

## **Minutes**

### **Judges Panel of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award**

**Baldrige Performance Excellence Program • National Institute of Standards and Technology**

**Wednesday, June 7, 2017**

#### **Attendees**

*Judges:* Ken Davis, Tammy Dye, Eric Fletcher, May Kay Fyda-Mar, John Harris, Miriam Kmetzo, John Molenda, Lawrence Ramunno, Diane Springer, Kristin Stehouwer, John Timmerman

*NIST:* Jamie Ambrosi, Rebecca Bayless, Jackie DesChamps, Robert Fangmeyer, Ellen Garshick, Robert Hunt, Darren Lowe, Suzanne Sullivan

The meeting was called to order at 8:55 a.m.

#### **Welcome and Meeting Overview**

Baldrige Program Director Robert Fangmeyer welcomed the judges and thanked them for their commitment to the responsibilities they will fulfill during the 2017 judging process. Chair of the Judges Panel John Timmerman asked the judges to introduce themselves and share what they hoped to contribute to the judging.

The minutes of the November 2016 Judges Panel Meeting were approved as written.

#### **Judges Panel Roles and Process**

Timmerman noted that the purpose of the meeting was to set the stage for the judges' work during the 2017 judging process: (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.

Robert Hunt reviewed the judges' responsibilities for the rest of the award cycle, as well as key process dates and deadlines. In June, the judges come to agreement on expectations and work processes, calibrate their calendars, and report to the Board of Overseers on judging process improvements.

On August 23, the judges will identify applicants to advance to Site Visit Review. Hunt summarized the process, with input from the returning judges. Also in August, the program reveals the names of the applicants to the judges and, with the judges, identifies their conflicts of interest. Judges do not receive applications or reports for applicants with which they have a conflict, and conflicted judges leave the room during the discussion of those applicants at the November 6–10 meeting.

Hunt said that in November, judges will review the applicants that have received a site visit and make recommendations on which should receive the Baldrige Award. Judges shared tips and guidelines on preparing their presentations for this meeting and on giving feedback to other judges before the meeting. Hunt reviewed the forms and tools designed to help the judges with their work and ensure a fair, rigorous process.

Timmerman encouraged the panel to trust the process, understand the evaluation teams' work, and use the collective input of judges make award recommendations.

### **Improvements to the Judging Process**

Timmerman and the other judges approved improvements to the judging process based on the judges' feedback in 2016. First, for health care applicants reporting value-based purchasing and Consumer Assessment of Health Care Providers measures, NIST will ask applicants to provide site visit teams with current, publicly available data on those measures in percent and percentile rank. The purpose is to ensure a level playing field in judging these applicants. Second, to increase the completeness of information received during the judges' information-seeking calls to site visit team leaders at the November meeting, the judges will allow team leaders to defer their answers to a later call if they need time to consider their answer. Finally, NIST and the judges will make a variety of usability-related technical changes to the judges' process forms, roles, mailings, meeting setup, and meeting procedures.

### **Baldrige Program Updates**

Fangmeyer reported on engagement scores for the 2016 award applicants based on the Survey of Award Applicants. Net Promoter Scores for respondents' likelihood to recommend the Baldrige Criteria, their relevance, likelihood to reapply, and satisfaction with participation all show improvement since 2010, when the program began using this measure, with scores above 50 for each element. Fangmeyer noted that 77–92 percent of respondents were very satisfied or satisfied with six characteristics of their feedback reports. One applicant in 2015 and one in 2016 expressed dissatisfaction with the feedback report.

Fangmeyer explained the steps the program is taking in 2017 to increase the quality of feedback reports: (1) in training, continue to emphasize key factors, Criteria relevance, and scoring calibration; (2) continue the clarifying telephone call between the Independent and Consensus Review team leader and the applicant; and (3) create a set of considerations for large, complex organizations as guidance for evaluation teams.

To increase the quality and quantity of feedback, the judges suggested sending the applicant survey to two individuals at each organization: the highest-ranking official and the official contact point.

Hunt reported on the number and distribution of applicants in 2017: 24, including 12 health care organizations (down from 21 in 2016), 5 education organizations, 4 nonprofit organizations, and 3 small businesses. He reviewed examiner team size and makeup, as well as other roles fulfilled by examiners, as well as the makeup of the Board of Examiners and criteria for selection.

Fangmeyer noted that the program had heard from some potential health care applicants that they chose not to apply in 2017 because of uncertainty around the Affordable Care Act and its potential replacement. In addition, large health care systems may be hesitating to apply. In response, the program is preparing guidance for examiner teams to ensure that the process treats them fairly.

Hunt reviewed changes to examiner status in 2017. First, to ensure sufficient time for development and make better use of examiners' expertise, they now transition from senior to alumni status in their eighth year instead of their sixth year. In addition, with some exceptions, if examiners are not designated as senior examiners by their sixth year, they are not selected as examiners.

The judges asked about the program's capacity to staff the 15 site visits designated by the judges in 2016. Fangmeyer noted (1) that examiners' availability, which the program attempts to determine in advance, is subject to change as the award process plays out, and (2) that availability of examiners becomes a challenge when more applicants than predicted are advanced to site visit. However, the program is committed to staffing site visits for as many applicants as the Judges Panel selects.

### **Preparation for the Board of Overseers Meeting**

The judges reached agreement on the minor judging process changes for Timmerman to report to the Board of Overseers at their meeting the following day. They also agreed to express their support of the program's proposed effort to explore the need for a redesign of the award process to ensure the efficiency, effectiveness, and value of the award process to all who participate in it.

### **Meeting Evaluation**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes are accurate and complete.

John Timmerman  
Chair  
Judges Panel  
8/3/2017