

Meeting of the Judges' Panel for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award

Baldrige Performance Excellence Program • National Institute of Standards and Technology

June 10, 2015 • Administration Building, Lecture Room A

Attendees

Judges: Kenneth Davis, Michael Dockery, Laura Huston, Miriam Kmetzo, Sharon Muret-Wagstaff, Michael Sather, Sunil Sinha, Roger Triplett, Fonda Vera. *Absent:* Gregory Gibson (candidate), Kenneth Schiller, John Timmerman

NIST: Dawn Bailey, Rebecca Bayless, Sandra Byrne, Robert Fangmeyer, Ellen Garshick, Robert Hunt, Renée Norris, Barbara Uglyk, Nancy Young

Laura Huston, chair of the Judges Panel, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Baldrige Program Director Robert Fangmeyer thanked the judges for their willingness to serve and their contributions. Huston welcomed the judges and NIST staff.

The minutes from the November 2014 meeting were unanimously approved.

The judges expressed their expectations for the meeting: to clarify the parameters of the judges' role, including the schedule, deliverables, and resource requirements; share tips and best practices; learn about the judges' role as advocates; and ask questions and work as a team.

Judges Panel's Role and Process

Huston explained that the purpose of this portion of the meeting was to give judges an overview of their responsibilities for the year and raise awareness of the schedule and deliverables for the remainder of the Baldrige Award cycle. She also reviewed individual mentoring assignments and reminded all judges of their roles as coaches and mentors to each other.

Huston summarized the judges' roles and responsibilities: (1) work as a team; (2) select applicants to advance to Site Visit Review; (3) recommend award recipients; (4) work with examiner team leaders on the site visit process and feedback report; (5) recommend process changes to the Board of Overseers; (6) provide input into the development of the Baldrige Criteria, and (7) serve as ambassadors. Fangmeyer said examiners and judges fulfill their roles as ambassadors for the program informally, by talking about Baldrige, or formally, by giving presentations on Baldrige. The Baldrige Program supplies materials as needed.

Huston reviewed the judges' responsibilities and deliverables for the rest of the award cycle: in June, the judges set the stage for their work, understand expectations and work processes, calibrate calendars, and work with the Board of Overseers on judging process improvements.

In August, the judges identify applicants to advance to Site Visit Review. Huston summarized the process and led a discussion of tips and best practices for making this determination. Also in August, the program reveals the names of the applicants to the judges, with the judges, identifies judges' conflicts of interest. Judges will not receive applications or feedback report for applicants for which they have a conflict, and conflicted judges will leave the room during the discussion of those applicants at the November meeting.

Huston then reviewed the timeline from September, when the judges receive applications for site-visited organizations, through the November meeting, when the judges recommend award recipients. She led a discussion of preparation for the November meeting, as well as tips, best practices, tools, and resources for this preparation.

Improvements to the Judging Process

The judges discussed suggestions for improving the judging process. They agreed to (1) clarify the products judges need to produce by including additional samples in the judges' notebook, (2) increase the efficiency of communication with team leaders during the November meeting, and (3) increase contact between new judges and their mentors. Improvements from 2013 that the judges agreed to continue were (1) a refined process for identifying and documenting category best practice recognition, (2) the use of criteria for changing applicant scores during the November meeting, and (3) presenting summary considerations for judging health care organizations at the August and November meetings.

Baldrige Program Updates

The judges offered suggestions and observations on Baldrige Examiner Training, including maintaining the focus on key factors and, as time permits, increasing the focus on key themes either in Examiner Preparation or in Senior Examiner Training.

Fangmeyer reviewed two of the program's strategic imperatives: increasing revenue and controlling costs. He said that the program is focusing on revenue opportunities, such as the Baldrige Examiner Training Experience, that take advantage of activities that are already in place and that processes have been greatly streamlined. He also noted that the program is working with Communities of Excellence 2026 on adapting the Baldrige framework for communities.

Fangmeyer reported on engagement scores for the 2014 award applicants based on the Judges' Survey of Award Applicants. Total engagement with the Baldrige Criteria and likelihood to recommend were very strong, and likelihood to reapply and satisfaction with participation have increased. As in the 2013 survey, the main opportunity for improvement lies in satisfaction with the feedback report. In 2015, actions taken to address these opportunities included a continued emphasis on key factors and Baldrige Criteria relevance in training, revisions to Criteria content and structure, and the addition of a call by the examiner team leader to the applicant organization to clarify important key factors.

The judges advised the program to attempt to increase the number of survey respondents and to clarify the drivers of dissatisfaction by segmenting the survey question that asks about the feedback report.

Robert Hunt reported on the makeup of the Board of Examiners historically and in 2015, including application numbers and considerations for selection of new, returning, senior, and alumni examiners. He noted that the number of applicants is sufficient to staff the board and that retention of returning examiners is high. One challenge is ensuring a sufficient number of senior examiners to lead teams. Given this challenge, the program is reexamining its expectations for examiner development from new, to returning, to senior examiner; meanwhile, a strong pool of alumni examiners serves in a variety of roles.

Renée Norris reported on the number and distribution of applicants in 2014: 26, including 16 health care organizations, 4 education organizations, 4 nonprofits, and 2 small businesses. Norris also reported that the program had coordinated the deadline for applicants to submit eligibility packages with examiner selection in an effort to "right-size" the Board of Examiners to the number of applicants. She reviewed examiner team size and makeup, as well as other roles fulfilled by examiners, and described changes to the award process in 2015: (1) examiner teams are being deployed in two rather than three waves, and (2) applicants will have the opportunity to clarify their business models and other key factors in a telephone call with the team leader early in the team's review.

Norris asked the judges to reconsider how value-based purchasing data should figure into Site Visit Review for health care organizations. The judges agreed that the program should (1) ask applicants to

provide two years of its summary reports to the site visit team and (2) eliminate the worksheet dedicated to those data; instead, the examiner teams will incorporate those data into their standard review. The judges also assigned lead responsibility for preparation of their annual orientation to Sunil Sinha; Sharon Muret-Wagstaff will review the Health Care Considerations document for examiners.

After a meeting evaluation, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Laura Huston

Laura Huston, Chair

29 July 2015

Date