

# Action Plan Reappraisals

## Conditions for Usage

---

### Guidance for recommending and delivering Action Plan Reappraisals

On rare occasions, a Lead Appraiser may encounter a situation wherein the Organizational Unit (OU) comes within a couple of goals—or even a couple of practices—of satisfying the targeted Capability or Maturity Level of a SCAMPI A appraisal. The Action Plan Reappraisal (APR) was created in 2014 for use in such a scenario. An APR allows the OU up to four months to address the goal-impacting weaknesses, and then have those goals reappraised by the same appraisal team lead and appraisal team. This then offers the appraised organization an opportunity to avoid the financial burden of incurring a second full-scale SCAMPI A appraisal. The intent of the APR is for appraisals where the target maturity or capability level rating was a “near-miss”. APRs cannot be planned for as part of a benchmark appraisal; if the criteria for an APR is met after the target rating is missed by a narrow margin, then the appraisal plan and related required artifacts (see below) would get updated and recorded as part of the appraisal record.

It is important to remember, however, that an APR cannot be used or recommended for all instances in which an OU has failed to achieve its desired rating for an appraisal. There are several factors to take into consideration when discussing the option of recommending and performing an APR:

- Are there any systemic weaknesses?
- How many Process Areas (PAs) were not satisfied?
- How many goals were not satisfied?
- How many weaknesses were identified for the practices?
- How do those weaknesses impact the practice from a characterization perspective (e.g., how many LI, PI, and NI characterizations in total, per PA, and per goal)?
- Do the weaknesses in one goal or PA relate to issues in other goals or PAs?
- How long is the process lifecycle required to address the weakness(es) in question and demonstrate institutionalization?

A systemic weakness is one where its presence or impact causes a “ripple effect” either within, across or throughout the practices, goals and PAs in the appraisal’s model scope, and results in findings against related practices in multiple parts of the OU and in-scope work efforts. A high

percentage of the goals or Process Areas rated as “not satisfied,” or a large number of identified weaknesses, would be examples of systemic weaknesses and would typically require a timetable of over four months to address, which then would preclude an APR being recommended or done. The process lifecycle must allow the organization the opportunity to address the weaknesses and exhibit persistence within the four months that an APR allows.

When a process area is rated “not satisfied,” the LA and team should perform a review of the weaknesses using the above criteria. If the number of weaknesses, nature of those weaknesses, number of impacted practices, goals, or PAs, or length of the process lifecycle will not make it feasible for the impacted goals to be satisfied within four months, the appraisal team (under guidance of the appraisal team lead) should not recommend proceeding with an Action Plan Reappraisal.

While the sponsor(s) makes the final decision on whether to perform an APR, the LA has a responsibility to advise the sponsor(s) on the magnitude of the weaknesses and the feasibility of addressing the weaknesses in the required four-month window. Unsatisfied goals can create gaps that cannot be met in such a timeframe; the Lead Appraiser has an obligation to inform the sponsor(s) with an expert, honest opinion, based on the objective evidence from the appraisal, regarding the steps and resources required to solve those gaps.

When a Lead Appraiser and sponsor have agreed to perform an APR, the LA notifies the CMMI Institute (via email to [quality@cmmiinstitute.com](mailto:quality@cmmiinstitute.com)), updates the tailoring checklist in the appraisal plan to reflect selection of an APR (Activity 4.1.1), and includes a completed SCAMPI Action Plan Reappraisal Worksheet (found in the [Partner Resource Center](#)) with the standard artifacts in the appraisal data submission package. The CMMI Institute performs a review of the appraisal documentation; if no quality concerns are identified, the appraisal review is given initial approval and an APR may be planned and performed. When the LA is ready to report the results of the APR onsite period, he or she notifies the CMMI Institute to request that the SAS record be reopened. Once it has, the updated appraisal plan, final findings, appraisal ratings, and Appraisal Disclosure Statement (ADS) are provided. The CMMI Institute will perform a final review, and upon acceptance post the results to the [Published Appraisal Results Site \(PARS\)](#).

Questions regarding this Quality Tip can be sent to [quality@cmmiinstitute.com](mailto:quality@cmmiinstitute.com).