

Evolving Effort Scoring from Time to Output

A practical measurement model for learning-design delivery, capacity, and constraints.



The goal: measure shared output, not self-reported time.

Preserve visibility into effort while creating a more consistent view of completed value.

Current state

- Hours or effort are self-reported
- Different interpretations across team members
- Difficult to compare work types
- Focus can shift toward activity rather than completed outputs



Evolved model

- Deliverables receive standard base points
- Complexity adjusts for real design difficulty
- Constraints provide context for missed or delayed work
- The same scoring rules apply across the team

Leadership benefit

- See completed output and work mix
- Understand where capacity is invested
- Identify work at risk and needed decisions
- Discuss trends without relying on hours alone

The measurement model has three separate views:

Each view answers a different leadership question. The measures should not be added together.

Output

Raw Delivery Points

Base points × complexity modifier × quantity

Answers: What was completed, and what mix of deliverables did the team produce?

Strategic alignment

Priority classification only

P1 operational | P2 business critical | P3 enterprise strategic

Answers: Where was completed capacity invested? No point multiplier.

Delivery constraints

Blocked points, days, severity, cause, owner, and action

Answers: What prevented planned delivery, and what intervention is needed?

Points measure completed output. Complexity adjusts difficulty. Constraints explain delivery conditions.

Standard base points create a common unit of output.

Score at the deliverable level. Initiatives are containers and receive no separate points.

Size	Points	Definition	Examples
XS	1	Minor update or documented review	Link update, small correction
S	3	Small, contained output	Job aid, discovery notes
M	5	Standard learning-design deliverable	Deck, workshop, storyboard
L	8	Multi-part or stakeholder-complex output	eLearning, resource hub
XL	13	High design depth, dependencies, or reuse	Simulation, curriculum architecture
XXL	21	Exceptional enterprise-scale solution	Integrated pathway; rare approval

Default

M is the default for standard learning-design work.

Not point eligible

Routine attendance, administration, micro-tasks without output.

Complexity modifies difficulty, not elapsed time.

Use 1.00 by default. A higher modifier requires documented evidence.

Level	Modifier	Use when	Governance
Standard	1.00	Clear scope, known audience, limited stakeholder or technical complexity.	Default; no added rationale.
Moderate	1.25	Multiple audiences, several review cycles, moderate ambiguity, or added technical requirements.	Short rationale in Asana.
High	1.50	Substantial ambiguity, high-risk content, complex technology, many stakeholders, or enterprise reuse.	Lead or manager review.
Exceptional	1.75	Rare, unusually difficult and critical work with cross-functional dependencies.	Approval required; use sparingly.

Use complexity for

Design ambiguity, audience variation, technical needs, risk, review depth, stakeholder complexity, or reuse.

Do not use complexity for

Work taking longer than expected, waiting for decisions, access delays, or other blockers.

Delivery constraints provide context and drive action.

Do not calculate burden points or add constraints to completed output.

Severity	Level	Definition	Expected response
None	0	Work is not materially affected.	No action.
Minor	1	Work continues with a manageable workaround.	Monitor.
Moderate	2	Progress slows or sequencing changes.	Review in the operating meeting.
Major	3	Most work on the deliverable stops.	Escalate to the resolution owner.
Stopped	4	The deliverable cannot proceed.	Immediate leadership decision or intervention.

Measure

- Blocked deliverables
- Blocked raw points
- Blocked days

Diagnose

- Severity
- Blocker type
- Controllability

Act

- Resolution owner
- Decision needed
- Target resolution date

Worked example: output and constraints reported side by side.

A single initiative can contain several scored deliverables. Priority remains a classification, not a multiplier.

Deliverable	Size / base	Qty	Complexity	Raw pts	Blocked days	Severity	Action
ILT workshop	M / 5	2	1.00	10	0	None	Complete
Resource hub	L / 8	1	1.25	10	4	Moderate	Decision owner due Friday
Scenario eLearning	L / 8	1	1.50	12	2	Minor	Access workaround
TOTAL		4		32	6		

Calculation

- Workshops: $2 \times 5 \times 1.00 = 10$
- Hub: $1 \times 8 \times 1.25 = 10$
- eLearning: $1 \times 8 \times 1.50 = 12$

Leadership readout

- 32 completed raw points
- 6 combined blocked days
- Decision delay is primary constraint

What is not done

- Do not add blocked days or severity to 32.
- Do not multiply output because the initiative is strategically important.

Example narrative: *The team completed four deliverables totaling 32 raw points. Two deliverables experienced six blocked days; the most significant constraint was a moderate stakeholder decision delay affecting the resource hub.*

What this looks like in Asana and leadership reporting:

Required fields support consistent scoring, credible reporting, and actionable follow-up.

At set-up

- Initiative and deliverable type
- Point eligible: Yes / No
- T-shirt size and base points
- Planned dates and owner
- Priority classification

During delivery

- Complexity modifier and rationale
- Status and last updated date
- Blocked days and severity
- Blocker type and controllability
- Resolution owner and action

In the report

- Completed raw points and asset count
- Planned vs. completed points
- Capacity by initiative and work type
- Blocked points, days, and actions
- Required-field completion rate

Example reporting statement: *“Completed 32 of 40 planned points. Eight points remain blocked pending a stakeholder decision; the resolution owner and due date are documented.”*

Recommended rollout: pilot, learn, then scale.

The goal is consistent team behavior and useful leadership decisions, not perfect scoring on day one.



Leadership decision requested:

Authorize a controlled pilot of output-based effort scoring for the training team.

Approve the model

- Base points by deliverable
- Complexity modifier with governance
- Constraints reported separately
- Priority used only as classification

Approve the pilot

- One representative portfolio
- Two reporting cycles
- Standard Asana fields and template
- Enablement and office hours

Review the evidence

- Scoring consistency
- Data completeness
- Leadership usefulness
- Team adoption and workload to maintain

Desired outcome: A shared, credible measure of completed learning-design output that improves capacity conversations without turning the model into time tracking.