

## REVIEWER FEEDBACK SUMMARY

---

- Time Requirements**
1. Scoring the application  
Range: 3.5 to 40 hours  
Average: 20.9 hours
- Consolidation of comments  
Range: 3 to 12  
Average: 6.7
- Refinement of comments:  
Range: 2 to 6  
Average: 3.3
- Review of Draft:  
Range: 1-4  
Average: 1.8
- Total:  
Range: 9.3 to 48  
Average: 33
- Plus time on site: 16 each  
Plus 1 day orientation (half day training plus travel time) = 8  
Average with on-site and orientation = **57 hours per reviewer**
- Feedback Report Development: Approximately 16 hours
2. The Tier II concept is a useful tool in helping WIBs become high performance organizations.
- Average: 4.6**
- |                   |   |         |   |                         |
|-------------------|---|---------|---|-------------------------|
| 1                 | 2 | 3       | 4 | 5                       |
| Strongly Disagree |   | Neutral |   | <b>X</b> Strongly Agree |
3. Current process contains right amount of rigor in ensuring that only top quality boards get certified
- Average 3.9**
- |                   |   |         |          |                |
|-------------------|---|---------|----------|----------------|
| 1                 | 2 | 3       | 4        | 5              |
| Strongly Disagree |   | Neutral | <b>X</b> | Strongly Agree |

4. The boards received valuable learning by participating in the process.

**Average: 4.3**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
Strongly Disagree                      Neutral                      **X**                      Strongly Agree

5. The reviewers received valuable learning by participating in the process

**Average: 4.4**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
Strongly Disagree                      Neutral                      **X**                      Strongly Agree

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

**Having certain processes in place, although they may be good, is not enough. Practices must be documented through a written procedure, which can then be repeated, measured, evaluated, and systematically improved.**

**Ideas for a written process to define the approach (in many different areas). Some ideas for evaluating effectiveness of approaches. How far we have to go in the process to achieve excellence!**

**Better organization of paperwork. Greater familiarity with current expectations of WIB. "Promising practices" from reviewed WIBs.**

**Confirmed that criteria that bear some similarity to Baldrige can be applied to WIBS and that WIBs can use the criteria as a tool for organizational assessment.**

**How the criteria can be used as a tool to encourage WIBs to take on a larger leadership role in regional workforce policy and service delivery development/coordination.**

**That a Baldrige type tool and assessment process can be used as a learning opportunity for those that participate in the process at any level – WIB board, WIB staff, one-stop operators, and examiners.**

**I certainly have a new vision of how the Baldrige criteria can be used to improve governmental and non-profit agencies. I am encouraged and proud of my home state for being on the cutting edge of this initiative. I believe that the applicants stretched way out of their traditional comfort zones and are aspiring to become exemplary organizations. This is good news for taxpayers and constituents as well as recipients of service.**

**That boards are working to be what WIA intended. I will use 2<sup>nd</sup> Tier to help my Indiana panel members view local boards as they should be.**

7. I felt adequately prepared to be a reviewer.

**Average: 3.3**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
Strongly Disagree                      Neutral **X**                      Strongly Agree

8. The reviewer training could be improved by:

Providing an example of an application, scorebook, and feedback report.  
(1 = No, 2=Yes) **Average: 2**

Expanding the length of training.  
(1 = No, 2=Yes) **Average: 2**

How much time would you have been willing to spend in training?  
Range: 1-2 full days  
Average: **1.6 days** (Certified examiners willing to spend more time than peers)

Spending more time on the concepts of approach, deployment, quality review, results, and creativity  
(1 = No, 2=Yes) **Average: 2**

Additional comments:

**Training should provide more structure and detailed approach to scoring and site visits.**

**The examiner training appeared to be the weakest link the in the process. The following are key improvement opportunities: Review the criteria and make sure all examiners have a common understanding of what is expected. The criteria developed are based loosely on Baldrige, but the items are different. Spending time on each category item and what is intended by each would substantially increase the ability of examiners to appropriately apply the criteria. This is especially important for those recruited to the board because of their Baldrige experience. Include more time to discuss/agree to some common processes teams will use in the review process. In the training day, individual teams ended up talking about team process, but this was happen-stance. And there was not enough time for full group discussion so that all groups could take advantage of suggestions coming out of other teams. This will increase consistency, process efficiencies, and team effectiveness across teams.**

**Since I was a veteran examiner, I felt I had enough training in the criteria, but lacked knowledge of the Workforce Development System. There were significant gaps that needed to be filled in my understanding of the system and the site visit. I retrospectively questioned whether or not I had been too hard during the scoring stage of the process. For my fellow examiners, I believe that 2 days of GOOD training upfront on the criteria and writing comments would have saved them countless hours in rework and made their scoring experience much more expedient, beneficial for both the applicants and themselves (not to mention the category champions and final scorebook writer.**

9. The paper review process could be improved by:

Keeping the teams together for review. That is, “sequestering” the teams to do the application scoring for 2-3 days following training so they could confer with each other and ensure time on their calendars for doing the review.

(1 = No; 2= Yes) **Average: 1.4**

I prefer to do scoring on my own time:

(1 = No; 2= Yes) **Average: 1.6**

Comments:

**It might prove difficult for reviewers to take the several days in a row that might be needed to accomplish the training and review. You might also lose the “independent” quality of the independent review. If thorough training on criteria was provided in training, then independent paper review and scoring might be more efficient.**

**It would be much more time consuming to do as a group. I do not think this is realistic nor do I know of any state of national program that uses this approach.**

**I believe the applicants could have prepared better applications that followed a “template” of approach defined, deployed, evaluated, etc. Would have been a good experience for them in examining their processes in this manner as well as easier to review. Just a thought.**

10. The team size was appropriate for the task.

1	2	3	4	5
Too Small		Just Right <b>X</b>		Too Big

11. 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:

**Average: 3.4**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
Insufficient                      Just Right   **X**                      Overkill

Additional Comment:

**DOL, DWD, and SHRIC don't need to be reviewers. They need to be recipients of the review outcomes.**

12. The on-site visit was important to ensuring an accurate score, identifying strengths and weaknesses for the feedback report, and understanding the board and its issues.

**Average: 5**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
Strongly Disagree                      Neutral                      **X** Strongly Agree

13. The Tier II process could be accomplished through a paper review only without a site visit.

**Average: 1.1**

**1X**                      2                      3                      4                      5  
Strongly Disagree                      Neutral                      Strongly Agree

14. To obtain sufficient information and reach consensus, the on-site visit was:

**Average: 2.3**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5  
Too short                      **X**                      Just Right                      Too Long

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

- A. 1= Keep the guidelines as they are now.  
2= Simplify the application guidelines so there is less detail.

**Average: 2**

- B. 1 = Keep the current process in which all team members score the application.  
2 = Have 1-3 individual(s) score the paper application and only send the application to the full team if it receives a minimum score.

**Average: 1.4**

Additional Comment:

**Have 1-3 carefully selected. Would not have just 1; our scores were extremely variable. Use a Baldrige/state quality examiner for this.**

- C. 1 = Keep the current scoring process which scored each question  
2 = Score only at the category/subcategory level

**Average: 1.9**

- D. 1= Keep the current scoring bands (10-20, 30-40, 50-60, etc) and only score within the band as opposed to an absolute number.  
2= Permit scoring on a continuum of anywhere from 0-100.

**Average: 1.3**

Additional comments:

**Despite the time demands and my lack of familiarity with Baldrige principles and the evaluation process, I found this experience to be very eye opening, challenging, and helpful. I learned a lot from my team members and from the board staff and board for which I am grateful.**

**Better training would have helped expedite the scoring. Sequestering would have made sure we all stayed focused in a timely manner. Many good suggestions in this questionnaire. I did find this process extremely helpful for my own development and guidance to my Workforce Board. Thanks for including me even through it was a time consuming project.**

**Will it be “embraced” by DWD and SHRIC? Where is their support for WIBs? And this process?**

**I thought this was an excellent process overall, though some ideas below may improve it: If Indiana continues to use its own unique criteria, eliminate all redundancy and ensure that you are asking the questions most relevant to the category. This is considerable duplication in the existing criteria, which may have contributed to some confusion on the part of applicant and examiners. While I think site visits improve review significantly, they add**

**time and cost to the process. If this is a primary concern, you may want to consider some alternatives to site visits, especially as more WIBs are involved in process or begin to reapply for Tier II. For example: do site visits only for applicants attaining a certain level at consensus, or conduct site visits for all reapplicants and new applicants that attain a certain level or conduct site visits on all new applicants and only those reapplicants that achieve a certain level in consensus.**

**I think that our consensus and site visit processes went extremely well. I was very pleased and my expectations were exceeded. It was really a nice mix of talent. Thanks for the opportunity to be involved. I really enjoyed it! I recognize the financial constraints that you are operating under and I feel that you tried to maximize the use of your resources quite admirably. Just a note on both the state and national levels, the site visit expense is borne by the applicant. This change may assist you in stretching scarce resources. Thanks again.**

**We have a panel of folks from a couple WIBs and technical colleges which have applied for our state quality awards, participated in DOL's enterprise process and/or become ISO certified. But your process takes on a slightly different focus that I think might be of real value to our state – including the links of quality process to WIBs and through WIBs to one-stop chartering process.**