Share Food
Scorebook

2007

National Institute of Standards and Technology
Technology Administration • Department of Commerce
Baldrige National Quality Program

Share Food

Scorebook

This case study scorebook was developed as an instructional tool for the 2007 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Examiner Preparation Course. A team of experienced Baldrige Examiners evaluated the Share Food Case Study, using the Independent and Consensus Review Process. The Share Food Case Study describes a fictitious nonprofit organization. There is no connection between the fictitious Share Food and any other organization, either named Share Food or otherwise. Other organizations cited in the case study also are fictitious, except for several national and government organizations. Because the case study is developed to train Baldrige Examiners and others and to provide an example of the possible content of a Baldrige application, there are areas in the case study where Criteria requirements are not addressed.

Share Food scored in band 3, showing that the organization demonstrates effective, systematic approaches responsive to the basic requirements of most Items, although there are still areas or work units in the early stages of deployment. Key processes are beginning to be systematically evaluated and improved. Results address many areas of importance to the organization's key requirements, with improvements and/or good performance being achieved. Comparative and trend data are available for some of these important results areas.

Recommended Scoring Ranges

Item	Scoring Range (%)
1.1	50 +/- 10%
1.2	40 +/- 10%
2.1	55 +/- 10%
2.2	40 +/- 10%
3.1	40 +/- 10%
3.2	30 +/- 10%
4.1	45 +/- 10%
4.2	45 +/- 10%
5.1	45 +/- 10%
5.2	35 +/- 10%
6.1	40 +/- 10%
6.2	45 +/- 10%
7.1	45 +/- 10%
7.2	43 +/- 10%
7.3	30 +/- 10%
7.4	40 +/- 10%
7.5	53 +/- 10%
7.6	40 +/- 10%

Scoring Range (points):   **425+/- 10**

Consensus Scorebook

2007

Examiner's Name	**Training Scorebook Team**	Number of Hours Worked	**Many**
Applicant Number	**2007 Case Study**		

Upload scorebook to *examinerdepot* by

Due date

Criteria, Score Summary Worksheet, and Scoring Guidelines Used:

X	Criteria for Performance Excellence		Education		Health Care

Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award

American Society for Quality

600 North Plankinton Avenue

Milwaukee, WI 53203

(800) 248-1946, ext. 7205

Key Factors Worksheet

To begin the evaluation process, review the applicant's Organizational Profile and the Additional Information Needed Form. List the key business/organization factors for this applicant, using the Areas to Address (Organizational Environment, Organizational Relationships, Competitive Environment, Strategic Context, and Performance Improvement System) in the order presented in the Preface: Organizational Profile section of the appropriate *Criteria for Performance Excellence* booklet.

In a change from the traditional process, please number your key factors rather than delineate them with bullet points.

P.1a Organizational Environment
1. A community-based nonprofit food bank that distributes food for the food-insecure
2. In 2002, organization exited food pantry and soup kitchen services to focus on food banking as core competency. Aims to provide best foods, at the right time, to the right place.
3. Fund and resource development is a second key service that is core to survival and growth
4. Paid employees and volunteers acquire, warehouse, transport, and distribute food to the food-insecure through partnerships with 58 member agencies.
5. Culture: We work hard because we know it matters. We think before we act to see if there is a better way. We care about each other and about the people we serve.
6. Mission, Vision, Values (MVV). Mission: A community-based food bank dedicated to feeding the hungry residents of its communities. Vision: Iowa's heartland is hunger-free. Values: We work together, we do what we say, everyone deserves respect, and we follow through.
7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees
8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.
9. Workforce key requirements: security; food safety; training; honesty, integrity, and accountability; regulatory and standards compliance; supervision/mentoring/guidance
10. Workforce expectations: focus on the MVV; respectful, nondiscriminatory communications and actions; collaboration and teamwork; stewardship of resources
11. Employee benefits include health and dental insurance and flexible work schedules; other benefits, such as in-kind gifts from donors, are shared equitably among employees and volunteers.
12. A donated 30,000 square-foot warehouse for food sorting, inventory, and storage can store up to one million pounds of food
13. Technologies: Uses FoodAnswers software from Food Banks of America (FBA) and Rapid Inventory Control Enterprise (RICE); an information technology firm provides pro bono hardware and software support
14. Equipment: refrigerators and other food storage equipment, two trucks, and one van
15. The regulatory environment includes multiple regulating agencies and standards to protect food, workers, and member agencies; food safety and the safety of employees and volunteers require tight controls

P.1b Organizational Relationships
16. Governance by a 12-member Board of Directors, including a county commission representative and a rotating member agency position, with five subcommittees linked to management functions
17. Major customer, stakeholder, and market segments and requirements:
    - Customers: member agencies. Requirements: timeliness; quality, variety, and quantity of food; competency and consistency; access to nutritional food; and continuity of service

- Stakeholders: county, city, state, and federal governments; Food Banks of America (FBA), the Food Bank Learning Collaborative (FBLC), and the Iowa Food Bank Association (IFBA); the Regional Network of Food Relief Agencies; and taxpayers. Requirements: accountability, cost efficiency, administrative cost reduction, dependability, and flexibility
- Community Segments: County residents, community groups, community leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, businesses, education entities, and volunteers. Requirements: effective response to emergency needs, cost efficiency, and meaningful opportunities to serve
- Donors/Suppliers: charitable foundations; corporations, grocers, and restaurants; individuals; The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP); and corporate contributors. Requirements: accountability; impact and integrity; a single point of service for deliveries; predictability of operations; coordinated management of donations; effective lead-time to meet requests; and proper food storage

18. Serves a six-county metropolitan statistical area (MSA) population of 500,000, with 75,000 client contacts annually. In this area, 8% of the residents are under age five (mostly urban), 13% are more than 65 years old (mostly rural), and 10% are below the federal poverty rate; there is a 13% unemployment rate; a third of clients receive federal food assistance services; and two counties have a 9.5% food-insecurity rate (above the state average).
19. Food suppliers and partners provide food, facilitate innovation, broaden the organization's reach, and improve core processes; finances and services suppliers and partners provide funds for food and activities, donate in-kind support, fund improved organizational capabilities, provide fiduciary controls, and volunteer.
20. Food safety and quality are intake supply chain requirements; on-time delivery and pick-up are distribution supply chain requirements.
21. Communication with suppliers and partners: The Agency and Industry Relations Manager and his advisory subcommittee meet with each supplier twice a year; suppliers are invited to an annual recognition event; and a twice-yearly regional network joint planning meeting includes agencies not currently working with the organization.

P.2a Competitive Environment

22. Competitive position: delivered nearly half of all food dispersed to those in need in Iowa last year
23. Demand for organization's services has doubled in the last three years
24. Competes with other social services for funds and volunteers; collaborates with these organizations in emergency and disaster relief
25. Key success factors (same as strategic advantages for this organization): its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, network of food suppliers, tight management of overhead costs (12.1% of operating expenses), and volunteer base. Other success factors: food availability and quality; fiscal agility; funding and food resources; organizational effectiveness; optimization of human, financial, food, and other resources; organizational learning, collaboration, and innovation; dedicated, experienced employees and volunteers; and the satisfaction of member agencies, donors/suppliers, and the community
26. The Corporate Contributor Program underwrites all indirect costs, enabling 100% of unrestricted funds to go directly for food and services.
27. Key changes: shifting groups of temporarily food-insecure persons, seasonal needs (e.g., related to school vacation times and migrant populations), and the doubling of Hispanic and Hmong populations in the past year. The nutritional quality of food, along with quantity, has become a key consideration in the past decade.
28. Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons, IFBA state comparisons, Assistance Now Finder, and collaborative FBLC regional data and best-practice sharing
29. Data limitations: incomplete or old data, time lags from government sources, inconsistencies in tracking and reporting systems, and manual data entry by volunteers (mitigated by the help of students and fellows)

P.2b Strategic Context

    30. Five strategic challenges:

- Ensure that food reaches those most in need, when they need it most
- Optimize human resources and partnerships
- Respond to member agency needs
- Obtain and maintain adequate financial resources
- Recruit volunteers from a broad range of age segments

P.2c Performance Improvement System

    31. Performance improvement system: Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Process

    32. Annual Baldrige self-assessment since 2000, state quality award application in 2001, received state quality award in 2005

Key Themes Worksheet

The Key Themes Worksheet provides an overall summary of the key points in the evaluation of the application and is an assessment of the key themes to be explored as the applicant proceeds to Consensus Review and if the applicant proceeds to Site Visit Review. A key theme is a strength or opportunity for improvement that addresses a central requirement of the Criteria, is common to more than one Item or Category (cross-cutting), is especially significant in terms of the applicant's key factors, and/or addresses a Core Value of the Criteria.

The Key Themes Worksheet should respond to the three questions below:

a. **What are the most important strengths or outstanding practices (of potential value to other organizations) identified?**

- Senior leaders demonstrate visionary leadership by creating strategies, systems, and methods to ensure organizational sustainability. For example, the Corporate Contributor Program, introduced in 2001 and adopted by other food banks as a best practice, addresses financial sustainability by providing a method for several key donor organizations to fund general administrative overhead. This allows 100% of other donations to be used to fulfill the organization's mission to feed the hungry. The organization also gains support through creative partnerships with government agencies and a university that provide students and fellows for improvement projects, as well as through workforce practices such as the Leadership Development Program (LDP), succession planning, and job rotation for employees and volunteers.

- The biennial 12-step Strategic Planning Process (SPP) is an effective, systematic approach initiated in 1997 and restructured in 2004 that involves members of the Board of Directors, employees, and stakeholders and aligns objectives with strategic challenges, values, key success factors, and stakeholder needs. Leaders have improved the process through benchmark analyses of food banks and other nonprofit organizations, Baldrige-based self-assessments, and feedback from the state award process, resulting in enhancements such as a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis and an Environmental Scan to identify potential blind spots. The SPP reflects a strong alignment with the organization's mission, vision, and values (MVV), as evidenced by the 2003 decision to exit food pantry and soup kitchen services to focus on the organization's core competency of food banking.

- The organization uses its five-step Critical-to-Quality (CTQ) Determination Process to determine key customer requirements, needs, and changing expectations and their relative importance to customers' relationship decisions. In addition, the CTQ Determination Process is used to identify key work process requirements, and teams use CTQ indicators, combined with the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Process (Figure 6.1-3), to help ensure that hunger-reducing processes meet customer needs. In-process measures based on CTQ indicators are tracked daily, weekly, and monthly and updated on the Daily Harvest, Monthly Harvest, and Balanced Plate Scorecard (Figures 4.1-1 and 4.1-2). The organization uses its team-based PDCA Process to systematically evaluate and improve its work processes and approaches. For example, in 2006, the organization conducted a redesign of each of its key work processes to ensure they had appropriate, effective CTQ indicators. The planning step of the PDCA Process was enhanced through extensive senior leader and stakeholder participation.

- The applicant demonstrates management by fact in its use of the FOODS Balanced Plate Scorecard; scheduled performance reviews of Harvest metrics, Baldrige-based self-assessments, SWOT Analyses, and Environmental Scans; and technological advances such as FoodAnswers and the Rapid Inventory Control Enterprise (RICE) system. The Balanced Plate Scorecard (Figure 4.1-1) is built on the organization's mission and key success factors and is linked to strategic objectives and action plans. These assessment methods have matured over successive cycles of improvement.

b. What are the most significant opportunities, concerns, or vulnerabilities identified?

- While the Executive Director is acknowledged as a community leader in ethics, the organization does not describe a systematic approach for senior leaders to personally promote an organizational environment that requires and results in ethical behavior, a method to monitor ethical behavior throughout the organization in all interactions, a way to anticipate public concerns with future services and operations, or processes to meet regulatory requirements and goals. A lack of systematic approaches to manage social responsibility may limit the organization's ability to fulfill the stakeholder and donor/supplier requirements of accountability and integrity.

- While the organization collects and reviews data to assess its performance related to the Strategic Plan and action plans (Figure 2.2-2), the applicant does not describe how it deploys its action plans or ensures that their outcomes are sustained. In addition, a systematic process is not evident for using performance review results to prioritize and carry out improvements and innovations. Further, it is not clear how these priorities and opportunities are deployed to suppliers, partners, and collaborators, when appropriate.

- While the applicant uses the Development and Friend-Raising Committees and the Donor Pyramid Framework (Figure 3.2-1) to build relationships with donors, a systematic process is not evident for building relationships with the organization's other customer/stakeholder groups in order to acquire new customers, increase loyalty and repeat business, and gain positive referrals. Further, it is not clear how the organization keeps its methods to build customer relationships and determine customer satisfaction current with business needs and directions. These gaps may detract from customer-driven excellence and limit the organization's ability to support its key success factor of the satisfaction of member agencies, donors/suppliers, and the community (Figure 4.1-1).

- Although employees and volunteers participate in mock disaster drills and emergency events, it is not clear that the organization has developed a fully deployed system that considers prevention, management, continuity of operations, and recovery in its preparedness system. For example, it is not clear how the organization prepares for or ensures the continuity of its many volunteer-dependent processes in the event that damage from the prevalent tornadoes in the area prevents volunteers from working. Likewise, the organization relies on a few core volunteers and pro bono services from a local information technology (IT) provider to maintain its hardware and software; however, it is not clear that these volunteers would be available and trained to ensure operations and the functionality of information systems in the event of an emergency. The lack of systematic approaches in these areas could compromise the organization's key community requirement to provide an effective response to emergency needs (Figure P.1-4) and its strategic challenge to ensure that food reaches those most in need when they need it most.

- It is not evident that the organization has yet developed well-deployed, systematic processes for several aspects of building an effective and supportive workforce environment. For example, while multiple mechanisms are used to recruit volunteers (Figure 5.2-2), it is not clear whether these or other methods are used to recruit employees, and a systematic approach is not evident for retaining members of the workforce. In addition, while the applicant uses focus groups to help recruit Hmong and Hispanic volunteers, a systematic process is not evident to address other diversity factors, such as diversity in volunteers' ages. Further, performance measures are not provided for workplace security, and it is not clear whether any policies or services are in place to support volunteers, including its 20 core team volunteers. Without systematic processes in these areas, the applicant may be limited in its ability to meet key workforce requirements, such as security and regulatory compliance, and to address its

strategic challenges to recruit sought-after volunteers, especially from a broad range of age segments, and to optimize human resources.

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

- The applicant's results address many areas of importance to its key requirements, with improvements and good performance being achieved. For example, product and service outcomes for food availability and distribution (Figures 7.1-1 through 7.1-4) demonstrate favorable trends from 2003 to 2006, and the organization's fill rate of 95% (Figure 7.1-4) was the best performance at the state and regional level (i.e., for the Iowa Food Bank Association [IFBA] and The Food Bank Learning Collaborative [FBLC], respectively). In addition, results for member agencies' satisfaction overall and their satisfaction with a variety of requirements (e.g., timeliness/dependability, communications, hours of operation, food selections and nutritional quality) show a positive trend from 2003 to 2006 (Figures 7.2-1 through 7.2-5).

- The organization demonstrates positive trends in leadership and workforce development results. The number of hours contributed by core volunteers increased steadily from 2003 to 2006 (Figure 7.4-11), and the number of volunteers also increased; for example, from 2004 to 2006, the number of former clients who became volunteers increased from 3 to 15 (Figure 7.4-5) and the number of court-ordered placements who became volunteers tripled (Figure 7.4-9). In addition, from 2003 to 2006, the annual number of training hours for employees more than tripled (to 350 hours) and for volunteers increased from 900 to 4,500 hours (Figure 7.4-1). In 2006, more than 60% of volunteers and 80% of employees were cross-trained, and the effectiveness of workforce and leader development reached the best performance level in the regional FBLC (Figure 7.4-7). These results address the organization's key success factor to maintain its dedicated and experienced employees and volunteers.

- Results for a number of process effectiveness measures demonstrate favorable performance levels, trends, and comparisons. The organization shows positive three-year trends and attained the FBLC best performance in the percentage of effectiveness in meeting food demands in both 2005 and 2006 (Figure 7.5-4) and in the percentage of times that it met seasonal demand in 2006 (Figure 7.5-10). In addition, the organization attained the best satisfaction ratings from its key suppliers and donors of services in 2005 and 2006 (Figure 7.5-15).

- The organization demonstrates several favorable governance and senior leadership outcomes, including rising stakeholder trust, as indicated by improving scores from 2004 to 2006 on survey responses addressing a variety of confidence and trust issues (Figure 7.3-10), as well as increases in donations (Figure 7.6-3) and annual grants (Figure 7.6-7) during the same time period. In addition, favorable fiscal accountability results include performance to budget above 99% from 2004 to 2006 (Figure 7.6-8), and improvements in regulatory compliance ratings include 2006 performance levels for sanitation and safe food handling and disposal at or near the best levels of the FBLC and Food Banks of America (FBA) (Figure 7.4-14). Also, organizational citizenship advances are represented by a three-year increase (from 75% to 100%) in Employee Participation in Community Ways of Connection Efforts (Figure 7.6-13), an increase in paper recycling from about 3,000 pounds in 2002 to more than 10,000 pounds in 2006 (Figure 7.6-14), and 2006 state-best performance in Food as an Economic Engine for Development (FEED) Iowa Partnership Development support (Figure 7.6-15).

- Results are not provided for a variety of measures relevant to the applicant's key organization factors, including the requirements and expectations of key customers, stakeholders, market segments, and workforce members (Figures P.1-4 and P.1-2a). For example, outcomes for product and service

performance do not include results related to the customer requirement of consistency or the customer expectation of dependability. In addition, there are no results related to several key employee and volunteer requirements and expectations, such as a focus on the MVV, respectful and nondiscriminatory communications and actions, a spirit of collaboration and teamwork, and supervision/mentoring/ guidance from the organization's leaders.

- Results are not provided for several scorecard and operational metrics, such as current liabilities (Figure 4.1-1) and the percentage of repackaging time, the food storage compliance index, accounts receivable days outstanding, and the warehouse equipment maintenance expense ratio (Figures 6.1-2 and 6.2-1). In addition, despite a doubling of demand in the past three years, no results for measures of marketplace performance are provided, such as changes in market share or position. Finally, results are not provided for survey responses on workforce perceptions of ethical behavior or for indicators of breaches of ethical behavior (e.g., the number of ethical conduct breaches).

- Comparative data are not included in a number of results areas. For example, comparisons are missing for several key indicators of work process effectiveness, including the Inventory and Resource Effectiveness Index (Figure 7.5-13), RICE Percentage of Uptime and User Interface Accuracy (Figure 7.5-19), Fleet Maintenance Index (Figure 7.5-20), and Key Maintenance Metrics (Refrigeration and Grounds Maintenance) (Figure 7.5-21), which also are strategic action plan or Balanced Plate Scorecard indicators. In addition, comparisons are not provided for a number of customer-focused results (e.g., results for complaints [Figure 7.2-6], referrals [Figure 7.2-7], communication [Figure 7.2-8], years of donation [Figure 7.2-10], and community satisfaction [Figure 7.2-11]). Further, limited or no comparisons are provided for several financial and market performance indicators; no comparative data are provided for income results (Figure 7.3-9), results related to organizational capacity and efficiency (Figures 7.3-1 through 7.3-7) include comparisons to only the national Assistance Now Finder, and results for the FBLC Overall Peer Comparison (Figure 7.3-8) include only four other food banks. A more comprehensive use of comparative data may assist the organization in better judging its progress relative to other nonprofit organizations providing the same or similar products and services.

- Although the organization segments its data for several measures, it does not use segmentation in many results related to its vision of Iowa's heartland as hunger-free. For example, most of the product and service outcomes presented are not segmented by product and service types, customer groups, or market segments, and most workforce-focused results are not segmented to address the diversity of the organization's workforce or its various workforce groups (e.g., employees, core volunteers, general volunteers, and students and fellows). In addition, customer-focused results include limited data on member agency segments; results are provided for only 3 of the 58 member agencies and no segmented data are provided based on the Segmentation Process definitions of size, frequency of service, and urban or rural location. Further, process effectiveness outcomes include limited segmentation; for example, the effectiveness of meeting food demands (Figure 7.5-4) is not segmented geographically to help assess whether the two counties with a percentage of food-insecure residents that is above the state average are equitably served. Lack of segmentation may limit the applicant's ability to identify and focus its resources on those groups and areas most in need of improvement.

- Most of the comparisons provided for the applicant's organizational performance results do not include trend data (generally a minimum of three historical data points); with a few exceptions, such as the Assistance Now Finder comparisons for financial and market results, the comparisons are for one year only. In addition, several results do not include any trend data. For example, results for Standards and Regulatory Agency Requirements (Figure 7.6-6) provide only the current status of the applicant's performance, and specific results data over time are not provided for primary revenue growth or working capital (7.3a[1]), two of the three measures that constitute the organizational capacity score. Without

data that delineate organizational performance over time in relation to comparable organizations, as well as within the organization, the applicant may be limited in its ability to accurately assess its progress.

Item Worksheet—Item 1.1

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

6. Mission, Vision, Values (MVV). Mission: A community-based food bank dedicated to feeding the hungry residents of its communities. Vision: Iowa's heartland is hunger-free. Values: We work together, we do what we say, everyone deserves respect, and we follow through.

7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

16. Governance by a 12-member Board of Directors, including a county commission representative and a rotating member agency position, with 5 subcommittees linked to management functions

17. Major customer, stakeholder, and market segments and requirements:
    - Customers: member agencies. Requirements: timeliness; quality, variety, and quantity of food; competency and consistency; access to nutritional food; and continuity of service
    - Stakeholders: county, city, state, and federal governments; Food Banks of America (FBA), the Food Bank Learning Collaborative (FBLC), and the Iowa Food Bank Association (IFBA); the Regional Network of Food Relief Agencies; and taxpayers. Requirements: accountability, cost efficiency, administrative cost reduction, dependability, and flexibility
    - Community Segments: County residents, community groups, community leaders, the Chamber of Commerce, businesses, education entities, and volunteers. Requirements: effective response to emergency needs, cost efficiency, and meaningful opportunities to serve
    - Donors/Suppliers: charitable foundations; corporations, grocers, and restaurants; individuals; The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP); and corporate contributors. Requirements: accountability; impact and integrity; a single point of service for deliveries; predictability of operations; coordinated management of donations; effective lead-time to meet requests; and proper food storage

31. Performance improvement system: Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Process

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
1.1a(1)	Senior leaders use Step 2 of the SPP (Figure 2.1-1) to review and change the MVV for the coming two years. They deploy the vision and values to the workforce through employee and volunteer orientation, role modeling, daily posting of a value at the workplace entrance and in the break room, and daily discussion of the value with employees and volunteers in the break room and during walk-arounds. The vision and values are deployed to other stakeholders through the organization's Web site, annual report, and newsletter and at an annual banquet. Deployment improvement cycles include implementing additional volunteer orientation, reinforcing the value of partnering and participation, and broadening senior leaders' involvement in posting the value of the day.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
1.1a(3)	**Senior leaders address financial sustainability through the Corporate Contributor Program, introduced in 2001, which provides a method for several key donor organizations to fund general administrative overhead, thus allowing all other donations to be used to fulfill the organization's mission to feed the hungry. Leadership sustainability is addressed through a succession planning system developed by the Board of Directors in which the board takes responsibility for training and mentoring future leaders. Employees and volunteers also receive leadership and professional development through mentoring, rotational assignments, just-in-time volunteer training, and the Leadership Development Program (LDP).**
1.1a(3)	Senior leaders use the structure of the Leadership System Model (Figure 1.1-1) to foster an environment for organizational performance improvement and a focus on accomplishing the organization's mission and strategic objectives. The board oversees the organizational direction through interlocking committees; senior leaders serve as champions for each strategic objective and form interlocking teams to develop and carry out action plans. All employees are involved in interlocking teams, which are composed of employees and volunteers.
1.1b(1)	Senior leaders communicate with and engage the employee and volunteer workforce through the various mechanisms shown in Figure 1.1-2, which include two-way communication methods such as daily walk-arounds, interlocking teams, annual evaluation, and quarterly brown-bag debriefings. Leaders are involved in numerous employee recognition events for both individuals and teams that are designed to support high performance.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
1.1a(2)	**It is unclear how senior leaders personally promote an organizational environment that fosters, requires, and results in legal and ethical behavior. For example, the Executive Director is widely acknowledged as a community leader in ethics; however, it is not clear that she or other senior leaders follow a systematic approach to personally promote an environment within the organization that requires and results in ethical behavior. Without an effective, systematic approach, the organization may find it challenging to consistently meet the customer, stakeholder, and supplier/donor key requirements of accountability, integrity, dependability, predictability of operations, and competency/consistency.**
1.1a(3)	While succession planning for the five key leadership positions is addressed during biennial strategic planning, it is not clear how senior leaders personally participate in the development of future organizational leaders. Also, information is not provided concerning other aspects of sustainability, such as issues related to the changing future business and market environment (including volunteer availability) or a safe and secure environment. The lack of an effective,

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
	systematic approach may affect the organization's ability to prepare for and manage its future state as it addresses threats and risks in the environment.
1.1b(2)	While senior leaders make quarterly reports on strategic action plans to board committees (Figures 2.1-1 and 2.2-2), review Balanced Plate Scorecard metrics monthly (Figure 4.1-1), and review numerous other indicators frequently (Figure 4.1-2), it is not clear how senior leaders include a focus on creating and balancing value in their organizational performance expectations for customers and stakeholders beyond the member agencies. Without such a focus, the organization may be limited in its ability to prioritize actions and ensure success with all stakeholder groups in meeting requirements.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 1.1:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
				X		
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
				X		
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; the Examiners select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 1.1—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☐ 30–45%
☒ 50–65%   Item 1.1 Score _____50_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 1.2

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

2. In 2002, organization exited food pantry and soup kitchen services to focus on food banking as core competency. Aims to provide best foods, at the right time, to the right place.

6. Mission, Vision, Values (MVV). Mission: A community-based food bank dedicated to feeding the hungry residents of its communities. Vision: Iowa's heartland is hunger-free. Values: We work together, we do what we say, everyone deserves respect, and we follow through.

7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

15. Multiple regulating agencies and standards to protect food, workers, member agencies; food safety and safety of employees and volunteers require tight controls

16. Governance by a 12-member Board of Directors, including a county commission representative and a rotating member agency position, with 5 subcommittees linked to management functions

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:
Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS
(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
1.2a(1)	The organization's governance system addresses key aspects of oversight through a variety of formal reviews and reports (Figure 1.2-1) that include involvement by the board, senior leaders, and board committees. Board committees include employees, volunteers, and, occasionally, suppliers and member agencies, as appropriate. In addition to these various methods, the organization addresses the protection of stakeholder interests through the broad involvement of internal and external stakeholders in the SPP (Figure 2.1-1).
1.2a(2)	Evaluation of senior leaders' performance occurs at various levels. The board conducts an annual self-evaluation to identify improvement opportunities, such as the creation of the interlocking Leadership System Model (Figure 1.1-1) in 2004. The board is responsible for the performance evaluation of the Executive Director, using a 360-degree approach that includes the board, senior leaders, two employees and volunteers, and executives of two member agencies. The other senior leaders are evaluated by the Executive Director in the areas of accomplishing strategic objectives and professional achievement goals. The senior leaders evaluate all employees and core volunteers.
1.2c	The organization identifies its key communities as those within its geographic service areas, choosing activities linked to food or hunger. It supports these communities through education about nutrition, hunger, and the food-insecure (Figure 3.1-2) and through the LDP, which is open

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
	to volunteers, employees, and representatives of other community nonprofits. The organization also collaborates with other organizations in the Food as an Economic Engine for Development (FEED) Partnership to provide safety-net services. Employees and all senior leaders are provided with time off to volunteer for community outreach programs (Figure 1.2-2). The organization also provides placement for people with court-ordered community service sentences.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
1.2a(2)	While the organization has developed an approach for evaluating senior leaders' performance, there is no indication of how senior leaders use the results of these reviews to further develop and improve personal leadership effectiveness and the effectiveness of the leadership system as a whole. Without a fact-based, systematic approach, the organization may find it difficult to provide the leadership necessary to achieve its vision: Iowa's heartland is hunger-free.
1.2b(1)	**It is not evident how the organization anticipates public concerns with future products, services, and operations. Additionally, while Figure P.1-3 outlines regulatory entities, measures, and performance goals, there is no indication of the key processes used to attain these performance levels. For instance, no processes are described to meet the requirements and goals of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) or The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP). Proactive anticipation of concerns and processes to address ongoing regulatory requirements may provide the opportunity to manage regulatory requirements and stakeholder risks as part of a systematic approach rather than attending to issues as they emerge.**
1.2b(2)	**While an employee appraisal form and orientation communicate the organization's ethics-based values, there is no indication of the effectiveness of the volunteer self-appraisal form in enabling or monitoring ethical behavior. In addition, it is not evident what key processes or measures for enabling and monitoring ethical behavior in governance, operations, or stakeholder interactions are used other than an ethics hotline that yielded only three calls in five years. This beginning of a systematic approach to promote, ensure, and measure ethical behavior does not appear to be aligned with the importance that the Executive Director places on this subject.**

16

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 1.2:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; the Examiners select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 1.2—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 1.2 Score _____40_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 2.1

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

6. Mission, Vision, Values (MVV). Mission: A community-based food bank dedicated to feeding the hungry residents of its communities. Vision: Iowa's heartland is hunger-free. Values: We work together, we do what we say, everyone deserves respect, and we follow through.

7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

24. Competes with other social services for funds and volunteers; collaborates with these organizations in emergency and disaster relief

25. Key success factors (same as strategic advantages for this organization): its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, network of food suppliers, tight management of overhead costs (12.1% of operating expenses), and volunteer base. Other success factors: food availability and quality; fiscal agility; funding and food resources; organizational effectiveness; optimization of human, financial, food, and other resources; organizational learning, collaboration, and innovation; dedicated, experienced employees and volunteers; and the satisfaction of member agencies, donors/suppliers, and the community

27. Key changes: shifting groups of temporarily food-insecure persons, seasonal needs (e.g., related to school vacation times and migrant populations), and the doubling of Hispanic and Hmong populations in the past year. The nutritional quality of food, along with quantity, has become a key consideration in the past decade.

30. Five strategic challenges: ensure food reaches those most in need when they need it most; optimize human resources and partnerships; respond to member agency needs; obtain and maintain adequate financial resources; recruit volunteers from a broad range of age segments

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
2.1a(1)	The organization uses a biennial 12-step SPP (Figure 2.1-1) that involves community leaders, volunteers, member agencies, and donors. The key process steps are Preparation; Review of the MVV; SWOT Analysis and an Environmental Scan; Review of Funding Mandates; "Current State" Performance Analysis; "Future State" Brainstorming; Development of Strategic Objectives, Goals, and Time Frames; Resource Allocation; Action Planning; Board Approval; Strategic Plan and Action Plan Deployment; and Strategic Plan Monitoring. The organization identifies strategic challenges in the "Current State" step, and it includes inputs from the SWOT Analysis, Environmental Scan, and Funding Mandate Review. The "Future State" step uses appreciative inquiry to identify strategic advantages. The SPP was initiated in 1997 and restructured in 2004 as a result of benchmarking analyses of food banks and other nonprofit organizations, Baldrige-based self-assessments, and feedback from the state award process, and the biennial Environmental Scan was added in 2005.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
2.1a(1)	The SPP (Figure 2.1-1) uses SWOT Analysis, an Environmental Scan, and performance analyses to identify potential blind spots. For example, the SWOT Analysis considers data and information relative to operations; shifts in economic, legal, political, market, and competitive environments; regulatory issues; and technology changes. An Environmental Scan using a minimum data set also is conducted as a stand-alone process in years when there is no SPP.
2.1b(1,2)	The organization has identified its strategic objectives (Figure 2.2-2), as well as its short- and longer-term goals (for FY2007, FY2008, FY2009, and FY2010), along with associated timetables for their accomplishment. The organization aligns its strategic objectives with strategic challenges, values, key success factors, and stakeholder requirements (Figure 2.1-3).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
2.1a(2)	It is unclear how the organization ensures that strategic planning addresses key factors in some areas that have been identified as important threats. For example, it is not clear how the organization addresses its need to optimize human resources and partnerships in light of fluctuations in the volunteer workforce, member agency needs, and supplier capabilities. It also is unclear how strategic planning addresses the need to obtain and maintain adequate financial resources, which may be of particular significance considering that support from key donors may be decreasing (Figure 7.6-9) and the organization competes with other nonprofit organizations for funding.
2.1b(2)	Although the organization notes innovations in specific areas, it is not clear how its strategic objectives address larger opportunities for innovation in products, services, operations, and its business model. For example, there is no evidence of innovation in the organization's approaches for competing with other nonprofits for funding or volunteers. A focus on developing and implementing innovations, possibly by capitalizing on the diversity of its large number of volunteers, may provide the organization with the opportunity to increase its effectiveness and provide greater service to the communities it serves.
2.1b(2)	While the applicant has aligned its strategic objectives with its strategic challenges (Figure 2.1-3), it is unclear how the organization ensures that its strategic objectives balance short- and longer-term challenges and opportunities. A systematic process for understanding and reacting to short- and long-term challenges and opportunities may help ensure that the organization can be agile in addressing organizational needs and directions.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 2.1:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
				X		
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
				X		
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
				X		
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
				X		

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 2.1—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%

☐ 10–25%

☐ 30–45%

☒ 50–65%   Item 2.1 Score _____55_____ %

☐ 70–85%

☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 2.2

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

4. Paid employees and volunteers acquire, warehouse, transport, and distribute food to the food-insecure through partnerships with 58 member agencies.

7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time)

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

23. Demand for organization's services has doubled in the last three years

24. Competes with other social services for funds and volunteers; collaborates with these organizations in emergency and disaster relief

27. Key changes: shifting groups of temporarily food-insecure persons, seasonal needs (e.g., related to school vacation times and migrant populations), and the doubling of Hispanic and Hmong populations in the past year. The nutritional quality of food, along with quantity, has become a key consideration in the past decade.

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
2.2a(1)	The SPP (Figure 2.1-1) and the PDCA Process (Figure 6.1-3) are used for the development of action plans. Action plans are created to support the strategic objectives during Step 9 of the SPP. Champions (chosen from senior leaders, board members, volunteers, and LDP graduates) are assigned to each action plan to lead development and deployment throughout the organization and to perform quarterly reviews.
2.2a(2)	The organization uses its SPP (Figure 2.1-1) to ensure that adequate financial and other resources are available and allocated to support the accomplishment of its action plans. For example, adequate financial resources are addressed as part of Steps 8 and 10. In Step 8, the Executive Director, with help from other senior leaders, develops annual fiscal and capital budgets in order to support the objectives and goals established in Step 7. The Finance/Audit Committee reviews these budgets and an outline of resources needed to support the Strategic Plan. The Finance/Audit Committee recommends allocations of resources based partly on action plans, and the budgets are presented for approval by the board in Step 10.
2.2a(3)	As circumstances warrant, the organization uses the Emergent Strategy Alert Process (Figure 2.2-1) to establish and deploy modified action plans. For example, circumstances may arise as the result of the Environmental Scan done on the years when there is no SPP or as the result of the Community Needs Assessment. The four-step Emergent Strategy Alert Process, which includes a rapid-cycle SWOT Analysis, guides the organization to develop and deploy new or modified strategies, goals, and actions.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
2.2a(4)	The organization has identified key short- and longer-term action plans that are mapped to strategic objectives and goals (Figure 2.2-2). For example, achieving a rating of 10 on the American Association of Food and Nutrition for a Healthier America (AAFNHA) Nutrition Scale by FY2010 is a long-term action plan, and increasing the number of pounds of food per person in poverty by 5% by FY2007 is a short-term action plan. Both are linked to the strategic objective "to increase the amount and quality of food delivered." The organization also has identified key changes planned for products and services. For example, in this fiscal year it will increase the variety of nutritional food offered to member agencies to reflect the *Dietary Guidelines for Americans*, 2005 and look for innovative ways to use Internet communication.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
2.2a(1)	**While champions are responsible for the deployment of action plans, a systematic approach is not described for deploying the plans to achieve strategic objectives or for ensuring that the key outcomes of action plans can be sustained. For example, it is not clear how the board's oversight at quarterly meetings ensures sustainability or what other actions are taken to integrate action plans into processes and approaches to ensure they are maintained. Without systematic approaches to deploy action plans and sustain their outcomes, the organization may find it difficult to attain its strategic performance goals.**
2.2a(2)	It is unclear how the organization assesses financial and other risks associated with its action plans (e.g., possible financial risks associated with its long-term action plan to achieve a rating of 10 on the AAFNHA Nutrition Scale, which might result in increased costs from purchasing food to supplement possibly less-nutritious, donated food). The lack of an effective, systematic approach may hamper the organization's ability to evaluate the feasibility of each action plan as it strives to consistently acquire, warehouse, transport, and distribute food to the food-insecure through partnerships with its 58 member agencies.
2.2a(5)	It is not clear how the key human resource plans the applicant has noted will accomplish its strategic objectives and action plans. More specifically, because the human resource plans are nearly identical to short- and longer-term action plans listed for the first strategic objective in Figure 2.2-2, it is not evident how the former will help accomplish the latter. In addition, while the human resource/action plans include goals (e.g., "increase volunteers' hours by 10% each year"), they do not include specific actions, including resource commitments, to accomplish those goals and the related strategic objective. Further, it is unclear how the human resource plans will address potential impacts on the workforce and potential changes to workforce capability and capacity. The lack of an effective, systematic approach and specific plans may impede the organization's ability to meet its annual strategic goals, as well as its ability to continue and expand its services for the food-insecure.

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
2.2b	While senior leaders and board committee chairs set performance projections during Step 7 of the SPP (Figure 2.2-2), it is not clear how these short- and longer-term performance projections are determined. Additionally, it does not appear that projected performance is compared with that of comparable organizations or past performance. Also, while goals are presented for FY2008, FY2009, and FY2010, it is not clear whether these differ from performance projections and if so, how. The lack of a fact-based, systematic approach may limit the organization's ability to assess its relative performance and prepare for projected changes, such as the growing demand for its services, which has doubled in the last three years.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 2.2:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
		X				
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 2.2—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 2.2 Score _____40_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 3.1

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

4. Paid employees and volunteers acquire, warehouse, transport, and distribute food to the food-insecure through partnerships with 58 member agencies.

6 Mission, Vision, Values (MVV). Mission: A community-based food bank dedicated to feeding the hungry residents of its communities. Vision: Iowa's heartland is hunger-free. Values: We work together, we do what we say, everyone deserves respect, and we follow through.

17. customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements: customers (member agencies), stakeholders (governments, organizations, taxpayers), community segments, donors/suppliers

18. Serves a six-county metropolitan statistical area (MSA) population of 500,000, with 75,000 client contacts annually. In this area, 8% of the residents are under age five (mostly urban), 13% are more than 65 years old (mostly rural), and 10% are below the federal poverty rate; there is a 13% unemployment rate; a third of clients receive federal food assistance services; and two counties have a 9.5% food-insecurity rate (above the state average)

27. Key changes: shifting groups of temporarily food-insecure persons, seasonal needs (e.g., related to school vacation times and migrant populations), and the doubling of Hispanic and Hmong populations in the past year. The nutritional quality of food, along with quantity, has become a key consideration in the past decade.

30. Strategic challenges: ensure that food reaches those most in need, when they need it most; optimize partnerships; respond to member agency needs

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
3.1a(1)	The Retreat Committee uses a four-step Segmentation Process during the SPP, SWOT Analysis, and Environmental Scan to identify current and future customers, customer groups, and market segments. The committee gathers and integrates information, validates existing segments and identifies emerging ones, communicates final segmentation throughout the organization, and organizes data by segments as input to the Critical-to-Quality (CTQ) Determination Process. For example, agencies are segmented by size, frequency of service, and urban or rural location, and donors are segmented by type of contribution. The Segmentation Process enables the organization to address the needs of constantly shifting groups of food-insecure persons.
3.1a(2)	The organization uses its five-step CTQ Determination Process, combined with the PDCA Process, to determine key customer requirements, needs, and changing expectations and their relative importance to customers' relationship decisions. The organization gathers voice-of-the-customer information using multiple listening and learning methods (Figure 3.1-2), analyzes segment requirements and priorities and their impact on operations and processes, and shares this information with its member agencies, the community, and other stakeholder groups. The organization uses this knowledge internally to plan, conduct performance reviews, design operations, and manage relationships and day-to-day distribution.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
3.1a(2)	The organization's multiple listening and learning methods vary for each of its four stakeholder groups and their needs (Figures 3.1-1 and 3.1-2). For example, the organization places a comment card in each delivery to member agencies to solicit comments on quality and timeliness, and it conducts community surveys and needs assessments to forecast future demand.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
3.1a(2)	**It is not clear how the organization uses relevant information and feedback from current and former customers, including customer loyalty and retention data, customer referrals, and win/loss analysis, in order to plan products and services and develop new business opportunities. For example, a key strategic challenge is to ensure that food reaches those most in need when they need it most; however, it is unclear how the organization uses relevant data and information from customers to addresses this challenge. The lack of a fact-based, systematic approach may impede the organization's ability to achieve its vision: Iowa's heartland is hunger-free.**
3.1a(3)	While the organization collects and analyzes a variety of voice-of-the-customer information for each of its four stakeholder groups (Figure 3.1-1) and it provides an example of focus group findings leading to the use of students as volunteers, a systematic process is not described for using voice-of-the-customer information to become more customer-focused, to take action to better satisfy customer needs and desires, or to identify opportunities for innovation.
3.1a(4)	It is not clear how the organization keeps its listening and learning methods current with business needs and directions. For example, the Board of Directors and senior leaders use information gathered through the organization's listening and learning methods to improve products, services, and operations; however, it is unclear how those listening and learning methods themselves are evaluated and improved. The lack of a systematic, fact-based evaluation and improvement method may hamper the organization's ability to identify and address the needs of its four major customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 3.1:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
				X		

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 3.1—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%

☐ 10–25%

☒ 30–45%

☐ 50–65%   Item 3.1 Score _____40_____ %

☐ 70–85%

☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 3.2

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

17. Four major customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements: customers (member agencies), stakeholders (governments, organizations, taxpayers), community segments, donors/suppliers

21 Communication with suppliers and partners: The Agency and Industry Relations Manager and his advisory subcommittee meet with each supplier twice a year; suppliers are invited to an annual recognition event; and a twice-yearly regional network joint planning meeting includes agencies not currently working with the organization.

24. Competes with other social services for funds and volunteers

25. Key success factors: its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, network of food suppliers, volunteer base, and the satisfaction of member agencies, donors/suppliers, and the community

27. Key changes: shifting groups of temporarily food-insecure persons, and the doubling of Hispanic and Hmong populations in the past year

30. Strategic challenges: ensure that food reaches those most in need, when they need it most; optimize partnerships; respond to member agency needs; obtain and maintain adequate financial resources

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
3.2a(1,2)	The applicant uses a variety of methods to build relationships with donors; for example, the Development and Friend-Raising Committees develop methods specific to each donor level (Figure 3.2-1), such as direct mail, the organization's Web site, and personal contact by letter or phone call. The applicant also uses a variety of access mechanisms, including a toll-free number, daily walk-arounds, and comment cards in food shipments, to enable various customer/ stakeholder groups to seek information, conduct business, and make complaints. Contact requirements are deployed via reminders during each work shift. Information gained through these interactions with customers and other stakeholders is then assessed in the SWOT Analysis and Environmental Scan.
3.2a(3)	The organization uses a Complaint Resolution Process to manage customer complaints, with the goal of resolving each complaint within 24 hours. All employees and volunteers keep a log of complaints and resolutions, and some of the data are aggregated using the FoodAnswers database and reviewed regularly by the board, senior leaders, employees, and volunteer leaders. When this process revealed a food storage problem in 2006, new refrigeration was added. In addition, FoodAnswers allows special access for employees, volunteers, partners, member agencies, and Food Banks of America (FBA), Food Bank Learning Collaborative (FBLC), and Iowa Food Bank Association (IFBA) members.
3.2b(1)	The organization uses a three-step Satisfaction Determination Process to capture actionable information for use in exceeding customers' expectations. The process steps entail identifying the

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
	factors that contribute to satisfaction and dissatisfaction; deploying the satisfaction assessments; and aggregating, analyzing, and distributing information. Satisfaction assessments include formal and informal methods, and member agencies are surveyed regularly using comment cards. The organization segments data to identify varying viewpoints and conducts a gap analysis to identify differences.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
3.2a(1)	**It is unclear how the organization builds relationships with customer/stakeholder groups other than donors, who are solicited through the Development and Friend-Raising Committees and the Donor Pyramid Framework (Figure 3.2-1). While the organization determines the needs and measures the satisfaction of member agencies, community segments, and other stakeholders, it does not describe how it builds relationships with these groups to acquire customers, to meet and exceed their expectations, to increase loyalty and repeat business, or to gain positive referrals.**
3.2a(3)	While the organization reviews its aggregated complaint data to identify systemic issues, it is not apparent how it resolves individual complaints effectively and promptly within its 24-hour goal or how it minimizes dissatisfaction and loss of repeat business and referrals at the time of each complaint.
3.2b(3)	Although the applicant uses competitive comparisons of customer satisfaction for its annual survey of donors, it is not clear how it obtains and uses information about the satisfaction of its other customer/stakeholder groups relative to the satisfaction levels of other organizations providing similar products or services and/or relative to industry benchmarks. For example, no comparative or competitive satisfaction assessments are described for its 58 member agencies, community segments, or other stakeholders. Without the use of comparative information to gauge its progress, the organization may be limited in building relationships and growing customer satisfaction and loyalty.
3.2a(4), 3.2b(4)	While the organization conducts an annual review of its satisfaction determination methodologies and CTQ Determination Process, it is not clear that this review addresses the need to keep its various relationship-building approaches, customer access mechanisms, and satisfaction determination approaches current with business needs and directions. A systematic process for keeping these approaches and mechanisms current may be of particular importance considering the demographic and seasonal changes in the organization's service area among groups of temporarily food-insecure persons.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 3.2:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
		X				
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 3.2—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 3.2 Score _____30_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 4.1

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

13. Technologies: Uses FoodAnswers software from Food Banks of America (FBA) and Rapid Inventory Control Enterprise (RICE); an information technology firm provides pro bono hardware and software support

16. Governance by 12-member board, including a county commission representative and a rotating member agency position, with five subcommittees linked to management functions

28. Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons, IFBA state comparisons, Assistance Now Finder, and collaborative FBLC regional data and best practice sharing

30. Five strategic challenges: Ensure food reaches those most in need when they need it most, optimize human resources and partnerships, respond to member agency needs, obtain and maintain adequate financial resources, recruit volunteers from a broad range of age segments

31. Performance improvement system: Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Process

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
4.1a(1-2)	The organization uses its SPP to select, collect, align, and integrate data and information to track daily operations and overall organizational performance, including progress relative to strategic objectives and action plans. For example, the SPP is used to select organizational performance measures during biennial review cycles. Key indicators are integrated using the FOODS/ Balanced Plate Scorecard, which is aligned with the organization's mission and is linked to the key success factors (Figure 4.1-1) and strategic objectives and action plans (Figure 2.2-2).
4.1a(3)	The organization uses its SPP to keep its performance measurement system current with business needs and directions. For example, the Balanced Plate Scorecard (Figure 4.1-1) has matured over successive improvement cycles that have addressed several areas, including the need for an Environmental Scan in the "off years" of the SPP, the implementation of annual Balanced Plate Scorecard reviews by the Executive Director and Finance/Audit Committee, and the need to keep comparative data sources current with changing needs. These cycles of improvement are aimed at keeping approaches responsive to changing data requirements and evolving business needs.
4.1b(1)	The organization uses the Performance Review System (Figure 4.1-2) to review organizational performance and capabilities. The system outlines daily, monthly, quarterly and annual meetings to review performance and capabilities. Comparative, trend, and pareto analyses are performed on the data provided through the Balanced Plate Scorecard (Figure 4.1-1). The Board of Directors, senior leaders, board committees, and employees use the Monthly and Annual Harvest, SWOT Analysis and Environmental Scan, and Board of Directors' Review to evaluate key indicators and assess performance relative to operational and strategic goals.

31

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
4.1a(2)	While the applicant states that during Step 9 of the SPP it selects comparative data relevant to the local, regional, and national food banking industries, it is not clear how the organization selects and ensures the effective use of key comparative data to support operational and strategic decision making and innovation. For example, comparative data are selected during the SPP to track performance against goals; however, it is not apparent how the comparative data used in reviews address all organizational key success factors, such as the optimization of human, financial, food, and other resources and organizational learning, collaboration, and innovation. Without an effective, systematic approach, the applicant may not fully understand its performance relative to other providers or effectively use comparative data when making decisions that affect performance in these key areas.
4.1a(3)	It is not evident how the organization ensures that its performance measurement system is sensitive to rapid or unexpected organizational or external changes. For example, the organization uses an annual process to review performance measures; however, it is not clear how this approach enables timely identification and response to rapid or unexpected changes occurring between reviews. The absence of a systematic approach in this area may make it difficult for the organization to accurately assess its data requirements, as well as its current performance, and make adjustments as needed.
4.1b(2)	**It is not clear how the applicant translates organizational performance review findings into priorities for continuous and breakthrough improvement and into opportunities for innovation. For example, senior leaders use walk-arounds to identify and set priorities for improvement; however, it is not clear how this approach is used with analyses from performance reviews (Figure 4.1-2). Further, it is not clear how priorities and opportunities are deployed to suppliers, partners, and collaborators, when appropriate. Without a systematic approach, the organization may find it difficult to focus precious resources on stakeholder requirements and key processes to achieve organizational goals.**
4.1b(3)	It is not apparent how the organization incorporates the results of organizational performance reviews into the systematic evaluation and improvement of key processes. While the applicant states that it uses the PDCA Process (Figure 6.1-3) to accomplish this task, it is not clear how the incorporation takes place or how the information is used in the PDCA Process to influence the improvement of core processes.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 4.1:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
				X		
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 4.1—Overall Score

☐   0–5%

☐ 10–25%

☒ 30–45%

☐ 50–65%   Item 4.1 Score _____45_____ %

☐ 70–85%

☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 4.2

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

13. Technologies: Uses FoodAnswers software from Food Banks of America (FBA) and Rapid Inventory Control Enterprise (RICE); an information technology firm provides pro bono hardware and software support

19 Food suppliers and partners provide food, facilitate innovation, broaden the organization's reach, and improve core processes; finances and services suppliers and partners provide funds for food and activities, donate in-kind support, fund improved organizational capabilities, provide fiduciary controls, and volunteer.

28. Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons, IFBA state comparisons, Assistance Now Finder, and collaborative FBLC regional data and best-practice sharing

29 Data limitations: incomplete or old data, time lags from government sources, inconsistencies in tracking and reporting systems, and manual data entry by volunteers (mitigated by the help of students and fellows)

30. Strategic challenges: Optimize partnerships; respond to member agency needs

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:
Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS
(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
4.2a(1-2)	The organization makes data and information available through five software systems (Figure 4.2-1): Donation Tracker, Rapid Inventory and Control Enterprise (RICE), Expense Tracker, FoodAnswers, and Training and Volunteer Tracker. Access to information is provided on an as-needed basis to employees, volunteers, suppliers, partners, collaborators, and member agencies. Protection of sensitive information is facilitated by limiting access to it (e.g., access to member agency information is given only to employees who have been trained regarding privacy laws). Maturational cycles of improvement include the implementation of FoodAnswers in 2003-2004 and RICE in 2005.
4.2a(4)	The organization keeps its information availability mechanisms current with business needs and directions and technological changes through the SWOT Analysis during the SPP. The results are deployed using annual action plans.
4.2b(1)	Industry-specific software and validation processes are used to ensure that the applicant's electronic data, information, and knowledge are accurate, have integrity and reliability, are timely, and are secure and confidential. Figure 4.2-2 outlines how the organization ensures the quality of electronic data and information. Validation processes include, but are not limited to, training, limited data entry fields, audits, drop-down menus, field validation, bar codes, beta testing, policies and procedures, an off-site system backup, 24/7 Web access, passwords, and

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
	limited administrator rights. The organization accomplishes much of this work through a pro bono partnership with a local technology firm.
4.2b(2)	Workforce knowledge is shared with employees, member agencies, and food donors through a variety of processes, including orientation for employees and volunteers, e-mails, an organizational newsletter, training and materials, routine supply chain interactions, industry-specific software, job rotations, visual process descriptions, and daily walk-arounds. Senior leaders facilitate the identification and sharing of best practices using daily walk-arounds, FoodAnswers, Monthly Harvest Reviews, and participation in FBA, IFBA, and FBLC activities.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
4.2a(2)	**It is not apparent how the organization ensures that its hardware and software are reliable and secure. For example, the organization relies on a few core volunteers and pro bono services from a local IT provider to maintain hardware and software; however, the processes to ensure that these key information systems are maintained to achieve reliability and security are not evident.**
4.2a(3)	**A systematic process is not apparent to ensure the functionality of critical information systems in the event of an emergency. Without an effective, systematic approach, problems in this area may limit the organization in meeting its community requirement of responsiveness in time of need.**
4.2b(1)	While the applicant has established methods to validate electronic data (Figure 4.2-2), it is not clear how the accuracy, integrity and reliability, timeliness, and security and confidentiality of nonelectronic data, information, and knowledge are addressed in these or other processes. The absence of a comprehensive, systematic approach in this area may hamper the organization's ability to ensure that decisions are based on reliable information in its efforts to respond to member agency needs.
4.2b(2)	A systematic process is not described for managing organizational knowledge to accomplish the assembly and transfer of relevant knowledge for use in the SPP. For example, the applicant has established several mechanisms, such as daily walk-arounds and Monthly Harvest reviews, to collect and share best practices; however, it is not clear how these or other methods are employed to transfer and use the best practices or other relevant knowledge in the SPP. Without an effective, systematic approach, the organization may have difficulty developing innovative solutions that add value for customers and the organization.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 4.2:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 4.2—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 4.2 Score _____45_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 5.1

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

9. Workforce key requirements: security; food safety; training; honesty, integrity, and accountability; regulatory and standards compliance; supervision/mentoring/guidance

10. Workforce expectations: focus on the MVV; respectful, nondiscriminatory communications and actions; collaboration and teamwork; stewardship of resources

11. Employee benefits include health and dental insurance and flexible work schedules; other benefits, such as in-kind gifts from donors, are shared equitably among employees and volunteers.

30. Strategic challenge: Optimize human resources and partnerships

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
5.1a(1)	The organization uses the SPP to determine key factors that affect workforce engagement, satisfaction, and well-being. As part of the 2004 SPP, senior leaders developed an initial set of key factors affecting employee and volunteer engagement. These factors continue to be identified through surveys, qualitative data gathered through walk-arounds, annual performance reviews of employees, quarterly informal briefings with employee and volunteer teams (V-teams), and event- and project-based orientation and debriefing. Validation of these factors has been incorporated into the SPP, using the employee and volunteer survey, which can be segmented by role and length of service.
5.1a(2,3) 5.1b	The Leadership System Model fosters an organizational culture conducive to high performance and engagement. For example, employee/volunteer teams throughout the organization, including the V-teams, cross-functional teams, and Process Improvement Teams (PITs), motivate workers to take initiative and allow teams to benefit from the diverse ideas of all members. This team-based culture serves as the basis for communication and information collection through the frequent information exchanges that occur during the shift changes and walk-arounds, and it forms the basis for team decision making, identification of training needs and improvement opportunities, and senior leader and SPP decision making.
5.1b(1)	The organization's Job Rotation Program and cross-training initiatives allow it to meet its identified strategic goal of increasing capacity, to facilitate the transfer of knowledge across the workforce, and to increase flexibility in staffing. This approach helps address the strategic

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
	challenge of optimizing human resources. It also reduces the learning curve for new employees and volunteers, which may be an important issue in an organization of this size.
5.1b(1,3, 4)	The organization provides career development and progression opportunities through development plans for each employee, training opportunities, a mentoring program for volunteer development, and inclusion of employees and volunteers in the Leadership System Model activities. Successors are designated and prepared for each senior leadership position. The Training and Volunteer Tracker captures special skills and interests, and information about training needs is collected through team exchanges, quarterly briefings, information boards, and other mechanisms. The effectiveness of the education delivered is evaluated through pre- and post-training surveys and performance metrics, such as satisfaction with training (Figure 7.4-3) and the percentage of cross-trained employees and volunteers (Figure 7.4-7).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
5.1a(3)	The applicant recognizes that many volunteers and employees are intrinsically motivated to contribute to its mission; however, it is unclear how the organization's workforce performance management system considers compensation, reward, recognition, and incentive practices for its employees and many volunteers. The lack of an effective workforce performance management system may impede the organization's efforts to address its strategic challenges of optimizing human resources and recruiting volunteers in competition with other nonprofit organizations.
5.1b(2)	**While an approach to senior leadership succession planning is in place, it is not evident how the organization's development and learning system for leaders addresses the development of personal leadership attributes, the development of organizational knowledge, ethical business practices, core competencies, strategic challenges, accomplishment of action plans, or improvement and innovation.**
5.1c(1,2)	It is not clear how the organization relates assessment findings to key business results to identify opportunities to improve workforce engagement and business results. For example, while the Executive Director and the Volunteer and Outreach Manager call volunteers and discuss workforce issues with leaders, it is not clear how they systematically aggregate and assess the multitude of information collected through surveys, shift reports, quarterly debriefings, and walk-arounds to drive innovation and improvement. Also, systematic approaches are not evident to determine workforce satisfaction or to transfer information from departing volunteers. These gaps may be important in light of the strategic challenge of optimizing human resources.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 5.1:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 5.1—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 5.1 Score _____45____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 5.2

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

9. Workforce key requirements: security; food safety; training; honesty, integrity, and accountability; regulatory and standards compliance; supervision/mentoring/guidance

11. Employee benefits include health and dental insurance and flexible work schedules; other benefits, such as in-kind gifts from donors, are shared equitably among employees and volunteers.

30. Strategic challenges: Optimize human resources and partnerships; recruit volunteers from a broad range of age segments

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
5.2a(1)	The organization uses various processes to assess its current workforce capability and capacity needs, including skills, competencies, and staffing levels. For example, these issues are addressed during the biennial SPP, which includes human resource planning activities and uses data sources such as surveys, shift-to-shift communications, quarterly reviews, Balanced Plate Scorecard results, surveys of member agencies, and information from the FBLC and FBA. With the help of student interns, the organization created process maps for critical skills and task descriptions for all jobs in 2004, and it updates task descriptions annually in alignment with regulatory requirements (Figure 5.2-1).
5.2a(2)	The organization uses a variety of recruitment approaches (Figure 5.2-2), with community outreach and word-of-mouth being the most powerful volunteer recruitment platforms. Program/Operations Committee members also have used focus groups to improve volunteer recruitment in the growing Hmong and Hispanic communities.
5.2a(3,4)	Various teams are used to manage and organize the workforce, capitalize on core competencies, reinforce a customer focus, address strategic challenges and action plans, and achieve the agility to address changing business needs. On V-teams, for example, the skills and abilities of individual employees and volunteers are matched to the work that needs to be accomplished. All employees and volunteers take part in cross-training and job rotation to provide job variety and new learning and to encourage improvements. Cross-functional, diverse teams help prepare employees, volunteers, and the organization for changing capability and capacity needs.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
5.2a(1,4)	Assessment of workforce capability and capacity occurs within the SPP as human resources are considered. However, this assessment deals primarily with current strategies and needs of the organization, and there is no evidence of a systematic approach to assess or plan for future and changing capacity and capability needs. This may be important to the organization in order to ensure its ability to meet the requirements of its longer-term strategic directions, such as increasing employee and volunteer retention and volunteer hours.
5.2a(2)	While the applicant has developed a variety of recruitment mechanisms (Figure 5.2-2), most of them appear to focus on volunteer recruitment; it is not clear whether these or other mechanisms target potential employees. In addition, while focus groups help recruit volunteers from the Hmong and Hispanic communities, it is not clear how other diversity factors are addressed (e.g., diversity in volunteers' ages). Further, a systematic approach to retain the organization's employees and volunteers is not evident. The lack of a systematic process in these areas may limit the organization's ability to recruit volunteers from a broad range of age segments and consistently optimize human resources, two of its five strategic challenges.
5.2b(1)	No performance measures are provided for workplace security, even though the applicant notes a security concern related to court-ordered placements. In addition, no improvement goals for workplace health and safety are provided. Further, other than segmented measures for transportation and warehouse accidents and injuries, there are no segmented or different measures for the safety and health requirements of differing groups of employees and volunteers. Without a fact-based, systematic approach to organizational health, safety, and security, the organization may be challenged in addressing its workforce's key requirements (Figure P.1-2a).
5.2b(2)	While the applicant provides health and dental insurance, as well flexible work schedules, for its employees, it is not apparent what policies and services, if any, support the organization's volunteers, including its core volunteer team. This may hamper the organization's ability to build an effective and supportive workforce environment and to support its key success factor of dedicated and experienced employees and volunteers.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 5.2:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 5.2—Overall Score

- [ ] 0–5%
- [ ] 10–25%
- [X] 30–45%
- [ ] 50–65%   Item 5.2 Score _____35_____ %
- [ ] 70–85%
- [ ] 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 6.1

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

2. In 2002, organization exited food pantry and soup kitchen services to focus on food banking as core competency. Aims to provide best foods, at the right time, to the right place.

6. Mission: A community-based food bank dedicated to feeding the hungry residents of its communities

17. Four major customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements: customers (member agencies), stakeholders (governments, organizations, taxpayers), community segments, donors/suppliers

19. Food suppliers and partners provide food, facilitate innovation, broaden the organization's reach, and improve core processes; finances and services suppliers and partners provide funds for food and activities, donate in-kind support, fund improved organizational capabilities, provide fiduciary controls, and volunteer.

25. Key success factors: its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, network of food suppliers, tight management of overhead costs (12.1% of operating expenses), volunteer base, and food availability and quality

31. Performance improvement system: Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Process

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
6.1a(1)	During the 1997 strategic planning retreat, senior leaders identified four core competencies based on member agency needs. These core competencies were determined to be the four hunger-reducing processes of Collection Management, Sort and Package Management, Inventory Management, and Distribution Management (Figure 6.1-2). They relate to the organization's mission by securing, producing, and delivering nutritional and balanced food products and services. In each subsequent SPP cycle, the organization reevaluates its core competencies to ensure that they still meet customer and stakeholder needs.
6.1b(1)	The applicant's key work processes include its hunger-reducing and support processes (Figures 6.1-1, 6.1-2, and 6.2-1). These relate to its core competencies by enabling the organization to effectively and efficiently supply and distribute food products to member agencies, which, in turn, distribute them to the food-insecure. Key process requirements, or CTQ indicators, are related to the value each brings to member agencies, profitability, organizational success, and sustainability.
6.1b(2) 6.1b(3)	The organization uses its CTQ Determination Process to determine and validate key work process requirements (Figures 6.1-2 and 6.2-1), incorporating input from customers, suppliers, and partners. The Program/Operations Committee and the Program Director/CFO use input gathered in the SPP, the CTQ Determination Process, and the PDCA Process to design work processes to meet key requirements. Recent refinements, including the current development of a scorecard and the mapping of key processes and subprocesses, are evident for these approaches.
6.1c	The organization participates in mock regional disaster drills and quarterly mock emergency events to help ensure work system and workplace preparedness for emergencies and disasters.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
	For example, employee and volunteer drills measure and ensure readiness for power outages, product spills, and warehouse, kitchen, and transportation accidents. Key lessons and improvements are documented and shared with employees and volunteers through quarterly debriefings, e-mails, newsletters, and board postings. Drills began in 2001, and the organization serves as a command center designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and as a regional distribution center. Improvements include reduced accidents, increased safety awareness, and increased regional FBLC cooperation.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
6.1a(1)	While senior leaders and the Board of Directors identified key hunger-reducing processes as the organization's core competencies during a 1997 strategic planning retreat, it is not clear what systematic approach was used at that time or whether a systematic method currently is used to assess and revalidate the core competencies. The lack of a systematic approach to determine core competencies that provide an advantage in the organization's service environment may make it difficult for the organization to consistently achieve the outcomes of its mission.
6.1a(2)	While the applicant states that it uses the PDCA Process (Figure 6.1-3) to design and innovate its work systems, it is not clear how the steps within this improvement cycle are used to design how work will be accomplished (work systems), including establishing the roles of the workforce, suppliers, and partners in producing and delivering products and services and coordinating internal work processes and external resources. The lack of a systematic, comprehensive design process may limit the organization's ability to ensure that it consistently provides the best foods, at the right time, to the right place.
6.1c	It is not apparent how the organization's disaster and emergency preparedness system fully considers prevention, management, continuity of operations, and recovery. For instance, while the organization's warehouse is situated in an area protected from wind and flood damage from the prevalent tornadoes in the area, in the event that a tornado or other disaster prevented a significant numbers of volunteers, or all lead volunteers, from coming to work, a process is not evident for ensuring the continuity of operations of its volunteer-dependent processes. Without a well-deployed approach that considers all aspects of disaster and emergency preparedness, the organization may find it difficult to accomplish its mission and address a key strategic challenge to ensure that food reaches those most in need when they need it most.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 6.1:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
				X		
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
			X			
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 6.1—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%

☐ 10–25%

☒ 30–45%

☐ 50–65%   Item 6.1 Score _____40_____ %

☐ 70–85%

☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 6.2

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

4. Paid employees and volunteers acquire, warehouse, transport, and distribute food to the food-insecure through partnerships with 58 member agencies.

13. Technologies: Uses FoodAnswers software from Food Banks of America (FBA) and Rapid Inventory Control Enterprise (RICE); an information technology firm provides hardware and software pro bono support

14. Equipment: refrigerators and other food storage equipment, two trucks, and one van

15. The regulatory environment includes multiple regulating agencies and standards to protect food, workers, and member agencies; food safety and the safety of employees and volunteers require tight controls

19. Food suppliers and partners provide food, facilitate innovation, broaden the organization's reach, and improve core processes; finances and services suppliers and partners provide funds for food and activities, donate in-kind support, fund improved organizational capabilities, provide fiduciary controls, and volunteer.

33. Performance improvement system: Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Process

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:
Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS
(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
6.2a(1)	The organization uses the PDCA Process to help ensure its work processes meet the design requirements identified in its CTQ indicators. In addition, the applicant has identified both outcome and in-process measures to control and improve its hunger-reducing and support processes (Figures 6.1-2 and 6.2-1). In-process measures are tracked daily, weekly, and monthly and updated on the Daily Harvest or Monthly Harvest Dashboards and/or the Balanced Plate Scorecard. All measures are evaluated regularly by senior leaders.
6.2a(2)	The organization uses the PDCA Process (Step 6) to minimize overall costs and eliminate rework. Employees, volunteers, senior leaders, and PITs use the PDCA Process to review, evaluate, and measure processes. Improvements include streamlined and/or improved processes, such as new sanitation and food handling processes, as well as improved fuel efficiency in the delivery fleet. In addition, process improvements through training, posting processes, sharing metrics, and implementing the RICE system have contributed to a 25% reduction in inspection and audit times.
6.2b	**The organization uses Step 7 of its PDCA Process and a semiannual review to improve its work processes to achieve better performance. The planning portion of the PDCA Process was enhanced through extensive senior leader and stakeholder participation to design and deploy each key work process. A senior leader involves employees, volunteers, and partners in an informal, semiannual process review that reflects on performance and identifies key learnings and improvement opportunities. For example, in 2006, the organization conducted a redesign of each key work process to ensure appropriate CTQ indicators.**

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
6.2a(1)	While a focus group of partners, donors/suppliers, core volunteers, and member agencies provides annual input on process requirements through the CTQ Determination Process, a process is not evident for using the input of these groups in the day-to-day management of the key processes, as appropriate.
6.2a(1)	While the CTQ Determination Process is used to determine process requirements and the PDCA Process is used to improve processes, it is not clear how the applicant's day-to-day operation of work processes ensures that they meet key process requirements.
6.2b	While the organization documents lessons learned and process improvements to include in process diagrams, it is not clear how these improvements and lessons are shared with other organizational processes and work units to drive organizational learning and innovation. Without a systematic, well-deployed approach, the organization's efforts to achieve its vision and optimize the use of resources may be restricted.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 6.2:

Factor	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
Approach	No systematic approach to Item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal	The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach , responsive to the overall requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident	An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the Item, is evident
			X			
Deployment	Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident	The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the Item	The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in the early stages of deployment	The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units	The approach is well deployed with no significant gaps	The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units
				X		
Learning	An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved through reacting to problems	Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are evident	The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident	A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement and innovation as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing	Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization
			X			
Integration	No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently	The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving	The approach is in early stages of alignment with your basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is aligned with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items	The approach is well integrated with your organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other Process Items
				X		

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 6.2—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 6.2 Score _____45_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 7.1

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

1. A community-based nonprofit food bank that distributes food for the food-insecure
17. Four major customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements: customers (member agencies), stakeholders (governments, organizations, taxpayers), community segments, donors/suppliers
22. Competitive position: delivered nearly half of all food dispersed to those in need in Iowa last year
25. Key success factors: its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, network of food suppliers, tight management of overhead costs (12.1% of operating expenses), volunteer base, food availability and quality, and optimization of food resources
27. Key changes: shifting groups of temporarily food-insecure persons, seasonal needs (e.g., related to school vacation times and migrant populations), and the doubling of Hispanic and Hmong populations in the past year. The nutritional quality of food, along with quantity, has become a key consideration in the past decade.
28. Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons, IFBA state comparisons, Assistance Now Finder, collaborative FBLC regional data and best practice sharing

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:
Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS
(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.1a	**Product and service results for food availability and distribution (Figures 7.1-1 through 7.1-4) show positive trends from 2003 to 2006. The applicant's 2006 fill rate of 95% (Figure 7.1-4) was the best in the IFBA (state) and the FBLC (region) for this Balanced Plate Scorecard and key process measure (Figures 4.1-1 and 6.1-2). The applicant distributed 7.5 million pounds of food in 2006 (Figure 7.1-1), which makes it the largest food bank in the IFBA, and it is nearing the 2007 projected best in the IFBA for this measure. In addition, the amount of food distributed from 2003 to 2006 increased in both rural and urban counties (Figure 7.1-2). These favorable results demonstrate that the organization is progressing toward its mission to feed the hungry residents of its communities.**
7.1a	Results for several key customer requirements demonstrate positive trends for the past three years. Nutritional value and overall food variety (Figure 7.1-5) improved from a rating of 6 (on a 10-point scale) in 2005 to approximately 7 in 2006, approaching the state-best level of 8. From 2003 to 2006, the applicant's On-Time Food Delivery to Member Agencies (Figure 7.1-6) increased from approximately 45% to more than 90%, while the Number of Emergency Food Boxes Distributed Per Week (Figure 7.1-7) increased from 180 to 729; these results are the best for the IFBA in 2006 and are approaching the FBA best. These positive results are linked to the customer requirements of quality and variety of food, timeliness, and continuity of service, as well as to the key success factor of food availability and quality.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.1a	Demand for service, as represented by the number of unduplicated food-insecure client contacts (Figure 7.1-8), has grown by about 75% between 2003 and 2006, with increases in all age-group segments of the population. This increase in demand has been met with a corresponding rise in the Pounds of Food Distributed per Person (Figure 7.1-9), which increased from approximately 90 pounds per person in 2003 to 100 pounds per person in 2006. The applicant's results on this strategic action plan and key process metric (Figures 2.2-2 and 6.1-2) demonstrate improved productivity and progress toward the organization's vision to make Iowa's heartland hunger-free.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
7.1a	While in some cases the applicant's product and service outcomes exceed those of regional and state comparisons, its performance is below that of the national comparisons (the FBA and the FBA best). Additionally, comparisons are not presented for more than the current year, which may make it difficult for the organization to evaluate how it is performing over time in relation to other food banks.
7.1a	While results for a few product and service measures include some segmented data (e.g., Figures 7.1-2 and 7.1-3), most results lack segmentation, which may make it difficult for the applicant to identify and understand changing or emerging market segments, changing requirements of specific customer groups, or the potential obsolescence of services in certain areas.
7.1a	Although the applicant provides results for some measures relevant to its key product and service features, such as nutritional value, overall food variety, and on-time food delivery, results related to the customer requirements of consistency and dependability are not provided. Without data on the performance of its products and services in these areas, the applicant may be limited in its ability to assess whether it is meeting the requirements of its key customers (i.e., its member agencies) and to implement any needed improvements.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 7.1:

Guidelines	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
First Element (*Levels/trends*)	There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported	A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas	Improvements and/ or good performance levels are reported in many areas addressed in the Item requirements	Improvement trends and/or good performance levels are reported for most areas addressed in the Item requirements	Current performance levels are good to excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements	Current performance levels are excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements
				X		
Second Element (*Trends/ sustained results*)	Trend data are not reported or show mainly adverse trends	Little or no trend data are reported, or many of the trends shown are adverse	Early stages of developing trends are evident	No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels have been sustained over time	Excellent improvement trends and/or consistently excellent performance levels are reported in most areas
				X		
Third Element (*Comparisons/ benchmarks*)	Comparative information is not reported	Little or no comparative information is reported	Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident	Some trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks— show areas of good to very good relative performance	Many to most reported trends and/or current performance levels— evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks— show areas of leadership and very good relative performance	Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas
			X			
Fourth Element (*Importance of results*)	Results are not reported for any areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for a few areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for many areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, and process requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements	Organizational performance results fully address key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 7.1—Overall Score

- [ ] 0–5%
- [ ] 10–25%
- [X] 30–45%
- [ ] 50–65%   Item 7.1 Score _____45_____ %
- [ ] 70–85%
- [ ] 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 7.2

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

17. Four major customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements: customers (member agencies), stakeholders (governments, organizations, taxpayers), community segments, donors/suppliers

18. Serves a six-county metropolitan statistical area (MSA) population of 500,000, with 75,000 client contacts annually. In this area, 8% of the residents are under age five (mostly urban), 13% are more than 65 years old (mostly rural), and 10% are below the federal poverty rate; there is a 13% unemployment rate; a third of clients receive federal food assistance services; and two counties have a 9.5% food-insecurity rate (above the state average).

25. Key success factors: its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, network of food suppliers; organizational learning, collaboration, and innovation; and the satisfaction of member agencies, donors/suppliers, and the community

28. Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons, IFBA state comparisons, Assistance Now Finder, and collaborative FBLC regional data and best-practice sharing

30. Strategic challenges: ensure food reaches those most in need, when they need it most, optimize human resources and partnerships, respond to member agency needs

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.2a(1)	Results demonstrate generally improving performance levels for member agencies' satisfaction with the organization's timeliness/dependability, communications, hours of operation, and food selections and nutritional quality, as well as their overall satisfaction and the communities' satisfaction that the applicant is "meeting growing needs" (Figures 7.2-1 through 7.2-5 and Figure 7.2-11). Workforce satisfaction with communications at the Assist Each Other member agency, at 90%, was the IFBA (state) best in 2006; satisfaction gaps among the three agencies presented are narrowing, and in 2006 variability in overall satisfaction was eliminated when all three agency levels reached a three-year high of 90%. Similarly, the gap in satisfaction between new donors and major donors has been closing steadily as the satisfaction of all groups rises toward 2006 IFBA and FBLC (regional) best levels (Figure 7.2-9).
7.2a(1)	Results for the Overall Number and Type of Complaints Received (Figure 7.2-6), an indicator of customer dissatisfaction, show that in 2006 the organization reversed an unfavorable trend for the number of complaints associated with the availability of food items stocked; this reversal may demonstrate the favorable impact of the RICE inventory tracker, which was implemented in 2005. Complaint data are segmented by several key customer requirements, and results vary from 2002 to 2006, with several trending favorably. Despite a doubling in demand for services in the past three years, the number of complaints overall declined to a five-year low in 2006.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.2a(2)	Results for the likelihood to refer others to the organization (Figure 7.2-7) demonstrate steady, favorable increases from 2003 to 2006 for each of the three agencies shown, while the variability of these results among the agencies is diminishing. Results related to providing information to the food-insecure (Figure 7.2-8) also show steady improvement from 2003 to 2006 for four of the five communication mechanisms shown, with the effectiveness of flyers and announcements made at churches increasing from approximately 83% to 90%.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
7.2a(1)	While results for several customer requirements in Overall Number and Type of Complaints Received (Figure 7.2-6) improved from 2003 to 2006, results for hours of access show variable levels and results for location show a small but steady rise since 2003. Problems in access and location may limit food availability for customers, a key success factor important to the organization's challenge of ensuring that food reaches those most in need when they need it most.
7.2a(1)	Comparisons are not provided for many customer-focused results (Figures 7.2-6, 7.2-7, 7.2-8, 7.2-10, and 7.2-11). Additionally, because only the 2006 level is shown for best-in-class results (Figures 7.2-1 through 7.2-5 and Figure 7.2-9), it is not possible for the organization to compare its trends with those of top performers in order to address its key success factor of organizational learning and innovation (Figure 4.1-1).
7.2a(1)	Customer-focused performance results are shown for only 3 of 58 member agencies, and results are not segmented by groups important to the organization, such as its customer/market/ stakeholder groups or the counties and demographics related to its end-users—the food-insecure. Additionally, while the organization's Segmentation Process defines member agency segments according to the size of agencies, frequency of service, and urban or rural location and it defines community segments according to various service organizations and leaders, results for these segments are not provided.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 7.2:

Guidelines	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
First Element *(Levels/trends)*	There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported	A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas	Improvements and/ or good performance levels are reported in many areas addressed in the Item requirements	Improvement trends and/or good performance levels are reported for most areas addressed in the Item requirements	Current performance levels are good to excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements	Current performance levels are excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements
				X		
Second Element *(Trends/ sustained results)*	Trend data are not reported or show mainly adverse trends	Little or no trend data are reported, or many of the trends shown are adverse	Early stages of developing trends are evident	No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels have been sustained over time	Excellent improvement trends and/or consistently excellent performance levels are reported in most areas
				X		
Third Element *(Comparisons/ benchmarks)*	Comparative information is not reported	Little or no comparative information is reported	Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident	Some trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of good to very good relative performance	Many to most reported trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of leadership and very good relative performance	Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas
			X			
Fourth Element *(Importance of results)*	Results are not reported for any areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for a few areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for many areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, and process requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements	Organizational performance results fully address key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 7.2—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 7.2 Score _____43_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 7.3

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

1. A community-based nonprofit food bank that distributes food for the food-insecure
18. Serves a six-county metropolitan statistical area (MSA) population of 500,000, with 75,000 client contacts annually. In this area, 8% of the residents are under age five (mostly urban), 13% are more than 65 years old (mostly rural), and 10% are below the federal poverty rate; there is a 13% unemployment rate; a third of clients receive federal food assistance services; and two counties have a 9.5% food-insecurity rate (above the state average).
25. Key success factors: its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, network of food suppliers, tight management of overhead costs (12.1% of operating expenses), and volunteer base
28 Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons, IFBA state comparisons, Assistance Now Finder, collaborative FBLC regional data and best practice sharing
30. Strategic challenge: obtain and maintain adequate financial resources

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:
Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS
(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.3a(1)	Results for Organizational Capacity (Figure 7.3-1), an indicator of financial performance, show steady, favorable rating increases from 2002 to 2006. This broad indicator consists of primary revenue growth, program expenses growth, and working capital ratio. Results for Organizational Efficiency (Figure 7.3-2), which includes program, administrative, and fundraising expenses, as well as fundraising efficiency, demonstrate steady, favorable rating increases from 2002 to 2006 (indicating the success of the Corporate Contributor Program). In addition, these results attained the Assistance Now Finder "Good" range from 2003 to 2006. Combined overall results (Figure 7.3-3) reached the "Good" range in 2005.
7.3a(1)	Financial performance results for direct Program Expenses (Figure 7.3-4) as a percentage of budget increased favorably by about 15 percentage points from 2002 to 2006, approaching the Assistance Now Finder best-in-class level of 90%. The organization's Administrative Expenses (Figure 7.3-5) as a percentage of budget have remained just under 10% from 2002 to 2006, meeting or near the "Exceptional" maximum of approximately 9%. During this time frame, Fundraising Expenses (Figure 7.3-6) per dollar improved within the "Exceptional" range from approximately $0.04 to $0.03, and Fundraising Efficiency (As a Percentage of Operating Expenses) (Figure 7.3-7) improved from 15% in 2003 to 3% in 2006, entering the "Exceptional" range in 2004.
7.3a(1)	Results for the organization's income (Figure 7.3-9) demonstrate a favorable, steady increase from just over $5 million in 2003 to more than $6 million in 2006. In addition, results for Performance to Budget (Figure 7.6-8) indicate consistent performance of better than 99% from 2004 to 2006. The 2006 level of 99.85% compares favorably to the federal government average

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
	of 98.62%. These positive financial performance results may contribute to the management of the organization's strategic challenge of obtaining and maintaining adequate financial resources.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
7.3a(1)	While ratings for Organizational Capacity (Figure 7.3-1) have improved since 2002, as of 2006 they remain below the minimum for a rating of "Good" by the Assistance Now Finder. Increased performance on this measure might assist the organization in maintaining adequate financial resources so that it can respond to member agency needs and more effectively address the rapidly changing needs of the food-insecure.
7.3a(1)	Levels and trends are not provided for several key indicators of financial performance. For example, the composite measure for organizational capacity shows improvement over time; however, results for two of the measures that make up this composite—primary revenue growth and working capital—are not shown over time.
7.3a(1)	Results are not provided for several measures that may provide insight into organizational sustainability, such as current liabilities (included in the Balanced Plate Scorecard in Figure 4.1-1), reserve funds (if applicable), and cost savings. The absence of results for these measures may limit the applicant's ability to assess its financial performance.
7.3	**Limited comparisons are provided for measures of financial and market performance. For example, no comparative data are provided for the applicant's income results (Figure 7.3-9). Results related to organizational capacity and efficiency (Figures 7.3-1 through 7.3-7) include comparisons only to the national Assistance Now Finder, and results for Overall Peer Comparison (Figure 7.3-8) include comparisons to only four food banks in the region. A more comprehensive use of comparisons may assist the organization in better judging its financial and market position relative to other nonprofit organizations providing the same or similar products and services.**

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 7.3:

Guidelines	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
First Element *(Levels/trends)*	There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported	A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas	Improvements and/ or good performance levels are reported in many areas addressed in the Item requirements	Improvement trends and/or good performance levels are reported for most areas addressed in the Item requirements	Current performance levels are good to excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements	Current performance levels are excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements
			X			
Second Element *(Trends/ sustained results)*	Trend data are not reported or show mainly adverse trends	Little or no trend data are reported, or many of the trends shown are adverse	Early stages of developing trends are evident	No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels have been sustained over time	Excellent improvement trends and/or consistently excellent performance levels are reported in most areas
				X		
Third Element *(Comparisons/ benchmarks)*	Comparative information is not reported	Little or no comparative information is reported	Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident	Some trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of good to very good relative performance	Many to most reported trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of leadership and very good relative performance	Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas
		X				
Fourth Element *(Importance of results)*	Results are not reported for any areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for a few areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for many areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, and process requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements	Organizational performance results fully address key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements
		X				

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 7.3—Overall Score

☐   0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 7.3 Score _____30_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 7.4

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

7. 10.5 FTE employees (8 full time, 5 part time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

9. Workforce key requirements: security; food safety; training; honesty, integrity, and accountability; regulatory compliance; supervision/mentoring/guidance

10. Workforce expectations: focus on the MVV; respectful, nondiscriminatory communications and actions; collaboration and teamwork; stewardship of resources

11. Employee benefits include health and dental insurance and flexible work schedules; other benefits, such as in-kind gifts from donors, are shared equitably among employees and volunteers.

30. Strategic challenges: Optimize human resources and partnerships; recruit volunteers from a broad range of age segments

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:
Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS
(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.4 a(1,2)	Results for several indicators of workforce engagement and capacity show favorable levels and trends, supporting the strategic goal to increase volunteer retention by 5% each year (Figure 2.2-2). For example, the number of former clients who became volunteers increased from 3 in 2004 to 15 in 2006 (Figure 7.4-5), the number of court-ordered placements who were retained as volunteers doubled from 2004 to 2006 (Figure 7.4-9), the number of volunteer groups has increased each year from 2003 to 2006 (Figures 7.4-12 and 7.4-13), and core volunteers contributed more hours than the regional average each year from 2003 to 2006 (Figure 7.4-11). In addition, volunteer referrals of family and friends increased from 4 in 2003 to 15 in 2006 (Figure 7.4-8).
7.4 a(1,2)	Workforce and leader development results demonstrate favorable performance. For example, from 2003 to 2006, the annual number of training hours for employees increased from approximately 100 hours to about 350 hours and for volunteers from approximately 900 hours to 4,500 hours (Figure 7.4-1), meeting the strategic goal to increase volunteers' hours by 10% each year (Figure 2.2-2). Additionally, in 2006, 80% of employees and more than 60% of volunteers were cross-trained, and the organization's workforce and leader development was ranked the best in the regional FBLC (Figure 7.4-7). Further, employee and volunteer satisfaction with training increased from approximately 5 in 2003 to about 9 in 2006 (on a 10-point scale), and the 2006 rating approaches the regional benchmark (Figure 7.4-3).

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.4a(3)	Workplace health and safety results demonstrate favorable performance trends. Sanitation ratings improved from 80% in 2003 to approximately 92% in 2006, and the food handling and disposal compliance rating improved from 80% in 2004 to approximately 93% in 2006, with both measures meeting the 2006 regional benchmark and approaching the national benchmark (Figure 7.4-14). In addition, employee and volunteer injuries have decreased from approximately 26 in 2003 to 5 in 2006, approaching the regional best performance for that year (Figure 7.4-4). These results indicate the effectiveness of training and education in these areas.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
7.4a(1,2, 3)	No comparative data are provided for many of the reported workplace-focused outcomes, including safety measures of workplace incidents (Figures 7.4-16 and 7.4-17), absenteeism (Figure 7.4-18), volunteer recruitment and retention (Figures 7.4-6, 7.4-9, 7.4-12, and 7.4-13), annual total training hours (Figure 7.4-1), and volunteer segmentation (Figure 7.4-10). In addition, the comparisons provided are for one year only (2006). Without relevant comparisons tracked over time, the applicant may have difficulty effectively assessing its progress in addressing its strategic challenges of optimizing human resources and recruiting volunteers from a broad range of age segments.
7.4a	**Results are not reported for several key employee and volunteer requirements and expectations, including a focus on the organization's MVV, respectful and nondiscriminatory communications and actions, a spirit of collaboration and teamwork, and supervision/mentoring/guidance from the organization's senior leaders or assigned employee/volunteer leaders (a requirement of students, fellows, and court-ordered community service placements). Without this information, the applicant may not be able to determine its progress in meeting the key requirements and expectations of its workforce**.
7.4a(1,3)	Limited or no results are provided for several measures related to the annual employee and volunteer survey. For example, while the applicant notes that it received a rating of 9 in 2006 for overall employee satisfaction (Figure 2.2-2), no trended data are provided for this measure. In addition, results are not presented for issues included in the survey amendment for employees, such as pay equity and support for career development. These gaps may make it difficult for the organization to evaluate the effectiveness of its workforce services and benefits; to address its key success factor of dedicated, experienced employees and volunteers; or to meet its strategic challenge to optimize human resources.
7.4 a	Most of the workforce-focused results that are provided include limited or no data segmented to address the diversity of the applicant's workforce or its various workforce groups. For example, no segmentation is provided for employee and volunteer injuries (Figure 7.4-4), for satisfaction with training (Figure 7.4-3), or for absenteeism (Figure 7.4-18). In addition, no results are presented for the engagement or satisfaction of workforce segments such as employees, university students, and government and foundation fellows—or for various age segments. This

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
	lack of segmented data may limit the organization's ability to assess its progress in addressing its strategic challenges of optimizing human resources and recruiting volunteers from a broad range of age segments and to prioritize improvement efforts.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 7.4:

Guidelines	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
First Element *(Levels/trends)*	There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported	A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas	Improvements and/ or good performance levels are reported in many areas addressed in the Item requirements	Improvement trends and/or good performance levels are reported for most areas addressed in the Item requirements	Current performance levels are good to excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements	Current performance levels are excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements
			X			
Second Element *(Trends/ sustained results)*	Trend data are not reported or show mainly adverse trends	Little or no trend data are reported, or many of the trends shown are adverse	Early stages of developing trends are evident	No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels have been sustained over time	Excellent improvement trends and/or consistently excellent performance levels are reported in most areas
				X		
Third Element *(Comparisons/ benchmarks)*	Comparative information is not reported	Little or no comparative information is reported	Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident	Some trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of good to very good relative performance	Many to most reported trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks—show areas of leadership and very good relative performance	Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas
			X			
Fourth Element *(Importance of results)*	Results are not reported for any areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for a few areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for many areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, and process requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements	Organizational performance results fully address key customer/patient/student, market, process, and action plan requirements
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 7.4—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 7.4 Score _____40_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 7.5

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

3. Fund and resource development is a second key service that is core to survival and growth

6. Mission: A community-based food bank dedicated to feeding the hungry residents of its communities.

17. Four major customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements: customers (member agencies), stakeholders (governments, organizations, taxpayers), community segments, donors/suppliers

18. Serves a six-county metropolitan statistical area (MSA) population of 500,000, with 75,000 client contacts annually. In this area, 8% of the residents are under age five (mostly urban), 13% are more than 65 years old (mostly rural), and 10% are below the federal poverty rate; there is a 13% unemployment rate; a third of clients receive federal food assistance services; and two counties have a 9.5% food-insecurity rate (above the state average).

28. Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons; IFBA state comparisons; Assistance Now Finder food bank and other nonprofit financial evaluations; and collaborative FBLC regional data and best practice sharing.

33. Performance improvement system: Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Process

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:
Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS
(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.5a(1)	Several results for the operational performance of key work systems show good to excellent performance levels and trends and favorable comparisons. From 2003 to 2006, the Inventory and Resource Effectiveness Index improved from 4 to approximately 7.5 out of 10 (Figure 7.5-13), while the percentage of suppliers' products utilized increased from approximately 78% to 93% and the percentage of suppliers reengaged improved significantly from approximately 54% to 96%, with the latter two levels approaching those of the 2006 regional FBLC and national FBA best (Figure 7.5-14). In addition, the satisfaction rating from key suppliers/donors of services and food (Figures 7.5-15 and 7.5-16) shows improvement from 2003 to 2006, with the 2005 and 2006 IFBA-best rating from suppliers/donors of services. Workplace preparedness results indicate significant improvement for Mock Disaster Drill Effectiveness (Figure 7.5-17) from 80% in 2003 to approximately 95% in 2006—the regional FBLC-best level.
7.5a(1)	From 2004 to 2006, the percentage of food products that required repackaging improved from approximately 47% to 23%, while the percentage of product waste during repackaging significantly improved from approximately 25% to 7% (Figure 7.5-5). Likewise, the Average Percentage of Packaging Waste (Figure 7.5-6) improved from approximately 17% in 2004 to about 7% in 2006, approaching the FBLC-best level. The percentage of food labeling errors (Figure 7.5-7) improved significantly from approximately 35% in 2004 to 10% in 2006.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.5a(2)	Several results for the operational performance of key work processes show good to excellent performance levels and trends, as well as favorable comparisons. Results for the Average Pounds of Food Collected (Figure 7.5-1) improved from slightly over 4 million pounds in 2003 to about 8 million pounds in 2006, approaching the 2006 FBLC-best level. In addition, during this time period, the percentage of edible food collected from drives improved from approximately 70% to about 92%, the percentage from salvage improved from about 50% to 81%, and the percentage from drop-offs improved from approximately 77% to 82%, with levels approaching the 2006 FBLC- and FBA-best comparisons in all areas (Figure 7.5-2). Further, the nutritional value of the food collected (Figure 7.5-3) improved from approximately 3.75 in 2004 to about 4.5 (on a 10-point scale) in 2006, and the effectiveness rating to meet food demands (Figure 7.5-4) significantly improved from 40% in 2003 to about 90% in 2006, the FBLC-best level.
7.5a(2)	From 2003 to 2006, the Number of Inventory Turns per Year (Figure 7.5-8) steadily improved from about 7 to 10, approaching the FBLC-best level of approximately 11, and the inventory for both perishable and nonperishable food (Figure 7.5-9) improved, with the total increasing from about 30 days to nearly 100 days. The applicant's results for meeting seasonal demand (Figure 7.5-10) significantly improved from 20% in 2003 to 80% in 2006, the FBLC-best level. In addition, the percentage of food spoilage and waste improved from about 13% in 2003 to 5% in 2006, and inventory errors decreased from about 27% in 2004 to 15% in 2006 (Figure 7.5-11).
7.5a(2)	From 2003 to 2006, the Fleet Maintenance Index (Figure 7.5-20) improved from about 7.5 to approximately 9.3 (out of 10), while the refrigeration accuracy index improved from 7 to approximately 9.2 and the ground maintenance index improved from 8 to 10 (Figure 7.5-21). In addition, from 2003 to 2006, Annual "Drive the Limit" Audit Results increased from 60% to 90% compliance, approaching the 99% state target (Figure 7.5-22), and fleet miles per gallon (MPG) improved from an average of 10 MPG to about 17 MPG, approaching the 20 MPG state target(Figure 7.5-23).

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
7.5a	Results are not provided for several key indicators of process effectiveness important to the organization (Figures 6.1-2 and 6.2-1), such as the percentage of repackaging time, the food storage compliance index, accounts receivable days outstanding, the warehouse equipment maintenance expense ratio, and process improvement team results. The lack of results for these indicators of process effectiveness may inhibit the applicant's ability to assess its process management and make improvements as needed.
7.5a	Comparisons are missing for some key indicators of process effectiveness related to the Strategic Plan and Balanced Plate Scorecard, such as the Inventory and Resource Effectiveness Index (Figure 7.5-13), RICE Percentage of Uptime and User Interface Accuracy (Figure 7.5-19), Fleet

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
	Maintenance Index (Figure 7.5-20), and Key Refrigeration and Grounds Maintenance Metrics (Figure 7.5-21). Without comparative data, the organization may find it difficult to assess its relative performance and set achievable goals as it strives to provide the best foods, at the right time, to the right place.
7.5a	Although supplier/donor satisfaction ratings (Figures 7.5-15 and 7.5-16) are available by segments on site and results for inventory days on hand (Figure 7.5-9) are segmented by perishable and nonperishable food, no other segmentation is used to address key product and service types and market segments. For example, the effectiveness of meeting food demands (Figure 7.5-4) is not segmented geographically to ensure that the two counties with above-state-average food insecurity are equitably served, and data for satisfaction (Figure 7.5-12) and other member agency metrics are not segmented by the 58 member agency characteristics or locations.

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 7.5:

Guidelines	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
First Element *(Levels/trends)*	There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported	A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas	Improvements and/ or good performance levels are reported in many areas addressed in the Item requirements	Improvement trends and/or good performance levels are reported for most areas addressed in the Item requirements	Current performance levels are good to excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements	Current performance levels are excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements
				X		
Second Element *(Trends/ sustained results)*	Trend data are not reported or show mainly adverse trends	Little or no trend data are reported, or many of the trends shown are adverse	Early stages of developing trends are evident	No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels have been sustained over time	Excellent improvement trends and/or consistently excellent performance levels are reported in most areas
			X			
Third Element *(Comparisons/ benchmarks)*	Comparative information is not reported	Little or no comparative information is reported	Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident	Some trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks— show areas of good to very good relative performance	Many to most reported trends and/or current performance levels— evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks— show areas of leadership and very good relative performance	Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas
				X		
Fourth Element *(Importance of results)*	Results are not reported for any areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for a few areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for many areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, and process requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient /student, market, process, and action plan requirements	Organizational performance results fully address key customer/patient /student, market, process, and action plan requirements
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 7.5—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%

☐ 10–25%

☐ 30–45%

☒ 50–65%   Item 7.5 Score _____53_____ %

☐ 70–85%

☐ 90–100%

Item Worksheet—Item 7.6

Indicate the 4–6 most important key business/organization factors relevant to this Item.

7. 10.5 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees (8 full-time and 5 part-time); 8 of 13 employees with bachelor-level or above degrees, 5 employees with high school diplomas or associate degrees

8. More than 500 volunteers, including a core team of 20 volunteers, contributed 28,600 hours in 2006. Volunteers include university nutrition and management students, government and foundation fellows, and court-ordered community-service placements. Nearly half of volunteers are over age 55.

15. The regulatory environment includes multiple regulating agencies and standards to protect food, workers, and member agencies; food safety and the safety of employees and volunteers require tight controls

17. Four major customer/stakeholder/market segments, each with specific requirements: customers (member agencies), stakeholders (governments, organizations, taxpayers), community segments, donors/suppliers

25. Key success factors: its ability to feed the food-insecure through member agencies, tight management of overhead costs (12.1% of operating expenses), volunteer base, fiscal agility, funding and food resources, and the satisfaction of member agencies, donors/suppliers, and the community.

28. Comparative and competitive data sources: FBA national comparisons, IFBA state comparisons, Assistance Now Finder, and collaborative FBLC regional data and best practice sharing

Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement:

Indicate the relative importance/strength of the comment by bolding the text for ++ or - - comments.

STRENGTHS

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.6a(2)	Several key indicators of stakeholder trust show improving performance from 2004 to 2006. Scores from a survey of member agencies, corporate contributors, volunteers, donors, and suppliers on a variety of confidence and trust issues (Figure 7.3-10) show improvement in all but one issue (member agencies' trust in managing grant dollars). In addition, results for donations and grants show increases that also may reflect stakeholder trust; the cumulative increases in the top 10% of donors' funding (Figure 7.6-3) improved significantly from approximately 28% to 38% from 2004 to 2006, with relatively static annual increases. Annual grants (Figure 7.6-7) increased from three in 2004 to four in both 2005 and 2006, with a corresponding increase in the aggregate grant dollars from $17,000 in 2004 to $32,000 in 2006.
7.6a(3)	Favorable fiscal accountability results include Performance to Budget (Figure 7.6-8), which has been sustained at a high level (above 99%) from 2004 to 2006. Results for the applicant's Volunteer and External Audit Programs (Figures 7.6-11 and 7.6-12) show a decreased number of findings since 2002 (with no findings in the external audit program since that time) and decreasing discrepancies in both Volunteer and External Audits since 2004 and 2003, respectively. These favorable trends may reflect the rigor of the internal audit program, which is intended to address issues prior to external audits.

Item Ref.	STRENGTHS
7.6a(4)	Regulatory compliance ratings indicate improvement in food safety and employee and facility certifications, which are identified as regulatory issues in Figure P.1-3. Sanitation and Food Handling and Disposal Compliance Ratings (Figure 7.4-14) improved in 2005, nearing or reaching FBLC (regional) and FBA (national) best ratings in 2006. From 2003 to 2006, Safety Audit Compliance Ratings improved from 60% to better than 90%, employee and facility certifications increased from almost 75% to 90%, and the Record Compliance Index improved from about 55% to more than 90%. These measures are approaching the 2006 FBLC (regional) and FBA (national) best performance (Figure 7.4-15).
7.6a(5)	Several organizational citizenship results demonstrate favorable performance. From 2003 to 2006, employee participation in the Community Ways of Connection efforts (Figure 7.6-13) increased from approximately 75% to 100%. Results for Recycled Paper and Pallets (Figure 7.6-14) show a favorable trend, with the amount of recycled paper growing from approximately 3,000 pounds in 2002 to about 11,000 pounds in 2006. In addition, the applicant's support for FEED Iowa Partnership development proposals (Figure 7.6-15) has increased from one proposal in 2004 to four in 2006, which represents the IFBA (state) best performance.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

(Tab to move to the next column; tab from the final column to begin the next comment.)

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
7.6a(2)	While results related to ethical conduct are shown for hotline calls (Figure 7.6-4) and the number of volunteers conducting ethics self-assessments (Figure 7.6-5), the applicant does not provide results for other indicators that would identify violations of ethical conduct, such as instances of ethical conduct breaches and responses, survey results on workforce perceptions of organizational ethics, and results of ethics reviews and audits. There is no indication of a similar assessment for board members or for ensuring and monitoring ethical behavior in all interactions with customers, partners, and other stakeholders. Without assessing organizational performance to high ethical standards, the organization may find it difficult to build and keep stakeholder trust.
7.6a(2)	Results for corporate contributors' donations (Figure 7.6-9) do not show a favorable trend from 2004 to 2006; donations declined by about $10,000 from 2005 to 2006. In addition, both overhead and the related Assistance Now Finder rating show an unfavorable increase during this time period. Considering that the applicant notes a commitment to its contributors to demonstrate prudent fiscal accountability by reducing overhead costs, these unfavorable results may negatively impact the organization's efforts to address its strategic challenge of maintaining adequate financial resources.
7.6a(all)	While the current status of performance for regulatory compliance is shown in Figure 7.6-6, with six of nine indicators at their goal of zero, pass, or 100% adherence, these data represent the performance of only one year, which does not allow for an understanding of trends over time. In addition, relevant comparisons are not provided for most of the leadership and social

Item Ref.	OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT
	responsibility results, and, when comparative data are provided (e.g., in Figure 7.6-15), the comparison is presented for only one year. The lack of relevant comparative data over time may make it difficult for the applicant to assess its progress in relation to comparable organizations.
7.6a (all)	Leadership and social responsibility results are not segmented to allow analysis of performance by groups. For example, Performance to Budget (Figure 7.6-8) results are not shown by budget grouping, Recent Increases in Funding (Figure 7.6-3) are not presented by contributor type, and results for Volunteers Completing Ethics/Values Self-Assessments (Figure 7.6-5) are not segmented by volunteer type (e.g., core volunteer, event volunteer).

Evaluation Factor Score Summary—Item 7.6:

Guidelines	0-5%	10-25%	30-45%	50-65%	70-85%	90-100%
First Element *(Levels/trends)*	There are no organizational performance results or poor results in areas reported	A few organizational performance results are reported; there are some improvements and/or early good performance levels in a few areas	Improvements and/ or good performance levels are reported in many areas addressed in the Item requirements	Improvement trends and/or good performance levels are reported for most areas addressed in the Item requirements	Current performance levels are good to excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements	Current performance levels are excellent in most areas of importance to the Item requirements
				X		
Second Element *(Trends/ sustained results)*	Trend data are not reported or show mainly adverse trends	Little or no trend data are reported, or many of the trends shown are adverse	Early stages of developing trends are evident	No pattern of adverse trends and no poor performance levels are evident in areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Most improvement trends and/or current performance levels have been sustained over time	Excellent improvement trends and/or consistently excellent performance levels are reported in most areas
			X			
Third Element *(Comparisons/ benchmarks)*	Comparative information is not reported	Little or no comparative information is reported	Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident	Some trends and/or current performance levels—evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks— show areas of good to very good relative performance	Many to most reported trends and/or current performance levels— evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks— show areas of leadership and very good relative performance	Evidence of industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas
		X				
Fourth Element *(Importance of results)*	Results are not reported for any areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for a few areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Results are reported for many areas of importance to your organization's key mission or organizational requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient/student, market, and process requirements	Organizational performance results address most key customer/patient /student, market, process, and action plan requirements	Organizational performance results fully address key customer/patient /student, market, process, and action plan requirements
			X			

Guidance: The overall score is not intended to be a numerical average of the elements above; you should select the range and score that are most descriptive of the organization's achievement level for the Item.

Item 7.6—Overall Score

☐ 0–5%
☐ 10–25%
☒ 30–45%
☐ 50–65%   Item 7.6 Score _____40_____ %
☐ 70–85%
☐ 90–100%

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET—ALL SECTORS

To enter data in this form, double click the worksheet. Enter the Item percent scores in column B. Do not enter data in any other column. The worksheet should automatically calculate the appropriate scores based on the information you enter.

SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET

Summary of Criteria Items	Total Points Possible Column A	Percent Score 0–100% (Stage 1—Use 5% Units) Column B	Score (AxB) Column C
Category 1			
1.1	70	50%	35
1.2	50	40%	20
Category Total	**120**		55
			SUM C
Category 2			
2.1	40	55%	22
2.2	45	40%	18
Category Total	**85**		40
			SUM C
Category 3			
3.1	40	40%	16
3.2	45	30%	14
Category Total	**85**		30
			SUM C
Category 4			
4.1	45	45%	20
4.2	45	45%	20
Category Total	**90**		40
			SUM C
Category 5			
5.1	45	45%	20
5.2	40	35%	14
Category Total	**85**		34
			SUM C
Category 6			
6.1	35	40%	14
6.2	50	45%	23
Category Total	**85**		37
			SUM C
Category 7			
7.1	100	45%	45
7.2	70	43%	30
7.3	70	30%	21
7.4	70	40%	28
7.5	70	53%	37
7.6	70	40%	28
Category Total	**450**		189
			SUM C
GRAND TOTAL (D)	**1,000**		425
			D

Baldrige National Quality Program

Baldrige National Quality Program
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Technology Administration
United States Department of Commerce
Administration Building, Room A600
100 Bureau Drive, Stop 1020
Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1020

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), an agency of the U.S. Commerce Department's Technology Administration, manages the Baldrige National Quality Program (BNQP). For more than a century, NIST has helped to lay the foundation for the innovation, economic growth, and quality of life that Americans have come to expect. NIST promotes U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life. Through a network of nearly 400 assistance centers that serve all 50 states and Puerto Rico, NIST provides technical and business assistance to help smaller manufacturers overcome barriers to productivity and competitiveness.

Call BNQP or visit our Web site for

- information on improving the performance of your organization
- information on eligibility requirements for the Baldrige Award
- information on applying for the Baldrige Award
- information on becoming a Baldrige Examiner
- information on the Baldrige Award recipients
- individual copies of the Criteria for Performance Excellence—Business/Nonprofit, Education, and Health Care (no cost)
- information on BNQP educational materials
- case studies

Telephone: (301) 975-2036; Fax: (301) 948-3716; E-mail: nqp@nist.gov
Web site: www.baldrige.nist.gov

American Society for Quality
600 North Plankinton Avenue
P.O. Box 3005
Milwaukee, WI 53201-3005

By making quality a global priority, an organizational imperative, and a personal ethic, the American Society for Quality (ASQ) becomes the community for everyone who seeks quality technology, concepts, or tools to improve themselves and their world. ASQ administers the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award under contract to NIST.

Call ASQ to order

- bulk copies of the Criteria
- Award recipient DVDs

Telephone: (800) 248-1946; Fax: (414) 272-1734; E-mail: asq@asq.org
Web site: www.asq.org