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Today’s Objectives

• Discuss some personal lessons learned -- other industries and frameworks

• Identify common factors that can be considered in Case for Quality

• Share examples from my Baldrige experiences and my personal experiences

• Discuss other future considerations
Key Messages

• Examples of progress in other industries, sectors, and framework providers
• Scoring system concepts
• Addressing multiple dimensions
• Setting the bar appropriately
Other Industries and Frameworks

http://baldrige.nist.gov

CyberSecurity Industry (a new Federal Initiative),
The Baldrige Cybersecurity Excellence Program
Challenges and Risks

What helps?

- Self-referential
- Self-correcting
- Self-balancing
Asking the Right Questions

Customer-Focused Product and Service Results

• What are your results for your products and your customer service processes?
• What are your current levels and trends in key measures or indicators of the performance of products and services that are important to and directly serve your customers?
• How do these results compare with the performance of your competitors and other organizations with similar offerings?
• How do these results differ by product offerings, customer groups, and market segments, as appropriate?

Self-referential: Potential for consensus definitions of core elements (but still allowing for results beyond the core elements)
Example Scoring Systems

• “Core” (key) measures can be defined
  o Self-definitions
  o Sector norms

• Multiple–Factor scoring system for results
  o Levels, Trends, Comparisons, Importance and segmentation

• Multiple-Factor scoring system for process descriptions
  o Approach, Deployment, Learning, Integration
Example of Multiple Factors

**Figure 7.1.2** Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

**Figure 7.1.3** Pneumonia

AtlantiCare: Health Care Outcomes, 2009
Baldrige Award Recipient
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Example 2: Multiple Factors

Hill Country Memorial: Health Care Outcomes, 2014 Baldrige Award Recipient

Figure 7.1-18 Risk Adjusted AMI Readmission Rate

Inpatient AMI (heart attack) 30-day readmission rate is a component of the Affordable Care Act. HCM has a very small number of AMI patients admitted, as most are transferred directly from the ED to a higher level of care. Only patients at the end of life and comfort care patients are admitted to HCM. Even with these conditions, HCM outperforms its nearest competitor and the national top 10%.

Index

Keeping patients free from potentially avoidable complications is a goal for all health care providers. A lower complications index indicates fewer patients with complications. With an emphasis on eliminating preventable harm, HCM has developed a laser focus on decreasing complications from care. The HCM leadership, clinical, and medical staffs continually review complication data for trends and develop action plans. The effectiveness of these plans is evidenced by a 5 year 35% improvement and national top 10% performance.
Example: Subjective Blend of Scoring Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% or 5%</td>
<td>There are no organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS, or the RESULTS reported are poor. (Le) TRENDS data either are not reported or show mainly adverse TRENDS. (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative information is not reported. (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESULTS are not reported for any areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%</td>
<td>A few organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item, and early good PERFORMANCE LEVELS are evident. (Le) Some TRENDS data are reported, with some adverse TRENDS evident. (T) Little or no comparative information is reported. (C) RESULTS are reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%</td>
<td>Good organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) Some TRENDS data are reported, and most of the TRENDS presented are beneficial. (T) Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident. (C) RESULTS are reported for many areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%</td>
<td>Good organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) Beneficial TRENDS are evident in areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (T) Some current PERFORMANCE LEVELS have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or BENCHMARKS and show areas of good relative PERFORMANCE. (C) Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, and PROCESS requirements. (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%</td>
<td>Good-to-excellent organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) Beneficial TRENDS have been sustained over time in most areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (T) Many to most TRENDS and current PERFORMANCE LEVELS have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or BENCHMARKS and show areas of leadership and very good relative PERFORMANCE. (C) Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements. (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%, 95%, or 100%</td>
<td>Excellent organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported that are fully responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le) Beneficial TRENDS have been sustained over time in all areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (T) Industry and BENCHMARK leadership is demonstrated in many areas. (C) Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS and PROJECTIONS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements. (I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example: Subjective Blend of Scoring Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0% or 5%       | • There are no organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS, or the RESULTS reported are poor. (Le)  
                 • TREND data either are not reported or show mainly adverse TRENDS. (T)  
                 • Comparative information is not reported. (C)  
                 • RESULTS are not reported for any areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (I)                                                                                   |
| 10%, 15%, 20%, or 25% | • A few organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item, and early good PERFORMANCE LEVELS are evident. (Le)  
                         • Some TREND data are reported, with some adverse TRENDS evident. (T)  
                         • Little or no comparative information is reported. (C)  
                         • RESULTS are reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (I)                                                                                   |
| 30%, 35%, 40%, or 45% | • Good organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the BASIC REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le)  
                               • Some TREND data are reported, and most of the TRENDS presented are beneficial. (T)  
                               • Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident. (C)  
                               • RESULTS are reported for many areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (I)                                                                                   |
### Example: Subjective Blend of Scoring Dimensions

| 50%, 55%, 60%, or 65% | • Good organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the OVERALL REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le)  
• Beneficial TRENDS are evident in areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (T)  
• Some current PERFORMANCE LEVELS have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or BENCHMARKS and show areas of good relative PERFORMANCE. (C)  
• Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, and PROCESS requirements. (I) |

| 70%, 75%, 80%, or 85% | • Good-to-excellent organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported, responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le)  
• Beneficial TRENDS have been sustained over time in most areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (T)  
• Many to most TRENDS and current PERFORMANCE LEVELS have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or BENCHMARKS and show areas of leadership and very good relative PERFORMANCE. (C)  
• Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements. (I) |

| 90%, 95%, or 100% | • Excellent organizational PERFORMANCE LEVELS are reported that are fully responsive to the MULTIPLE REQUIREMENTS of the item. (Le)  
• Beneficial TRENDS have been sustained over time in all areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization’s MISSION. (T)  
• Industry and BENCHMARK leadership is demonstrated in many areas. (C)  
• Organizational PERFORMANCE RESULTS and PROJECTIONS are reported for most KEY CUSTOMER, market, PROCESS, and ACTION PLAN requirements. (I) |
### Example of Scoring Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Graph #</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong overall but declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unfavorable trends in Img</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Positive for communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Negative comparison in B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Negative comparison in B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Negative trends for Input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Kirk’s approach is to create a global view of the mixture of results for a Category (e.g. Customer results)
- Trained review teams can usually reach consensus relatively quickly
Scoring scale used in Environmental Industry and Council on Great Lakes Industries. “CGLI’s TQEM Primer and Self-Assessment Matrix, published in 1993, provided a template for development of programs within member companies and other organizations which have now become full scale environmental management systems.” quote from “Optimizing Industry Water Use Great Lakes Protection Fund Project #926”. Chart from the book “Sustainability Perspectives for Resources and Businesses”
Consider Multiple Categories

- Important to address all key categories of results to support self-balancing needs

L,T,C,I scoring scale is then applied to each of these 5 results categories.
Systems Perspective

- Results are driven by process (leading indicators)
- Recognizes importance of CULTURE!!
- Scoring done using LTCI and ADLI for each category. Each category is weighted differently
Do These Concepts Work?

- President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology advocates systems engineering approach to Health Care
    - “…promote the use of systems methods and tools…”

- The improvements shown earlier by AtlantiCare is typical pattern for Awardees

*But, do Award winners win in real life?*
Correlation to Market Leadership

• This approach (systems oriented with multi-dimensional results comparisons) demonstrates correlations to market leadership

• Healthcare:
  o 9 out of last 19 Baldrige Winners are Healthcare
  o Thomson Reuters study: Baldrige hospitals are 6 times more likely to be among “Top 100 Hospitals”

• Two-time Baldrige winners far outpace their sector competitors in between wins, with respect to revenue (median 93% growth) and jobs (median 63% vs. median 3.2% growth)
• Can you or should you apply systematic framework to the development of this Case for Quality program itself?
  ○ RECOMMENDATION: YES
EXAMPLE: How Can You Compare Entire Communities?

...the initiative will help communities work together across sectors and “support them to implement the framework, measure progress, define their practices and capabilities, and benchmark” their success.

The framework consists of six categories that span strategic and operational processes which must be aligned to drive outcomes (results) for the community as a whole.
Communities of Excellence
Also has Big Objectives

Expected Results: *Communities for Excellence*

**Short Term Results (2-3 years)**
1. Leading indicators of improvement and key community-prioritized metrics.
2. Agreement on a common language and values that will assist collaboration
3. A process for documenting/sharing best practices
4. Businesses and organizations prioritizing their activities and action plans to fit with those prioritized by the community.

**Long Term Results (3 years and beyond)**
5. Benchmarked status in prioritized outcomes compared to similar communities.
6. A collaborative leadership structure composed of diverse community leaders, businesses and organizations, and engaged residents across all sectors …and work towards shared goals with …sustainability.

From http://www.communitiesofexcellence2026.org/
Summary of Key Concepts

• Examples of progress in other industries, sectors, and framework providers
• Scoring system factors and calibrations
• Multiple dimensions of results
• Systems approach (leading and lagging)
• Setting the bar for collective impact?
  o I recommend that you set it high
Thank You!

Good luck in your collaboration

Kirk Holmes
Holmes and Associates, Inc.
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kirk@holmesinc.net
http://www.holmesinc.net

Impact the World through Quality