

Consensus Review Scorebook—Final

TST2014

05/23/2014

Key Factors Worksheet

P.1a Organizational Environment

Organizational Description—Preschool/K–12 public school system, ~4,000 students, 100-square-mile Midwestern district: farming & suburban areas. \$50M budget

Educational Programs & Services—Preschool/K–12 public education; students in service boundaries & out-of-district tuition students

Instructional Settings/Delivery Methods/Locations—Regular education classrooms, vocational/trade classrooms and workshops, blended learning classes. All are inclusive environments including some students w/cognitive and/or physical disabilities and regular ed. students; other special-needs students at preschool facility.

Locations: 1 high school (1,000); 1 middle school (900); 2 K–3 elementary schools (550 each); 1 4th- and 5th-grade elementary school (600); 1 preschool w/children w/special needs (100); local 9–12 online charter school run w/other school districts

Mission, Vision, Values—

Mission—Inspiring others to learn and succeed

Vision—To provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018

Values—The Applicant School Way

- Applicant Quality: Desire to be the best, to be courageous, to innovate, to demonstrate integrity
- Applicant Golden Rule: Treat others as you would like to be treated, treat others with respect, demonstrate proactive student and customer (community) service
- Applicant Character: Make learning fun, maintain perspective, celebrate success, enjoy work and have fun, be a consummate team player

Philosophical Principles—

- We focus on children and their learning, not on politics and adults.
- We believe that all children can learn, not some children can learn.
- We believe that students, teachers, principals, and parents are accountable for student performance, not just the student.
- We do not believe that we can reach all students with a traditional curriculum, so we diversify our curriculum to meet students' needs.
- We give teachers our total support.
- We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
- We are not afraid of the press but embrace opportunities to tell our story.
- We embrace innovation and change.
- We treat our students as whole individuals, respecting what they bring to their learning experience and understanding their unique situations.

Core Competencies—CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children; CC-2: Application of instructional technology/computer learning as sources of tailored instruction matched to students' individual needs; CC-3: Curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum

Workforce Profile—425 paid staff with various skills and abilities: 225 certified instructional teachers (100% Highly Qualified Teachers: 1% doctoral, 65% master's, 34% bachelor's). 175 classified staff, 25 administrative staff, 100 volunteers (including parents)

Race/ethnicity: Mirrors service-area demographics; 85% live within school district

Two organized bargaining units: State Teachers Union, State Classified Staff Union

Workforce Engagement Elements—

- Physical conditions of the workspace allow me to do my job

- I am able to select benefits that meet my needs.
- The work I do gives me a sense of personal accomplishment.
- I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills.
- I have sufficient resources to get the job done.
- I can contribute to decision making in my school or work unit.
- I can see the impact of my work in my school or work unit.
- Reward and recognition in my workplace are based on how well we do our jobs.
- Participating in the professional learning community helps me improve my teaching skills
- Participating in collaborative planning with my peers helps me improve my daily instruction

Workforce Health & Safety Requirements—Regulatory: OSHA, SDE, FDA. School board policy, state legislature bills affecting education, service offerings required by IDEA and Free and Appropriate Public Education laws

Assets—6 school buildings, technology equipment, 35 buses and depot, district office, food service facility

Regulatory Requirements & Accreditation—Regulatory: State/federal statutes (e.g., Child Nutrition, Fair Labor Standards, Title 1), ADA, FMLA, IDEA, IRS, NAEP, OSHA, and SDE. FERPA for student privacy/confidentiality

Accreditation: Through SDE performance rating; curriculum based on mandated state standards. Rated “Excellent with Distinction” by achieving AYP since 2008

P.1b Organizational Relationships

Organizational Structure—

- Policy set by elected, 5-member school board. Board committees (aligned w/SOs, 2.1b[2]): engagement, stewardship (financial), wellness, communication
- Current superintendent hired one year ago. Appointed by board; reports to board, runs district pursuant to board policies
- Treasurer: Appointed by board; reports to board

Student Groups—Students (87% Caucasian, 4% Latino, 8% African American, 1% other); 17% qualify for free/reduced-price lunch based on low household income; 35 K–12 tuition students

Stakeholders & Collaborators—Stakeholders: Parents (families), local community, volunteers. Key collaborators: Other school districts that collaborate to run online charter school

Student Requirements—

- Solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures
- Workforce members who encourage discovery and inquiry, stimulate creative thought, and treat students fairly
- Safe school environment
- Involvement in curriculum development
- Involvement in extracurricular programming and development
- Communication
- Access to technology
- Technology-based learning

Stakeholder and Collaborator Requirements—Parents (families): (1) Information about student educational progress; (2) Engagement in decisions about student programming—both curricular and extracurricular

Local Community: (1) communication; (2) district schools as good partners with the community; (3) efficient, effective, and economical educational programs

Volunteers: (1) communication; (2) recognition

Key Collaborators: (1) autonomy to tailor programs and curriculum to each student’s individual needs; (2) autonomy to hire and develop workforce members

Key Market Segments for Eligible Students/Parents—Traditional public schools, blended learning public schools, private independent schools, parochial schools, home schooling families, independent study, online schooling, tech-savvy stakeholders, paper-preference stakeholders

Partners, Suppliers, Casual Suppliers—Three-tier system to characterize vendors.

(Vendor) Partnerships in key support areas: curriculum, technology, office supplies, maintenance/cleaning supplies, vehicle maintenance/parts, UCPD focus group facilitators [3.1a(1)], insurance company (for risk assessor inspections, 6.2c[1])

Suppliers: for monitoring/gathering social media data, ethics hotline, surveys, community surveys, Social Media Analysis Toolkit [3.1a(1)]

Key Communic. Mechanisms with Partners/Suppliers—Strategic plan deployment sessions; Updates (superintendent blog); intranet; Senior leader e-mail updates; Appearancebook, Bird-Call; online journal (each school maintains its own); superintendent on social media

P.2a Competitive Environment

Parent/Student Competition—

- Parents choose school district and school; students from “academically challenged” district can enroll in any state school w/funding following student; students in service area can pay to attend schools in other districts.
- Competition: other school districts (3% market share), 3 parochial (6%), 2 private (3%), home schools (1%); 13% total market share [SC-2]; online charter school: 2% market share [SC-2]

Staff Competition—Other state districts recruit applicant’s instructional staff [SC-5]

Competitive Changes—Key changes:

- State funding formula reduces funds for schools [SC-1]
- Depressed economy; lack of tax dollars for schools [SC-1]
- Online charter school’s potential for collaboration/competition [SA?]
- Zero-based budgeting (deployed in 2015) [SA?]
- 2014–2015: state/applicant to adopt Common Core Standards of National Governors Association Center for Best Practices

Comparative Data—Education sector for academic performance, customer satisfaction, workforce satisfaction and engagement, financial and market results

- Key academic performance comparisons: ACT/SAT scores, similar-sized state school districts/local competitor school district, state top-decile districts, graduation rates, State Academic Assessment results, State Graduation Test results, State Academic Excellence Consortium [4.1a(2)]
- Key student satisfaction/engagement and school operations comparisons: national, state, county data, local competitor school districts. “Baldrige comparisons”: USPS, FirstExpress, hospital systems
- Key workforce satisfaction/engagement comparisons: Outside sector—annual, national Best Career Location Workforce Engagement Survey
- Financial/market survey comparisons—SDE, other state agencies, Union Efficiency and Quality Center [2.2b]

P.2b Strategic Context

Strategic Challenges (Figure P.2-1)—

- Educational programs/services: SC-1: State funding formula/uncertainty, SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings
- Operations: SC-3: Cost containment
- Societal Responsibility: SC-4: Engagement of workforce members to give back to the community
- Workforce: SC-5: Competitors wishing to hire applicant’s engaged workforce

Strategic Advantages (Figure P.2-1)—

- Educational programs/services: SA-1: Community support for levies

- Operations: SA-2: Culture of innovation among employees
- Societal Responsibility: SA-3: Great community support and communication
- Workforce: SA-4: Engaged workforce focused on student achievement and learning

P.2c Performance Improvement System

Performance Improvement System—Management system includes core processes and a leadership system that follows IIE (Figure 6.1-1).

IIE: DMADV for new process creation, DMAIC for improving existing processes. Balanced scorecard system trends progress toward vision. PDCA/PDSA used to improve processes.

Has applied Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence since 2003.

Key Themes Worksheet

a. What are the most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified in the applicant's response to process items?

1. The applicant continuously evaluates and improves many processes that are important to its success and sustainability. Examples are systematic improvement of leadership approaches that help the district create a sustainable organization and enhance leadership effectiveness, as well as senior leaders' prioritization of suggested improvements entered in the Data Analysis, Statistics, and Heuristics System (DASH). In addition, the strategic planning process (SPP) is reviewed annually for improvement opportunities, with one review resulting in recognition of the need to identify, support, and strengthen the applicant's local communities. Other improvements include a prioritization step added to the applicant's approach to identifying and anticipating current and future student and customer groups and market segments, as well as a well-ordered, data-driven process for identifying best practices and opportunities for continuous improvement. By assessing and refining many approaches that are important to organizational success, the applicant supports its desire to be the best.
2. The applicant's senior leaders guide and sustain the district using several systematic methods. For example, senior leaders demonstrate their commitment to legal and ethical behavior through an annual ethics review and by providing ethics training for workforce members, suppliers, and partners. Executive Leadership Team (ELT) members also encourage frank, two-way communication with students and stakeholders using multiple methods of communication. In addition, the district's leadership system ensures that leaders are responsible for their actions through systematic evaluation of their performance, and the applicant's well-deployed key governance processes ensure accountability, transparency, fiscal responsibility, and attention to stakeholders' interests. And to create a focus on action, senior leaders define and refine district-level action plans and explore cause-and-effect relationships using DASH data and dashboards. These processes enable the applicant's leaders to run their schools like businesses, a philosophical principle (PhilP) of the district.

b. What are the most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified in the applicant's response to process items?

1. It is not evident that the applicant systematically determines and aligns its key performance measures and organizational goals. For example, the applicant's four strategic objectives do not appear to align with the balanced scorecard measures used by the district, buildings, and departments to consider and balance key stakeholders' needs, address strategic advantages and challenges, and leverage core competencies. In addition, it is not clear how the applicant's two key district-level performance indicators and balanced scorecard measures track the achievement, effectiveness, and alignment of action plans related to the four strategic objectives. Similarly, the district's key performance measures do not appear to align fully with those used in district-, building-, and department-level balanced scorecards to track the achievement and effectiveness of action plans, and the requirements of the applicant's core work process and its derivatives do not appear to align with strategic objectives and related goals and measures. Furthermore, alignment and integration of data and information to support organizational decision making, continuous improvement, and innovation do not appear to be systematic. Aligning key performance measures and goals may allow the applicant to invoke its PhilP of running its schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
2. How the applicant systematically enacts the PhilP that students, teachers, principals, parents, volunteers, and workforce members are all accountable for student achievement is not apparent. For example, it is not clear how the applicant systematically transfers knowledge relevant to teaching and learning processes to parents and volunteers. The applicant also does not appear to have a systematic process for deploying action plans to parents, who are co-educators of students. Furthermore, ELT members do not appear to collect, review, and analyze dissatisfaction feedback from parents to determine and resolve issues at their source. Systematic processes that demonstrate this PhilP and the related core competency of engaging parents as co-educators may help the applicant fulfill its mission of inspiring others to learn and succeed.

3. There is limited evidence of systematic approaches to innovation. For example, systematic processes are not evident to ensure that processes for updating the applicant's data repository support the ability to disseminate and capitalize on accumulated knowledge. Systematic processes are also not evident for the selection of comparative measures to help identify opportunities for innovation. In addition, it is not clear how the applicant improves its approach to managing organizational knowledge, information, and information technology or how it improves processes that build an effective environment to support a culture of innovation among its employees. Finally, it is unclear how the applicant decides to discontinue pursuit of a strategic opportunity risk once it has begun. Systematic approaches may help the applicant discover opportunities to support organizational learning and innovation that align with the PhilP of embracing innovation and change.

c. Considering the applicant's key business/organization factors, what are the most significant strengths found in its response to results items?

1. Many of the applicant's results for workforce engagement demonstrate progress in leveraging the strategic advantage of an engaged workforce that is focused on student achievement and learning. For example, results for balanced scorecard measures of instructional staff members' engagement—such as the ability to select useful benefits and services, improve skills, achieve a sense of personal accomplishment, contribute to decision making, and see the impact of their work on students' learning—have steadily improved and are approaching the top-decile level. In addition, results for employee reward and recognition that acknowledge job performance and for staff turnover have improved and outperform the top decile.
2. Some results support the applicant's PhilP of running its schools like businesses. For example, the performance index—a key district-level performance indicator—has improved over the period shown and compares favorably to the state top decile. Other examples are improved results for per-pupil expenditure (PPE), another key district-level performance indicator; student-to-teacher ratios; and satisfaction with the Shared Vision Development Process and the student performance monitoring and reporting system. Effective governance and regulation are evident in zero findings for internal/external audits and 100% compliance with Internal Revenue Service (IRS) audits and conflict-of-interest (COI) forms, improving scores on and compliance with key regulatory requirements, and compliance with policies and negotiated agreements.
3. Some results support the applicant's values of desiring to be the best, to be courageous, and to demonstrate integrity. For example, results relating to the effectiveness of student learning and student-focused processes—including the percentage of 10th-grade students performing at and above proficiency levels on the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT) and graduation rates—have improved and outperform the comparisons given. In addition, results indicating workforce members' and stakeholders' perceptions of leaders' integrity and their trust in leaders have improved and are approaching the top-decile level, and results for ethical behavior improved from 2009 to 2013 in areas important to the district's values and principles.

d. Considering the applicant's key business/organization factors, what are the most significant opportunities, vulnerabilities, and/or gaps (related to data, comparisons, linkages) found in its response to results items?

1. Results related to several key student requirements, other customer-focused indicators, and workforce-focused indicators are missing or limited. Examples are results for building relationships with students and their parents through the stages of their relationship with the district, effectiveness in addressing students' expectations that workforce members will stimulate creative thought and treat students fairly, and effectiveness in preparing students to be competitive in advancing their education. In addition, no results are reported for the strengthening of core competencies or for measures associated with intelligent risk taking. Results are also missing for important measures of workforce engagement and performance, including staff members' participation in professional and leadership development, watch-list observations related to the acquisition of new knowledge and skills, and findings from exit surveys and interviews. Tracking these results may reveal ways to retain families and attract them to district schools and to retain the applicant's engaged staff in the face of competitors' attempts to hire them.
2. Several customer-focused and workforce-focused results do not include competitive or comparative data. Customer-focused results lacking comparisons include those for student engagement based

on exit surveys and those related to effective teaching methods, as well as some results for students' satisfaction and engagement. Other examples are results for the satisfaction and engagement of volunteers and key collaborators and for parent participation. In addition, comparative data are missing for some measures of workforce capability and workforce climate. Comparing these results against relevant results from other organizations may help the applicant understand its market position and its effectiveness in addressing the elements of customer and workforce engagement.

3. Several key results are not segmented by student group or by the workforce groups identified by the applicant. Specifically, some results for student and parent satisfaction, as well as results for market share, are not segmented by student demographics or grade level. In addition, some workforce-focused results are not segmented by building, grade level, or workforce demographics. Results for workforce and student satisfaction with leadership also lack segmentation. Segmented results in these areas may help the applicant identify improvement opportunities related to specific student and parent demographics and reinforce student achievement.

Item Worksheet—Item 1.1

Senior Leadership

Relevant Key Factors

1. Mission—Inspiring others to learn and succeed
 Vision—To provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018
 Values—Applicant School Way
 - Applicant Quality: Desire to be the best, to be courageous, to innovate, to demonstrate integrity
 - Applicant Golden Rule: Treat others as you would like to be treated, treat others with respect, demonstrate proactive student and customer (community) service
 - Applicant Character: Make learning fun, maintain perspective, celebrate success, enjoy work and have fun, be a consummate team player
2. We embrace innovation and change.
3. Operations: SA-2: Culture of innovation among employees
 Societal Responsibility: SA-3: Great community support and communication
 Workforce: SA-4: Engaged workforce focused on student achievement and learning
4. **Performance Improvement System**—Management system includes core processes and a leadership system that follows IIE.

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>Aligned, well-deployed leadership approaches help senior leaders create a sustainable organization, achieve the applicant's mission and strategic objectives, and create a focus on action. Senior leaders align and integrate approaches through the Leadership System, which includes steps for setting and communicating direction and objectives and for monitoring and reviewing performance. Action plan responsibilities cascade from the SPP into each Employee Performance Plan.</p>		a(1, 3)
	<p>By demonstrating their commitment to legal and ethical behavior, senior leaders fulfill the applicant's Golden Rule. For example, they set clear expectations for legal and ethical behavior through the Code of Conduct, which also includes district policies; a Financial Conflict of Interest Form; and a criminal records questionnaire. Since 2010, leaders have also conducted an annual mandatory legal and ethical behavior refresher course for all employees, volunteers, and key partners and suppliers.</p>		a(2)
	<p>Executive Leadership Team (ELT) members encourage frank, two-way communication through methods (Figure 1.1-2) that include an online journal for each school and, for parents and other customers, the superintendent's district updates through various forms of social media. In 2010, through the Improvement and Innovation Engine (IIE) process, the ELT enhanced the Communication Plan to ensure more systematic leader communication and to engage the workforce, volunteers, students, key</p>	<p>Cited by 7 examiners. Added aspects of 3 examiners' comments about enhanced communication plan.</p>	b(1)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	customers, and stakeholders.		
	In support of the strategic advantage of a focused, engaged workforce, senior leaders create an environment for performance leadership and personal learning. Mechanisms include monthly ELT performance reviews, the sharing of monthly organizational performance with the workforce, and participation in succession planning. In addition, ELT and Building Leadership Team (BLT) members encourage staff members to pursue personal education and development through the Learning and Development System.		a(3)

Notes

All strength comments used. a(3) strength modified so as to not conflict with added 1st sentence in OFI on innovation.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	It is not clear how senior leaders systematically create an environment for innovation and intelligent risk taking. For example, it is unclear how ideas submitted for Innovation Award consideration are reviewed, supported, and assessed for alignment with the applicant's mission and strategies. Without a systematic approach in this area, senior leaders may be limited in their ability to demonstrate how the district embraces innovation and change, a PhilP.	Added lack of evidence of a systematic approach to innovation and intelligent risk taking and used BIA as an example. This was done after a conference call with 3 examiners.	b(2)

Notes

Strengthen b(2) OFI to include lack of evidence of systematic approaches to innovation and intelligent risk taking. Supported after a phone conf. with 3 examiners.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%
 Score Value: 60
 Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Scores: 80 70 70 65 65 60 50
 Changed score from 70 to 60 because of the strengthening of the OFI on innovation and intelligent risk taking.

Item Worksheet—Item 1.2

Governance and Societal Responsibilities

Relevant Key Factors

1. Policy set by elected, 5-member school board. Board committees (aligned w/SOs, 2.1b[2]): engagement, stewardship (financial), wellness, communication
2. Current superintendent hired one year ago. Appointed by board; reports to board, runs district pursuant to board policies
3. Local Community: (1) communication; (2) district schools as good partners with the community (3) efficient, effective, and economical educational programs
Volunteers: (1) communication; (2) recognition
4. Regulatory: State/federal statutes (e.g., Child Nutrition, Fair Labor Standards, Title 1), ADA, FMLA, IDEA, IRS, NAEP, OSHA, and SDE. FERPA for student privacy/confidentiality
5. Treasurer: Appointed by board; reports to board
6. Accreditation: Through SDE performance rating; curriculum based on mandated state standards. Rated “Excellent with Distinction” by achieving AYP since 2008
7. SC-4: Engagement of workforce members to give back to community
8. SA-3: Great community support and communication

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	Systematic, well-deployed governance processes help the applicant achieve accountability, transparency, and fiscal accountability, as well as protect stakeholder interests. Examples of mechanisms include the dashboard (which is public); a system of internal and external audits; state audits and the applicant’s treasurer, who reports directly to the board; a publicly elected board; and inclusion of stakeholders in the SPP.		a(1)
	Improved approaches for strengthening key communities support the applicant’s strategic advantage of community support and communication. In 2011, for example, the applicant identified the need to better identify, support, and strengthen its local communities and thus established the Good Resident Program, which allows the applicant to determine which communities to serve and how best to serve them.		c(2)
	To promote and ensure ethical behavior, ELT members use multiple methods (Figure 1.2-3), including ethics training for the workforce, suppliers, and partners during New Employee Orientation and the annual ethics review. In addition, ethics scenarios posted on the district’s intranet provide advice on appropriate responses to typical situations. Labor and partner/supplier agreements indicate zero tolerance for Code of Conduct and ethical violations.	Listed by 3 examiners.	b(2)
	To improve organizational leadership, the applicant systematically includes an evaluation of the performance		a(2)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	of senior leaders and the board in the Leadership System. In senior leaders' evaluation, they set five top goals, with measurements and associated leader bonus levels, and identify two skills to improve. The board's self-evaluation was recently refined to include how well it evaluates executive performance and enhances the board's effectiveness.		

Notes

All R2 comments incorporated except:
 1. 1 examiner asked that a relevance statement be connected to a PhilP.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	Beyond listening to feedback and including stakeholders in the SPP, it is not clear how the applicant systematically anticipates public concerns as opposed to addressing them after they occur. A systematic approach in this area may help the applicant address the community requirement of being a good partner.	Listed by 5 examiners.	b(1)
	It is unclear how the applicant evaluates and improves many of its governance processes. For example, the program that engages senior leaders in annual legal and ethical refresher courses, as well as senior leaders' performance review process, does not appear to have been assessed. It is also unclear how the applicant evaluates processes that ensure transparency and accountability.		a, b, c

Notes

All comments used in some form except:

1. 1 examiner asked if "ethical breaches" rises to the level of an OFI. I do not think so because the app. explains it asks the local county attorney's office to investigate breaches. Also, in the last 5 years there has been only 1 reported breach and none in the last three (Figure 7.4-11).
2. 1 examiner asked about an OFI relating to "social/economic system." Since there is a strength in this area and in 7.4, an OFI would be in conflict.
3. 1 examiner asked about an OFI related to the lack of evidence that the leadership goals are related to the SPP. 1 examiner had mentioned it in the R1. I could not find how this OFI language would relate to the Criteria language in 1.2.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%
 Score Value: 55
 Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Range of scores: 40 45 45 55

60 60 65 70

Why not below range: Approaches are at the overall requirement levels, well deployed in organization, evidence of learning and well integrated with MVV.

Why not above this range: Although most approaches are at the multiple requirement level, the OFI raises issues of deployment with a significant gap.

Item Worksheet—Item 2.1

Strategy Development

Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision—To provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018
2. We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
3. We embrace innovation and change.
4. Stakeholders: Parents (families), local community, volunteers
5. **Core Competencies—**
 - CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children
 - CC-2: Application of instructional technology/computer learning as sources of tailored instruction matched to students’ individual needs
 - CC-3: Curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum
6. **Competitive Changes—**Key changes:
 - State funding formula (reduces funds for schools) [SC-1]
 - Depressed economy; lack of tax dollars for schools [SC-1]
 - Online charter school’s potential for collaboration/competition [SA?]
 - Zero-based budgeting (deployed in 2015) [SA?]
 - Online charter school: opportunity to collaborate w/school districts/home schools to explore customer interest in online education [SA?]
7. **Strategic Challenges (Figure P.2-1)—**
 - Educational programs/services: SC-1: State funding formula/uncertainty, SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings
 - Operations: SC-3: Cost containment
 - Societal Responsibility: SC-4: Engagement of workforce members to give back to the community
 - Workforce: SC-5: Competitors wishing to hire applicant’s engaged workforce
8. **Strategic Advantages (Figure P.2-1)—**
 - Educational programs/services: SA-1: Community support for levies
 - Operations: SA-2: Culture of innovation among employees
 - Societal Responsibility: SA-3: Great community support and communication
 - Workforce: SA-4: Engaged workforce focused on student achievement and learning

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	Annual review of and subsequent improvements to the applicant’s systematic SPP reflect the need for organizational agility and operational flexibility. Leaders review the plan before the academic year ends, allowing the applicant to begin the next academic year with district-level plans in place. The planning time horizon was reduced to one year in recognition of ongoing changes in school funding, demographics, staffing, and state mandates that are issued multiple times during the year.	Cited all examiners as a strength— Yearlong, four-part SPP (Figure 2.1-1) culminates in one-day strategic planning meeting. —District-, building-, and department-level actions plans derive from SP; specifically, members of the ELT, SLT, and ALT review the SP prior to close of AY, which allows APP to begin the next AY with district-level plans in place, allowing building- and dept.-level plans to be developed in first weeks of AY. —SPP demonstrates cycles of learning and improvement; SPP time horizon was	a(1)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
		<p>reduced from 5-year to 1-year planning process in recognition of ongoing changes in school funding, demographics, staffing, and state mandates that are issued multiple times during the year</p> <p>—SPP began in 1996 using the Cambridge Model for planning and then adopted Baldrige in 2003.</p>	
	<p>The applicant creates an environment that supports innovation through regular environmental scans and analyses of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT). These analyses encompass core questions (CQs) that certified instructional teachers use to assess students' academic progress and that classified and administrative workforce members use to assess customer services. As appropriate, the results of the CQ Process are incorporated into pilot projects, and strategic opportunities are identified by aligning the results of the CQ Process with strategic challenges.</p>	<p>Cited by 3 examiners.</p> <p>APP creates an environment that supports innovation thru planning process and regularly recurring environmental scans and SWOT analyses conducted by SLT.</p> <p>—SWOT analyses align with district's CCs and encompass CQs that certified instructional teachers use to assess students' academic progress and that classified and administrative workforce members use to assess customer services.</p> <p>—CQ Process (Figures 2.1-2 and 2.1-3) encourages innovation thru understanding of needs and satisfaction of stakeholder groups; ELT members review results and incorporate solutions into pilot projects.</p> <p>—Applicant identifies key strategic opportunities by aligning results of CQ Process and strategic challenges.</p>	a(2)

Notes

R3—removed a(4) strength—Did not use the 2.1b(1) comments cited by 3 examiners —these may be in conflict with the b(1) OFI—2/27/14 Post feedback note on a(4) strength—it's essentially a “did the applicant list something in the application” strength. If it provides no value, I would support removing it.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	<p>It is not clear how the applicant's four strategic objectives align with the balanced scorecards used by the district, buildings, and departments to consider and balance the needs of all key stakeholders. Systematic alignment may help the district run its schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving limited resources and focusing on producing the best student learning (a PhilP).</p>	<p>Cited by 5 examiners.</p> <p>—No evident alignment of strategic objective considerations with balanced scorecards used by district, buildings, and departments to consider and balance the needs of all key stakeholders.</p> <p>R1 update—applied feedback from 3 examiners on B OFI.</p>	b
	<p>It is not evident how the applicant collects data and analyzes district-, building-, and</p>	<p>6 examiners cited in IR.</p>	a(3)

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>department-level balanced scorecards to review the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and alignment of data and information used in the SPP. Systematic processes in this area may help the district use balanced scorecards effectively to develop information on progress in executing its strategic plan and achieving its objectives.</p>	<p>The applicant says it determines strategic challenges and advantages, risks to sustainability, potential blind spots, and its ability to execute the plan in its SPP.</p> <p>But the applicant never says how it does these things within the SPP. It was very blurry, at best. And sometimes the response just didn't address the issue.</p> <p>The Criteria ask for how you "...collect and analyze relevant data... [for these things]" and the applicant didn't get into any description of all for that. So I can't give benefit of the doubt on this.</p> <p>Relevance—Without these approaches, the applicant may not be able to keep abreast of changes in its environment and adjust strategy to meet those changes.</p>	
	<p>It is not evident how the applicant decides which key processes will remain internal and which will be accomplished by external partners and suppliers. A process in this area—combined with the applicant's stated processes for choosing and evaluating vendors, once this decision is made—may help the applicant manage costs while not harming student achievement.</p>	<p>Cited in part by 4 examiners—1 examiner has an a(4) comment, but I believe it really is a b(2) comment</p> <p>See comments on strength; may need to discuss at consensus.</p> <p>Although the SLT and ALT review the performance of key suppliers and partners, and the IIE uses DMADV and DMAIC for internal as well as external partnership processes,</p> <p>They do say that MVV are used to decide whether or not to partner; that is too vague for me to give benefit of the doubt.</p> <p>I've reread this section several times and the response was just too blurry to give benefit of the doubt.</p> <p>Relevance—This may impact the applicant's ability to partner to manage costs while not negatively impacting student achievement.</p>	<p>a(4)</p>

Notes

R3—made edits to a(3) OFI—There are two a(2) OFIs (2 examiners) on the innovation process—these weren't used, they may be in conflict with a(2) strength.

1 examiner has an a(2) OFI comment on intelligent risk; this may be prescriptive as written.

There's one a(1) OFI not used. It might be in conflict with the unanimous a(1) strength comment.

Scoring

Score Range: 30–45%

Score Value: 45

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Individual scores ranged from 35 to 65, with an average in the mid-50s. There's a balance of 2 strengths and 3 OFIs. Processes are not fully deployed, and while there aren't any OFIs focused on learning, it's not evident that systematic learning is occurring.

Item Worksheet—Item 2.2

Strategy Implementation

Relevant Key Factors

1. Mission—Inspiring others to learn and succeed
Vision—To provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018
Values—The Applicant School Way
2. We believe that students, teachers, principals, and parents are accountable for student performance, not just the student.
3. We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
4. SA-4: Engaged workforce focused on student achievement and learning
5. SC-1: State funding formula/uncertainty
6. SC-3: Cost containment
7. Zero-based budgeting (deployed in 2015)
8. **Key Communic. Mechanisms with Partners/Suppliers**—Strategic plan deployment sessions
9. Education sector comparative data for academic performance, customer satisfaction, workforce satisfaction and engagement, and financial and market results

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>Reflecting an improvement in action planning to help ensure BLTs’ understanding and support of the strategic plan, the ELT and Strategic Leadership Team (SLT) members confirm the four strategic objective areas and define actions to promote the applicant’s mission, vision, values, and objectives. This step may enhance the understanding of the plan and thus the development of action plans.</p>	<p>Cited in part by 4 examiners —this may be in conflict with 3 similar OFIs.</p> <p>Here is one rationale that supports keeping this as a strength:</p> <p>—SPP four objective areas are engagement, communication, stewardship (financial), and wellness [ARE THESE THE AREAS USED IN CONSTRUCTING DISTRICT, BUILDING, AND DEPARTMENT BALANCED SCORECARDS?]</p> <p>—ELT/SLT review of alignment of SPP objective areas with MVV is evidence of learning/refining the process</p> <p>—SLT has four committees—one for each strategy area [WHAT DO THESE COMMITTEES DO?]</p>	a(1)
	<p>To support its engaged workforce—a strategic advantage—the applicant proactively ensures that its workforce plans support and address any needed changes. For example, through surveys and data and budget analysis, the applicant takes a proactive approach to workforce capacity and uses a “vertical teamwork” approach to ensure that instructional staff can be allocated to areas of greatest need.</p>	<p>Cited by 3 examiners—each selected as their 2.2 comment. There are also 3 conflicting potential OFIs that are not being used for the rationale stated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant indicates key workforce plans in Figure 2.2-3. • It describes how it deals proactively with potential changes. • Instructional staff are encouraged to 	a(4)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
		obtain multiple certifications. • Vertical teamwork.	

Notes

Didn't use a(3), a(5), and b (1 examiner) strength comments because they appeared to be in conflict with the OFIs identified. Although there isn't currently an OFI for a(6), there could be and an a(6) strength—cited by just 1 examiner.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>It is unclear how the applicant manages the financial and other risks associated with the plan to ensure financial viability, such as the zero-based budgeting process. A systematic approach in this area may help the applicant manage the impact of the state funding formula and cost containment, both strategic challenges.</p>	<p>Cited by 6 examiners.</p> <p>—District budgets created by allocation of state funding and property tax income rather than thru a budgeting process.</p> <p>—Changes in tax base—based on inflation or deflation of property values—affects district's general fund balance.</p> <p>—Guiding principle of entrepreneurship [WE EMBRACE INNOVATION AND CHANGE?] is evident in its planning; therefore, district and new treasurer adopted zero-based budgeting approach to resource allocation to focus resources on strategic objectives (based on 2010 Baldrige Award recipient example [Montgomery County, p. 12 of application]).</p> <p>—State funding mandates can cause action plans to be cut short or eliminated in successive school years if budget needs to be reallocated.</p>	a(3)
	<p>The applicant's two key district-level performance indicators and balanced scorecard measures do not appear to align with the district's four strategic objective areas (Figure 2.1-4). For example, the indicators and scorecard measures do not appear to track wellness action plans or measures related to creating a separate philanthropic budget to support financial objectives. Such alignment may help the applicant run its schools like businesses, a PhilP.</p>	<p>Cited by 3 examiners.</p> <p>Applicant states that it ensures overall action plan measurement system reinforces organizational alignment through the quarterly review process in which all ALT members participate. At that time, balanced scorecards are reviewed for alignment as well as action plan accomplishment. The systematic step-by-step process for who and how this occurs is unclear.</p>	a(5)
	<p>The applicant does not report performance projections for key district-level balanced scorecard performance measures and</p>	<p>Cited by 4 examiners.</p> <p>—No projections for identified balanced</p>	b

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>indicators. Because the applicant reached its maximum allowable fund balance in FY2013 and higher balances in the future will result in reductions in state funding, these projections may reveal opportunities to address the strategic challenge of uncertain state funding.</p>	<p>scorecard measures, e.g., OAA Figure 7.1-3 OGT Figures 7.1-2a, 7.1-2b ACT Figure 7.1-4 SAT Figure 7.1-5 Staff retention Figure 7.3-5 Staff and student engagement Figures 7.2-2a, 7.2-2b, 7.2-6, 7.3-6-7.3-13 Partner and supplier performance Figure 7.1-17 Communication satisfaction Figures 7.1-9a, 7.1-9b Quarterly building budget surplus/deficit [no results indicated] Community service activities Figure 7.4-17</p>	
	<p>A systematic process to deploy action plans to parents—who are co-educators of students—and to suppliers and partners—who provide key processes and mechanisms—is not evident. For example, in the cascading of district-level plans to buildings, the relationship between Strategic Goal Cards and plans developed at the classroom level is unclear.</p>	<p>Cited by 3 examiners (twice) and 1 more. There are also conflicting strengths for this area to address. For the reasons cited below, I am recommending we keep as an OFI.</p> <p>These weren't addressed in the application.</p> <p>Relevance—Suppliers may help in addressing the strategic challenge of cost containment. Deployment to volunteers may positively impact student achievement or other goals.</p> <p>The whole process of cascading district-level plans to buildings was vague.</p> <p>Staff members then develop Strategic Goal Cards from what they are exposed to at Convocation and opening ceremonies...but this seems disjointed because the application says plans are also developed at the classroom level. I wish this had been tied together and made clearer. I was left with the impression that this was not systematic. At least not enough to give benefit of the doubt.</p>	<p>a(2)</p>

Notes

See rationales for reason for not using a(1), a(4) comments. Did not use a(6) OFIs cited by 3 examiners — this could also be added based on feedback from team.

Scoring

Score Range: 30–45%

Score Value: 40

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Processes that are not well deployed—balance of comments

Item Worksheet—Item 3.1

Voice of the Customer

Relevant Key Factors

1. **Student Groups**—Students (87% Caucasian, 4% Latino, 8% African American, 1% other); 17% qualify for free/reduced-price lunch based on low household income; 35 K–12 tuition students
2. **Student Requirements**—
 - Solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures
 - Workforce members who encourage discovery and inquiry, stimulate creative thought, and treat students fairly
 - Safe school environment
 - Involvement in curriculum development
 - Involvement in extracurricular programming and development
 - Communication
 - Access to technology
 - Technology-based learning
3. Parents (families): (1) Information about student educational progress; (2) engagement in decisions about student programming—both curricular and extracurricular
4. Competition: other school districts (3% market share), 3 parochial (6%), 2 private (3%), home schools (1%); 13% total market share [SC-2]; online charter school: 2% market share [SC-2]
5. Inclusive environments including some students w/cognitive and/or physical disabilities and regular ed. students; other special-needs students at preschool facility
6. SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	The applicant regularly improves its systematic listening processes (Figure 3.1-1) in alignment with its desire to be the best. Data collected from the various stakeholders are entered into the DASH System for review and identification of potential improvements. Senior leaders prioritize suggested improvements; this recently led to the incorporation of social media into the Communication Plan.	A1 was referenced as a strength individually or in conjunction with another item in 16 feedback responses. It was highlighted by every examiner. It was used as a final comment by 7 examiners.	a(1)
	The core competency of engagement is reflected in the applicant’s use of multiple monthly and annual electronic surveys to determine student and parent satisfaction, as well as in the monthly “How I Feel Today about Learning” and exit surveys. A key indicator for tracking the success of the engagement processes is school and event attendance.	7 examiners mentioned engagement processes as a strength for the applicant.	b(1)
	To determine satisfaction relative to competitors, the applicant conducts focus groups with students and parents who toured the district but subsequently chose a different school. Annual student and parent satisfaction surveys administered at other districts around the country	Highlighted by 2 examiners and used as a final comment by 1.	b(2)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	and across the state establish benchmarks for comparison. This approach may help the applicant address its strategic challenge of students choosing other educational offerings.		

Notes

b(3) strength not used due to OFI around dissatisfaction. Replaced with b(2) focused strength on listening to outside sources.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	It is unclear how the applicant’s process to collect, consolidate, and review student and parent dissatisfaction feedback allows ELT members to determine the root causes of such dissatisfaction. This may limit the district’s ability to capture actionable information to use in meeting students’ and parents’ requirements.	Listed by 4 examiners.	b(3)
	It is unclear how voice-of-the-customer (VOC) information aligns with short- and longer-term time frames for engagement action plans (Figure 2.1-4). Systematic processes to align VOC information with the applicant’s vision, values, and four strategy areas may help ensure achievement of strategic planning goals and support continuous innovation.	Listed by 3 examiners in one way or another through feedback.	a, b

Notes

Focused the b(3) OFI on how root-cause analysis occurs through the engagement processes.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%
 Score Value: 55
 Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? All examiners but 1 put the applicant in this range. Chose 60 due to the comments relative to meeting the overall requirements, but deployment varying in some areas.
 Following feedback, dropped score to 55.

Item Worksheet—Item 3.2

Customer Engagement

Relevant Key Factors

1. CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children
2. **Student Groups**—Students (87% Caucasian, 4% Latino, 8% African American, 1% other); 17% qualify for free/reduced-price lunch; 35 K–12 tuition students
3. Locations: Locations: 1 high school (1,000); 1 middle school (900); 2 K–3 elementary schools (550 each); 1 4th- and 5th-grade elementary school (600); 1 preschool w/children w/special needs (100); local 9–12 online charter school run w/other school districts
4. **Student Requirements**—
 - Solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures
 - Workforce members who encourage discovery and inquiry, stimulate creative thought, and treat students fairly
 - Safe school environment
 - Involvement in curriculum development
 - Involvement in extracurricular programming and development
 - Communication
 - Access to technology
 - Technology-based learning
5. Parents (families): (1) information about student educational progress; (2) engagement in decisions about student programming—both curricular and extracurricular
6. Competition: other school districts (3% market share), 3 parochial (6%), 2 private (3%), home schools (1%); 13% total market share [SC-2]; online charter school: 2% market share [SC-2]
7. SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	Addressing the student and community requirement of communication, the applicant improves support and communication mechanisms for students and other customers (Figures 3.2-1 and 3.2-2) annually in the SPP based on customer feedback. Improvements have included the differentiation of support requirements for students, parents, and the community based on whether the individual is paper-preferring or tech-savvy.	Mentioned by 6 of 7 examiners. Used as final comment by 3 examiners.	a(2)
	The applicant's systematic approach to identify current and anticipate future student and other customer groups and market segments may help the district increase its market share. For example, information collected throughout the year is analyzed during the SPP to identify current and potential student and other customer groups and market segments. In 2010, the applicant added a prioritization step to this process.	Highlighted by 5 examiners. Used as final comment by 2.	a(3)
	The applicant's process for managing complaints (Figure 3.2-3) helps address the number of students choosing alternative educational offerings, a	Mentioned by 3 examiners, used as final by 1.	b(2)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	strategic challenge. Complaints are entered, aggregated, and redeployed to the appropriate party for resolution. In addition, all staff members are trained in the service interaction protocol. The applicant uses findings from analyses at a variety of levels to improve processes, including the Complaint Management Process.		
	A focus on data in designing student requirements beyond the “standard” aligns with students’ requirement for a solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures. Specifically, in 2009, the applicant established educational program and service requirements—beyond state mandates—using the Shared Vision Development Process, including meetings to collect data from stakeholders on what students need to know in the 21st century.	Highlighted by 4 examiners.	a(1)

Notes

Edited a (1) based on feedback to be more focused on its current point.
 Don't see b2 OFI and strength conflicting as one can have a systematic process with certain questions within that process.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	It is not apparent how the Complaint Management Process (Figure 3.2-3) enables interactions to recover the confidence of complainants other than students (Figure 3.1-3). A systematic process in this area may help engage parents, a customer requirement.	Highlighted by 3 examiners and used as final comment by 2.	b(2)
	It is unclear how the applicant markets, builds, and manages relationships with students and other customers to meet their requirements and increase their engagement. Without systematic approaches in this area, the applicant may miss opportunities to address the number of students choosing alternative educational offerings, a strategic challenge.	Listed by 2 examiners and used as a final comment by 1.	b(1)

Notes

Dropped a(1) OFI based on feedback and a(1) strength conflict. Strength is more appropriate feedback for applicant.
 Original a(2) OFI deleted as it was connected to b(2) OFI and was redundant.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%

Score Value: 60

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? All examiners in this range. 3 examiners at 60 exactly with others at 65. Applicant does have approaches responsive to overall requirements with varying deployment in some areas, but also with some examples of improvement provided.

Item Worksheet—Item 4.1

Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance

Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision—To provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018.
2. We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning;
3. We embrace innovation and change.
4.
 - Key academic performance comparisons: ACT/SAT scores, similar-sized state school districts/local competitor school district, state top-decile districts, graduation rates, State Academic Assessment results, State Graduation Test results, State Academic Excellence Consortium.
 - Key student satisfaction/engagement and school operations comparisons: national, state, and county data, data from local competitor school districts. “Baldrige comparisons:” USPS, FirstExpress, hospital systems.
 - Key workforce satisfaction/engagement comparisons: Outside education sector—annual, national Best Career Location Workforce Engagement Survey results
 - Financial/market survey comparisons—data from SDE, other state agencies, Union Efficiency and Quality Center.
5. SA-2: Culture of innovation among employees; SA-4: Engaged workforce focused on student achievement and learning
6. **Performance Improvement System**—Management system includes core processes and a leadership system that follows IIE.

IIE: DMADV for new process creation, DMAIC for improving existing processes. Balanced scorecard system trends progress toward vision. PDCA/PDSA also used to improve processes.

Has applied Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence since 2003.

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	Systematic, well-deployed processes for reviewing organizational performance and capabilities helps the applicant run its schools like businesses, a PhilP. For example, the DASH system aggregates data from the various databases into dashboards that faculty and leaders throughout the district use to drill down into specific cause-and-effect relationships.	<p>R3: 1 examiner suggests the Learning provided by the applicant is from AY 08-09, which is older. It looks like it was identified as a best practice in 2010 and deployed throughout the org in AY 10-11... which is slightly more recent. Electing to keep it as an example of learning and also supports c(1, 3) strength regarding a systematic process for sharing best practices. 1 examiner also notes learning is an opportunity...and I agree. My sense is it is in the very early stages, which would be verified on site.</p> <p>R2: Three supporting feedback-ready comments from 3 examiners. No conflicting OFI Feedback-ready comments. 4 examiners have IR OFIs. Potential OFI could be supported for lack of integration</p>	b

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
		and responding rapidly to changing circumstances.	
	Systematic processes to select data and information to use in tracking daily operations and overall organizational performance help the applicant identify factors leading to improved student learning outcomes. Key organizational performance measures (Figure 4.1-1) are identified and aligned with short- and longer-term plans.	R3: Updated the “so what” to not read like an OFI. R2: Supported by 4 examiners. Focused strength on applicant’s approach for selecting and collecting data.	a(1)
	This applicant’s continued focus on sharing best practices and driving continuous improvement help keep the workforce focused on student achievement and learning. For example, blue performance levels on scorecards indicate best practices, and yellow/red results indicate a need for an improvement plan; each event is triggered after three consecutive cycles. Also, an annual Best Practice Workshop provides opportunities to recognize best practices.	R3: Added the annual best practice workshop. 1 examiner notes he’s not sure the applicant has a systematic process for sharing best practices. With the journal and annual workshop, and BOD since it is a small applicant (hence more informal interactions between employees), I’m giving credit here with a note to review on site. R2: Supported by 1 examiner feedback-ready comment and IR comments by 4 examiners. Focused comment on best practices and continuous improvement. Suggest best practices conference is not driving innovation. OFI IR comments by 2 examiners (comparative data and how IIE—Fig. 6.1-1 is integrated into PI).	c(1,3)

Notes

R2 overall balance of IR comments was 16+, 20-, and 2--. Did not use:
a(3) comments from 2 examiners were balanced by OFIs from 2 others—given the balance from the team and other strengths, elected not to raise this to the level of the final six.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	The applicant’s organizational performance measures (Figure 4.1-1) do not appear to align fully with the performance measures used in district-, building-, and department-level balanced scorecards (2.2a[5]). Alignment of these measures to support organizational decision making, continuous improvement, and innovation may help the applicant build its culture of innovation.	R3: No changes from team. 1 examiner notes this may be in conflict with the a(1) strength. Suggest this is focused on integration of selected measures to support decision-making while the a(1) strength is focused on the approach for selecting the measures. Thoughts? R2: 3 examiners all had a(1) included in their OFI feedback-ready comment; 1 examiner had IR OFI comment. Focused OFI on “using data and	a(1)

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
		information to support org decision-making, continuous improvement, and innovation.” Used 2 examiners’ feedback-ready comment as base. Kept as double OFI.	
	In the applicant’s use of key comparative data from the education sector (P.2a[3]), a systematic process is not evident for selecting relevant measures, including national top-decile comparisons, to support decision making and innovation. Such a process may support the applicant’s vision to provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally.	<p>Consensus: added “national ...including national top-decile...”</p> <p>R3: Modified the example to focus on the need to identify national top-decile comparisons to help the applicant achieve its vision. This supports the dearth of national comparisons found in cat 7.1.</p> <p>R2: Supported by IR comments (4 examiners). Merged 3 examiners’ comments and modified. 1 examiner strength IR comment not used— suggest applicant tells us where they get metrics, not HOW it selects them, especially in light of legislative and competitive changes.</p>	a(2)
	It is unclear how the applicant ensures that its performance measurement system can respond to rapid or unexpected changes, in alignment with its PhilP of embracing innovation and change. For example, limited IT resource availability to fully test the data management system when data fields are added during the year, as well as the need for approval by the director of technology, may indicate a lack of agility.	<p>Consensus: minor edits for clarity. R3: modified second sentence and changed the so-what to focus on supporting an engaged workforce focused on student learning (SA-4).</p> <p>R2: 1 examiner has one feedback-ready comment strength, and 1 examiner has strength comment (which is a nuance to the corresponding OFI). Three OFI comments from 3 examiners for agility. Applicant provides the technical repository for the data, but no mention of the processes by which the data is updated or supports agility.</p>	a(4)

Notes

R1 overall balance of IR comments was 16+, 20–, and 2--. Did not use these:

a(3) Feedback-ready comment from 1 examiner along with IR comments from 3 examiners. Comments were equally split between +/- . Felt selected comments will provide more value to the applicant.

c(2) comment from MH—did not rise to the level of the six.

c(3) comment from 1 examiner—deployment OFI for suppliers and partners—did not rise to the final six.

c OFIs by 1 examiner (comparative data) and 1 other (how IIE—Fig. 6.1-1 is integrated into PI) were higher level and not used given the comment for c(1, 3) on approaches.

Scoring

Score Range: 50-65%

Score Value: 50

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? R2: no change to score.

Overall scoring 40–60 in IR.

Above: gaps in approaches, minimal learning; and double OFI for approaches to use data supporting organizational decision making, and missing innovation.

Below: systematic approach to overall requirements and some opportunities for improvement identified.

Item Worksheet—Item 4.2

Knowledge Management, Information, and Information Technology

Relevant Key Factors

1. Locations: 1 high school (1,000); 1 middle school (900); 2 K–3 elementary schools (550 each); 1 4th- and 5th-grade elementary school (600); 1 preschool w/children w/special needs (100); local 9–12 online charter school run w/other school districts
2. We believe that students, teachers, principals, and parents are accountable for student performance, not just the student
3. We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
4. FERPA for student privacy/confidentiality
5. Stakeholders: Parents (families), local community, volunteers. Key collaborators: Other school districts that collaborate to run online charter school
6. **Key Communic. Mechanisms with Partners/Suppliers**—Strategic plan deployment sessions; Updates (superintendent blog); intranet; Senior leader e-mail updates; Appearancebook, Bird-Call; online journal (each school maintains its own); superintendent on social media
7. SA-2: Culture of innovation among employees

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	<p>Systematic data accuracy and security measures, especially for student data, help the applicant comply with privacy requirements. The Business Systems Network is available only to administrative personnel through specifically authorized on-campus workstations with fingerprint verification, and the School Network is available only to staff members, students, suppliers, and parents who have a “need to know.” Data are encrypted for privacy, and the IT department runs statistical analyses on data to ensure reliability.</p>	<p>Consensus: minor edits for clarity of the nugget.</p> <p>R3: 1 examiner asks if we should add FERPA to the list of regulatory agencies and are we within our bounds as examiners using it? I think given the widespread knowledge of FERPA and its applicability to education we are OK.</p> <p>R2: supported by 5 examiners (feedback-ready comment). 1 examiner’s OFI conflicts with other examiners—although specific processes are not defined for timeliness, accuracy, or reliability suggest BOD given small organization; IT Group subjects data and information to statistical analysis and internal reviews. Also, a best practice from a Baldrige award recipient is used to design systems to facilitate accuracy.</p>	b(1)
	<p>The applicant’s multiple, integrated approaches to transfer and share knowledge among internal stakeholders helps engage workforce members in collaborative planning and improve their daily instruction. For example, teachers share and acquire knowledge at grade- and school-levels forum. In addition, classified workforce members participate in process</p>	<p>Consensus: edited the nugget for clarity.</p> <p>R3: edits for clarity.</p> <p>R2: 5+ and 4– Feedback-ready comments provided—9 total out of 14. Strength related to transferring workforce knowledge and best practice sharing to internal stakeholders. Corresponding OFI</p>	a(1)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	review meetings within their building or operational groups.	is for deployment to external stakeholders. Conflicting OFI from 1 examiner—suggest providing BOD the approach defined with meetings, blogs, and storing info on servers is effective.	
	Continued review of hardware and software during the year, including alignment with the SPP, ensures the quality of these systems. The IT Group facilitates network-user discussion group meetings every quarter throughout the school year to get feedback on user-friendliness and reliability. In addition, systems are evaluated against the following year's SPP goals, and improvement ideas are solicited from Parent Organization (PO) leaders.	<p>R3: The applicant defines a systematic approach consisting of quarterly meetings and interactions with the workforce, PO groups, and various vendors. Given the size of the org. and no results provided for system uptime or help-desk tickets providing BOD.</p> <p>R2: Supported by 4 examiners. 2 examiners (how is uptime maintained and no processes defined) have conflicting IR OFIs. Suggest providing BOD for 1 examiner—nature of school district does not require “always on” availability and standard IT operational processes focus on system uptime. For 1 examiner, applicant does define focus groups, integration with SPP, and vendor input.</p>	b(3)

Notes

R1
b(4): did not use comment by 5 examiners—did not rise to the top.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	It is unclear how the applicant systematically improves its approaches to managing organizational knowledge, information, and information technology to support its culture of innovation among employees. For example, improvements are not evident in processes for transferring relevant knowledge for use in innovation and strategic planning, making needed data and information available, and embedding learning in the way the district operates.	<p>R3: Revised comment for clarity and align the examples with the relevance.</p> <p>R2: 2 examiners (feedback-ready comment) support learning OFI. In addition, included comments from 5 examiners for a(2) learning. It may be important for the applicant to understand it has a defined approach for improving processes, but no evidence of them being improved.</p>	a, b
	It is unclear how the applicant systematically uses the mechanisms in the Communication Plan (Figure 1.1-2) to transfer relevant knowledge to parents, volunteers, suppliers, partners, and collaborators. Systematic processes may help fulfill the applicant's PhilP that all are accountable for student performance.	<p>Consensus: revised last sentence for clarity.</p> <p>R3: Modified the example to reflect that it provides the “what” types of communication methods are used, not the “how.” This is a deployment OFI as the a(1) strength focuses on the transfer of knowledge between the workforce.</p>	a(1)

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
		R2: 5+ and 4– Feedback-ready comments provided—9 total out of 14. Focus of OFI is on deployment and includes support from Feedback-ready comments from 1 examiner and partially by 2 examiners' support. I've added specific examples from Figure 4.2-1 School Network Access Privileges highlighting potential gaps in what parents and volunteers see given the applicant's statements in its PhilP: We believe that students, teachers, principals, and parents are accountable for student performance, not just the student; and CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children. Given the number of comments, suggesting double.	
	It is unclear how the applicant makes needed data and information available in a user-friendly format to suppliers, partners, and collaborators, in alignment with its PhilP of running its schools like businesses. For example, these groups do not appear to attend best-practice sessions or quarterly focus groups run by IT.	R3: Revised this comment for clarity. This is a deployment OFI—no mention is made of how data and information are provided in a “user-friendly” format to the listed audiences. R2: Supported by 3 examiners. Given suppliers, partners, collaborators, students, and parents all play a part in student success, this is a potential gap to help the applicant to the next level.	b(2)

Notes

a(1): Comment from 1 examiner not used—suggest BOD. More detail provided in R1 comment rationale.
b(3): Two comments were not used—conflicted with strength and believe BOD can be applied to both. More detail provided in R1 comment rationale.
b(4): Comment from 1 examiner not used—did not rise to the top.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%
Score Value: 55
Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Consensus Call: revised score to 60 based on balance of comments.
R3: removed double OFI giving three strengths and 3 OFIs; learning OFI is now in number one place. Suggested range is 50-65% with a score of 55. The learning OFI keeps it from going higher.
R2: Double OFI for a(1) and weaker strengths.
Above: gaps in deployment and learning
Below: systematic approach to the basic requirements with some overall met, some alignment with SPP

Item Worksheet—Item 5.1

Workforce Environment

Relevant Key Factors

1. CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children; CC-2: Application of instructional technology/computer learning as sources of tailored instruction matched to students' individual needs. CC-3: Curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum
2. 425 paid staff with various skills and abilities: 225 certified instructional teachers are 100% Highly Qualified Teachers (1% doctoral, 65% master's, 34% bachelor's). 175 classified staff, 25 administrative staff, 100 volunteers [including parents]
Race/ethnicity: Mirrors service-area demographics (90% Caucasian, 5% African American, 5% Latino/other); 85% live within school district.
3. Physical conditions of the workspace allow me to do my job; I am able to select benefits that meet my needs
4. I have sufficient resources to get the job done
5. **Workforce Health & Safety Requirements**—Regulatory: OSHA, SDE, FDA. School board policy, state legislature bills affecting education, service offerings required by IDEA and Free and Appropriate Public Education laws
6. SC-5: Competitors wishing to hire applicant's engaged workforce

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	The applicant's well-deployed approach to maintaining a highly qualified and capable workforce and to assessing capacity and capability supports the core competency of curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum. Capability needs for instructional staff and principals derive from districtwide performance on the state tests. Job performance goals aligned with district-level action plans determine capability needs for other classified and administrative staff. Student-teacher ratios and district standards determine capacity.	3 examiners mention processes for both capacity and capability while 1 examiner mentioned capability only and 1 examiner noted capacity only. Modified comment during R1 to show how capability needs are assessed through student achievement. This is brought out in a(2) as well. Workforce capability is addressed in 5.2c(1) where applicant discusses updating math skills of faculty based on student performance as an example. Moved this comment to first strength based on feedback.	a(1)
	Reinforcing the strategic advantage of a workforce focus on student achievement and learning, the applicant systematically bases recruitment on capability needs established during analysis of achievement data. The recruitment plan includes statewide advertising for seasoned teachers and recruitment at local universities for graduating students. Hiring decisions for building-based staff members are made at the school level, while district-office staff members are hired after a two-tier interview process.	3 examiners mention the systematic approaches. 2 examiners mention retention but this was not included since it conflicts with the OFI. Modified relevance based on R1 feedback. Included suggested edits from tech review.	a(2)

Notes

Strengths not used: b(2)—3 examiners mention the applicant has a list of benefit choices; this is a weak strength, a(4)—2 examiners discuss workforce reductions for instructional staff can be mitigated through dual certification. This is also a weak strength and may be confusing compared to OFI. a(3)—1 examiner says have processes to leverage CC which conflicts with OFI. b(1)—3 examiners supported measures for security, requirement to meet state standards, and workforce survey. I believed a(2) was a more cohesive strength to use instead of b(1).

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>It is not clear how the deployment of instructional staff by grade level leverages the applicant's core competencies of instructional technology for tailored instruction and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum. Deploying staff in a way that capitalizes on core competencies may reveal opportunities to strengthen these areas of greatest expertise.</p>	<p>Mentioned by 5 examiners—2 mentioned the missing core competencies (CC-2 and CC-3), 2 examiners mentioned team approach alone does tie back to a systematic approach and 1 examiner noted there is no evidence to show how it is exceeding expectations. All mentioned the lack of a process. Simplified opening statement and modified relevance based on R2 feedback.</p>	a(3)
	<p>It is not clear how the applicant's key workforce plans (Figure 2.2-3), the monitoring of workforce demographic characteristics, and the continuous improvement of climate and engagement factors contribute to the diversity and retention of new workforce members. For example, it is not apparent how increased staff development and/or taking coursework impacts retention. A systematic approach may strengthen the strategic advantage of an engaged workforce focused on student achievement and learning.</p>	<p>Five examiners mentioned this: 4 mentioned the lack of a process for retention of employees, 3 examiners also specifically brought out that it is not clear that the hiring process addresses the diverse ideas and cultures of the hiring and student communities.</p> <p>Removed portion of comment on diverse thinking based on consensus feedback.</p>	a(2)
	<p>Evaluation and improvement of processes to build an effective and supportive workforce environment—such as processes around benefits and total compensation, workforce security and accessibility, recruitment, workforce capacity, and retention—are not evident. Such evaluation and improvement may contribute to the culture of innovation among employees, a strategic advantage.</p>	<p>2 examiners mention no evidence of learning or how the applicant does improvement for workforce processes. Moved learning comment to third position based on consensus feedback.</p>	a, b
	<p>A systematic, well-deployed process to prevent workforce reductions for noninstructional staff and minimize the impact of such reductions is not apparent. Such an approach may help mitigate the strategic challenge of competitors wishing to hire the applicant's workforce.</p>	<p>5 examiners address this—noting that there is no systematic process. The applicant mentions encouraging instructional staff to gain dual certification and 2 examiners note non-instructional staff are not mentioned at all. Placed “noninstructional staff” in opening nugget per R1 feedback. Removed “action plans” and cleaned up relevance statement per R2 feedback</p>	a(4)

Notes

1 examiner thought a(3) comment should be bolded, but the other four did not—am not recommending this comment for bolding.

OFls not used: a(1)—3 examiners mention staffing for principals, custodians etc. and if the processes really relate to workforce or individuals. I didn't use this because the others outweighed this one, and I felt learning was a stronger OFI. (b)—1 examiner mentions lack of processes on volunteers—this is great observation and it may be worth discussing if this should be included as 20% of workforce are volunteers. b(1)—1 examiner says safety committee may be a reaction to recent events like Sandy Hook, 1 examiner says environmental factors don't differentiate between facilities. These are way into the multiple requirements, and the applicant still needs approaches. 1 examiner mentions performance measures for health and accessibility which are listed in Fig 7.3-3 and 7.3-6.

Scoring

Score Range: 30–45%

Score Value: 40

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Shouldn't be in 50–65 because approaches are not well-deployed, very little learning outside of safety procedures being updated, some integration with SPP.

Shouldn't be in 10–25 because they have some approaches into the multiple requirements, deployment is there for instructional and administrative staff and they have some alignment.

Item Worksheet—Item 5.2

Workforce Engagement Relevant Key Factors

1. CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children
2. 425 paid staff with various skills and abilities: 225 certified instructional teachers are 100% Highly Qualified Teachers (1% doctoral, 65% master’s, 34% bachelor’s). 175 classified staff, 25 administrative staff, 100 volunteers [including parents]
3. Two organized bargaining units: State Teachers Union, State Classified Staff Union
4. **Workforce Engagement Elements—**
 - The work I do gives me a sense of personal accomplishment;
 - I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills;
 - I can contribute to decision making in my school or work unit;
 - I can see the impact of my work in my school or work unit;
 - Reward and recognition in my workplace are based on how well we do our jobs;
 - Participating in the professional learning community helps me improve my teaching skills;
 - Participating in collaborative planning with my peers helps me improve my daily instruction.
5. Volunteers: (1) communication; (2) recognition
6. SC-5: Competitors wishing to hire applicant’s engaged workforce;
7. SA-2: Culture of innovation among employees
8. SA-4: Engaged workforce focused on student achievement and learning

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	The applicant’s systematic determination and assessment of the key elements of workforce engagement promotes the strategic advantage of an engaged workforce. Annually during the SWOT analysis portion of the SPP, the ELT reviews the results of the Best Career Location Workforce Engagement Survey for all employees, along with other measures, such as turnover, absenteeism, and grievances. Opportunities for improvement are incorporated into human resource plans as necessary.	4 examiners noted the survey and focus groups under a(1) to identify the Best Location survey. 2 examiners noted the assessment using the same survey so I combined the two into one comment. Am leaving reference to a(1) because they determine elements of engagement through survey as well.	a(1), b(1)
	The applicant’s Performance Management System supports employee engagement and the alignment of goals across the district. All employee segments set goals that are aligned with district-level action plans, resulting in individual Employee Performance Plans (EPPs). The EPPs identify training, supplies, and other resources needed to accomplish the goals, and workforce members are expected to experiment with innovative methods to improve student performance.	2 examiners noted the PMS for high performance work, 2 examiners also noted the PMS supporting engagement and alignment of goals. Changed "workforce" to "employee" due to missing volunteer segment OFI.	a(3)
	The identification of professional development opportunities through the Learning and Development System (LDS) reinforces the strategic advantage of a workforce focused	1 examiner noted systematic processes to support organizational needs and personal development, 2 examiners noted the LDS is systematic to develop learning opportunities	c(1)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	on student achievement and learning. After an analysis of satisfaction and achievement data, the applicant identifies development opportunities that support organizational performance, build new knowledge and skills, and focus on ethics training. For example, an analysis of state testing data led to a redesign of math instructional methods to include teaching for concept mastery.	for workforce.	

Notes

Strengths not used: b(2)—1 examiner noted the statistical tools used to correlate engagement with organizational results and c(2)—2 examiners noted the three approaches to evaluate the learning. I felt these would not advance the applicant as much as the ones listed above.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	It is not clear how the applicant’s concept of “reciprocal accountability” systematically fosters high-performance work across all workforce segments. For example, it is not evident how this idea drives the workforce process of setting performance goals that relate to organizational goals or how the applicant’s communication methods support reciprocal accountability. A systematic process in this area my support the workforce requirements to have an opportunity to improve skills and contribute to decision making.	3 examiners noted that the process is not clear.	a(2)
	Beyond self-reporting of the adoption of instructional strategies and “watch list” observations, systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of the learning and development system is not evident. Such evaluation, in alignment with the applicant’s IIE framework for evaluating processes based on DMAIC, may respond to the workforce engagement factor of having a real opportunity to improve skills.	2 examiners note a lack of process to measure effectiveness.	c(2)
	The applicant’s approaches to manage, support, and assess workforce performance and engagement—such as learning and reinforcement of new skills—do not appear to include volunteers. Deploying these approaches to volunteers may strengthen the core competency of engaging parents as volunteers and co-educators.	I removed the OFI on b per R2 feedback and added this new one on volunteers. I crafted it on 5.2a(3) and c(1) because the process talks about the survey and the PMS but they don't mention volunteers. Removed the section of Best Location survey deployment to volunteers and included learning and reinforcement of new skills.	a(3),c(1)

Notes

OFls not used: a(1)—2 examiners mention a lack of process for determining factors of engagement because the processes were identified in b(1), a(3)—2 examiners mention lack of process for innovation and intelligent risk taking—I agree with this but the applicant is not mature enough for this to help them yet, (b)—2 examiners mention lack of learning and since I put this in 5.1, I didn't use it here, b(1)—1 examiner mentions lack of approach for using turnover, etc. I gave them benefit of doubt because they say they do it, b(2)—2 examiners for lack of approach to correlate results—I felt other OFIs were stronger, c(1)—2 examiners for addressing CC in LDS and support of Quality value—strength was used, c(3) 3 examiners for lack of approach. I could be talked into including this one.

Scoring

Score Range: 30–45%

Score Value: 45

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? The score shouldn't be lower because they do have approaches that are deployed to most workforce segments. There is alignment with SPP and action plans. It shouldn't be higher because the approaches are not aligned with all workforce needs, there is little evidence of learning, and the volunteer segment is mostly ignored.

Item Worksheet—Item 6.1

Work Processes

Relevant Key Factors

1. Regular education classrooms, vocational and trade classrooms and workshops, blended learning classes. All are inclusive environments including some students w/cognitive and/or physical disabilities and regular ed. students; other special-needs students at preschool facility
2. CC-2: Application of instructional technology/computer learning as sources of tailored instruction matched to students' individual needs
CC-3: Curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum.
3. I can contribute to decision making in my school or work unit.
I can see the impact of my work in my school or work unit.
4. Solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures
Workforce members who encourage discovery and inquiry, stimulate creative thought, and treat students fairly.
5. Access to technology
Technology-based learning
6. **Performance Improvement System**—Management system includes core processes and a leadership system that follows IIE.
IIE: DMADV for new process creation and DMAIC for improving existing processes. Balanced scorecard system trends progress toward vision. PDCA/PDSA also used to improve processes. Has applied Baldrige Education Criteria for Performance Excellence since 2003.

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>Systematic performance reviews facilitated by Bulls Eye data ensure that the operation of the applicant's core work process and its derivatives meets process and regulatory requirements. For example, Learning Monitoring Process data enable various analyses (Figure 6.1-2). In the "analyze" step of IIE, key questions probe the relationship of support processes to the mission-centered Learning Process. Each key support process has requirements and measurements (Figure 6.1-4), as well as a designated process owner.</p>	<p>R1: Based on 2 examiners' feedback, I combined the b(1) and (2) comments; kept a(2) comment. *****</p> <p>Consensus among all examiners: one double. Strength noted by all examiners: one doubled and four placed in first position.</p> <p>2 note as A, only; 2 note as ADLI; one notes as ADI, one notes as AD; one notes as AL.</p> <p>Related OFI noted by 3 examiners, who note that reviews of data are monthly and annual, not day-to-day. My proposed solution is to avoid a focus on day-to-day MONITORING of data in favor of adhering to Criteria focus on day-to-day OPERATION. Does this work?</p> <p>Deleted "and innovates" from penultimate sentence because of potential for emerging innovation OFI key theme. If an innovation OFI does not emerge as a theme, we might want to replace "and innovates" in this comment.</p> <p>CONSIDER COMBINING b(1) and b(2) TO CREATE A b(1, 2) COMMENT. TO FACILITATE CONSIDERATION OF THIS OPTION, I PUT b(1) and b(2) COMMENTS IN SEQUENCE.</p>	<p>b(1, 2)</p>

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>The applicant's use of the IIE (Figure 6.1-1) to design educational programs, services, and work processes, and its use of Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA) to improve classroom teaching and learning processes, supports the core competency of curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory curriculum. The IIE includes Define, Measure, Analyze, Design, Verify (DMADV; to create new processes) and Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, Control (DMAIC; to improve existing processes). Key requirements and performance data are entered in the Bulls Eye database to support improvement processes.</p>	<p>R3: Based on 1 examiner's R2 feedback and review of application and IR inputs, I revised the final sentence of a(1), b(3) S by deleting reference annual SPS review. I agree that it is unclear that all programs, services, and processes are systematically reviewed during SPS. Thank you for the feedback!</p> <p>R1: 1 examiner suggested using 1 examiner's IR impact for a 1b(3) comment, but I elected to avoid tension with OFIs in other Items on a lack of processes/results that demonstrate embrace of innovation and change.</p> <p>Strength for a(1) noted by 5 examiners; 2 note as ADLI, 1 notes as AI, 1 notes as ADI, 1 notes as AD.</p> <p>Strength for b(3) noted by 2 examiners; one notes AI, one notes AD.</p> <p>"Baked in" the applicant Quality value (desire to be the best), but left out reference to "innovation" due to insufficient evidence and examiner support.</p>	<p>a(1), b(3)</p>
	<p>The applicant uses systematic approaches integrated with the Shared Vision Development Process (3.2a[1]) to determine key educational program, service, and work process requirements that meet stakeholders' needs. In the "measure" step of DMADV, teams determine requirements based on customer needs and specifications that are retrieved from DASH, organized, and prioritized. Requirements are refined in the "improve" step of DMAIC. Each derivative of the Learning Process has additional indicators of efficiency, effectiveness, and productivity (Figure 6.1-2).</p>	<p>R1: Based on 2 examiners' feedback, I "baked" the relevance to meeting stakeholders' needs into the first/nugget sentence. The comment is stronger now that it "shows" the significance of the strength--although still in last place in our ranking of strengths.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Strength noted by 3 examiners; 1 notes AI, 1 notes ADI, 1 notes A.</p> <p>CONCERN: This comment is just "telling" the applicant what it does without "showing" a significance for the district's improvement journey. Changed in response to 1 examiner suggesting that the relevance of the comment is that these approaches help to ensure that processes will meet stakeholders' needs.</p>	<p>a(2)</p>

Notes

Backup and TL: What is your advice about combining the b(1) and b(2) comments? I think that four strength comments affects the balance of strength and OFI comments in a way that appears to inflate the importance of the strengths in comparison to the strategic importance of the OFIs we have identified; therefore, I suggest that we either combine the b(1) and b(2) comments, or drop the a(2). The a(2) comment might get covered in item 3.1 comments and, as written, it adds little value to the applicant because it "tells" rather than "shows" the applicant feedback of significance to its improvement journey.

Bottom line: Combine b(1) and b(2) OR delete a(2)? Or other ideas?

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	<p>The requirements of the applicant's core work process—the Learning Process—and of derivative key work processes—do not appear to align with the district's four objectives and their related goals and measures (Figures 2.1-4 and 4.1-1) or to leverage its core competencies. Such alignment may help the applicant ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of its most important value-creation processes.</p>	<p>R3: In consideration of 3 examiners' feedback, I rewrote the a(2) OFI, which is no longer doubled. Also moved Learning (a, b) OFI to top rank. *****</p> <p>R1: Added 6.1-1 and deleted CCs. *****</p> <p>OFI noted by 4 examiners: 1 for deployment to suppliers/partners, 1 for process to determine requirements, 1 double for CC and alignment w/indicators of efficiency/effectiveness/productivity), 1 for lack of alignment with SP/performance management); 1 notes ADI, 1 notes AD, 1 notes A, one notes I.</p> <p>This is an I comment.</p> <p>CONCERN: CCs are not mentioned explicitly in the Criteria. HOWEVER, as the Criteria Notes indicate, key work processes are the applicant's most important internal value-creation processes. The logic sequence I attempted to create in our a(2) comment is this:</p> <p>Key work processes and their requirements ALIGN with strategic objectives, which LEVERAGE CCs (2.1b[2]), and ALIGN with key perf. measures. LACK OF EVIDENCE OF SUCH ALIGNMENT=INCLUDE CCs in this a(2) Integration OFI--d</p>	a(2)
	<p>It is not clear how the applicant embeds opportunities for learning in the IIE and PDCA. For example, it is unclear how the scoring guides developed as measures of effectiveness for standards are systematically reviewed and refined. Evaluating, improving, and learning about the effectiveness of these processes may help the applicant respond to students' requirement for a solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures.</p>	<p>R3: NOTE, please, that we have a proposed Key Theme strength for learning. This OFI for learning about processes to design and manage educational programs, services, and work processes is an EXCEPTION to the evidence presented in our Key Theme. *****</p> <p>OFI noted by 3 examiners. This is an L comment.</p>	a, b
	<p>It is not clear how the monthly review of dashboard measures, monthly administration of the core student engagement survey, and annual review of all processes ensure that the day-to-day operation of work and support processes meets key requirements (Figures 6.1-2 and 6.1-4). Reviews that account for day-to-day operation may assist in ensuring that processes support the applicant in</p>	<p>R3: To clarify the distinction between our b(1, 2) OFI and b(1, 2) Strength, I revised the final sentence to emphasize ensuring DAILY operations meet process requirements. The earlier part of our comment notes that regularly recurring performance reviews are MONTHLY and ANNUAL. *****</p> <p>OFI noted by 4 examiners; 1 notes AI, 1</p>	b(1, 2)

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	delivering its key work processes.	notes A, 1 notes ADLI, 1 notes AD. This is an ADI comment.	

Notes

Comments unused: 1 examiner offered an OFI for a(2) about lack of evidence of vendors' engagement in processes to determine key process requirements. Based on examiner IR inputs, the alignment/Integration issue(s) for a(2) appeared to be the opportunity of greater strategic importance to the applicant than the deployment issue. I drafted the a(2) OFI as an Integration opportunity. In scoring, this doubled Integration OFI and a Learning OFI limit progress to the next higher scoring range.

Scoring

Score Range: 30–45%

Score Value: 45

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? R3: I left the score at 45%, even though the a(2) OFI is no longer doubled. My reason for not increasing the score is that the Learning OFI (a, b) keeps the applicant in the 30–45% range.

R1: Moved range down to 30–45% and lowered score to top of the lower range because of adjusted balance of strength and OFI comments and significance of (doubled) a(2) OFI.

Score not in 70–85% range due to lack of evidence of learning.

Item Worksheet—Item 6.2

Operational Effectiveness

Relevant Key Factors

1. to innovate
2. Two organized bargaining units: State Teachers Union, State Classified Staff Union
3. We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
4. We embrace innovation and change.
5. Safe school environment
6. Three-tier system to characterize vendors
7. SC-1: State funding formula/uncertainty
8. SC-3: Cost containment

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>Systematic supply-chain management helps the applicant mitigate the strategic challenge of cost containment. The applicant categorizes vendors as partners, suppliers, or casual suppliers based on the length and level of engagement and performance. Agreements include the district’s MVV and measurable performance expectations in contracts; performance is assessed quarterly. Partners provide best-price guarantees, participate in an annual review, and maintain a proactive quality management system.</p>	<p>Feedback used to draft R2: Added a “relevance” phrase at the beginning of the first sentence.</p> <p>Rationale used in drafting R1:</p> <p>Five team members, all except 2 examiners, cited this as a strength, and all but one of them cited it as their #1 strength.</p> <p>1 examiner had an OFI on this regarding lack of clarity how the applicant selects and provides feedback to suppliers. I think the quarterly performance assessments and the annual review cover this concern.</p>	b
	<p>Integrated approaches help the applicant ensure a safe operating environment and preparedness for emergencies. Mechanisms to ensure safety include annual and monthly safety inspections, with results reported monthly and root-cause analysis used when gaps occur. The Emergency Response Plan addresses multiple types of emergencies, includes collaboration with the local community, and calls for quarterly drills that are analyzed and evaluated for effectiveness.</p>	<p>See notes for all.</p> <p>Broad team support for including safety emergency preparedness as a strength with all except 1 examiner noting a strength for either or both safety (c1) and emergency preparedness (c2). Two examiners noted a combined strength. One examiner had separate strengths for c1 and c2. Three examiners had strength comments for emergency preparedness (c2) only.</p> <p>I’m proposing one combined c1/c2 comment because this strength is kind of a “check the box” kind of strength. I don’t think the applicant will get extra value from having two strength comments. But I’m very willing to draft two comments if team members desire that.</p> <p>Some noted OFIs here: One examiner doesn’t see how the ERP addressed continuity of operations and recovery from a</p>	c

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
		disaster. (But they do say they have a disaster recovery plan, so they get BOD.) 1 examiner sees more “whats” than “hows.” Another examiner has concerns the approaches are not systematic. (App said enough to get BOD with their responses. 50 page max. Small applicant.	
	In alignment with the PhilP of running the schools like businesses, the applicant minimizes the costs of inspections, tests, and audits by evaluating the need for them in a subprocess of the IIE. In 2012, for example, the applicant reduced the cost of Standards Clearing Assessments by administering them randomly for a subset of all standards mastered rather than verifying that every student had mastered every standard.	1 examiner noted this (especially the SCA example) as his #1 strength. 1 examiner noted the SCA example in a strength observation. One examiner noted the aspects of Criteria “a” other than “cost control” as a strength (cost control itself is widely supported as an OFI). This comment is getting a bit granular, but it sends a message to the applicant that we noticed they had an approach to the “cost control” Criteria item for the parts that aren’t “cost control.” I’ve always thought it was peculiar that the Criteria placed these other things in the “cost control” section. It’s just not how my brain sorts it out.	a

Notes

<p>Feedback to R2:</p> <p>Editing based on feedback noted from team members and the technical editor.</p> <p>No substantive changes to strengths. Had dialogue with several team members with suggestions and varied opinions. I believe we're in consensus heading into the consensus calls.</p> <p>Feedback to R1:</p> <p>Strength b—Added a “relevance” phrase at the beginning of 1st sentence.</p> <p>Strength c—No changes to R1. One examiner reflected on moving this comment to the bottom of strengths. I'm keeping it here because the last-ranking strength was so granular. But let's keep an open mind to this.</p> <p>Strength a—No changes.</p> <p>OFI a—No changes. Potential key theme.</p> <p>OFI d—One examiner wonders if we should double this. I'm leaving it undoubled because it's a bit granular. We were also torn as a team whether innovation processes are a strength (although perhaps a vaguely described one) or an OFI. This area has potential for a key theme. Let's keep an open mind as things sort out on innovation throughout the application.</p> <p>Notes in drafting R1:</p> <p>Two observations were not included:</p> <p>One examiner had a comment about cost control, but then listed the SCA example (noted above) as evidence. I'm not including this as a strength because it would conflict with a nearly unanimous OFI and the examiner may have written “cost control” instead of “costs of inspections, etc.” by mistake.</p> <p>Three examiners listed innovation management as a strength, although one says it's a close call on the borderline of an OFI. There was wide disagreement as to whether innovation management should be a strength or an OFI. I'm going to leave it off entirely and propose an OFI for a narrow portion of Criteria “d.” See the OFIs for a complete explanation.</p>

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	<p>It is unclear how the applicant's Shared Vision Budget Process, which balances the need for cost control with students' needs, controls the overall costs of operations, a strategic challenge given uncertainties in state funding. For example, it is not clear how the applicant works with its two bargaining units to control costs, given the significant portion of the district's costs attributable to wages and benefits.</p>	<p>Feedback to R1: OFI a—No changes. Support for doubling confirmed. Potential key theme.</p> <p>Rationale used to prepare R1: Note: I'm using my industry knowledge of school district cost structures to support the example of labor agreements.</p> <p>This is the runaway #1 choice for OFIs. And I'm going to double it since it relates to a significant strategic challenge.</p> <p>4 examiners listed it as their #1 choice. One examiner listed it as a component of a broader OFI for part "a." Two listed the more granular "unclear on how the applicant balances the needs for cost control against the needs of students," which I believe is covered by the Shared Vision Budgeting Process. But I think their comments are generally supportive of a broader "unclear approaches to control costs" comment.</p>	a
	<p>Once proposals for innovation have been implemented via the applicant's go/no-go milestones, it is unclear how the applicant decides to stop pursuing such opportunities. A process in this area may help the applicant maximize the impact on student achievement by aligning scarce resources with the highest-priority opportunities.</p>	<p>See notes.</p> <p>Many different opinions here. 3 examiners list innovation as a strength (although one says it's just over the borderline from an OFI). They cite the innovation teams that are formed and some of the inputs those teams use to do their work; that innovation is addressed in step 6 of the SPP; that the Baldrige Criteria are used; and innovation examples in Figure 6.2-1 to support their position.</p> <p>2 examiners support an OFI because it's not clear how the Baldrige Criteria are used, or (in one case) how members of the innovation teams are chosen and prepared.</p> <p>1 examiner supports an OFI because the description of innovation sounds more like continuous improvement.</p> <p>If I had to pick between a strength or OFI I think strength is supported more, However I'm proposing a different OFI proposed by 2 examiners: It's unclear how they discontinue pursuing opportunities to support higher priority ones. This is granular, but gives us an acceptable OFI for this section, I hope.</p>	d

Notes

Feedback to R2:

Made edits based on feedback from team member comments and the technical editor. One change removed the word “innovation” from the first clause of the first sentence (the “While...” sentence) so as not to give the impression that we were acknowledging any strength with respect to innovation.

No substantive changes made to the OFI comments. I believe the team is in consensus heading into the consensus calls.

Feedback to R1:

OFI a—No changes. Support for doubling confirmed. Potential key theme.

OFI d—1 examiner wonders if we should double this. I’m leaving it undoubled because it’s a bit granular. This area has potential for a key theme. Let’s keep an open mind as things sort out on innovation throughout the application.

Notes in drafting R1:

Several interesting comments not used:

1 examiner had an OFI on preventing errors and re-work because the applicant didn’t indicate how they deal with SWOT question #4: “What will they do if they haven’t learned it?” I give BOD here assuming this is covered in the Learning Monitoring Process. But it would have been a “knock it out of the park response” if they had addressed that.

2 examiners had similar comments about lack of learning and improvement for the approaches in broad portions of item 6.2. I saw enough snippets of improvement-oriented comments that I would not give an OFI here. But I would keep this in our hip pocket to explore on site.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%

Score Value: 50

Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Feedback to R1: Score supported. No changes.

Rationale used to prepare R1:

IR scores in the 50–65 range were supported by all but two team members (who were in 30–45).

I’m proposing 50–65, with a score of 55%.

The responses seem to relate (for approach and alignment) to the overall requirements (50–65) instead of the basic (30–45). There is some organizational learning (again 50–65). We had some deployment in the supply chain strength to warrant 50–65.

The 70–85 range is out of the question given its focus on the multiple requirements, “well deployed,” fact-based learning including innovation, and alignment with current and future organizational needs.

Looking at the comment balance: three strengths and two OFIs. One of the OFIs was doubled; the other was very granular. This supports the low- or mid-level of 50–65.

One of the strengths (c) could be split into two separate ones. If this were the case, we might go higher.

Item Worksheet—Item 7.1

Student Learning and Process Results

Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision—To provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018
2. We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
3. CC-2: Application of instructional technology/computer learning as sources of tailored instruction matched to students' individual needs
CC-3: Curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum
4. **Student Requirements—**
 - Solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures
 - Workforce members who encourage discovery and inquiry, stimulate creative thought, and treat students fairly
 - Safe school environment
 - Involvement in curriculum development
 - Involvement in extracurricular programming and development
 - Communication
 - Access to technology
 - Technology-based learning
5. SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	Some results relative to a local competitor, the state top decile, or both indicate progress toward a top 10% ranking in achievement nationally by 2018. Examples are the performance index (a key performance indicator; Figure 7.1-1), the percentage of 10th-grade students proficient or above on the OGT (Figures 7.1-2a and b), and graduation rates for the applicant and the online charter school (Figures 7.1-6a and 7.1-6b).	R3—minor edits for clarity and focus on comparisons. Also, left in the reference to Serendipity—the applicant called its processes out of scope; however, they provide results that are favorable. R2—favorable levels, trends, comparisons to state benchmarks in student learning and student-focused process results supported by 6 examiners. No conflicting comments. Made sense to give them credit for momentum towards their ultimate vision.	a
	Beneficial trends for several results demonstrate the applicant's PhilP of running its schools like businesses while producing the best student learning. For example, PPE (a key performance indicator; Figure 7.1-10) and Student-to-Teacher Ratio (Figure 7.3-2) demonstrate improvement in the performance of the student learning process. Improved satisfaction with the Shared Vision Development Process (Figure 7.1-13) and Student Performance Monitoring (Figure 7.1-15) indicates improved effectiveness in two key support processes.	R3—minor edits for clarity. R2—favorable levels and trends supported by 4 examiners. No conflicting comments.	b(1)
	Results for several key indicators of workplace	R3—minor edits for clarity. This strength	b(2)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	emergency preparedness (Figure 7.1-16) show beneficial trends, responding to health and safety requirements and students' expectations of a safe school environment. For example, scores for disaster-recovery drills in preparation for fires, tornadoes, lock-downs, and pandemic flu have improved as assessed internally and by the insurance risk assessor.	focuses on favorable trends. R2—favorable levels and trends supported by 4 examiners. No conflicting comments.	

Notes

R1: Did not use four strength comments for c. Mixed results, no comparisons. Chose to not mention.

a—1 examiner IR for workforce satisfaction with communication not used—did not bubble up to the top few.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	The applicant does not provide results for the number of students accepted to their first-choice school or the number attending college. Such results may help the applicant measure whether it is providing a solid education to prepare college-bound students for next steps in their futures, a student requirement.	Consensus: Revised comment to focus on some missing results related to preparing students for pursuing an advanced education. On page 36, first sentence in right column the applicant states “BCS considers it to be important to prepare students to be competitive in advancing their education.” Tied the relevance to the third CC related to college prep. curriculum. Included “some” in nugget to provide credit for the SAT and ACT scores which they may use as indicators of college prep curriculum. R3: Added “that leverage core competencies” to the first sentence and edited for clarity. This focuses the comment on identifying and monitoring core competencies. R2—Missing results supported by 3 examiners. No conflicting comments. Only three examiners had this as an IR comment; however, I think it’s important to the applicant to understand it needs to have a more complete set of indicators to better manage its organization.	a
	Comparisons to competitors, benchmarks, or industry leaders, which may help the applicant identify areas for potential innovation and change, are missing for some process results. Examples are results for student engagement and effective teaching processes (Figures 7.1-7a and 7.1-11), emergency preparedness (Figure 7.1-16), and partner and supplier performance (Figure 7.1-17).	Consensus: modified nugget for brevity and clarity R3: no changes. R2: missing comparisons supported by 4 examiners. No conflicting comments. Similar in feel to the first OFI for comparisons with the top decile, however broader in scope regarding breadth of comparisons for measures.	a, b, c

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>Results for student performance on the SAT and ACT (Figures 7.1-4 and 7.1-5) lag the national top-decile comparisons. This may indicate the need for progress in achieving the applicant’s vision to provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018.</p>	<p>R3—narrowed comment to focus on not meeting top decile for the SAT and ACT based on feedback from 3 examiners. Removed double and limited to 7.1a only and moved it to third position. In conjunction, also modified 4.1a(2) OFI to incorporate missing approach for selecting top-decile comparisons. Score is currently 50, suggest same range with a score of 60.</p> <p>R2—not meeting top-decile targets supported by 4 examiners. Good call-out since the applicant is after top-decile performance and provides limited comparisons by which to identify where they are on the journey. This is NOT about comparisons which is the a, b, c OFI. The key to this OFI is they do not know where they stand on several key indicators and for those they have comparisons, they are lagging.</p> <p>Given the critical nature of the indicators to the vision, this is doubled? Should it be?</p>	a

Notes

<p>Previous R3 (first a) Comment:</p> <p>The applicant may be able to provide a better education to its students by collecting and reviewing results for indicators of student learning processes that leverage core competencies. For example, results are not provided for CC-1 “engaging parents as volunteers and co-educators of children” and CC-2 “application of instructional technology/computer learning as sources of tailored instruction matched to students’ individual needs.”</p> <p>R1 a</p> <p>—First-ranked comment from 1 examiner regarding workforce attendance below students—should this be included in 7.3? Is it important enough?</p> <p>—IR comments from 3 examiners for lack of segmentation not used; did not rise to the top few.</p> <p>—feedback-ready comment from 1 examiner for inconsistent trends in several measures related to student learning and process results. In “a” strength used “some results” to incorporate comment.</p> <p>—IR from 1 examiner regarding student dissatisfaction not used—not one of the top few.</p> <p>—IR comments from 1 examiner on graduation rates and “I am challenged...” question were not used. A, b double OFI included reference to graduation rates for grad rates and “a” strength used “some favorable trends” to incorporate comment.</p> <p>—1 examiner IR comment on longitudinal performance shows adverse trends not used, did not rise to the top.</p>

Scoring

<p>Score Range: 50–65%</p> <p>Score Value: 55</p> <p>Why shouldn’t the score be in the range above or below the selected one? R3: Score was 50. Based on</p>
--

removal of double OFI suggest same range with a score of 55.

R2: IR scores ranged from 30 to 70. Given the balance of comments 3+/2-/1-- a score of 55 seems reasonable.

Below—applicant has performance levels beyond the basic requirements, beneficial trends are evident, some comparisons are used, results are provided for many areas of importance

Above—applicant is responsive to the multiple requirements, and is in the earlier stages of using relevant comparisons/benchmarks.

Item Worksheet—Item 7.2

Customer-Focused Results

Relevant Key Factors

1. Regular education classrooms, vocational and trade classrooms and workshops, blended learning classes. All are inclusive environments; other special-needs students attend the district’s designated preschool facility. 1 high school (1,000); 1 middle school (900); two K–3 elementary schools (550 each); one 4th- and 5th-grade elementary school (600); one preschool w/children w/special needs (100); local 9–12 online charter school run w/other school districts (100: opened in 2008, not included in application)
2. We treat our students as whole individuals, respecting what they bring to their learning experience and understanding their unique situations.
3. Students (87% Caucasian, 4% Latino, 8% African American, 1% other); 17% qualify for free and reduced-price lunch based on low household income; 35 tuition students in grades K-12
4. **Student Requirements—**
 - Solid education to prepare them for next steps in their futures
 - Workforce members who encourage discovery and inquiry, stimulate creative thought, and treat students fairly
 - Safe school environment
 - Involvement in curriculum development
 - Involvement in extracurricular programming and development
 - Communication
 - Access to technology
 - Technology-based learning
5. **Market Segments—**
 - Traditional public schools
 - Blended learning public schools
 - Private independent schools
 - Parochial schools
 - Home schooling families
 - Independent study
 - Online schooling
 - Tech-savvy stakeholders
 - Paper-preference stakeholders
6. SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings
7. Key student satisfaction and engagement comparisons and school operations comparisons: national, state, and county data, and data from local competitor school districts. Also, “Baldrige comparisons”: USPS, FirstExpress, hospital systems

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	Beneficial trends for student satisfaction support the applicant in retaining and attracting students in a competitive environment. Results improving over the periods shown include those for meeting student requirements, including “good education”; workforce members who encourage discovery and inquiry; involvement in curriculum and extracurricular development); good communication; and access to technology (Figures 7.2-1 and 7.2-2b).	Every examiner mentioned beneficial trends across the entire item.	a(1)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	Favorable performance relative to the national average, a Baldrige Award recipient, or both for engagement indicates some success in meeting the strategic challenge of students choosing alternative offerings. Examples are results for high school dropout rate (Figure 7.2-7), graduation rate (Figure 7.2-8), out-of-school suspension rate (Figure 7.2-9), and positive referral (Figure 7.2-10).	5 examiners highlighted this strength. Used as final by 2 examiners	a(2)
	The applicant reports good levels and beneficial trends for three indicators of student engagement—high school drop-out rate (Figure 7.2-7), graduation rate (Figure 7.2-8), and out-of-school suspension rate (Figure 7.2-9). These results support the applicant’s PhilP of treating students as whole individuals, respecting what they bring to their learning experience and understanding their unique situations.	Trends and favorable levels were mentioned in some way shape or form in every comment.	a(2)

Notes

Beneficial trends, as well as some favorable comparisons, were mentioned in some way shape or form in every comment. These appeared to be the two that rose to the top from a volume of comments addressing them standpoint. They encompass all strength comments.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	Results are missing for measures that might yield insight into how to retain families and attract families to the district. Examples are results for the key student requirements of stimulating creative thought, treating students fairly, and providing a safe school environment. Also missing are results reflecting the course of students’ and parents’ relationships with the district, such as those for newer students and parents and for longstanding customers.	Missing results were mentioned by 4 examiners.	a
	Several student- and other customer-focused results lack comparative data, such as competitors’ performance and benchmarks that provide a context for understanding the applicant’s performance relative to its values and mission. Examples are results for students recommending the district (Figure 7.2-2a), student engagement (Figure 7.2-6), volunteer satisfaction and engagement (Figure 7.2-11), key collaborators’ satisfaction and engagement (Figure 7.2-12), parent attendance at the student-led conference (Figure 7.2-15), and PO participation (Figure 7.2-16).	Every examiner mentioned the lack comparisons in a comment. Sector expert on team confirms that one would expect comparisons in these examples.	a
	Satisfaction measures are not segmented by student demographics or grade level, which may hinder identification of opportunities for	Segmentation is a standalone nugget. Examiner feedback leads to need for comment focused on the lack of results	a(1)

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	improvement related to specific student or parent groups. Some examples are students and parents giving the applicant a grade of “A” in areas such as “I can be involved in curriculum development” (Figure 7.2-2b) and “my child’s teachers expect my child to do well in class” (Figure 7.2-3).	revealing segmented data based on segments the applicant shares as key.	

Notes

OFI around inconsistent levels in some results within the same metric that reflects a potential lack of systematic processes or fully deployed systematic processes left out. Few examiners identified this OFI.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%
Score Value: 50
Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? All but 2 examiners scored in the 50–65 range. 2 examiners scored the applicant in the lower range. There is a lack of comparisons in several areas, which makes performance determination difficult. Good levels are not present in the overall, but the results with trend data do show good trends in several areas of importance to accomplishment of mission. Applicant is scored in the 50–65, but at the lower end due to these issues.

Item Worksheet—Item 7.3

Workforce-Focused Results

Relevant Key Factors

1. CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children
2. CC-3: Curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum.
3. 225 certified instructional teachers (100% Highly Qualified Teachers: 1% doctoral, 65% master’s, 34% bachelor’s). 175 classified staff, 25 administrative staff, 100 volunteers (including parents)
4. Two organized bargaining units: State Teachers Union and State Classified Staff Union
5. **Workforce Engagement Elements—**
 - Physical conditions of the workspace allow me to do my job.
 - I am able to select benefits that meet my needs.
 - The work I do gives me a sense of personal accomplishment.
 - I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills.
 - I have sufficient resources to get the job done.
 - I can contribute to decision making in my school or work unit.
 - I can see the impact of my work in my school or work unit.
 - Reward and recognition in my workplace are based on how well we do our jobs.
 - Participating in the professional learning community helps me improve my teaching skills.
 - Participating in collaborative planning with my peers helps me improve my daily instruction.
6. Key workforce satisfaction/engagement comparisons: From outside education sector—annual, national Best Career Location Workforce Engagement Survey results
Financial and market survey comparisons include data from SDE and other state agencies, and Union Efficiency and Quality Center [2.2b, p. 16]
7. Societal Responsibility: SC-4: Engagement of workforce members to give back to the community
Workforce: SC-5: Competitors wishing to hire applicant’s engaged workforce

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	Many results for workforce engagement are at or are approaching national top-decile levels on the Best Career Location survey. For instructional staff, these include results relating to workforce requirements (Figures 7.3-7, 7.3-9, 7.3-8, 7.3-11, and 7.3-12); for all employee segments, examples are staff turnover (Figure 7.3-5) and rewards and recognition (Figure 7.3-13).	6 examiners all mention the engagement charts either as overall item “a” strength or as a(3). Each mentioned LTC with I for workforce segments on some of the graphs. I am recommending bold on this since so many of the indicators are over and very close to top-decile on nationally normed survey. Relevance statement changed based on R1 feedback. Added “national” top-decile comparison.	a(3)
	The applicant’s results for capability and capacity show success in meeting the engagement factor of having sufficient resources to get the job done. Results for capability (Figure 7.3-1) show a beneficial trend, with certifications at or close to the goal of 100%. The student-teacher ratio has also improved and outperforms that of a Baldrige Award recipient for the elementary and middle school segments.	5 examiners all mention beneficial trends and favorable comparisons either as part of overall item “a” or as a(1). Relevance changed per R1 feedback.	a(1)

Notes

There were some individual charts that I didn't specifically mention but I believe this captures all the strengths noted in some form.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	The applicant does not provide many workforce engagement and learning results that may help the district assess progress toward the objectives of wellness, stewardship, and engagement (Figure 2.1-4). Examples are participation in nutrition and wellness programs, participation in professional and leadership development, watch-list observations, and findings from exit surveys and interviews.	Several examiners mentioned missing data: leadership development—3 examiners, wellness—1 examiner. 1 examiner suggested doubling and I am recommending this due to the number of data points that are missing. Removed reference to action plans per R3 feedback since covered in 7.4	a
	Some results—such as those for student-to-teacher ratios (Figure 7.3-2), staff turnover (Figure 7.3-5), physical conditions in the workplace (Figure 7.3-6), and participation in professional learning communities (Figure 7.3-14)—are not segmented by building, grade level, or workforce group. Segmented results may reveal differences in the related engagement factors of adequate physical conditions, sufficient resources to get the job done, and opportunities to improve skills.	Lack of segmentation by facilities and grade level was mentioned by 3 examiners, diversity was mentioned by 1 examiner. I didn't include volunteers (mentioned by 2 examiners) because they had a chart on volunteer satisfaction and engagement in 7.2. Moved previous relevance to nugget statement per R1 feedback. Moved comment lower to show missing results as most important.	a
	The applicant does not provide comparative data for some results related to progress in meeting the strategic challenge of competitors recruiting staff members. Some examples are the percentage of staff meeting certification requirements (Figure 7.3-1), OSHA and worker accidents (Figure 7.3-4), the percentage of staff receiving tuition reimbursement (Figure 7.3-17), and the percentage of promotions filled from within the district (Figure 7.3-18).	3 examiners mentioned comparison information.	a

Notes

I really struggled with the volunteer issue—we should discuss where to put this. I deleted the OFI on a(4) after further review. It was redundant with the comment on missing results. I increased the score to 40.

Scoring

Score Range: 30–45%

Score Value: 40

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? They do show beneficial trends and comparisons in key engagement factors beyond the basic requirements. However, they are missing other data and do not segment according to organizational structure.

Item Worksheet—Item 7.4

Leadership and Governance Results

Relevant Key Factors

1. Vision: Provide education that ranks in the top 10% in achievement nationally by 2018
Values: Applicant School Way:
 - Applicant Quality: Desire to be the best, to be courageous, to innovate, to demonstrate integrity
 - Applicant Golden Rule: Treat others with respect, treat others as you would like to be treated, demonstrate proactive student and customer (community) service
 - Applicant Character: Make learning fun, maintain perspective, celebrate success, enjoy work and have fun, be a consummate team player
2. CC-1: Engagement of parents as volunteers and co-educators of their children; CC-2: Application of instructional technology/computer learning as sources of tailored instruction matched to students' individual needs; CC-3: Curriculum design, counseling, and delivery of a college-preparatory educational curriculum
3. **Regulatory Requirements**—State and federal statutes (e.g., Child Nutrition, Fair Labor Standards, Title 1), ADA, FMLA, IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), IRS, NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress), OSHA, and State Department of Education (SDE). FERPA for student privacy and confidentiality
4. SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings
5. SC-5: Competitors wishing to hire applicant's engaged workforce
6. SA-2: Culture of innovation among employees

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>Results for ethical behavior and for senior leaders' communication reflect leaders' modeling of the Applicant School Way. The applicant reports beneficial trends (and some near-top-decile levels) for satisfaction with senior leaders' methods of communicating with the workforce, stakeholders, and students (Figures 7.4-1, 7.4-2, and 7.4-3). Other examples are results for stakeholders' trust in leaders and their integrity (Figures 7.4-13, 7.4-14 and 7.4-15), as well as results for ethical behavior (Figure 7.4-11).</p>	<p>Favorable trends for communication methods for the workforce (Figure 7.4-1), stakeholders (Figure 7.4-2), and students (Figure 7.4-3). Nearing top decile for workforce and stakeholder.</p> <p>Also favorable trends in workforce trust in and perception of senior leader integrity (Figure 7.4-13) from 2009-2010 to 2013-2014; national top decile reached.</p> <p>Favorable trends in ethical behavior results from 2009 to 2013 (Figure 7.4-11). Also for stakeholders' trust in leaders and their integrity has also grown; top-decile reached (Figures 7.4-14 and 7.4-15).</p> <p>Cited by 7 examiners, combined with senior leaders results on trust cited by 3 examiners as well.</p>	a(1, 4)
	<p>Results for several measures demonstrate effective governance. For example, the applicant reports zero findings for internal/external audits from 2010 to 2013, achievement of 100% compliance with IRS</p>	<p>Cited by 7 examiners.</p>	a(2)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	audits and COI forms (Figure 7.4-6), compliance with key regulatory requirements (Figure 7.4-7), and improving policy compliance (Figure 7.4-9).		
	Some beneficial trends demonstrate the district's benefits to society through Green Team initiatives. For example, results for consumption of gas and diesel and for the volume of recycling have improved, as have results for the balanced scorecard measure of community service activities—including staff contributions of money and volunteer hours to community agencies (Figure 7.4-17).	Cited by 3 examiners.	a(5)

Notes

One comment was originally not used; it was incorporated.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	The applicant does not present results associated with taking intelligent risks or strengthening the district's core competencies. Lack of results in these areas may limit the district in determining if it is maintaining its culture of innovation, a strategic advantage.		b
	Results for the effectiveness of senior leaders' communication with the workforce (e.g., Figures 7.4-2, 7.4-3, and 7.4-5) and for workforce trust/perception of senior leaders (Figure 7.4-13) lack segmentation (e.g., by building gender, age, and years of service). Such results may help the applicant pinpoint areas in which it particularly faces the strategic challenges of competitors hiring workforce members and students choosing alternative educational offerings.		a(1), a(4)
	The applicant does not provide comparative data for several leadership and governance results, including those for meeting key regulatory requirements (Figure 7.4-7) and for PPE vs. PI (Figure 7.4-19). Relevant comparisons may help the district understand the context for organizational performance.	Cited by 5 examiners.	a, b

Notes

All comments incorporated.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%

Score Value: 50

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Scores ranged from 25 to 65% on this item.

Not in range below because results respond to overall and multiple requirement, there are positive trends with some comparative info provided. Not in range above because good to excellent performance levels are not reported for all MULTIPLE ITEMS and there are missing comparative info for many items. In the lower end of the range because of lack of missing results and some comparisons missing.

Item Worksheet—Item 7.5

Budgetary, Financial, and Market Results

Relevant Key Factors

1. We run our schools like businesses, cognizant of conserving our limited resources and focusing on producing the best product—student learning.
2. **Competitive Changes**—Key changes:
 - State funding formula reduces funds for schools [SC-1]
 - Depressed economy; lack of tax dollars for schools [SC-1]
 - Online charter school’s potential for collaboration/competition [SA?]
 - Zero-based budgeting (deployed in 2015) [SA?]
 - 2014–2015: state/applicant to adopt Common Core Standards of National Governors Association Center for Best Practices
3. Uses education sector comparative data for financial and market results
4. Educational programs/services: SC-1: State funding formula/uncertainty, SC-2: No. of students choosing alternative educational offerings
Operations: SC-3: Cost containment

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	Some results indicate progress in addressing the applicant’s strategic challenge of cost containment. For example, fund balance as a percent of budget (Figure 7.5-3) is near the state-allowed maximum. In addition, PPE (Figure 7.1-10) has decreased to \$8,300 over the past five years, even while resources have been reallocated to instructional purposes. More than 85% of costs now go toward instruction, better than the state average (Figure 7.5-2).	Cited by all examiners.	a(1)
	The applicant’s market share (Figures 7.2-4 and 7.5-4) improved from fiscal year (FY) 2009 through FY2013, with approximately 85% of eligible students enrolled in the school district. These results may indicate the applicant’s addressing of its strategic challenge of students choosing alternative educational offerings.	Cited by 6 examiners.	a(2)

Notes

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	The applicant does not provide results for budget vs. actual or for number of financial plans by department, which are key measures for the objective of stewardship (Figure 2.1-4). Without these results, the	UPDATED based on consensus meeting discussion. Missing data cited by most of team.	a(1)

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	applicant may not be able to enact the PhilP of running its schools like businesses.		
	The applicant does not report market share results by its identified student segments (lower and upper elementary, middle, and high school students). Such segmentation may help the applicant identify the extent in each segment of the strategic challenge around students choosing alternative educational offerings.	Cited by 3 examiners. The applicant does not report comparisons for some indicators where they might be expected to be available. For example, carry-over fund balance (Figure 7.5-3) does not report results for other nearby public school districts. Market share performance (Figure 7.5-3) does not report levels or trends for competitor schools	a(2)

Notes

Did not use one comment from 1 examiner focusing on performance projections. Projections are only referenced in scoring guidelines in the 90-100 range.

Scoring

Score Range: 50–65%
 Score Value: 50
 Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one? Score changed to 50 in consensus meeting. Scores ranged from 25 to 55. Not scoring higher due to missing data and lack of segmentation.

Consensus Review—TST2014—Final 05/16/2014

Summary of Criteria Items	Total Points Possible	% Score	Score	Scoring Band
Category 1—Leadership				
1.1 Senior Leadership	70	60%	42	
1.2 Governance and Societal Responsibilities	50	55%	28	
Category Totals	120		70	
Category 2—Strategic Planning				
2.1 Strategy Development	45	45%	20	
2.2 Strategy Implementation	40	40%	16	
Category Totals	85		36	
Category 3—Customer Focus				
3.1 Voice of the Customer	40	55%	22	
3.2 Customer Engagement	45	60%	27	
Category Totals	85		49	
Category 4—Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge Management				
4.1 Measurement, Analysis, and Improvement of Organizational Performance	45	50%	23	
4.2 Knowledge Management, Information, and Information Technology	45	55%	25	
Category Totals	90		47	
Category 5—Workforce Focus				
5.1 Workforce Environment	40	40%	16	
5.2 Workforce Engagement	45	45%	20	
Category Totals	85		36	
Category 6—Operations Focus				
6.1 Work Processes	45	45%	20	
6.2 Operational Effectiveness	40	50%	20	
Category Totals	85		40	
SUBTOTAL Cat. 1-6	550		279	4 (261-320)
Category 7—Results				
7.1 Student Learning and Process Results	120	55%	66	
7.2 Customer-Focused Results	85	50%	43	
7.3 Workforce-Focused Results	85	40%	34	
7.4 Leadership and Governance Results	80	50%	40	
7.5 Budgetary, Financial, and Market Results	80	50%	40	
SUBTOTAL Cat. 7	450		223	4 (211-255)
GRAND TOTAL	1000	TOTAL	509	

Summary of Criteria Items	Total Points Possible	% Score	Score	Scoring Band
		SCORE		