PROBLEM SOLVING EVALUATION CRITERIA 2014

Company Name: _____

CIRCLE NAME: _____

Graph/QC Tool Usage, Teamwork, and Shared Duties will be evaluated based on information shared throughout the presentation.

1. Team Development

		4	3	2	1	0
•4 pts.	-Team achieved and exceeded all of the guidelines below	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- •4 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all of the guidelines below
- •3 pts. -Team members' roles & responsibilities were determined by leveraging strengths, building skills, or considering intervening circumstances
- •2 pts -Team used decision-making tool(s) to determine roles and responsibilities
- •1 pt. -Team members' roles and responsibilities were defined
- •0 pts. -Team members' roles and responsibilities not defined

Comments:

2. Theme Selection

	5	4	3	2	1	0
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- •5 pts. -Data & quality tools used to select problem stated with stakeholder involvement and aligned with company business plan
- •4 pts. -Data & quality tools used to select problem stated; explained why problem was selected and how stakeholders were involved in process
- •3 pts. -Data and quality tools used to select project or problem; stakeholders identified; explained how selected
- •2 pts -Theme stated and supported with data
- •1 pt. -Theme stated with no supporting data
- •0 pts. -Theme not clearly stated

Comments:

3. Activity Plan

	2	1	0
	☐	☐	☐

- •2 pts -Activity plan constructed and used correctly (logical, realistic, and relevant to the project)
- •1 pt. -Activity plan presented
- •0 pts. -Activity plan not stated or shown

Comments:

4. Data Collection for Current Situation

	5	4	3	2	1	0
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- •5 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all of the guidelines below by explaining why they selected the data collection tools utilized
- •4 pts. -(Why) Core data collected with stakeholder involvement and presented in appropriate format
- •3 pts. -(How) Team described current situation visually and with collected data; presented in appropriate format
- •2 pts -(What) Team described current situation with photos/drawings, layout and/or flow chart
- •1 pt. -Limited data collected; opportunities for additional data collection were missed
- •0 pts. -No situation analysis

Comments:

5. Goal Setting

	4	3	2	1	0
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

- •4 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •3 pts. -Clear explanation of how your goal is derived from your data collection
- •2 pts -Goal is described using SMART or other appropriate method (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Trackable)
- •1 pt. -Goal is identified and shown graphically
- •0 pts. -No mention of goal

*NOTE*** Goal Setting may not be presented/explained until after the root cause has been verified.*

Comments:

6. Root Cause Analysis

- •5 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below by explaining why/why analysis
- •4 pts. -Explanation clearly shows appropriate depth of brainstorming and why/why analysis
- •3 pts. -Evidence of brainstorming and appropriate root cause analysis tools used correctly
- •2 pts -Evidence of brainstorming but inappropriate tool used in root cause analysis or root cause analysis tool used incorrectly
- •1 pt. -Root cause analysis based upon subjective opinion only
- •0 pts. -No root cause analysis tool identified

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	0
□	□	□	□	□	□

7. Root Cause Identification

- •5 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •4 pts. -Root causes verified and confirmed using visuals and data collection confirmation
- •3 pts. -Root causes identified by verifying actual spot / actual time / actual part
- •2 pts -Root cause(s) identified with supporting data
- •1 pt. -Root cause identified with superficial explanation
- •0 pts. -No root cause identified

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	0
□	□	□	□	□	□

8. Countermeasure Selection & Prioritization

- •5 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •4 pts. -Countermeasures selected and prioritized using methods below with stakeholder involvement
- •3 pts. -Appropriate countermeasure selection process tools used correctly, and potential outcomes explored
- •2 pts -Evidence of countermeasure selection process but inappropriate tool used or appropriate tool used incorrectly
- •1 pt. -Countermeasures identified with superficial explanation
- •0 pts. -No countermeasures identified

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	0
□	□	□	□	□	□

9. Countermeasure Planning (PLAN)

- •5 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •4 pts. -Same as below with explanation of stakeholder involvement and potential problem analysis
- •3 pts. -Same as below and correctly explained and analyzed the potential outcome of the process
- •2 pts -Showed and explained C/M plan (employing 5W's-1H or other appropriate method)
- •1 pt. -Simple C/M plan presented with superficial explanation
- •0 pts. -No mention of C/M planning

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	0
□	□	□	□	□	□

10. Countermeasure Testing (DO)

- •5 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •4 pts. -Same as below with explanation of obstacles encountered (if any)
- •3 pts. -C/M testing process appropriate in scope and duration, and adequately monitored and measured
- •2 pts -Evidence of C/M testing process but timeframe not mentioned or appeared inconsistent with data collection timeframe
- •1 pt. -C/M testing identified with superficial explanation
- •0 pts. -No mention of C/M testing

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	0
□	□	□	□	□	□

11. Countermeasure Verification (CHECK)

- •5 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •4 pts. -Same as below with explanation of stakeholder involvement in verification process
- •3 pts. -C/M verification process monitored, measured, and compared results against data collected prior to C/M implementation
- •2 pts -Evidence of C/M verification process presented but inadequately displayed graphically
- •1 pt. -C/M verification identified with superficial explanation
- •0 pts. -No mention of C/M verification

5	4	3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

12. Countermeasure Standardization (ACT)

- •5 pts. -C/M standardized across organization (including different shifts and departments)
- •4 pts. -C/M standardized and stakeholders involved in C/M standardization process
- •3 pts. -C/M standardized into normal daily operations and communicated effectively to stakeholders
- •2 pts -Evidence of C/M standardization presented but inadequately communicated to stakeholders
- •1 pt. -C/M standardization identified with superficial explanation
- •0 pts. -No mention of C/M standardization

5	4	3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

13. Data Comparison Summary

- •4 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •3 pts. -Data summarization graphed correctly and easy to follow and understand, reflecting Criteria 4 above
- •2 pts -Data comparison identified with superficial explanation
- •1 pt. -Data summarized graphically, but inappropriate graphs used or graphs used incorrectly
- •0 pts. -No mention of data comparison

4	3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

14. Planned Goal vs. Actual Results

- •3 pts. -Team achieved and exceeded all guidelines below
- •2 pts -Goal and actual results compared and graphed, and clearly explained
- •1 pt. -Goal and actual results compared with superficial explanation
- •0 pts. -No comparison of goal and actual results

3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

15. Activity Plan (Planned vs Actual)

- •2 pts -Detailed activity plan showing all activities (planned vs. actual) presented and gaps explained
- •1 pt. -Activity plan showing all activities (planned vs actual) presented
- •0 pts. -Activity plan not stated or shown

2	1	0
☐	☐	☐

Comments:

16. Impact Analysis

- •4 pts. -Indepth explanation of individual and team growth AND Activity Cost Assessment
- •3 pts. -Indepth explanation of individual and team growth OR Activity Cost Assessment
- •2 pts -Superficial explanation of individual and team growth AND Activity Cost Assessment
- •1 pt. -Superficial explanation of individual and team growth OR Activity Cost Assessment
- •0 pts. -Did not explain individual and team growth NOR Activity Cost Assessment

4	3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

Overall Tool Usage

- •5 pts.   -Extensive/creative use of tools, well constructed and appropriate for process step
- •4 pts.   -Extensive use of tools, appropriate for process step and mostly well constructed
- •3 pts.   -Adequate use of tools, appropriate for process step and mostly well constructed
- •2 pts   -Adequate use of tools, appropriate for process step, but poorly constructed
- •1 pt.   -Minimal use of tools and/or poorly constructed
- •0 pts.   -No evidence that tools were used

5	4	3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

Circle Duties Shared - Teamwork

- •3 pts.   -All members participated in presentation & teamwork was evident throughout the circle activity.
- •2 pts   -Not all team members had a role in presentation but teamwork was evident throughout the circle activity
- •1 pt.   -Not all members participated in presentation and limited teamwork evident during circle activity
- •0 pts.   -Not all team members had a role in presentation and teamwork was not evident throughout the circle activity

3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

Presentation Easily Understood

- •4 pts.   -Team achieved and exceeded all the guidelines below
- •3 pts.   -Presentation had good flow and was easily understood. Someone with no knowledge of the business could understand the presentation well. All specialized equipment processes, part names, initials, etc. were clearly explained
- •2 pts   -Presentation had good flow, was easy to understand, but some parts could have been presented more effectively
- •1 pt.   -Presentation somewhat confusing, but the main idea was understood
- •0 pts.   -Presentation not easily understood

4	3	2	1	0
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

Total Score:	