1.2. Does the department participate in GC-wide approaches and initiatives related to developing, implementing, sharing, and leveraging IM policies and practices?

1.2.1 Is the department active in GC IM committees, working groups, workshops, etc.?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee membership lists; meeting minutes
Response	Yes/No: _____ Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided
n/a	n/a

1.2.2 Is the department sharing or leveraging best practices across the GC?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in collaborative work bodies; presentations to conferences; GC IM Initiatives Inventory; etc.
Response	Yes/No: _____ Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided
n/a	n/a

Rating	Criteria Description
Attention Required	There is little or no evidence that governance structures include IM accountabilities, roles, and responsibilities assigned to one or more senior officials, and they are not seeking opportunities to leverage existing GC IM policy instruments, the GC IM Strategy, or the GC IM Initiatives Inventory.
Opportunity for Improvement	Accountability for IM is assigned to senior officials, and there is some evidence of IM representation in corporate-wide governance or approval committees, business planning or business strategies, processes, or procedures. There is little evidence of leveraging existing GC IM policy instruments, the GC IM Strategy, or the GC IM Initiatives Inventory.
Acceptable	IM accountabilities are assigned to senior officials, and IM roles and responsibilities are defined throughout the department. There is evidence of effective IM representation in corporate-wide governance and approval committees, and IM roles and responsibilities included in business plans or strategies, processes, or procedures. They are leveraging existing GC IM policy instruments, the GC IM Strategy, or the GC IM Initiatives Inventory.
Strong	IM accountabilities are assigned to senior officials, and IM roles and responsibilities are defined throughout the department. There is evidence of effective, sustained IM representation in corporate-wide governance and approval committees, and IM roles and responsibilities included in strategic planning strategies or plans, business processes, or procedures. Best practices, lessons learned, models, and tools are shared with other GC departments, as well as leveraging existing GC IM Policy instruments, the GC IM Strategy, or the GC IM Initiatives Inventory.

2. Management of information and records to meet program and service outcomes, operational needs, and accountabilities

Departmental IM Strategic Planning and Implementation Plans—with a focus on awareness at all levels on applying effective IM to meet policy requirements, program and service outcomes, operational needs and accountabilities.

Please provide evidence of a corporate IM strategy, plan, and implementation activities for the management of information and records to meet program and service outcomes, operational needs and accountabilities, including the communication and awareness activities to inform employees at all levels.

2.1. Is there an approved, resourced IM strategy and implementation plan underway?

2.1.1 Is there a current and active departmental IM strategy and implementation plan in support of departmental business priorities and operations?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Departmental IM strategy implementation plan • Documents accompanying the strategy (implementation plan(s), resourcing plan(s), business case, project charter, etc.) may provide information for multiple points; please indicate the references within the documents that illustrate the information required • Approval and funding levels for the strategy and implementation plan
Response	Yes/No: _____ Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided (maximum 3) Please provide electronic file name and title of document.

2.1.2 Is the GC IM Strategy integrated with other corporate strategies, plans, and planning cycles, such as an IT plan, business plans, capital investment plans, and Human Resources (HR) plans?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation outlining departmental strategic/business planning process and governance model; decision-making framework; IT Plan, business plan(s), capital investment plan, or other plans showing the IM integration or collaboration (internally or externally)
Response	Yes/No: _____ Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided (maximum 3) Please provide electronic file name and title of document.

2.1.3 Are implementation plans for the GC IM Strategy underway in the department? What are the achievements to date?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report or presentation on the status of the implementation plan Status reports (must demonstrate measurable results)
Response	Yes/No: _____ Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided (maximum 2) Please provide electronic file name and title of document.

2.2. Have departmental staff and executives been made aware of and helped to understand their roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities for the quality, handling, and management of information?

2.2.1 Is there a current IM awareness campaign underway within the department?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communications, awareness, training plan(s), or activities
Response	Yes/No: _____ Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided (maximum 1) Please provide electronic file name and title of document.

2.2.2 Does awareness and training reflect requirements of current GC and departmental IM policies and directives?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Date material was last updated Types of awareness and training
Response	Yes/No: _____ Date of last update: _____ Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided.
n/a	n/a

2.2.3 How are employees being made aware of the revised GC IM Policy, directives, and guidelines?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication, awareness, training plan(s) or activities
Response	Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided (maximum 1) Please provide electronic file name and title of document.

2.2.4 To what extent are training and awareness sessions and advice made available to help employees understand their roles, and responsibilities and accountabilities for managing information?	
Possible Sources of Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IM training and awareness included as part of employee orientation and regular training schedules • Topics covered in the IM awareness or training sessions • Percentage employees who have attended and from how many different branches, directorates, or sectors of how many possible branches, directorates, or sectors • Training for managers, employees, and IM functional specialists is included in departmental HR plan
Response	Narrative response [respond here or in an attached document]:
Page or Section Reference	Evidence Provided (maximum 3) Please provide electronic file name and title of document.

Management Accountability Framework VI—Effectiveness of IM

Rating	Criteria Description
Attention Required	The department does not have an IM strategy or plan or an IM awareness strategy or plan.
Opportunity for Improvement	<p>There is evidence to demonstrate that the department has an IM strategy that may identify some business objectives and program and service outcomes, operational needs, IM policy requirements, and some internal or external collaboration opportunities. The GC IM Strategy is integrated with some corporate strategies and plans.</p> <p>There is evidence to demonstrate that the department includes IM in its awareness and training programs but it is not well attended or current in its treatment of information needs, accountabilities, or policy requirements.</p>
Acceptable	<p>There is evidence to demonstrate that the department has an IM strategy and implementation plan that identifies all major departmental business objectives and program and service outcomes, operational needs and accountabilities, IM policy requirements, internal and external collaboration opportunities; implementation activities are underway. The GC IM Strategy is integrated with most corporate strategies and plans.</p> <p>There is evidence to demonstrate that the department has an IM awareness strategy that identifies information needs and accountabilities and IM policy requirements; that training and awareness sessions are available for employees at all levels; and that participants represent most staff from all branches and levels.</p>
Strong	<p>There is evidence to demonstrate that the department has an IM strategy and implementation plan that identifies all business objectives and program and service outcomes, operational needs and accountabilities, IM policy requirements, internal and external collaboration opportunities; implementation activities are well underway, measurable, and sustainable. The GC IM Strategy is integrated with all corporate strategies and plans.</p> <p>There is evidence to demonstrate that the department has an IM awareness and training strategy or plan that identifies information needs and accountabilities, IM policy requirements; that the majority of staff has participated in awareness activities or training sessions; and that awareness activities are well underway, measurable, and sustainable.</p>

Evaluation Methodologies and Evidence—Lines of Evidence 12.3 and 12.4

PRIVACY

12.3 Statutory and regulatory requirements of the *Privacy Act* are met (including sound management practices with respect to the handling and protection of personal information and consistent public reporting on the administration of the Act).

Sources of evidence:

- 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament on the Administration of the *Privacy Act* (includes Statistical Report);
- Institution-Specific Personal Information Banks (registered and under development) and Classes of Personal Information listed in the institution's 2008 Chapter of *Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information*;
- The institution's website;
- 2006–07 Annual Report of the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada (OPC);
- 2008 Reports of other Officers of Parliament (e.g. the Auditor General of Canada);
- 2008 (or most recent) Program Activity Architecture (PAA) structure;
- 2008–09 Estimates (Parts I and II);
- 2006–07 Departmental Performance Report;
- 2008–09 Report on Plans and Priorities; and
- The institution's privacy progress report (maximum three-page document outlining initiatives that affect the administration of the *Privacy Act* and have been implemented since the institution's Annual Report was submitted).

Methodology

The evaluation will comprise the following:

- i) Review the institution's 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament to determine if all of TBS' mandatory reporting requirements have been met. (Implementation Report No. 109 —http://publiservice.tbs-sct.gc.ca/atip-aiprp/impl-rep/2008/109-imp-mise_e.asp).
 - Review results of MAF Round V to determine if issues identified have been addressed or if any action has been taken by the institution to resolve them.
- ii) Review the institution's website to confirm that summaries of completed Privacy Impact Assessments (as stated in the institution's Annual Report to Parliament) have been posted in accordance with Treasury Board policy and to determine if related institution-specific Personal Information Banks have been, or are being, developed.
- iii) Review the 2006–07 Annual Report of the Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada (OPC) to determine if issues specific to an institution were identified. The relevant institution's 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament will then be reviewed to determine if the issues or recommendations highlighted by the OPC were addressed and subsequently included in the institution's annual report (i.e. as changes to its privacy program and as part of the institution's ongoing administration of the legislation).
- iv) Review 2008 Reports of other Officers of Parliament (e.g. the Auditor General of Canada) to determine if issues specific to an institution were identified. The relevant institution's 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament will then be reviewed to determine if the issues or recommendations highlighted by the Officers' reports were addressed and subsequently

included in the institution's annual report (i.e. as changes to its privacy program and as part of the institution's ongoing administration of the legislation).

- v) Examine institution-specific Personal Information Banks (registered and under development) and Classes of Personal Information in the institution's 2008 Chapter of *Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information* to determine if they comply with the requirements of the *Privacy Act* for the effective protection and management of personal information; e.g. if a Personal Information Bank is required rather than a Class of Personal Information.
- vi) Review the institution's website to identify functions, programs, and activities that would reasonably require the creation or collection of personal information and determine if those collections have been appropriately described in compliance with the *Privacy Act* (e.g. in Personal Information Banks or Classes of Personal Information).
- vii) Review the institution's 2008 (or most recent) Program Activity Architecture structure (where applicable); 2008–09 Estimates (Parts I and II); 2006–07 Departmental Performance Report; and 2007–08 Report on Plans and Priorities to identify functions, programs, and activities that would reasonably require the creation or collection of personal information and determine if those collections have been appropriately described in compliance with the *Privacy Act* (e.g. in Personal Information Banks or Classes of Personal Information).
- viii) Review results of MAF Rounds IV and V to determine if issues identified in those assessments have been addressed or if any action has been taken by the institution to resolve them.
 - If the institution has not taken any apparent action to address significant privacy-related issues identified in Round IV, it will receive an "Attention Required (AR)" rating.
 - If the institution has not taken any apparent action to address other privacy-related issues identified in Round IV or any privacy-related issues identified in Round V, it will receive an "Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)" rating.
- ix) Review the institution's progress report. The institution may submit a **brief** (maximum of three pages in length) report outlining any activities, changes, or improvements it has undertaken since the submission of its Annual Report to Parliament on the Administration of the *Privacy Act* was submitted at end of the reporting period (for most institutions, the end of the reporting period is March 31 2008) to address specific issues identified by the Secretariat in MAF Round IV, MAF Round V, or through other feedback mechanisms and as part of the institution's ongoing administration of the legislation.

Rating	Criteria Description
Attention Required	The institution did not submit an Annual Report to Parliament or has no institution-specific descriptions of the personal information under its control, as required by the <i>Privacy Act</i> . The institution has not taken any apparent action to address significant privacy-related issues identified in MAF Round IV.
Opportunity for Improvement	The institution submitted an Annual Report to Parliament but did not address all of the mandatory reporting elements. Significant collections of personal information under the control of the institution have not been appropriately identified or described in institution-specific Personal Information Banks or Classes of Personal Information.
Acceptable	The institution's Annual Report to Parliament met the mandatory reporting requirements although some collections of personal information under the control of the institution have not been appropriately identified or described in institution-specific Personal Information Banks or Classes of Personal Information.

Strong	The institution consistently (over a period of two or more years) submits a complete and thorough Annual Report to Parliament, and all collections of personal information under its control are identified and described in clear, up-to-date, and comprehensive Personal Information Banks or Classes of Personal Information.
--------	--

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

12.4 Statutory and regulatory requirements of the *Access to Information Act* are met (including consistent public reporting on the administration of the Act).

Sources of evidence:

- 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament on the Administration of the *Access to Information Act* (includes Statistical Report);
- Institution's 2008 Chapter of *Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information*;
- The 2006–07 Annual Report of the Office of the Information Commissioner of Canada (OIC);
- The institution's website;
- 2008 reports of other Officers of Parliament (e.g. the Auditor General of Canada);
- 2008 (or most recent) Program Activity Architecture (PAA) structure;
- 2008–09 Estimates (Parts I and II);
- 2006–07 Departmental Performance Report;
- 2008–09 Report on Plans and Priorities; and
- The institution's access to information progress report (Maximum three-page document outlining initiatives that affect the administration of the *Access to Information Act* that have implemented since the institution's Annual Report was submitted).

Methodology

The evaluation will comprise the following:

- i) Review the institution's 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament to determine if all of TBS' mandatory reporting requirements have been met. (Implementation Report No. 109—http://publiservice.tbs-sct.gc.ca/atip-ajpr/impl-rep/2008/109-imp-mise_e.asp.
 - Review results of MAF Round V to determine if issues identified have been addressed or if any action has been taken by the institution to resolve them.
- ii) Review the 2006–07 Annual Report of the Office of the Information Commissioner (OIC) to determine if issues specific to an institution were identified. The relevant institution's 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament will then be reviewed to determine if the issues or recommendations highlighted by the OIC were addressed and subsequently included in the institution's Annual Report (i.e. as changes to its access to information regime and as part of the institution's ongoing management of the legislation).
- iii) Review 2008 Reports of other Officers of Parliament (e.g. the Auditor General of Canada) to determine if issues specific to an institution were identified. The relevant institution's 2007–08 Annual Report to Parliament will then be reviewed to determine if the issues or recommendations highlighted by the Officers' reports were addressed and subsequently included in the institution's Annual Report (i.e. as changes to its access to information regime and as part of the institution's ongoing management of the legislation).
- iv) Examine the institution's 2008 Chapter in *Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information* to determine if the institution is providing complete and comprehensive descriptions of all of its functions, programs, activities, and related information holdings.

(Secretariat Implementation Report No. 110
 —http://publiservice.tbs-sct.gc.ca/atip-airpr/impl-rep/2008/110-imp-mise_e.asp)

- v) Review the institution’s website to determine if all functions, programs, activities, and related information holdings have been appropriately identified and described in the institution’s 2008 Chapter of *Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information*.
- vi) Review the institution's 2008 (or most recent) Program Activity Architecture structure (where applicable); 2008–09 Estimates (Parts I and II); 2006–07 Departmental Performance Report; and 2007–08 Report on Plans and Priorities to determine if all of the stated functions, programs, and activities have been appropriately identified and described in the institution's 2008 Chapter of *Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information*.
- vii) Review results of MAF Rounds IV and V to determine if issues identified in those assessments have been addressed or if any action has been taken by the institution to resolve them.
 - If the institution has not taken any apparent action to address significant access-related issues identified in Round IV it will receive an “Attention Required (AR)” rating.
 - If the institution has not taken any apparent action to address to address other access-related issues identified in Round IV or any access-related gaps identified in Round V, it will receive an “Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)” rating.
- viii) Review the institution's progress report. Institution may submit a **brief** (maximum of three pages in length) report outlining any activities, changes, improvements it has undertaken since the submission of its Annual Report to Parliament on the Administration of the *Access to Information Act* was submitted at end of the reporting period (for most institutions, the end of the reporting period is March 31, 2008) to address specific issues identified by the Secretariat in MAF Round IV, MAF Round V, or through other feedback mechanisms and as part of the institution’s ongoing administration of the legislation.

Rating	Criteria Description
Attention Required	The institution did not submit an Annual Report to Parliament or did not provide its annual submission for the <i>Info Source</i> publications, as required by the <i>Access to Information Act</i> . There are no institution-specific descriptions of the information holdings (Classes of Records) under the control of the institution, as required by the <i>Access to Information Act</i> . The institution has not taken any apparent action to address significant access to information–related issues identified in MAF Round IV.
Opportunity for Improvement	The institution submitted an Annual Report to Parliament but did not address all of the mandatory reporting requirements, and its 2008 Chapter in <i>Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information</i> contains significant gaps in the description of the institution’s functions, programs, activities, and related information holdings (Classes of Records).
Acceptable	The institution’s Annual Report to Parliament met the mandatory reporting requirements, although its 2008 Chapter in <i>Info Source: Sources of Federal Government Information</i> contains some gaps in the description of the institution’s functions, programs, activities, and related information holdings (Classes of Records).
Strong	The institution consistently (over a period of two or more years) submits a complete and thorough Annual Report to Parliament and has ensured that the descriptions of all of its functions, programs, activities, and related information holdings (Classes

	of Records) are clear, comprehensive, and updated annually in the <i>Info Source</i> publications.
--	--

Scoring methodology

Line of Evidence ratings will be arrived at according to the rating category to which the majority of evidence applies or the presence or absence of evidence in all the ratings.

Note: A rating of “Attention Required” will be applied regardless of evidence of other characteristics for the following:

- Line of Evidence 12.1: If it is determined that governance structures do not include IM roles and responsibilities assigned to one or more senior officials.
- Line of Evidence 12.2: If no departmental IM strategy or evidence of implementation activities exist or no attempt at employee awareness has been undertaken.
- Line of Evidence 12.3: If the institution is non-compliant in submitting an Annual Report to Parliament, has no descriptions of the personal information under its control, or has not taken any apparent action to address significant privacy-related issues identified in MAF Round IV.
- Line of Evidence 12.4: If institution is non-compliant in submitting an Annual Report to Parliament, did not provide its annual submission for the *Info Source* publications, or has not taken any apparent action to address significant access to information–related issues identified in MAF Round IV.

Area of Management rating will be based on the ratings for the four Lines of Evidence, according to the following decision rules:

Decision rules for Area of Management 12—Effectiveness of Information Management

Rating will be Attention Required if:

- three or more lines of evidence are rated as Attention Required
- two or more lines of evidence are rated as Attention Required and none are Acceptable or Strong

Rating will be Opportunity for Improvement if:

- three or more lines of evidence are rated as Opportunity for Improvement
- two lines of evidence are rated as Attention Required and one each is Opportunity for Improvement and Acceptable
- two lines of evidence are rated as Acceptable and one each is Opportunity for Improvement and Attention Required
- two lines of evidence are rated as Acceptable and one each is Strong and Attention Required
- one line of evidence is each Attention Required, Opportunity for Improvement, Acceptable, and Strong
- two lines of evidence are rated as Opportunity for Improvement, one is Attention Required, and one is Acceptable or Strong

Rating will be Acceptable if:

- three or more lines of evidence are rated as Acceptable
- two lines of evidence are rated as Acceptable and one each is Strong and Opportunity for Improvement
- two lines of evidence are rated as Strong (provided one is Line of Evidence 1 or 2 and the other is Line of Evidence 3 or 4) and one each is Opportunity for Improvement and Attention Required.
- three lines of evidence are Strong and one is Opportunity for Improvement or Attention Required

Rating will be Strong if:

- three or more are Strong and none is Opportunity for Improvement or Attention Required

If lines of evidence ratings are equally divided between two levels that are

- adjacent, the lower rating will be given (e.g. two Strong and two Acceptable = Acceptable)
- separated by one level, the level between the two will be given (e.g. two Strong and two Opportunity for Improvement = Acceptable)
- separated by two levels, the level above the lower level will be given (e.g. two Strong and two Attention Required = Opportunity for Improvement)