

# Guidance for Reviewers

## Contents

- Commitment from us..... 2
- Commitment from you ..... 2
- Time commitment..... 2
- Date milestones ..... 3
  - Dates to be aware of:..... 3
- Attend reviewers' briefing webinar ..... 3
- Application Guidance ..... 4
  - The review process, what to expect ..... 4
  - Assessment criteria ..... 4
  - Scoring categories ..... 5
  - Scoring breakdown ..... 5

---

## Commitment from us

- Help you as best we can on how to score ([Webinar 27th November](#))
- Provide easy-to-use informative formats
- Be available, approachable, and communicative (🗨️)
- Provide you with information as early as possible
- Publish your name as one of the reviewers on the website – after the application deadline
- Send you the final report that is shared with the applicants
- Invite you to join our growing communities and Special Interest Groups (SIGs)

## Commitment from you

- Avoid naming which organisations you have reviewed
- Commit not to disclose the detail and content of applications you have reviewed
- Declare any relationships held that may preclude your evaluation of an entry
- Review each application without bias
- Attend the webinar on 27th November or watch the recording
- Evaluate content and evidence as per guidance offered
- Support and positively represent the brand of the Agile Business Awards at all times
- Share any relevant feedback pertaining to the awards process or conference, so we can continue to improve
- Utilise your networks to promote the Awards to bring in potential candidates

## Time commitment

Reviewers can expect around 3-4 hours on general meetings and balancing meetings, and approximately 5-8 hours of review time per application they review. We strive for a maximum of 2 applications per reviewer. The review time is between December 8<sup>th</sup> and January 19<sup>th</sup>.



We are anticipating no fewer than 6 reviewers for each award category. Each entry will be evaluated by 3 independent reviewers.

Peter Coesmans, Agile Business Consortium Chief Agility Officer, will oversee the review process together with Consortium Director Jason Wright. Should you need to do so, you can contact Peter on [Peter@agilebusiness.org](mailto:Peter@agilebusiness.org) and Jason at [Jason@agilebusiness.org](mailto:Jason@agilebusiness.org)

## Date milestones

Dates to be aware of:

**July** – Application form and guidance live

**18<sup>th</sup> September** and **23<sup>rd</sup> October 2023** - Reviewer check-ins – note these 2 check-ins are optional

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81598304165?pwd=Q09FS2wrdXgwM3pKTVI5LytOelN2dz09>  
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81598304165?pwd=Q09FS2wrdXgwM3pKTVI5LytOelN2dz09>

**27<sup>th</sup> November** – [Webinar](#) for all reviewers on the evaluation process for applications

**4<sup>th</sup> December 22:00 GMT/UTC** – Deadline for Awards applications

Before receiving applications for review, you will be sent a list of applicant organisation names. This is so that no reviewer will evaluate entries from organisations with whom they have a relationship or potential conflict. Please let us know if this applies once you have received that list.

**6<sup>th</sup> December** – Before receiving applications for review, you will be sent a list of applicant organisation names. This is so that no reviewer will evaluate entries from organisations with whom they have a relationship or potential conflict. Please let us know if this applies once you have received that list. At this point, you will be asked to confirm you have no relationship with the applicants you are going to review.

**8<sup>th</sup> December** – Date by which applications will be sent to you for review.

**19<sup>th</sup> January 2024 22:00 GMT/UTC** – Deadline for application reviews

**23<sup>rd</sup>/24<sup>th</sup> January TBC** – Balancing reviewer panels per category

**29<sup>th</sup> January** – Organisations will be informed whether they have been selected for awards and are invited to speak at the Agile Business Conference

**6<sup>th</sup> February** – Public announcement of winning organisations in each category, i.e. those invited to present at the virtual Agile Business Conference

**17<sup>th</sup> -18<sup>th</sup> April** – Agile Business Conference

*Note: dates may be open to minor changes*

## Attend reviewers' briefing webinar

**27<sup>th</sup> November** – 4pm GMT/UTC. [Zoom registration link here](#), calendar invite will be sent out to reviewers in advance and the recording will follow.

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

## Application Guidance

### The review process, what to expect

- In the webinar session on November 27<sup>th</sup>, all details and supporting forms will be explained
- Reviewers will perform an individual assessment of a maximum of 2 applications. The lead reviewer will gather all individual assessments and combine them. All applications will be individually reviewed by 3 reviewers  
In a “Balancing Meeting”, all reviewers will come to a conclusion. The final conclusion will be based on consent, although the reviewers will strive to be unanimous. It might be that reviewers change their scoring and / or feedback due to the discussion in the “Balancing Meeting” so that the final individual scores and feedback reflect the decision. The conclusion will be three examples of excellence ready to be showcased at the conference
- While doing the individual assessments, reviewers will provide 3 pieces of information per assessment category:
  - The score
  - Supporting information regarding the score (what influenced your decision)
  - Feedback which can be used for the candidate in the feedback report
- No reviewer will see all applications, the focus of review is on evaluating the content, based on the criteria, and providing feedback
- Each application will be reviewed by 3 independent reviewers to avoid bias. We aim for each category to have a minimum of 6 independent reviewers. There are no fixed review teams and we will also aim to have different teams for different applicants, to ensure balancing and better learning for reviewers

### Assessment criteria

For all awards categories, the assessment will be based on the [Framework for Business Agility](#) (FBA). The application has to

- Describe what has been achieved in the areas of the FBA, per area (the “evidence story”) - score 0-5
- You can refer to the Review Criteria Excel document and Application Guidance.

#### Evidence Stories should be written in the following format:

- Situation
- What did you do and how? Action
- Results Achieved
- Lessons Learned

**Note:** per assessment category, several evidence stories can be supplied.

**Note:** “business agility approach used” does not refer to methods or techniques directly, they might refer to principles, behaviour, techniques, tools, methods, presentations, workshops etc.

## Scoring categories

- Blue Zone
  - Leadership
  - Culture
  - Governance
- Teal Zone
  - Operational Agility
  - Support or Change Agility
- Purple Zone
  - Customers
  - People
  - Ecosystem
- Grey Zone
  - Strategy

Full application breakdown is available [here. \[Link to assessment form information\]](#)

## Scoring breakdown

Score	Explanation	Supporting Evidence is Scored
0	No evidence found in this category, no useful information supplied in the application report, or negative information found. NOTE: 0-scores are not uncommon! Feedback should describe what information was sought for but not found.	N.A.
1	Some positive information found in this category, supporting business agility in this awards category. Significant room for improvement based on the assessor's experience, either because of lacking information or even some negative information. Feedback should support the information found and provide some further improvement potential.	If supporting evidence is not given or doesn't support anything, add 0. If supporting evidence supports most of the evidence stories, score +1; if supporting evidence supports all evidence stories, score +2
2	Positive information is found in this category supporting business agility in this awards category. Some room for further improvement based on the assessor's experience, or perhaps in general, very positive but some negative information. Feedback should support the information found and provide some further improvement potential.	If supporting evidence is not given or doesn't support anything, add 0. If supporting evidence supports most of the evidence stories, score +1; if supporting evidence supports all evidence stories, score +2
3	Well done! Extensive positive information was found in this assessment category, showing the organisation is doing very well in the awards category. This is the standard for good work. On top of the game, "industry standard". <b>No negative indications should be found when scoring three or higher.</b> Feedback should applaud the excellent work and perhaps indicate room for innovation.	If supporting evidence is not given or doesn't support anything, add 0. If supporting evidence supports most of the evidence stories, score +1; if supporting evidence supports all evidence stories, score +2
4	Extensive positive information was found in this assessment category, including some innovations or excellent results regarding business agility for this awards category, above and beyond what is considered to be standard. Feedback should be applauding the work and highlighting the innovations, asking the candidate to share these innovations with the broader business agility audience.	If supporting evidence is not given or doesn't support anything, add 0. If supporting evidence supports most of the evidence stories, score +1; if supporting evidence supports all evidence stories, score +2
5	A very innovative approach was found in this assessment category, leading to excellent results. Feedback should highlight the innovations, asking the candidate to share these innovations with the broader business agility audience and work towards establishing new standards.	If supporting evidence is not given or doesn't support anything, add 0. If supporting evidence supports most of the evidence stories, score +1; if supporting evidence supports all evidence stories, score +2

For further scoring breakdown, the [Excel spreadsheet](#) supports the online form.