Minutes
Judges Panel of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award
Baldrige Performance Excellence Program ● National Institute of Standards and Technology
Thursday, June 9, 2016

Attendees
Judges: Kenneth Davis, Michael Dockery, Gregory Gibson, John Harris (candidate), Laura Huston (chair), Miriam Kmetzo, Lawrence Ramunno (candidate), Kenneth Schiller, Diane Springer (candidate), Fonda Vera, John Timmerman (via telephone)

NIST: Dawn Bailey, Rebecca Bayless, Robert Fangmeyer, Ellen Garshick, Robert Hunt, Gail Lantion, Darren Lowe, Renée Norris, Christine Schaefer, Nancy Young

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

Baldrige Program Director Robert Fangmeyer and Judges Panel Chair Laura Huston welcomed the judges. They noted that the purpose of the meeting was to build a sense of teamwork among the judges and to prepare the judges for their roles in recommending applicants to receive the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award.

Huston asked the judges their expectations for the meeting. These included reaching a clear understanding of the Judges Panel’s role, leveraging mentors, optimizing the workflow, refreshing knowledge, transferring knowledge, and creating an environment of mutual support.

Judges Panel Roles and Process
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.

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.

On August 17, the judges will 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 and, with the judges, identifies judges’ conflicts of interest. Judges will not receive applications or feedback reports for applicants for which they have a conflict, and conflicted judges will leave the room during the discussion of those applicants at the October 31–November 4 meeting.

Huston then reviewed the timeline from August, when the judges receive applications for site-visited organizations, through the October–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
Huston and the other judges discussed improvements to the judging process based on the judges’ feedback in 2015: the addition of a comprehensive process document for the judge presentations, clarification of elements of various process documents, the alignment of terminology in these documents, and the addition of these documents to the Judges’ Notebook.

The judges also discussed the continued need to document their rationale for and specific feedback comments related to recommendations for category best-practice recognition.
Baldrige Program Updates

Fangmeyer reported on engagement scores for the 2015 award applicants based on the Judges’ Survey of Award Applicants. Total engagement with the Baldrige Criteria and likelihood to recommend were very strong. The main opportunity for improvement lies in satisfaction with the feedback report, which the program segmented into satisfaction factors for the 2015 survey in response to the judges’ suggestion. Actions to address this opportunity included a continued emphasis on key factors and Baldrige Criteria relevance in training and the addition of a call by the examiner team leader to the applicant organization to clarify important key factors. Another area for improvement is the survey response rate.

Robert Hunt reported on the makeup of the Board of Examiners historically and in 2016, including application numbers and considerations for selection of new, returning, senior, and alumni examiners. He noted that the number of examiner applicants is more than sufficient to staff the board. One remaining challenge is ensuring a sufficient number of senior examiners to lead teams. Given this challenge, the program has revised its expectations for examiner development from new, to returning, to senior examiner, as well as for the participation of alumni examiners.

Renée Norris reported on the number and distribution of applicants in 2016: 34, including 21 health care organizations, 4 nonprofit organizations, 4 small businesses, and 2 service businesses. She reviewed examiner team size and makeup, as well as other roles fulfilled by examiners, and described changes to the award process in 2016: full use of every examiner on the board and increased monitoring of examiners’ work. To have officially served on the Board of Examiners, those examiners assigned to teams must complete an Independent Review Scorebook.

Norris also confirmed that the judges from the health care sector will continue briefing the remaining judges on health care metrics during the August meeting and will take on the management of that briefing. In conjunction with Baldrige staff, the health care judges will also update “Considerations for Health Care Organizations at Site Visit,” which serves as guidance to site visit teams. The judges agreed that the program should continue asking applicants to provide two years of its value-based purchasing summary reports to the site visit team. In addition, in August, judges from the education sector will deliver a short briefing to the panel on changes in that sector.

After a meeting evaluation, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Laura Huston, Chair, Judges Panel

Date