

Lean Enterprise Division

April 2012 Highlights

- 2 T³ Tools, Techniques, and Templates: Standard Work
- 4 Inspiring Kaizen and Continuous Improvement Instead of Forcing It
- 5 Comparing the AQL International Lean and Six Sigma Conference to the ASQ Lean and Six Sigma Conference
- 5 Total Productive Maintenance
- 7 ASQ ITEA Competition
- 7 Meet Us Now on Twitter @asqled

Chair's Message

Dear Lean Enterprise Division (LED) members,

What a way to begin the spring season after a record attendance of 620 people at the Lean and Six Sigma Conference in Phoenix, AZ! It was indeed a pleasure to again partner with the Six Sigma Forum and ASQ staff to produce an outstanding conference. I would like to thank everyone who visited our booth and our hospitality suite during the conference. It is a sincere pleasure to meet current and potential LED members. All members who took time to visit our booth received our T-shirt. We had a truly fantastic time at not only the conference but also our two hospitality events. And even though our café dialogue session did not have a large population, those who did attend walked away with their questions answered about the lean certification (in partnership with SME, AME, and the Shingo Prize organizations).

Mark your calendars! We plan to be at the 2013 Lean and Six Sigma Conference March 4–5, again in Phoenix. We have identified several improvement opportunities for this event and look forward to an even better conference program next year. Don't be surprised if we also offer a post-conference lean tour. We have a couple of companies interested in hosting such an event.

On the horizon, we are excited to be at the ASQ World Conference on Quality and Improvement in Anaheim, CA, May 21–23. We hope you will stop by our booth to pick up your free T-shirt and meet us at our hospitality suite.

The LED and the ASQ Healthcare Division are interested in combining efforts to support a conference-within-a-conference at the 2013 World Conference. One of the ideas brainstormed includes offering hands-on workshops, in lieu of PowerPoint presentations. If you have any ideas about the 2013 program, please forward them to me and David Behling, the LED programs chair, at behling4ci@hotmail.com.

Also, we are excited to be a sponsor of the Rocky Mountain Quality Conference in September in Denver, CO, and will be hosting a full-day preconference workshop. This workshop will be free to attendees and will include lunch. In a nut shell, it will push the

envelope on the use of QFD and DOEs. We hope to see you there!

The LED is a global network of professionals helping individuals and organizations apply proven and leading-edge lean principles and practices to achieve dramatic results for your personal and organizational success. We have a lot going on within the division—here are some samples of what is to come. First, the leadership team met in Dallas, TX, for a weekend strategic planning session. We decided to focus heavily on education and training primarily in support of the newly released ASQ lean certification. We also decided to hold a drawing from member contributions of articles and case studies, providing two lucky winners with a registration to the annual Lean and Six Sigma Conference, a \$1,000 value, and a \$50 Amazon gift card. Please email our education chair, Don Smith, at dsmith@netresults.com and our publications subcommittee chair, Lance Coleman, at lance.coleman@westpharma.com.

I wish you a lean spring and summer. "Come lean with us."

Kiami Rogers, Chair
kiamiasq@gmail.com



Members of the Lean Enterprise Division's leadership team (pictured from left to right: Kiami Rogers, Kam Gupta (seated), and Lance Coleman) greeting people at their booth at the Lean and Six Sigma Conference, Phoenix, AZ, February 28–29, 2012.



**Lean Enterprise
Division**
The Global Voice of Quality™

Lean Enterprise Division Contacts

Kiami Rogers, chair

Maxim Integrated Products
krogers_asq@verizon.net

Frank K. Murdock, chair-elect

Plymouth Tube Company
fmurdock@plymouth.com

Robert M. Johnson, past chair

Tyco Fire Suppression & Bldg. Prod.
jobbymjohnson@yahoo.com

Maria Stoletova, membership chair

m_stoletova@hotmail.com

David Behling, programs

behling4cl@hotmail.com

Tammy Lynn Miller, secretary

Plexus
tammy.miller@plexus.com

Bernie Klemmer, treasurer

bklemmer@gmail.com

Wendy Gomez, newsletter editor

Danmer Inc.
wendy.gomez@danmer.com

Madhavi Chodankar, VoC co-chair

madhavichodankar@yahoo.com

Nick Vyas, VoC co-chair

Allogistx International Inc.
nvyas@allogistx.com

Alan Mendelssohn, discussion board

Resources Global Professionals
asmquality@aol.com

Don Smith, education

Net Results Inc.
dons322@gmail.com

Javaid Cheema, BoK & certification

Lean-O-Pex
jmcheema@sbcglobal.net

Linda Milanowski, staff liaison

ASQ
lmilanowski@asq.org

T³ Tools, Techniques, and Templates: Standard Work

by Frank Murdock, chair-elect

In this issue of T³ Time, we will provide a brief overview of standard work, one of the basic building blocks of lean. T³ Time is a regular feature of the LED newsletter dedicated to introducing some of the common tools, techniques, and templates used to help organizations on their lean journey.

What is standard work?

According to the ASQ quality glossary, standard work is “A precise description of each work activity, specifying cycle time, takt time, the work sequence of specific tasks, and the minimum inventory of parts on hand needed to conduct the activity. All jobs are organized around human motion to create an efficient sequence without waste. Work organized in such a way is called standard(ized) work. The three elements that make up standard work are takt time, working sequence, and standard in-process stock.” Standard work instructions are a “lean manufacturing tool that enables operators to observe a production process with an understanding of how assembly tasks are to be performed. It ensures the quality level is understood and serves as an excellent training aid, enabling replacement or temporary individuals to easily adapt and perform the assembly operation” (<http://asq.org/glossary/s.html>).

Why is standard work important?

In most organizations—churches, hotels, city offices, attorneys, research—and in every aspect of human endeavor, processes are being performed. Some processes are more repetitive than others; however, all processes have a flow of work, a sequence of steps which, when performed, result in the output of a material like a product, document, or data. It could also be the output of an action like a service. Variation in the quality or the product, document, data, or service does not only depend on the consistency of the inputs to the process (data, equipment, material, parts, and the knowledge and skills of the people operating the process), but also how and how consistently the process is performed. One of the first improvement actions to be taken in any process improvement effort is to understand the current state process and this includes how *standardized* is the work being performed. The more ad hoc the work, the less consistent is the process and the products and services it produces. Standard work is critical in capturing and recording the best ways that work should be done. Having standard work also enables rapid identification of root causes when problems occur.

How to develop standard work instructions

Standard work instructions take many forms, depending on the needs of the organization. In some circumstances the standard work consists entirely of sequences of pictures with few—if any—words. In other circumstances, it is sufficient to lay out each step in words only. In all circumstances it is important to limit the scope of the standard work to an individual performing specific tasks or steps in the larger sequence of steps within the process.

1. Begin with the customer requirements—both the immediate internal customer and the end user or ultimate customer of the product or service. This includes clear operational definitions (criteria, method, and test) or standards for quality, safety, delivery, and cycle time—the latter based on the frequency of customer orders or demands for service (takt time).
2. Then develop a process flow diagram or value stream map—the actual sequence of steps needed to complete the process in enough detail that changes or movement of material, equipment, or data is captured. Include what tools and equipment to use, when, what parameter settings, and under what conditions they are used. Also include how long it takes to perform each step and what in-process material or data is required to be stored and where. This is usually done by both observing people performing in the process along with getting them together to discuss what they do, how they do it, and why they do it that way. Many times this reveals a lot of hidden knowledge, sometimes called “tribal knowledge,” about how things are done. “We have always done it that way” usually means the reasons have been lost over time and it may be necessary to perform some plan, do, study, act experiments or other research to determine the why’s.

| Job Instruction Breakdown | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------------------------|---|---|------------|
| PROCESS NAME: Sampling at Mill | | | O Control S 2012.17-1.G | | DATE: 10/21/2011 | |
| | | | | REVISION #: 1.0 | | |
| Important Step | Work Secs | Wait Secs | Walk Secs | Key Points | Reasons | References |
| 1 Cut a 6" to 8" sample | 5 | 0 | 0 | Cut sample after production tube has reached it's length | Minimize scrap | |
| 1 | 30 | 0 | 0 | Label tube on the weld with the Order #, Bundle Number, Date and Time of Day it was cut. | On the weld so that when tube is split the labeling is not obscured. | |
| | | | | | Identifying information is used to reference sample off the mill with the bundle's performance through NDT | |
| | | | | | Identifying information used to label data on the control chart | |
| | | | | | Control chart is constructed and posted daily on the mill to provide feedback on tube quality sooner than waiting for NDT performance which can | |
| 1 | | | | Provide two samples per shift - one before and one after lunch | To provide samples that are representative of production throughout the shift. | |
| 2 Split sample lengthwise so that the weld is centered on one of the halves | 60 | 0 | 80 | Mark the side of the tube to aid in splitting the tube to ensure the weld is centered down one of the halves. | QA laser micrometer cannot measure the height of the weld if it is within 1/4" of the edge of the split tube. | |
| 3 | | | | | | |

Note From the Editor



It is with very mixed emotions that I write that this is my last newsletter as editor. It's hard to believe, but I have been doing this for almost seven years. The growth that this division has had is quite extraordinary, not to mention the volunteer efforts of everyone who has volunteered with the LED. Thank you to all of those who have contributed over the years; your insights and expertise were definitely appreciated. I take with me a tremendous amount of knowledge and wonderful memories. I am also excited about the prospect of someone stepping in and bringing a fresh perspective for all the readers to enjoy.

The World Conference is coming up and it appears to be the best one yet! I am certain that you will not want to miss it.

Respectfully,
Wendy Gomez

- Writing down the work instructions in a standard form, as discussed previously, can take many forms. The example shown is in the training within industry (TWI) format of the job instruction breakdown (JIB), where the key work activities or steps are listed on the left—usually directly from the process flow diagram—usually five to seven steps describing the major activities being performed by an individual. Then key points are added which include the standards to which the work must be done. The reasons for these key points are also included. In this format the cycle time for each step is broken down into work, wait, and walk times to emphasize and, where possible eliminate, the nonvalue-added time—wait and walk are forms of the eight wastes.
- Once the standard work instructions are drafted, they should be tested using the plan, do, study, act cycle, where the guess or hypothesis is that they can be used for training new or temporary personnel. Experienced personnel should try to follow the standard work instructions first; however, they may find some differences compared to the way they normally perform the work. Since it is important that all work be performed to the standard, this may require management coaching and mentoring with particular emphasis on the reasons for the key points to get everyone to follow the same standardized approach. Of course this exercise might also reveal aspects of the work that were overlooked initially, in which case these need to be added. The final test is to train two or three people who are unfamiliar with the process to see if they can perform the work adequately using the standard work instructions. This may also require some prerequisite education and training (e.g., standard safety training for the organization).

One further point. It is common to have any experienced worker train a new or temporary worker on how to perform work in the process. As Dr. W. Edwards Deming pointed out in his book *Out of Crisis*, training is the responsibility of the manager or supervisor. Without standard work instructions, the different approaches used and taught by various experienced workers will drive the process “off to the Milky Way” as Dr. Deming used to say.

In summary, standard work:

- Removes the variation in the same work being done by different individuals working at different times and in different places.
- Sets the standards for the quality, safety, delivery, and cycle time of the work being performed.
- Enables quick identification of root cause process deviations.
- Is used by management to train new and temporary personnel and to assure consistent delivery of quality products and services while maintaining a safe working environment.



Please consider the environment.
 Do you really need a paper copy of this newsletter? Please send a message to Imilanowski@asq.org with “Electronic Only” in the subject line.

Newsletter Publishing Guidelines

1. Technical Merit
 - Factually correct
 - Relevant to our mission
 - Meets all guidelines
2. No selling of services
3. Nothing offensive

Additional factors to be considered are:

4. Not too similar to something recently done
5. Desired subject matter—how timely is material?
6. Well-written and not boring
7. Needed length

Review and Selection

Our review and selection process will also be simple. Upon approval of a submitted work, the subcommittee forwards the piece to newsletter editor Wendy Gomez for final review and approval. Our goal is to allow Wendy to have a reserve of 4 – 5 articles for the newsletter. As works are submitted, I will forward them on to all of you for review. I want us to strive for a turnaround time of two weeks for those works that need little or no editing. I would propose that every submitted work be reviewed by at least three of us, with majority vote determining whether or not to pass the work on to Wendy, reject the work, or send back for editing/modification. In the event of a tie, I will cast the deciding vote. I will also be responsible for maintaining a tracking log of all submittals.

Length

The desired length for tips, book reviews, articles, and case studies is 400 to 800 words. Tips and book reviews would be in the 400 to 600 range, articles anywhere from 400 to 800 words, and case studies 500-plus. If a submission goes beyond 800 words, then we should look at breaking it into more than one part. I see these proposed values not as rigid restrictions but rather as a sorting mechanism with occasional overlap between categories.

Inspiring Kaizen and Continuous Improvement Instead of Forcing It

by Mark Graban

The Japanese word “kaizen” can be translated as “change for the better” and was originally used in the context of the phrase “continuous improvement.” Since kaizen is a core part of the lean mindset, improvement should be occurring in small doses every day. As Masaaki Imai wrote in his seminal 1986 book *Kaizen*, “Kaizen is for everybody.”

So why is kaizen so often missing from organizations? If there is improvement, why is it so often limited to weeklong events or “blitzes?” Managers often say, “Well, people hate change,” and the statement goes unchallenged. We agree, mutter, and shake our heads, as it’s very easy to blame people for being resistant to change. From my experience, saying they are resistant to change is managerial code for they won’t do what I want them to do.

Let’s step back and evaluate if people really hate change. Workers at Toyota contribute 10 improvement ideas per person per year. At Autoliv, in Utah, workers contribute more than 50 ideas per person per year. Some might ask, “What is wrong them? What otherworldly force drives them to—gasp—make changes? Don’t they also hate change?”

Peter Scholtes, the late great management thinker put it well when he said, “People don’t resist change; they resist being changed.” Workers in a kaizen culture, including some leading hospitals, are enthusiastic about change because they are identifying and implementing improvements that matter to them and their work. Changes aren’t being forced on them.

Think about going to lunch with a group of co-workers. If Tracy in marketing announces you are all going to that new Ethiopian-Mexican-British fusion place, you might naturally be resistant. While some people enjoy the comfort of eating the same thing every day, I think most of us enjoy trying new restaurants and cuisines—when we have input or especially when it is our own decision. People tend to support what they help create, as they say.

How do we get people to create change? The changes need to be meaningful—probably more significant than choosing where to eat. In working with healthcare professionals, we have the major advantage of this industry being very mission- and purpose-driven. It’s often said that healthcare is a calling, not just a job, so it’s relatively easy to rally people around patient-centered improvements that would improve quality, prevent errors, and create a better patient stay. These changes align with their personal missions.

A small kaizen might involve recognizing that nursing mothers in the NICU need privacy, but there are often gaps in the curtains—so staff members implement the idea of having simple binder clips available in each bay to ensure privacy and prevent staff members from having to run around looking for the clips. This small improvement was deeply pleasing to staff and customers alike.

People might want to make meaningful changes, but everyone is busy and the idea of spending time on improvement can seem overwhelming. Starting small helps build enthusiasm and employees tend to move on to larger, more complex problems to solve. In a kaizen approach, we are asking employees to look for ideas that:

- Make your job easier.
- Save a few seconds.
- Improve patient care or service.
- Improve safety.
- Reduce waiting.

The kaizen process is not primarily focused on financial benefits or return on investment (ROI). It’s often just not worth the time to calculate an ROI for every small improvement, such as with the binder clips. Especially in healthcare, staff members might tune out requests or demands for cost reduction, but they will be much more engaged when asked to look for improvements to service and care—and everybody wants to make their work easier, less frustrating, and more fulfilling. We know that the financial impact will follow—as an end result of these improvements, not as the primary aim.

Franciscan St. Francis Health System (where my *Healthcare Kaizen* co-author works) will take time to estimate a cost savings from just those kaizens with the largest financial impact. Its results from 2010:

- 3,949 implemented kaizens (about 1.7 per FTE).
- 36% of staff members did at least one kaizen.
- \$3 million of estimated financial impact (on revenue of \$500 million).

The \$3 million figure is a very conservative estimate, since, again, there is not an ROI for each kaizen and this does not account for benefits beyond cost.

About five years into its program, Franciscan St. Francis is still working toward the goal of every employee being a problem solver every day. That's the power of kaizen. Events and projects are fine, but we need a way to engage everyone to put the continuous back into continuous improvement, improving things that are meaningful to all.

About the author: ASQ member **Mark Graban** is author of *Lean Hospitals: Improving Quality, Patient Safety, and Staff Engagement* and is co-author of the upcoming book *Healthcare Kaizen: Engaging Front-Line Staff in Sustainable Continuous Improvements*.

Comparing the AQI International Lean and Six Sigma Conference to the ASQ Lean and Six Sigma Conference

by *Scott Smith, LSS Master Black Belt, CQE, CQA*

The American Quality Institute held the 7th Annual International Lean and Six Sigma Conference February 29 – March 1. This was my first time attending this conference in Orlando, FL, and I was a session speaker, which I will describe below. Last year I attended the ASQ Lean and Six Sigma Conference in Phoenix, AZ, so naturally I will compare the two conferences. These are simply my opinions about the two conferences. The ASQ conference had just short of 600 attendees last year and a little more than 600 this year, whereas the AQI conference had approximately 150 attendees this year (I contacted the conference chair for information for this article, but she would not release attendance numbers for the AQI conference). Both conferences garnered international audiences, with approximately 19 countries represented at the AQI conference. Both conferences were two days and featured more than 50 sessions. I feel the AQI conference was mostly geared toward lean Six Sigma attendees, whereas the ASQ conference was split pretty evenly between lean, Six Sigma, and Lean Six Sigma. Both venues were excellent, but I would give a slight edge in the accommodations to the Grand Cypress Hilton in Orlando where the AQI conference convened over the Pointe Hilton Tapatio Cliffs Resort where the ASQ conference was held, although the food was better at the Pointe Hilton Tapatio Cliffs Resort in my view. I would also give Orlando a slight edge for things to do with Disney World and MGM just a few miles from the conference hotel, but Phoenix was prettier in my opinion and nice for outdoor activities with the proximity to the Grand Canyon and Sedona. Both conferences had excellent session speakers and keynote speakers. If I had to choose, I would give a slight edge on the ASQ keynotes, but both conferences did a good job in this department in my opinion. I felt I learned quite a bit at both conferences. It is

a shame that AQI scheduled its conference to begin the day after the ASQ conference ended. It would have been nice to attend both conferences, but it is hard to sell your boss on going to a conference for two days in Phoenix and then going to another similar conference the following two days in Orlando. Due to my locale, the AQI conference was only a four-and-a-half-hour drive from my home which was convenient. ASQ had much better vendors than AQI (AQI had two booths set up, to my knowledge, during the International Lean and Six Sigma Conference). The early bird pricing for the AQI conference was \$945 and \$995 regular price, whereas early bird pricing for ASQ's conference was \$1,095 and \$1,195 regular price, either of which I feel is reasonable. Of course, networking opportunities were better at the ASQ conference because there were so many more attendees at that conference. You also have the East Coast/West Coast difference in the two conference attendance groups. I did run in to a few people who attended both conferences. (They must have very understanding bosses or work for themselves.)

The presentation that I gave at the AQI conference was Applying Lean Tools to Service Functions. This was a case study where I described a project my team had undertaken to reduce the accounting close process cycle time. I described the tools we used and the similarities and differences between these tools applied to a service area as opposed to a manufacturing area. I described the team's results as well as the next steps in our lean evolution. There were between 50 and 75 attendees at my presentation, which was one of three presentations taking place during my timeslot. All in all, I felt the presentation was well received, although I have not received my feedback from the AQI conference yet. I can say that nobody threw any rotten produce at me or booed me off of the stage—which is a plus! Stay tuned, as I will present my work in case study form as an exclusive feature for a future addition of the LED newsletter.

Total Productive Maintenance

by *Scott Smith, LSS Master Black Belt, CQE, CQA*

Traditionally, maintenance has been performed after a machine had broken down. Once the machine had broken, mechanics were summoned with great urgency to get the machine running again—quickly. This method of firefighting, of course, is highly inefficient. We can have significant downtime while we wait to have the machinery repaired, and we might have to wait a long time if a part needs to be ordered! Factoring in our historic downtime due to these catastrophic machine failures, often great stock piles of inventory were built up to smooth out the inevitable lapses in production due to this machine failure.

The concept of preventive maintenance really came to the forefront in the 1950s. Preventive maintenance consisted of regularly scheduled activities, such as lubricating and replacing critical parts at a given interval. While this was an improvement over conducting maintenance after a failure, there were still considerable drawbacks with a strictly preventive maintenance system. Timing can tend to be arbitrary. Even if you base your schedule off of mean time between failures, you still must take into account how much variation you can have using the average. Traditionally, you were also still relying on the maintenance department to perform these duties, which caused issues such

cont. on p. 6

Total Productive Maintenance cont. from p. 5

as scheduling and prioritization. Since the machinery was sometimes taken offline to make repairs, in the traditional push production system, there was often a conflict between when maintenance was scheduled and the production schedule. “It’s only preventive maintenance—nothing is wrong with the machine.” “Do we really have to do it right now?” “The schedule is tight right now, so we will have to put maintenance off.” These are several of the excuses I have heard for not conducting preventive maintenance when scheduled.

There is another problem with preventive maintenance that is sometimes not considered. While replacing parts, particularly critical parts, on a schedule is preferable to having machine failure, it is not ideal. There is waste in this process because oftentimes a part is replaced under preventive maintenance while it still may have a significant amount of useable life. This is what led facilities to start using predictive maintenance. Predictive maintenance relies on measurement, often continual measurement, of major components, key fault points, and components that are prone to failure. Analysis of these measurements leads to more informed decisions about when maintenance needs to be done. Therefore, machine availability tends to be higher, and overall maintenance costs tend to be lower than using strictly preventive maintenance. Some of the tests used to assess the need for maintenance include vibration, infrared, acoustics, and oil analysis. However, even with advantages of predictive maintenance, we were still primarily at the mercy of the maintenance department and its schedule. Somehow the power needed to be shifted from the mechanics to the operators, because who knows the status of their machinery better than the people who run it every day?

Building off of the concepts of total quality management (TQM), total productive maintenance (TPM) was born. Along with 5S, TPM is one of the fundamental pillars of a lean management system. TPM takes some of the best aspects of preventive maintenance and predictive maintenance and incorporates teamwork and lean principles into the process. This merging of philosophies can be seen by examining the eight pillars of TPM. The eight pillars of TPM are:

1. 5S
2. Autonomous maintenance
3. Quality-based maintenance
4. Planning
5. Kaizen
6. Training and development
7. TPM for administration
8. Environmental health, safety, and welfare

5S helps you “see” the waste. In this case, it also allows you to see that you have a maintenance issue. For example, if your machines are extremely clean and organized, an oil leak will quickly become evident. Autonomous maintenance gets workers involved in fixing minor problems with their machines and lets them conduct many preventive and predictive maintenance chores themselves. This shifts the power to the people who are running the machines, but also frees up the mechanics’ time away from firefighting so they can focus on more value-

added activities. Quality-based maintenance relates mostly to predictive maintenance, whereas we are charting measurements in critical areas, and holding major maintenance until the point just before our machine productivity drops off. Planning simply means that some of the more routine maintenance will still be conducted on a schedule. This is usually best for non-critical maintenance activities with a low cost threshold. The concept of kaizen is embodied in an adaptable plan derived by the team that is flexible and can be modified as circumstances change. It also means that we are constantly evaluating our maintenance process for systematic improvements that can be made to increase machine availability. Training and development is crucial for the success of the TPM program and is not to be taken lightly. It can take a considerable amount of time to get full buy-in from the team that they own the maintenance system, particularly because of management’s past activities to put off maintenance in favor of production. However, once you start to get this buy-in, the employees who will be conducting the maintenance must be trained on how to diagnose issues and how to perform the maintenance. TPM for administration refers to managing the operation so that TPM of the machinery is possible. The operators are not the only people who need to adjust their mindset. Adoption of lean production methods, such as a pull system, frees up time that can be scheduled for routine maintenance to ensure our machinery remains reliable. The final pillar, environmental health, safety, and welfare, ensures that we balance the overall needs of production with the other obligations that the lean organization has to its workers and to society as a whole.

The basic principles of implementing TPM are as follows: A TPM coordinator is hired or appointed to facilitate the process in the early stages of the team. It is the TPM coordinator’s job to champion the TPM process; to ensure that both management and teams are on board; to train the cross-functional teams made up of maintenance, operators, supervisors, and management members on the tools and practices of TPM; to ensure that measurement systems are in place and standard work is developed; and to lead the team through the early stages of team formation until the team is self-sufficient.

Some of the benefits of TPM are:

1. Longer usable life for equipment.
2. Wasteful downtime is reduced.
3. Customers obtain their product sooner.
4. Employees feel a sense of accomplishment because they have a hand in keeping “their” machines running.
5. It can foster friendly competition between departments, shifts, and plants to obtain the highest overall equipment effectiveness scores (a measure of machine availability).

In conclusion, TPM benefits from the evolution of maintenance by incorporating the best parts of preventive and predictive maintenance into a cohesive system that works well with the other systems in our lean enterprises. TPM maximizes machine up-time while minimizing part replacement cost by delaying the change until the maintenance is necessary. Perhaps most importantly, TPM embraces the lean concept of “respect for people” by putting the power in the hands of the operators.

ASQ ITEA Competition: My Experience as a Two-time Preliminary Round Judge

by Dave Harry, PMP® CSSBB, ASQ LED Marketing Lead

Since 1985, the ASQ International Team Excellence Award (ITEA) Process has involved and recognized more than 800 high-performing teams from around the globe. The final judging and awards culminate at the ASQ World Conference on Quality and Improvement. This year the World Conference will be held in Anaheim, CA, May 21–23. In 2013, the World Conference will be held in Indianapolis, IN, May 6–8. Please mark your calendars.

I have served the last two years as a preliminary-round judge for the ASQ ITEA Process. The judging process was fun, but also a bit stressful. It gave me a wonderful insight into the inner-workings of high-performing teams. Here are the main reasons I chose to volunteer:

1. Giving back to ASQ.
2. Bonding, networking, and learning from high-performing fellow international judges.
3. Honing consensus-building skills.
4. Learning what was important for possible future ITEA Process entries.
5. Judging the highest performing teams in the world.

ASQ's screening process for judges is rigorous and the competition is intense. Following are the skills and qualities that I brought to the process:

1. I enjoy teamwork like many of my ASQ peers.
2. My background as a PMP®, certified Black Belt (ASQ, Northrop Grumman, and Rolls-Royce), and a Big Five consultant gave me the tools to effectively judge a team competition.
3. Above all, I brought a keen willingness to learn from others and to network.

The timeline for ITEA judging and competition takes about 10 months to complete. The 2011-2012 ITEA Process and judging began in July 2011 when the criteria guidelines and judge applications became available. Volunteer judges needed to submit applications by mid-August. Meanwhile, teams entering the competition needed to submit their entry materials and complete the online entry form.

In mid-September, ASQ notified me that I was selected to be a preliminary-round judge. I needed to select a training city (ASQ usually offers about a dozen locations across the United States). In 2011, I chose to go to Louisville, KY, whereas in 2010, I had selected Manassas, VA, as my training/judging site. From this point on, I dealt directly with the ITEA local site coordinator.

Travel costs and arrangements are the responsibility of each individual judge. I spent two days in Louisville

cont. on back page

Meet Us Now on Twitter @asqled

The ASQ Lean Enterprise Division exists as a strong advocate of eliminating nonvalue-added activities that add waste in the form of unnecessary time, effort, or cost, and creating products and services that will add direct value to a customer. Value from the perspective of the customer is the voice of the customer (VOC).

In my role as the chair of the Lean Enterprise Division VOC committee, I am continually trying to understand clearly and exactly what product or service our members desire, when it needs to be delivered, and at what price. I am always looking at technologies and creative ways that will help us understand our members better, and this is why we started using Twitter.

As we all know, Twitter is an online social networking and microblogging service that enables its users to send and read text-based posts of up to 140 characters, informally known as "tweets." Twitter is really just another form of online communication in a new shape, but is also a platform for listening to the communication of others in new ways. As a Twitter user, one can post updates, follow, and view updates from other users and send a public reply or private direct message to connect with another Twitterer. Tweets have evolved to more than everyday experiences, and take the shape of shared links to interesting content on the Web, conversations around hot topics (using hashtags), photos, videos, as well as real-time accounts from people who are in the midst of a newsworthy event, conference, crisis, or natural disaster. Users who enjoy reading what you share on Twitter become your followers and, likewise, you follow those who share content that is of interest to you.

I have outlined some of the goals that the ASQ Lean Enterprise Division is aiming to achieve using Twitter:

1. Connect with our members all over the world and those who are interested in what we do.
2. Share lean content from ASQ and the Lean Enterprise Division, which may include, but is not limited to, articles, newsletters, best practices, case studies, podcasts, videos, tools and techniques, education, conferences, certifications, and calls for papers.
3. Retweet and share content from quality professionals and lean practitioners around the world.
4. Share ASQ and the Lean Enterprise Division's special offers, exclusive promotions related to lean education, membership, and lean conferences.
5. Announce and recognize winners of lean contests at conferences, best lean writers, speakers at lean conferences, and certified lean professionals.
6. Announcements and reminders for conferences, training, and call for white paper submissions.
7. Announcements for case studies and articles.
8. Announcements for lean jobs and career advancement opportunities.
9. Get direct feedback from our members and those who are interested in what we do.
10. Tweet ups and Twitter discussions.

Twitter is a small attempt by the Lean Enterprise Division to make ourselves available for our members, help whenever possible, and to show that the Lean Enterprise Division is built and run by real people who believe in quality and lean, and who care about our members. So come follow us on Twitter and get immediate access to rich content from quality professionals and lean practitioners around the world. We can be followed on Twitter at @asqled. We look forward to meeting you.

Madhavi Chodankar

Voice of the Customer Committee Chair



600 N. Plankinton Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53203-2914

The Global Voice of Quality™

NON-PROFIT
U.S. Postage
PAID
Milwaukee, WI
Permit No. 5419

Lean Enterprise Division | April 2012 | Volume 11, Issue 1

ASQ ITEA Competition *cont. from p. 7*

at Humana, the corporate training host. Prior to going to Humana to judge the presentations, I had to complete about six hours of prework and submit it to the site coordinator. The training and judging is fast paced, so it is important to have experience with both the criteria and judging process.

The first day on-site consisted of ITEA training for all judges because standard processes and consistency are important. The second day we broke into small teams of six and judged one presentation. In Louisville, my team of judges included a Master Black Belt from John Deere and a Six Sigma manager from a Chinese IT firm. Judging is all about consensus and ASQ has wonderful tools to bring all the judges into reasonable agreement. We had a detailed ITEA score sheet and based our preliminary round grades on what was in the presentation. I am happy to see the team we graded from Ford Motor Company will be in the finals this year. After the

on-site judging is complete, one judge is selected to write the feedback report for the team over the course of the next two weeks.

In late January, all the preliminary round scores and feedback are emailed to the ITEA teams and in late February, judges are notified if they were selected to be final round judges at the World Conference. Being selected as a final-round judge is competitive. About 10 preliminary-round judges apply for each of the 40 final-round judging slots. The final round of the ITEA live presentations will be held at ASQ's World Conference in Anaheim this year. I would encourage you to attend at least one final round judging session if you attend the World Conference.

If you would like to get involved with the ITEA Process, I would encourage you to mark your calendar and volunteer as a preliminary-round judge by August 3. I would also encourage your high-performing project teams to enter the competition and demonstrate their dedication to excellence.

The deadline to enter your team for the 2013 ITEA Process is September 12, 2012.

Although Rolls-Royce Energy, my employer, was unable to sponsor my training, it benefited from my participation. On my return, I briefed my vice president on the characteristics of an excellent team and the business value of entering the ITEA Process. The conversation that followed enlightened our leadership to the advantages and we are planning to enter the 2013 ITEA Process. Of course, I will be there to coach our Rolls-Royce ITEA teams.

For more information, visit the ASQ ITEA website at <http://wcqi.asq.org/team-competition/index.html>. Also check out the cool video at <http://wcqi.asq.org/team-competition/video.html>. If you really want your team to get into the finals, I recommend that you purchase *Best Practice in Team Excellence* by Laurie Broedling and Vern Goodwalt (ASQ Quality Press). There is a major payoff to volunteering, so please do.