

Meeting of the Judges Panel of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award
Thursday, June 20, 2024, 12:00 – 5:00 PM ET, Virtual
Closed Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Judges: Keith Everett, Cary Hill, Lynda Johnson, Sophia McIntyre, Brian Miller, Jennifer Niswonger, Rebecca Ruhl, Peter Scheuer, Allyson Young

NIST: Jamie Ambrosi, Dawn Bailey, Rebecca Bayless, Robyn Decker, Mary Eastman, Robert Fangmeyer, Barbara Fischer, Elif Karakas, Darren Lowe, Christine Schaefer, Kelly Welsh

Meeting start: 12:03 pm

Opening Remarks and Introductions (Robert Fangmeyer, Baldrige Performance Excellence Program (BPEP) Director; Cary Hill, Judges Panel Chair)

Fangmeyer and Hill welcomed the judges and reviewed the 2024 Baldrige Award Consensus Review process.

Fangmeyer reminded the Judges that the process has been simplified and streamlined, and noted that the program has already identified opportunities for improvement. He also noted that BPEP wanted to ensure flexibility for the judges because everything is so new. An example is that the program didn't assign weights to criteria sections to allow the judges flexibility in determining which sections were more important than others for advancement in the award process.

Fangmeyer also noted that the online application functioned great, but the limited character count and requirement to upload one image at a time for each result challenged some. Staff members were actively engaged in real-time sharing of questions from and responses to the examiners, and met with examiner team leaders each week to provide clarification and answer additional questions.

BPEP Observations:

- There was some confusion from both applicants and examiners on how to deal with comparisons. BPEP attributes this to a lack of clarity when asking for *high-performance* benchmarks and/or comparisons.
- Relevance as an evaluation factor was confusing to some. BPEP limited characters and the number of charts, so the applicant was not expected to upload every result of importance.
- The Operational Continuity section needs attention, as applicants across all sectors seemed to struggle with how to respond.

Ethics Briefing (Meghan Keifer, Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Commerce)

Judges received an ethics briefing for "special government employees" from the Department of Commerce.

Review of Judges' Applicant Workbook (Darren Lowe, Kelly Welsh, Baldrige Staff Members)

Lowé ensured that all judges had received the rating summary for the 2024 applicants. At a high level, he reviewed what blinded data were being provided and how they were segmented and could be viewed.

Welsh reminded the judges to ground themselves in the rubric and the 2024 Baldrige Award Criteria questions. The judges discussed the ratings in relation to the rubric and criteria.

Individual Review of Scoring Profiles

Judges took about 45 minutes to individually review ratings.

Selection of Applicants for Site Visits:

- Panel review of scoring profiles
- Discussion and Voting

Organizations Selected for Site Visit

Service: 1
Nonprofit: 3
Health Care: 4
Education: 1
TOTAL 9/16

Review of Judges' Conflicts of Interest with Site-Visited Applicants (Rebecca Bayless, Baldrige Staff Member)

Bayless announced the names and locations of the 9 applicants advanced to site visit. She also shared any known conflicts based on information available to the program. Judges then revealed any potential real or perceived conflicts with each organization based on their prior knowledge and/or direct or indirect relationships with the organizations. Judges with conflicts will receive no further information about the applicant and will not see or participate in any of the judges sharing, discussions, or voting on that applicant.

Next Steps

Review of judges' roles were discussed, including the judges' work process, output, and timeline.

Upcoming Meetings

Health Care and Education Orientations TBD
September 9-13, 2024 (virtual)

Meeting end: 5:04 pm ET



Cary Hill, Chair

9/2/2024