

# Applicant Feedback Survey

---

1. Please estimate the number of hours you spent for each activity:

- Development of Business Overview      **Range: 40-60. Average: 53.3**
- Development of Application              **Range: 24-140. Average: 101**
- Preparation for Site Visit                **Range: 8-48. Average: 32**

**Total Hours for Applicant: Range 72-248. Average: 186.7**

Circle the number for the response that best corresponds to your perceptions:

2. The Tier II Certification *concept* is a useful tool in helping Workforce Investment Boards become high performance organizations. (This question pertains to the concept, not necessarily the current process)      **Range: 4-5 Average: 4.3**

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree

3. The current process contains the right amount of rigor in ensuring that only top quality boards get certified.      **Range: 4-5 Average: 4.3**

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree

4. Our board members received valuable learning by participating in the process.      **Range: 2-4 Average: 3.0**

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Strongly Agree

**(higher scores shown by those boards that received site visits)**

5. The board staff received valuable learning by participating in the process.      **Range: 4-5. Average: 4.7**

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strongly Agree

6. Briefly described what you will take away from this experience that is most valuable to you.

- **As we prepared the application, it became apparent what our weaknesses were. The process validated what we thought were the areas where we needed to make improvements. We had already started to incorporate some of the suggestions for improvement because of our own internal strategic planning process. I think the experience will help the WIB and its staff move forward to be able to quantify what we are doing and also enable us to make continuous improvements based on data and not gut level feelings.**
- **How to organize and articulate key process in a succinct fashion. How to align key factors and process outcomes with business results. How to “close the loop.”**

7. I felt adequately prepared to be an applicant. **Range: 2-4. Average: 3**

1	2	3	4	5
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

**Higher scores shown by those boards that received site visits.**

8. Applicant preparation could be improved by:

Providing an example of an application, scorebook, and feedback report.	Yes <u>XXX</u>	No <u>    </u>
How much time would you have been willing to spend in training?	½ day <u>X</u>	Full day <u>X</u>
	2 days <u>X</u>	3 days <u>    </u>
Offering an on-site overview of the process to the WIB prior to application (i.e., DWD providing an overview vs. the WIB staff)	Yes <u>X</u>	No <u>XX</u>
	<b>“Overview needs to come from the HRIC. They are the certifying agency, not DWD.”</b>	
Offering a “pre-review” so an application could be unofficially scored before being officially submitted.	Yes <u>XX</u>	No <u>X</u>

9. The review team size (7 individuals) was appropriate for the task. **Range: 3-5. Average: 4**

1	2	3	4	5
		Just Right	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Too small				Too Big

10. The various teams' composition included in-state peer reviewers, out-of-state peer reviewers, Baldrige Examiners, national organization staff, regional DOL staff, DWD staff, and state board representation. This kind of diversity is:

**Range: 3-4 Average: 3.3**

1	2	3	4	5
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Insufficient		Just right		Overkill

Please add any other comments about the types of team members we should seek in the future:

**Having a limited number of WIBs who generally have similar agendas, funding, and whose WIA and WtW performance is a part of the whole, it became virtually impossible to ensure total objectivity.**

**I felt that we had a very qualified review team. I would want to ensure that all review team members have a strong quality background, have received training that provides a thorough understanding and overview of the process.**

11. The on-site visit was important to ensuring understanding the board and its issues.  
**Range: 4 Average: 4**

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

12. The Tier II process could be accomplished through a paper review only without a site visit. **Range: 1. Average: 1**

1	2	3	4	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

13. The on-site visit was: **Range: 3. Average: 3**

1	2	3	4	5
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Too short		Just right		Too long

14. We are considering changes to the process. Please check the option you would recommend:

A. Application Guidelines:  
XX Keep the guidelines as they are now.

X Simplify the application guidelines so there is less detail and more emphasis on the essential point of the category.

B. Review Process

XXX Keep the current process in which all team members score the application.

\_\_\_\_\_ Have 1-3 individual(s) score the paper application and only send the application to the full team if it receives a minimum score.

C. Scoring Bands

XXX Keep the current scoring bands (10-20, 30-40, 50-60, etc.) and only score within the band as opposed to an absolute number.

\_\_\_\_\_ Permit scoring on a continuum of anywhere from 0-100.

15. The feedback report was helpful in understanding what we need to do next.

**Range: 4. Average: 4.**

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	<b>X</b>	Strongly Agree

16. Our board plans to refine the application and request another review toward becoming certified. **Range: 3-5. Average: 4**

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral	<b>X</b>	Strongly Agree

**Both boards that received site visits strongly agreed.**

Please provide any additional comments you may have about the Tier II concept and process overall and/or your experience:

- **Generally positive and beneficial to staff and board. We'll use as a learning experience for continuous improvement. Great foundational experience and tool.**
- **For our WIB and the staff, the process was a learning experience. We will use the information that we believe is valid to make continuous improvements to our systems. I think that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier Certification process is a good one and promotes expected quality criteria for WIBs. I do not feel that the HRIC/DWD are on board with the notion of 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier Certification 100%. It seems like they might be backing off of the Tier II certification and thinking about promoting the WEN certification process. While I believe that the WEN process is a good one and valid as well, I think that the WEN certification process focuses more on programs and regulatory issues, instead**

**of the bigger issues of workforce development in communities and the roles that boards play. If the HRIC/DWD expects excellence from WIBs, then they need to continue to define and award what excellence means for WIBs.**