

# RMPEX Examiner Quick Reference Guide

2020 RMPEX Review Process

## Contents

General Process Steps For Examiners .....	2
Independent Review Phase.....	2
Consensus Review Phase .....	3
Results “Bucket” Definitions.....	4
NERD Comment Format .....	4
Process Maturity Model .....	5
Results Maturity Model.....	6
Evaluation and Improvement Maturity Levels.....	7
Feedback Report Checklist .....	8
Comment Writing Rules for Examiners .....	10

## General Process Steps for Examiners

1. Receive applications, read through and check for conflicts of interest.
2. Follow the process for each of the applications assigned to your team.

### **INDEPENDENT REVIEW PHASE:**

Each Team Member (including the Team Leader) will complete an independent review of their assigned application and determine a score for each of the items using the guidelines below:

1. Each Team Member prepares a Key Factors Worksheet (based primarily on the Organizational Profile) and circulates that to the rest of the team to use during Independent Review. Remember that the Organizational Profile identifies key elements and priorities of the organization, which should be frequently revisited in terms of processes and results discussed throughout the application. The Organizational Profile will also allow you to start to identify expected results to be recorded in the Table of Expected Results (TOER) in the Scorebook and Comment Matrix (SCM).
2. Each Team Member should then work through the Process Items 1.1 through 6.2, using the following brief outline:
  - Write Strength comments (bulleted or feedback ready). Be sure to use the A-B, A-O, A-M, D, L, and I notations.
  - Determine the scoring range using the Scoring Calibration Guide and make sure that the noted Strength comments support the scoring range.
  - Write OFI comments (bulleted or feedback ready). The OFI comments should identify the next most important development steps the applicant needs to take or what kept the score from being higher.
  - Determine the score in 5% increments within the identified range.
  - Record your comments and scores in the SCM.
3. While or after reviewing items 1.1 through 6.2, each Team Member should prepare an initial draft of the first three columns of the Table of Expected Results (TOER) and circulate to the team. Once there is consensus on the first three columns, the primary lead on the application completes the remaining columns of the TOER based on the information in Category 7 of the application.
  - Based on the bucket numbers assigned to each of the results, construct the Strengths and OFI comments using the appropriate rows and comment stems in the SCM.
  - Use the results section of the Scoring Calibration Guidelines to determine a percentage score for each of the Results items (7.1 through 7.5).
4. Submit the completed SCM to the primary lead for the application.

## **CONSENSUS REVIEW PHASE:**

To be completed by all team members together.

1. During team calls, the team will consider all comments and scores submitted for a given application.
2. The team will identify and reach consensus on the applicant's Strengths and OFIs. The team will also come to consensus on the scoring range and final 5% score for each of the Items.
3. Enter the percentage score for items 1.1 through 7.5 in the Scorebook Navigator to determine a proposed final score. Teams should use the Scoring Calibration Guidelines to resolve scoring disputes.
4. Once consensus is reached on an application, the team will reflect all changes in the final consensus Scorebook Navigator for the application. Additionally, Scoring Navigator will be completed to reflect the scores assigned to the application.

## Results “Bucket” Definitions

Strengths:

1. Results showing favorable trends
2. Results showing good levels based on relevant comparative data

OFI:

3. Results showing unfavorable trends
4. Results showing poor levels or no relevant comparative data to show a level
5. Results showing incomplete trend data (This is where the applicant did not provide sufficient data to demonstrate trends, minimum of three data points)
6. Missing results (important and expected-but not provided)

### Definitions for Results<sup>1</sup>

Few/Little—5% to 15%

Some—more than 15% to 30%

Many—more than 30% to 50%

Most/Majority—more than 50%

All/Fully—100%

<sup>1</sup> Note, that when importance is assessed in the results categories, only few (5-30%), many (31-50%), most (more than 50%), and all (100%) are utilized. This is due to the structure of the Baldrige scoring guidelines.

## NERD Comment Format

A typical comment is 2-4 sentences in length, incorporating the following components

	<b>Strength</b>	<b>OFI</b>
<b>Nugget</b>	Clear statement of Strength, including key phrase from Criteria	Clear statement of OFI, including key phrase from Criteria
<b>Evidence</b>	Example from application	Gap from application
<b>Relevance</b>	Optional tie to Key Factor	So what? Connect to Key Factor
<b>Done!</b>	Review from applicant point of view. Put yourself in the Administrator’s chair. Would you understand the Strength?	Review from applicant point of view. Put yourself in the Administrator’s chair. Would you understand the OFI?

# Process Maturity Model (Approach (A), Deployment (D), Learning (L), and Integration (I))

## For Use with Categories 1-6

<p><b>Score:</b> 90%, 95%, or 100%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACHES, fully responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACHES are well DEPLOYED, with no gaps. (D)</li> <li>▪ A fact-based, SYSTEMATIC PROCESS is in place to evaluate and improve all elements of the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS, with clear evidence of INNOVATION, organizational learning, and organization-level sharing and analysis, resulting in refinements and improved integration. (L)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACHES are fully integrated with the organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of other PROCESS items. (I)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACHES are well DEPLOYED, with no significant gaps. (D)</li> <li>▪ A fact-based, SYSTEMATIC PROCESS is in place to evaluate and improve all elements of the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS, with clear evidence of INNOVATION, organizational learning, and organization-level sharing and analysis, resulting in refinements and improved integration. (L)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACHES are integrated with the organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of other PROCESS items. (I)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACHES are well DEPLOYED, although minor gaps may exist. (D)</li> <li>▪ A fact-based, SYSTEMATIC PROCESS is in place to evaluate the efficiency and EFFECTIVENESS of some of the key elements of the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS and there is evidence of at least one cycle of improvement and some INNOVATION (meaningful change). (L)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACHES are generally ALIGNED with the organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of other PROCESS items. (I)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An EFFECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item, is evident. (A)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACH is DEPLOYED, although some areas or work units are in early stages of DEPLOYMENT and some gaps may exist. (D)</li> <li>▪ The organization is beginning to evaluate some of the PROCESSES of the item and improvements may or may not have been made. (L)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACH is generally consistent and ALIGNED with the organization priorities set forth in the Organizational Profile and the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of other PROCESS items. (I)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The organization is in the beginning of establishing or using a SYSTEMATIC APPROACH to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item. (A)</li> <li>▪ Major gaps exist in the DEPLOYMENT of the basic APPROACHES. (D)</li> <li>▪ Reacting to problems is widespread; organization is in the beginning stages to prevent problems. (L)</li> <li>▪ The APPROACH is ALIGNED with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving. (I)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 0% or 5%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are no EFFECTIVE processes or APPROACHES to meet the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item. (A)</li> <li>▪ There is no DEPLOYMENT of any SYSTEMATIC APPROACH, efforts are ad hoc, inconsistent or vague. (D)</li> <li>▪ Reacting to problems is the normal way of approaching work and no consistent effort is made to prevent problems. (L)</li> <li>▪ There is no effective ALIGNMENT in the organization. (I)</li> </ul>

**Results Maturity Model** (Integration/Importance (I), Trends (T), Levels (Le), Comparisons (C))  
**For Use with Category 7 - Results**

<p><b>Score:</b> 90%, 95% or 100%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Most</u> RESULTS are reported as well as projections of performance for areas of importance responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item and to the accomplishment of the organization’s MISSION. (I)</li> <li>▪ <u>Most</u> TREND DATA, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, are reported and differentiated by segments and <u>most</u> show positive TRENDS and sustained performance over time. (T)</li> <li>▪ <u>Many to most</u> current levels of results, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, when compared to relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks, show industry and benchmark leadership levels of performance. (Le, C)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 70%, 75%, 80% or 85%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Most</u> RESULTS are reported for areas of importance responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item and to the accomplishment of the organization’s MISSION. (I)</li> <li>▪ <u>Most</u> TREND DATA, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, are reported and differentiated by segments and <u>most</u> show positive TRENDS and sustained performance over time. (T)</li> <li>▪ <u>Many to most</u> current levels of results, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item, when compared to relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks, show good to excellent relative levels of performance. (Le, C)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 50%, 55%, 60% or 65%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Most</u> RESULTS are reported for areas of importance responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item and to the accomplishment of the organization’s MISSION. (I)</li> <li>▪ <u>Some</u> TREND DATA, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item, are reported and <u>most</u> show beneficial TRENDS. (T)</li> <li>▪ <u>Some</u> current levels of results, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item, when compared to relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks, show good levels of performance. (Le, C)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 30%, 35%, 40% or 45%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>Many</u> RESULTS are reported for areas of importance responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item and to the accomplishment of the organization’s MISSION. (I)</li> <li>▪ <u>Some</u> TREND DATA are reported, and <u>most</u> show beneficial TRENDS. (T)</li> <li>▪ <u>Some</u> current levels of results, when compared to others, show good levels of performance. (Le, C)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 10%, 15%, 20% or 25%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A <u>few</u> RESULTS are reported for areas of importance responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item and to the accomplishment of the organization’s MISSION. (I)</li> <li>▪ <u>Some</u> TREND DATA are reported, and <u>some</u> may show adverse TRENDS. (T)</li> <li>▪ A <u>few</u> of the reported organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS show good levels of PERFORMANCE. (Le)</li> <li>▪ Little or no COMPARATIVE information is reported. (C)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Score:</b> 0% or 5%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There are no RESULTS reported for any areas of importance to the accomplishment of the organization’s MISSION or the RESULTS reported are poor. (I)</li> <li>▪ TREND DATA either are not reported or show mainly adverse TRENDS. (T)</li> <li>▪ COMPARATIVE information is not reported, nor expected. (Le, C)</li> </ul>

# Evaluation and Improvement Maturity Levels

**The purpose of this hierarchy is to provide examples for scoring calibration on the Learning (L) Dimension.** To determine the appropriate scoring range, the L-Learning dimension must be considered along with the A-Approach, D-Deployment, and I-Integration dimensions.

- 1 Finding: A random improvement or change is made. Reason for change not identified.  
**Example: We painted the lobby area green.**  
Score: Meets the L requirement of the 10-25% range.
- 2 Finding: Some gathering of feedback about the process(es) required by the criteria is done. Information is not fact-based- beginning of evaluation. (Subjective evaluation- no improvement)  
**Example: We ask a few customers if SL communication meets their needs.**  
Score: Meets the L requirement of the 30-45% range
- 3 Finding: Some gathering of feedback about the process(es) required by the criteria is done. Information is not fact-based and the process about which the feedback was received has been improved. (Subjective evaluation - some improvement)  
**Example: Two new employees complained about orientation training and, as a result, we changed the orientation agenda so the CEO personally reviews the MVV during orientation.**  
Score: Meets the L requirement of the 30-45% range
- 4 Finding: A fact-based evaluation of the process(es) required by the criteria has been conducted, but there is no evidence of change. (Fact-based evaluation- no improvement)  
**Example: Our Voice of the Customer methods are assessed on the monthly customer satisfaction survey.**  
Score: Meets the L requirement in the 30-45% range and part of the 50-65% range (missing evidence of improvement).
- 5 Finding: A fact-based evaluation of the process(es) required by the criteria has been conducted, including use of prior feedback reports, and there is evidence of improvement of these methods. (Fact-based evaluation-some improvement)  
**Example: Based on feedback from our 2017 feedback report, we evaluated the planning process using an external consultant and added a SWOT analysis to help identify strategic advantages and challenges.**  
Score: Meets the L requirement in the 30-45% range and part of the 50-65% range (missing evidence that the improvement resulted in meaningful change (expectation for innovation in this range) ).
- 6 Finding: A fact-based evaluation of the process(es) required by the criteria has been conducted and there is evidence of improvement of these methods resulting in meaningful change. (Fact-based improvement - meaningful change)  
**Example- Based on staff satisfaction survey responses in early 2018, monthly skip-level and one-on-one meetings between leaders and each employee were implemented. Since then, staff satisfaction survey scores have gone up and turnover has been reduced by 15%.**  
Score: Fully meets the L requirement in the 50-65% range
- 7 Finding: A fact-based evaluation of the process(es) required by the criteria has been conducted and there is evidence of innovation in an improvement to these methods. (Fact-based evaluation- Innovation)  
**Example: To address the strategic challenge of care transitions, the Senior Leadership Team visited a Baldrige award winning organization and brought back and implemented a new production process that is unique to our industry.**  
Score: Meets the L requirement in the 50-65% range and part of the 70-85% range (missing evidence that the improvement was innovative (expectation for this range)).

Developed by Jeff Calhoun of Calhoun Consulting Partners, Inc.



## Feedback Report Checklist

- Is there a Strength provided for every area to address [such as 1.1a(1)] if there is evidence of a strength for that area to address?
- Do the comments meet the Comment Writing Rules, especially the following?
  - Is a blocker OFI identified in each Item's feedback? A "blocker" OFI prevents advancing a Process Item to the top of the range or to the next higher range in its scoring range(s). A blocker OFI must be identified in the report by having an asterisk (\*) in front of it.
  - Is there a notation of A-B (Approach-Basic), A-O (Approach-Overall), A-M (Approach Multiple), D (Deployment), L (Learning) and I (integration) within each Process (Cat 1-6) comment?
  - Is the individual Item area to address [such as 1.2a(1)] identified next to the strength or OFI feedback comments (Process Items only)?
  - Are there any "It is not clear how ..." phrases at the beginning of any comments? Change to "It is not evident that ..." to keep the focus on system deficiencies, not poor writing.
  - Are learning comments appropriate to where they are placed? For instance, it's a mistake to give an applicant a strength in 3.1 for making changes based on what they learn from a customer satisfaction survey. An example of Learning in that item would be how they improved the customer survey process (for instance, they may have increased the frequency, added new questions, or found a way to increase participation in the survey). Learning comments should identify a *process to improve the process* that is being described.
  - Is there a strength and/or OFI comment for the Learning component of ADLI for any process item scored 30% or above?
  - Is there a strength comment for the Learning component of ADLI for any process item scored 50% or above?
  - Are there any comments that begin with "It is not evident..."? If there has been a site visit, there cannot be phrases such as "It is not evident..." All comments with these phrases have to be resolved on site visit.
  - Are there any Results comments that identify "missing measures" or "missing results"? If measures are missing, they must be asked for during site visit. If you do not ask for them, you cannot have a Results comment in the final feedback report saying they are missing.

## Training PowerPoint Index

Subject	Slide #
Introduction and Review Process .....	1-9
Organizational Profile and Key Factors Worksheet .....	10-15
Intro to Results .....	16-23
Interpreting the Application .....	25-39
Process Comment Writing .....	40-71
Scoring Process Items .....	72-98
Evaluation and Improvement .....	99-108
Analyzing Results .....	112-149
Scoring Results Items .....	150-162
Writing Results Feedback .....	163-167
Key Themes.....	171-179

# Comment Writing Rules for Examiners

*Keep these comment rules next to you as you write your comments.* Check each one to be sure your comment adds value for our key customer – the applicant. Feedback comments must reflect either an organizational **Strength** or a **key Opportunity for Improvement (OFI)**, based on the requirements of the Criteria and Scoring Calibration Guidelines. Keep in mind that all comments are made up of words from the Application + Criteria Requirements + Scoring Guidelines + Key Factor.

## Rules for Strength Comments

- S-1. Strength comments reflect any and all of the applicant’s processes that meet the criteria and scoring guidelines requirements. Strengths support the score that the Examiner assigns.
- S-2. Strength comments contain enough detail so the applicant understands the main reasons why the examiner determined the process(es) to which the comment refers met the criteria and scoring guidelines requirements.

## Rules for Opportunity for Improvement (OFI) Comments

- O-1. OFI comments reflect criteria requirements, including scoring guidelines, that the organization does not meet. Of the many possible OFIs, a feedback report contains only the vital few or “key” OFIs that prevent the organization from scoring at the top of the range in which it is placed or at the next higher range.
- O-2. OFI comments are relevant and actionable. The applicant should be able to understand the potential adverse consequences it may face because it does not do what the criteria require.
- O-3. OFI comments are nonprescriptive and based on criteria requirements. Do not offer your opinion about what the organization should be doing to meet criteria requirements. Do not state that something is missing (e.g., a process, approach, or list) if it is not required by the criteria. Clues that you have prescriptive comments include the use of the words “should” or “could” in an OFI comment.
- O-4. OFI comments focus on process or system deficiencies not on poor writing. Do not critique the applicant’s writing. Do not use the word “how” in an OFI comment.

## Rules for All Comments

- A-1. Comments do not contradict other comments in the same Item or other Items.
- A-2. Comments do not provide more than one Strength (and/or OFI) per area to address [i.e. 1.1a(2) or 2.1a(3)]. Consolidate into one clear, concise comment.
- A-3. Comments accurately reflect the information provided by the applicant. Double check the facts and data, including figure references, contained in the comment.
- A-4. Comments use the applicant’s terminology and avoid the use of acronyms (e.g., for the applicant’s processes and for figure names).
- A-5. Comments stand-alone and are complete, with no vague modifiers. Do not use vague, undefined terms such as “excellent”, “good”, or “inadequate” to describe an applicant’s process.
- A-6. Comments are grammatically correct.
- A-7. Comments are consistent with score and scoring guidelines and are identified using correct Item references. Any Process Item scoring 30% or higher **MUST** have a comment that addresses Learning (L) as a Strength and/or OFI. Annotate appropriate references as A-B, A-O, A-M, D, L, I in the body of all comments.
- A-8. Do not bury a strength in an OFI. If a required process is in place, mention it as a strength (in the strength section) not just as part of an OFI.
- A-9. Comments are concise, but not cryptic— usually about 2-4 sentences in length. Well-written comments use only enough criteria and scoring guidelines language—together with enough process detail from the application—to clarify the nature of the strength.

## Final Step in Comment Writing

After comments have been written for all Items, set aside your feedback report for a day. Then read the report again from the perspective of the applicant to be sure all comments are clear, support the scores you have assigned, and add insights to help them take the next developmental steps towards performance excellence.