

Excalibur Scoring Guidelines

System-wide replication potential

0= No opportunity for knowledge transfer / process implementation at any other facility / organizational unit or replication potential is not addressed

1= Process likely transferrable to 1 – 2 like facilities / organizational unit

2= Process likely transferrable to all like facilities / organizational units (e.g., process can be implemented at either all Army MEDCENS or MEDACs, but not both)

3= Process likely transferrable to all like facilities / organizational units (e.g., process can be implemented at all Army MEDCENS and MEDACs)

4= Process transferrable to like facilities / organizational units (e.g., process can be implemented at either all Army MEDCENS and MEDACs and has broader application among non-MTF components of the organization)

Sustainability

4= Capable of being maintained at a steady level without additional resources

3= Capable of being maintained at a steady level with an annual cost of less than \$50K

2= Capable of being maintained at a steady level with an annual cost of \$51K to \$99K

1= Capable of being maintained at a steady level with an annual cost of \$100K or more

0= Overall implementation cost is not addressed

Increased Value for Patients and Customers

4= Productivity, performance, and/or outcomes were enhanced without increasing cost

3= Productivity, performance, and/or outcomes were enhanced with < \$25K in start-up cost

2= Productivity, performance, and/or outcomes were enhanced with between \$26K & \$99K in start-up cost

1= Productivity, performance, and/or outcomes were enhanced with \$100K or more in start-up cost

Excalibur Scoring Guidelines

0= Productivity, performance, and/or outcomes were not addressed in relationship to cost

Multidisciplinary

0 = Unable to determine which stakeholders provided input into initiative development

1= Initiative was developed primarily by one constituency without input from other stakeholders

2= Initiative was developed in conjunction with multiple stakeholders, but one or more stakeholders were left out of the process

3= Initiative was developed in conjunction with multiple stakeholders, but one key stakeholder was left out of the process

4= Initiative was developed in conjunction with the full spectrum of stakeholders that are affected by the revised or new process

Process-Oriented

0= The initiative is not process-oriented

1= Initiative is process oriented but does not account for any of the effects the process change may have on related processes, people and resources

2= Initiative is process oriented but does not account for some of the effects the process change may have on related processes, people and resources

3= Initiative is process oriented and reasonably accounts for most of the effects the process change may have on related processes, people and resources

4= Initiative is process oriented and thoroughly accounts for the effects the process change may have on related processes, people and resources

Excalibur Scoring Guidelines

Improved Quality or Standard

0= The initiative demonstrates no measurable improvement in comparison to a nationally recognized quality measure or benchmark (e.g., ORYX, HEDIS, AHRQ Patient Safety Indicator, Patient Satisfaction Scores, etc.)

1= The initiative demonstrates no measurable improvement in comparison to a nationally recognized quality measure or benchmark, but demonstrates measurable, local improvement to an internal benchmark

2= The initiative demonstrates improvement to meet a nationally recognized quality measure or benchmark

3= The initiative demonstrates improvement to exceed a nationally recognized quality measure or benchmark

4= The initiative demonstrates a dramatic measurable improvement to reach performance in the top 10% of a nationally recognized quality measure or benchmark