



Panel of Judges

Process Handbook

January 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW

- Purpose of this Document
- Mission of the Panel of Judges
- Basic Principles
- Changes to Panel of Judges Processes

TPE – AWARD PROCESS

- Mission, Vision, and Core Values of TPE
- TPE Evaluation Process

BASIC JUDGING INFORMATION

- Schedule
- Estimated Judges' Time Investment
- Pre-Meeting Selection Activities
- Conflict of Interest
- TPE Award Levels
- Guidelines for Award Selection
- Criteria for Assigning Award Levels

PANEL OF JUDGES PROCESSES

- Selection of Judges
- Orientation Conference Call
- Action Steps Done Prior to Award Selection Meeting
- Award Selection Meeting
- Action Steps Done After the Award Selection Meeting
- Completing the *Feedback Report*
- Evaluation of Process and Judges

JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION FORM

CATEGORY LEAD PERFORMER AWARD – JUDGE'S RECOMMENDATION FORM

OVERVIEW

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This is a summary of the processes used by The Partnership for Excellence (TPE) Panel of Judges to help ensure fair and thorough evaluations of Applicants.

MISSION OF THE PANEL OF JUDGES

The Panel of Judges reviews evaluations made by members of the TPE Board of Examiners and determines applicant award levels to be presented to TPE Board of Trustees for ratification.

Judges also mentor Examiner Team Leaders to improve comments of their assigned Applicant, review and strengthen the draft *Feedback Report*, and approve it prior to TPE sending it to the Applicant.

Judges will identify Applicants with exceptional performance practices in Categories 1 – 6 as Category Lead Performer recipients and potential presenters at annual Quest for Success conference.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

- The use of discussion and consensus will be maximized.
- An optimal number of Judges will participate in consensus and decision-making based on the number of applications being evaluated.
- Conflicts of interest and appearances of conflict will be eliminated.
- A Judge may not vote on an Applicant if the Judge has not been present for a substantial portion of the discussion on the Applicant.
- A Judge may not vote on an Applicant if the Judge has a conflict of interest.
- Documentation must be provided to support Judge's recommendations.
- TPE recognizes members of the Panel of Judges as part of the TPE Board of Examiners.

CHANGES TO PANEL OF JUDGES PROCESSES

Changes to these processes can be made immediately by a majority vote of the Panel of Judges to ensure fair and thorough evaluations of Applicants.

Each Judge should provide TPE with any recommended future changes, ideas, and suggestions for improvement.

THE PARTNERSHIP FOR EXCELLENCE

Since 1998, The Partnership for Excellence has taken results-focused organizations to the next level. TPE is a non-profit organization (501(c)3) that works with organizations to improve their performance to become better at what they do. Based on the Baldrige Excellence Framework, TPE helps organizations improve all aspects of an organization through the use of seven performance excellence categories.

MISSION, VISION, AND CORE VALUES OF TPE

Mission: To cultivate organizational performance excellence and continuous improvement in Ohio, Indiana and West Virginia

Vision: To be the partner of choice for creating high performing organizations that produce exceptional results

Core Values: Excellence, Diversity & Inclusion, Integrity, Visionary Leadership, Professionalism, Agility

TPE EVALUATION PROCESS

TPE conducts evaluations of Applicants using the same processes as the Baldrige Performance Excellence Program (BPEP), with only minor differences. These include:


- TPE uses the BPEP *Baldrige Excellence Framework* for Business, Non-profit and Government; Healthcare; and Education. Since Full Applications are due to TPE prior to the end of the calendar year, but evaluated early in the next year, TPE is traditionally completing its evaluation one criteria year “behind” BPEP updates.
- Applicants choose the sector Criteria in preparing their *Application Report*.
- Full Applicants address all Items of their sector Criteria, and submit a 50-page *Application Report* in addition to the Organizational Profile. Only these applicants are reviewed by the Panel of Judges.
- Site Visits focus on the Applicant’s use of performance excellence, in addition to the materials contained in the *Application Report*.
- All members of the Board of Examiners receive a two-day Examiner Training session using BPEP training materials.
- TPE organizes teams of six to ten Examiners for each Applicant, based upon the size, location, and sector.
- TPE appoints a Team Leader to provide leadership to each Examiner Team. These individuals receive a half-day Team Leader Training session and supplemental webinars using BPEP training materials.

- Depending upon the size and experience level of the Examiner Team, another Examiner may serve as a Feedback Editor and another as Assistant Team Leader. The Team Leader is ultimately responsible for completing the draft Feedback Report.
- After completing the Site Visit, the Examiner Team will revise and update comments from their Consensus Scorebook, revise the consensus score as needed, and complete the Site Visit Issue Worksheets.
- The Panel of Judges assign award levels of recognition using the following guidelines:
 - ALL Applicants receive Award Level recognition; however, applicants may decline to be recognized.
 - TPE may recognize an unlimited number of Applicants at each Award Level.
 - The Panel of Judges determines the Award Levels for all Full Applicants. Any award level may be decided by the Panel of Judges, including Platinum, Gold, Silver or Bronze.
 - If an applicant submits a Full Application, and if for some reason the applicant does not receive a site visit, Bronze is the highest award level the judges may award the applicant and the judges may decide that no award is appropriate.
 - The TPE Board of Trustees reviews and ratifies the Award Levels determined by the Panel of Judges.
- Concurrently during this process, the Team Leader works with his/her Lead Judge to finalize the *Feedback Report*. The Lead Judge reviews, approves, strengthens and sends the *Feedback Report* to TPE with the final score summary worksheet.

BASIC JUDGING INFORMATION

SCHEDULE

- Selection of members of Panel of Judges – September TPE Board Meeting
- Orientation Conference Call – Late January (before Consensus Meetings)
- Applications and Criteria books distributed – Late January/Early February
- Conference Call with all Judges and TL's – Mid/Late February (before Site Visits)
- Consensus Scorebooks sent to Judges - Late February/March
- Draft Feedback Reports, Score Summary Worksheet, Score Summary Comparison Worksheet, SVI Worksheets sent to Judges from TLs – March/April
- Final Conference Call with Judges to prepare for Judges Meeting- Mid April
- Assessment Form with Key Factors, Draft FBR, Final Score Summary Worksheet, Score Summary Comparison Worksheet emailed to all Judges – April
- Award Selection Meeting – Late April/Early May
- Final Feedback Report and Final Score Summary Worksheet due in to TPE – Mid May



ESTIMATED JUDGES TIME INVESTMENT

- Judges Orientation Conference Call: 2 hours
- Read *Application Report*: 7-12 hours per Applicant
- Review *Draft Feedback Report*: 4-8 hours per Applicant
- Judges Award Selection Meeting: 5-6 hours
- Review and approval of *Feedback Report* : 3-5 hours per Applicant

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Conflict of interest refers to conflicts due to circumstances or relationships, such as current or recent employment and/or client relationship; significant ownership; employment, client relationship and/or significant ownership with business competitors of Applicants; current or recent participation on the Board of Directors of the company or of a competitor; or other significant knowledge or relationship. A conflict of interest also exists if an individual has served as an Examiner, including the Advising & Partnering Program for an Applicant during a previous or current application. If a Judge feels uncertain if a particular relationship or circumstance constitutes a conflict of interest, the Judge will declare a conflict of interest and not participate in evaluations of the Applicant at the Award Selection Meeting.

TPE AWARD LEVELS

TPE incorporates four levels of recognition. This system both encourages and recognizes Ohio, Indiana and West Virginia organizations in their path toward performance excellence. The four levels described in the Program Materials Booklet are shown below:

Platinum Award (Governor's Award for Excellence). This is the highest level of recognition for organizations that have demonstrated, through practices and superior results, the highest level of excellence. These organizations are outstanding examples of excellence in Ohio, Indiana and West Virginia, exhibiting processes that generate results better than competitive and comparative performance for areas important to key organizational success.

Gold Award (Achievement of Excellence). This is an advanced level of recognition for organizations that have demonstrated, through commitment and practice, significant progress toward excellence. Organizations recognized at this level clearly demonstrate results directly attributable to deployment of a systematic approach.

Silver Award (Commitment to Excellence). This is the intermediate level of recognition for organizations that have demonstrated a serious commitment to excellence and a process for continuous improvement. These organizations have documented a solid system-level approach to achieving excellence and measurement of process results.

Bronze Award (Pledge to Excellence). This is the starting level of recognition for organizations that have begun their journey toward understanding and applying principles of excellence.

GUIDELINES FOR AWARD SELECTION

To receive a given Award Level, Judges should assess an Applicant favorably (with some supporting evidence), in the following key areas:

- Understanding of performance excellence.
- Leadership commitment.
- Systematic performance excellence system in place.
- Evidence of Improvement cycles.
- Positive results and trends along with comparative data or benchmarks.

Judges may consider, as mitigating factors:

- The number of employees and resources available to the Applicant to implement a performance excellence system.
- The key organizational factors and/or the Applicant's position in the market/sector prior to implementing a performance excellence system.

CRITERIA FOR ASSIGNING AWARD LEVELS

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Potential <i>Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award</i> Recipient</p> | <p>The Applicant has an effective, systematic approach responsive to many of the Areas to Address and to key organizational needs, with a fact-based evaluation and improvement process in place in key areas. No major gaps in deployment, and a commitment exists to organizational learning and sharing. Improvement trends and/or good performance reported for most areas of importance. Results address most key customer/stakeholder and process requirements and demonstrate areas of leadership.</p> |
| <p>Platinum Award</p> <p>Process 5-Results 3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>Process 4-Results 4</p> | <p>PROCESS (5): The organization demonstrates effective, systematic, well-deployed approaches responsive to the overall requirements of most Criteria items. The organization demonstrates a fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and organizational learning, including innovation that result in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of key processes.</p> <p>RESULTS (3): Results address areas of importance to the basic Criteria requirements and accomplishment of the organization’s mission, with good performance being achieved. Comparative and trend data are available for some of these important results areas, and some beneficial trends are evident.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>PROCESS (4): The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the overall requirements of the Criteria, but deployment may vary in some areas or work units. Key processes benefit from fact-based evaluation and improvement, and approaches are being aligned with overall organizational needs.</p> <p>RESULTS (4): Results address some key customer/ stakeholder, market, and process requirements, and they demonstrate good relative performance against relevant comparisons. There are no patterns of adverse trends or poor performance in areas of importance to the overall Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a best fit with the Baldrige “Scoring Band Descriptors”, Process band number 4/5, and Results band number 4/3? 2. Would the organization be a good State role model? Do they show leadership? Would they be willing to share? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Is the organization aligned with the criteria’s core values? 4. Can the organization achieve a Baldrige Site Visit in one to two years with sustained approaches, continuous maturity? 5. Is the organization a role model in at least two categories including leadership and mature deployment in most categories? 6. Does the organization have strong to leading, relative competitive and/or comparative performance in areas of importance to the organization? 7. Are the results of the quality effort recognized by the marketplace? 8. Are all levels of employees involved? 9. Does involved leadership exist that goes beyond the CEO or Quality Champion? 10. Are the approaches well-deployed throughout all of the organization? Is it institutionalized? 11. Does management show a relentless drive toward achieving quality improvement? |
| <p>Gold Award</p> <p>Process 3-Results 3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>Process 4-Results 2</p> | <p>PROCESS (3): The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of most Criteria items, although there are still areas or work units in the early stages of deployment. Key processes are beginning to be systematically evaluated and improved.</p> <p>RESULTS (3): Results address areas of importance to the basic Criteria requirements and accomplishment of the organization’s mission, with good performance being achieved. Comparative and trend data are available for some of these important results areas, and some beneficial trends are evident.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>PROCESS (4): The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the overall requirements of the Criteria, but deployment may vary in some areas or work units. Key processes benefit from fact-based evaluation and improvement, and approaches are being aligned with overall organizational needs.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>RESULTS (2): Results are reported for several areas responsive to the basic Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission. Some of these results demonstrate good performance levels. The use of comparative and trend data is in the early stages.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a best fit with the Baldrige “Scoring Band Descriptors”, Process band number 3/4, and Results band number 3/2? 2. Does the organization have one or two categories where they are a role model and/or are there one or two key themes that are role model? 3. Has the organization demonstrated a commitment to continuous improvement by documenting a sound systematic approach? 4. Is the organization in the process of deploying effective plans, procedures and measurement systems? 5. Does the organization have early performance indicators, which show positive results and areas of strength? 6. Can the organization, with continued maturity, achieve Platinum Award recognition? 7. Has the organization implemented practices with potential for good results - some initiatives may be in the early stages of deployment, however, there are no gaps relative to basic or key concepts, Core Values and Criteria? 8. Does involved leadership exist that goes beyond the CEO or Quality Champion? |
| <p>Silver Award</p> <p>Process 2-Results 2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Or</p> <p>Process 3-Results 1</p> | <p>PROCESS (2): The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of the Criteria, but some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment. The organization has developed a general improvement orientation that is forward- looking.</p> <p>RESULTS (2): Results are reported for several areas responsive to the basic Criteria requirements and the accomplishment of the organization’s mission. Some of these results demonstrate good performance levels. The use of comparative and trend data is in the early stages.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>PROCESS (3): The organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of most Criteria items, although there are still areas or work units in the early stages of deployment. Key processes are beginning to be systematically evaluated and improved.</p> <p>RESULTS (1): A few results are reported responsive to the basic Criteria requirements, but they generally lack trend and comparative data.</p> <p>1. Is there a best fit with the Baldrige “Scoring Band Descriptors”, Process band numbers 2/3, and Results band number 2/1?</p> |
| <p>Bronze Award</p> <p>Process 1-Results 1</p> | <p>PROCESS (1): The organization demonstrates early stages of developing and implementing approaches to the basic Criteria requirements, with deployment lagging and inhibiting progress. Improvement efforts are a combination of problem solving and an early general improvement orientation.</p> <p>RESULTS (1): A few results are reported responsive to the basic Criteria requirements, but they generally lack trend and comparative data.</p> <p>1. Is there a best fit with the Baldrige “Scoring Band Descriptors”, Process band number 1, and Results band number 1?</p> <p>2. The Applicant is in the early stages of developing and implementing approaches to Category requirements. Important gaps exist in most Categories.</p> |

PANEL OF JUDGES PROCESSES

SELECTION OF JUDGES (SEPTEMBER)

The TPE Judges Panel consists of nine Judges serving three staggered three-year terms plus a Chair of the panel, who serves a three-year term. Judges are nominated by the TPE President/CEO and the Chair of the Judges Panel, and approved by the TPE Board of Trustees at the September TPE board meeting. Upon completion of the first term, Judges may be considered for reappointment to the Judges Panel for a second term. Each of the three states in TPE's region (Ohio, Indiana and West Virginia) will have representation on the panel, and at least one Judge will be from another state.

Selection criteria includes several of the following factors:

- Experience as a BPEP or State Quality Award Judge.
- Experience as a BPEP or State Quality Award Senior Examiner.
- Experience as a BPEP Overseer or Member of a State Quality Award program Board of Directors.
- Experience as a recognized expert in performance excellence.
- Experience as a recognized expert in Business, Education, Health Care, Government or Non-Profit sectors.
- Availability and willingness to perform the Panel of Judges Mission.

Upon receipt of the Applicant's Application Report in January/February, Judges will read the Organizational Profile to ensure that they do not have a conflict of interest. If a conflict is identified, the judge will notify the Chair of the Panel of Judges and President/CEO.

ORIENTATION CONFERENCE CALL (JANUARY)

The Panel of Judges will participate in a conference call to:

- Review and clarify the Panel of Judges Processes.
- Clarify questions or concerns about the TPE Evaluation Process.
- Identify any known conflicts of interest with Applicants and Judges.
- Clarify the Timeline and Actions Steps to be completed prior to the Award Selection Meeting.

Prior to and/or just after the conference call, Judges will receive the following by email:

- Listing of all Applicants, with sector and application information.
- Listing of Examiner Team Leaders with Applicant assignment and contact information.
- Listing of the Panel of Judges, with contact information.
- Criteria (Sector-Specific).
- Application report for their applicant,

The Lead Judge will read and review the Application Report and evaluation materials in January/early February. The Lead Judge will contact the Team Leader by phone to introduce themselves and clarify any concerns or issues identified in the application report. The Lead

Judge will not contact the Applicant for any reason. Information that the Lead Judge needs that the Team Leader cannot provide should be discussed with TPE's President/CEO.

CONFERENCE CALL WITH JUDGES AND TLs (MID- to LATE FEBRUARY)

The Panel of Judges and all TLs will participate in a conference call to:

- Review and clarify the Processes, Timeline, and Deliverables.
- Offer insights and tips for TLs.
- Discuss the SV process and ensure TL's are prepared.

JUDGES MEETING COORDINATION CONFERENCE CALL (MID-APRIL)

The Panel of Judges will participate in a conference call to:

- Confirm the process and details for the Judges Meeting.
- Discuss Best Practices.
- Discuss preparation of the Judge's Assessment Form and Rationale.
- Format for the Oral Presentation during the Judges Meeting (limited to 15 minutes each).
- Deliverables/Timeline.
- Timeline to complete Feedback Report.
- Review Team Leader (TL) Evaluation Form.
- Open Discussion.

The Lead Judge will also start the mentoring process with the Team Leader to translate the Site Visit Report into a draft Feedback Report. The Judge should concentrate on ensuring that the comments provide clarity to the Applicant. The Judge will also provide suggestions for grammar, prescriptive comments, spelling, and related issues. The Team Leader is responsible for completing this task.

TPE will provide an electronic version of the Site Visit Scorebook (includes Key Factors, Key Themes, Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement for each Item, and Site Visit Scores) for all applicants to all judges.

Team Leaders will send the following documents to their Lead Judge at the conclusion of Site Visit:

1. Copy of the Consensus Scorebook and Key Factors.
2. Score Summary Worksheet for the final scorebook.
3. Score Summary Comparison Worksheet- showing changes in Item scores between the Consensus and Site Visit Reviews that is signed at the end of Site Visit by all examiner team members.
4. All Site Visit Issue Worksheets with the Evidence and Conclusions and Effect on Comments sections completed.
5. Final Scorebook in Feedback Report format using the FBR template.

The Team Leader and Lead Judge will begin using the Draft Feedback Report format and the judging process will use this document for Key Themes and Item comments instead of the Site Visit Scorebook. The draft Feedback Report is used instead of the Site Visit Scorebook in order to provide Judges with the best information to make an award decision.

The Lead Judge will prepare the Judge's Assessment Form for each Applicant, and provide it to all Judges and the President/CEO one week prior to the Judges' Meeting.

Additionally, the Lead Judge will send to TPE the latest version of the draft Feedback Report with the latest Key Themes, the excel file showing Item scoring and the Scoring Comparison Sheet and any updated Key Factors. TPE will combine all the assessment forms and prepare packages for each Judge, and will provide these to ALL Judges, except those with conflicts with an Applicant.

All judges will read the each Organizational Profile, Judge's Assessment Form, Key Factors, Key Themes, and Scoring information for all Applicants. It is recommended that all judges read the entire draft Feedback Report.

The Lead Judge will prepare a 15-minute **oral presentation** that the Judge will present at the Award Selection Meeting. The key elements of the presentation are:

- Brief description of the Applicant (Key Factors, such as sector, industry/services provided, size, etc.)
- Significant Process Key Theme Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement comments from its approaches and deployment of performance excellence.
- Significant Results Key Theme Strength and Opportunities for Improvement comments on the Applicant's results.
- Significant changes in Item level scores or scoring levels.
- Significant comments from Process and/or Results Items.
- Judge's assessment of the Applicant's maturity level.
- Best fit Award Level and reason why.
- The Lead Judge is to serve as an Advocate for the Applicant to the Panel.

If the Lead Judge cannot attend the Award Selection Meeting or dial-in by teleconference, the Lead Judge will notify the Chair of the Panel of Judges who will appoint another judge attending the meeting to read the completed Judge's Assessment Form at the meeting. The Lead Judge will assist the newly appointed Backup Judge in understanding the organization and recommendation.

Each Judge will read all Judge's Assessment Forms prior to the Award Selection Meeting. Judges will not receive assessments for those Applicants that they have a conflict with.

AWARD SELECTION MEETING

The agenda includes:

- Housekeeping and review of materials.
- Review of all Judges' conflicts of interest.

- Discussion of Award Selection procedures and Criteria for Assigning Award Levels.
- Site Visit Applicant Discussion and Award Level Vote (30 minutes each).
- Recalibration after review of 2-3 Applicants.
- Discussion and Voting of remaining Site Visit Applicants.
- Review of Award Level decisions and any re-discussions and re-voting.
- Review recommendations for Category Lead Performer Awards. Discuss and vote on recommendations for award.
- Discussion of Next Steps to finalize Feedback Reports with Team Leaders.
- Identification of Applicants for Quest for Success Conference presentations.
- Identification of Opportunities for Improvement in Judges Processes.
- Review of TPE Awards Cycle and Recommendations for Improvement

Judges with a conflict of interest with an Applicant will leave the room whenever the Applicant is being discussed or voting occurs.

The Judges will discuss each Applicant in detail. The Judges consider all of the findings of the Examiner Team, with emphasis given to the findings of the Site Visit. The Judges discuss and consider the findings within the context of the nature of the Applicant's sector and any key organizational factors that may apply. Discussion of the Applicant continues until all participating Judges conclude that the case has been adequately covered.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the Judges will vote “yes” or “no” as to whether the Applicant should receive a given Award Level. A two-thirds “yes” vote is required to receive an Award Level. The minimum margin of the voting for a two-thirds margin of the voting Judges is: 12/18, 12/17, 11/16, 10/15, 10/14, 9/13, 8/12, 8/11, 7/10, 6/9, 6/8, 5/7, 4/6, 4/5, 3/4, 2/3, and 2/2.

In the case where the Applicant was recommended for an Award Level by the Lead Judge, but failed to achieve a two-thirds "yes" vote, the Lead Judge may request further discussion. Dissenting Judges should state their objections and the Lead Judge should make a brief explanation or rebuttal prior to a second vote.

Failure of achieving a two-thirds “yes” on the second vote will generate a vote at the next lower Award Level.

This review and voting process is repeated for each Applicant.

Note: *The Panel of Judges may review and change previous Award Level recommendations made during their review if some decisions appear to be inconsistent with those previously made. Previous year decisions by the Judges may also be reviewed to assure consistency. The Award Level decisions are not FINAL until the Award Selection Meeting is over.*

After all award levels for full applications have been determined, recommendations for Category Lead Performer Awards will be discussed and voted on. Applicants demonstrating role model performance in categories 1 – 6 will be eligible for recognition and recommended

by the lead judge. Platinum Award recipients will not be considered for this recognition. Category Lead Performer recipients will meet the following criteria:

- Scoring is at the high side or *higher than* **characteristics** of the 50–65% scoring range.
- There is linkage to appropriate organizational results demonstrating favorable levels, trends, and comparisons.
- Credible performance across other categories and no fatal flaws.
- Evidence of cycles of learning and significant improvement in the category.
- No issues surfaced during HRO meeting or site visit.

Judges will delete electronic files and emails and destroy written evaluation materials, recommendation materials, and other information used during the Award Selection Meeting to TPE at the conclusion of the meeting, except for Applicants for which they serve as Lead Judge.

ACTION STEPS AFTER THE AWARD SELECTION MEETING

The names of Applicants and the Judges' Award Level decisions are to be held in confidence until TPE sends out its press release announcing award recipients. The names of other Applicants are not to be revealed; and the details of the Judges' discussions are confidential.

The President/CEO will present the Judges' decisions for award recipients to the TPE Board of Trustees for ratification. Upon a majority vote of the Board of Trustees, the Board consents to the Award level decisions and directs the TPE President/CEO to inform each Applicant of their Award Level.

The TPE President/CEO will contact the Highest Ranking Official for each Applicant and inform the organization of their Award Level. The Applicant must either accept or decline the Award Level. Applicants may choose not to receive an Award Level, in which case, the name of the Applicant will no longer appear against that or any Award Level. An Applicant that declines an Award Level will still receive a Feedback Report.

The TPE President/CEO will issue a press release announcing the award recipients.

COMPLETING THE FEEDBACK REPORT

The Lead Judge will serve as reviewer and approver for the Applicant's Feedback Report. Emphasis should be placed on creating Feedback Reports that are clear and as specific as possible. Ultimately, the Feedback Report should be both informative and "actionable" for the Applicant.

The Lead Judge will work with the Team Leader to make improvements to comments contained in the Feedback Report. The Judge will receive the draft Feedback Report from the Team Leader in order to provide review and comments. The Judge will approve the final Feedback Report and send it by email to the TPE President/CEO and cc the Team Leader.

Each Judge will return all materials provided by TPE, including the Application Report and evaluation materials, upon submission of the Feedback Report to TPE. Electronic files and email messages will be deleted.

TPE encourages all Judges to provide opportunities for improvement to the TPE President/CEO after approving and submitting all Feedback Reports. These recommendations may address any TPE process.

EVALUATION OF PROCESS AND JUDGES

To ensure continuous improvement and cycles of learning, evaluation of the judging process and of each judge will occur at the conclusion of the annual judging cycle. Judges will provide input to the Chair of the Judges Panel and TPE President/CEO on the strengths and opportunities for improvement of the judging process. Additionally, each Judge will conduct a self-evaluation of their performance pertaining to thoroughness, process understanding, criteria understanding, overall professionalism and mentoring/collaboration with the Team Leader.



JUDGE'S ASSESSMENT FORM 2022 TPE Examination Cycle

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| Applicant: | | | | | | Lead Judge: | |
| Sector: (X in box) | <u>Business</u> | <u>Not for Profit</u> | <u>Government</u> | <u>Health Care</u> | <u>Education</u> | Size: | |
| Brief Description of Organization | | | | | | | |

| Consensus and Site Visit Scoring Summary | | | | | |
|--|-----------|------------|------|-----------|------------|
| Item | Consensus | Site Visit | Item | Consensus | Site Visit |
| 1.1 | | | 5.1 | | |
| 1.2 | | | 5.2 | | |
| 2.1 | | | 6.1 | | |
| 2.2 | | | 6.2 | | |
| 3.1 | | | 7.1 | | |
| 3.2 | | | 7.2 | | |
| 4.1 | | | 7.3 | | |
| 4.2 | | | 7.4 | | |
| | | | 7.5 | | |

Score & Scoring Bands: (maximum points = 1000)

PROCESS = Band _____

RESULTS = Band _____

| Key Areas (Insert X in box) | <u>1</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>4</u> |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | (Low) | | | (High) |
| Understanding of Performance Excellence | | | | |
| Leadership Commitment | | | | |
| Systematic Performance Excellence System in Place | | | | |
| Evidence of Improvement Cycles | | | | |
| Positive Results and Trends | | | | |
| Results Better than Benchmarks | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Observations and Maturity Level: | |
| Assessment: | |

Recognition Level – Best Fit (see Judges Process Handbook)

| | |
|--|--|
| Which level of recognition is the best fit and why? | |
| Key Themes | |



**Category Lead Performer Award –
Judge’s Recommendation
2022 TPE Examination Cycle**

Judges can recommend an applicant as a Lead Performer in a given category. Role model performance in categories 1 – 6 will be eligible for recognition. Note: Platinum Award recipients will not be considered for this recognition.

| | | |
|---|--------------------|------------------|
| Applicant: | Lead Judge: | Category: |
| Overall rationale for recommending applicant for category award: | | |
| | | |

Provide a rationale for leading performance in the given category based on the following criteria.

| Criteria | Rationale/Supporting Comments & Information |
|---|--|
| Category Score (50 – 65% or higher) | |
| Linkage to organizational results with favorable levels, trends & comparisons | |
| Evidence of significant improvement in performance | |
| Cycles of learning demonstrated | |
| Credible performance across other categories and no fatal flaws | |
| No issues surfaced during HRO meeting or site visit | |