



# Quality Connection

Official Newsletter of the Baltimore Section, ASQ  
August 2000

Voice Mail: (410) 347-1453

E-mail: [asq0502@quality.org](mailto:asq0502@quality.org)

Internet: [http://www.quality.org/ASQC\\_Sections/Section\\_0502/index.html](http://www.quality.org/ASQC_Sections/Section_0502/index.html)

## 2000-2001 EXECUTIVE BOARD

<b>Frank Vojik</b>	Chair
410-354-7714 (W)	410-354-7962 (Fax)
<b>Elaine Wilhelm-Hass</b>	Vice Chair / Program
410-864-3193 (W)	410-547-9154 (Fax)
<b>Sid Lewis</b>	Treasurer
410-879-0136 (W)	410-879-0136 (Fax)
<b>Gil Cuffari</b>	Secretary
410-477-3700	
<b>Scott Fairchild</b>	Arrangements
410-667-7340 (W)	410-667-7397 (Fax)
<b>Mike Rohmeier</b>	Employment
410 357 5601 (W)	410 771 5196 (Fax)
<b>Lloyd Dixon</b>	Education
410-765-3153 (W)	410-694-2376 (Fax)
<b>Howard Swartz</b>	Examining
410-628-3278 (W)	410-683-6337 (Fax)
<b>Kevin Gilson</b>	Koalaty Kid / NQM
410- (W)	410- (Fax)
<b>Bev Earman</b>	Membership
410-636-7651 (W)	410- 636-7133 (Fax)
<b>Sid Lewis</b>	Tutorials
410-879-0136 (W)	410-879-0136 (Fax)
<b>Jim Cooper</b>	Newsletter
410-765-2934 (W)	410-765-0165 (Fax)
E-mail: <a href="mailto:james_e_cooper@mail.northgrum.com">james_e_cooper@mail.northgrum.com</a>	
<b>Bob Rayme</b>	Financial Audit
301-208-7571 (W)	301-208-7671 (Fax)
<b>Mel Alexander</b>	Database / Home Page
410-782-2216 (W)	410-712-0737 (Fax)
E- mail: <a href="mailto:alexandm@globomax.com">alexandm@globomax.com</a>	
<b>Don Jacoby</b>	Past Chair / Nominating
410-825-4414 (W)	410-825-4415 (Fax)
<b>Beth Reigel</b>	SMP / BWPLC
410-993-3373	410-765-0165 (Fax)
<b>Joel Glazer</b>	Software Quality
410-765-4567 (W)	410-765-0165
<b>Sal Scicchitani</b>	Regional Director
215-355-5420(W)	215-355-7741 (Fax)

**Support your local Section this year.  
Attend monthly Section meetings.**

## Chairman's Message

Frank Vojik

### Hello everyone!

I'd like to welcome our Section membership to what I hope will be an informative and interesting year of activities, meetings and seminars. The 2000-2001 year kicked off on July 1, 2000 when the Baltimore ASQ Executive Board officially assumed their volunteer duties.

I must admit to a bit of trepidation as I assume the Chair's responsibilities. Our section is large (over 900 members) and diverse, with many interests in an ever-widening field of quality-related activities and functions. But I know I will be supported and sustained by the able and energetic Executive Board members whose names and positions are listed to the left of this article. Many of these individuals have served with distinction as Past Chairs of our Section and I know I can count on them for advice and counsel.

Actually, this is a great time to be stepping into the Chair's role in the Baltimore Section. Earlier this year members of the board met to review and revise our vision and mission statements and to formulate a strategic plan for the Section in the coming year. All members of the board now have defined goals and objectives for their positions and will be reporting on them at our monthly board meetings. Copies of our Section Management Program (SMP) matrix that describes our

goals and objectives will be available at all section meetings. But above and beyond what ASQ National and the Section Management Program requires, we would have done that in any case since **strategic quality planning is good business.**

So, what can you look forward to this year? We have already planned our first seminar on Gage R&R in late August planned by **Lloyd Dixon** and conducted by **Sid Lewis**. Our Vice Chair and Program Manager **Elaine Wilhelm-Hass** has been working hard on this year's section program and we already have many of the pieces in place. We'll kick things off in September with a presentation on the ISO 9001:2000 revisions presented by our own **Morgan Hall**. Morgan has been deeply involved in the ISO revision process and recently served as the Mid-Atlantic counselor for the nationwide ISO 9001:2000 Validation Program. By September, the Final Draft International Standard (FDIS) will have been issued and information on the new standard requirements will be high on everyone's list.

October's meeting will have a health care focus, and in November we will hold the first of two joint meetings with the Association for Quality and Participation. As we move into the New Year (celebrating the **real** start of the new Millennium, by the way) (*Continued on page2*)

### *Chairman's Message (Continued from page 1)*

our January Statistics Night will feature a presentation by **Larry Barrentine** the internationally known statistician, teacher, and author who has penned several books on the design of experiments and gage R&R.

The advent of spring will feature our annual software quality night in Columbia and our Spouse / Significant Others Night. Where are we going this year? Well, Elaine's keeping that's a secret right now but it's a safe bet we will be revisiting a venue somewhere in Baltimore's Inner Harbor. We're also working on at least one joint activity with the Washington Section.

The Baltimore Section has been selected as one of the pilot sites for the new Certified Quality Auditor (CQA) add-on certification for Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP). Called **CQA-HAACP**, the certification is for those working in food quality and food handling. The pilot exam is scheduled to be held September 30.

Two important ASQ conferences return to the East Coast this year as the Quality Audit Division holds the Quality Audit Conference in Atlanta in early February and the Annual Quality Congress will convene in Charlotte, NC in early May. Because of their close proximity by car and/or airline, I would expect that many Section members would attend one of these conferences.

We'll have our usual compliment of interesting tutorials hosted by **Sid Lewis** (who's also pulling double duty as Treasurer) but this year we're doing it with a twist. On two occasions, we'll be holding our monthly board meetings as a tutorial prior to the regular meeting. This will give the membership a chance to see firsthand how the Section is managed and will put the board members on their best meeting behavior! Since we will only have 45 minutes or so to discuss section business, that will hopefully cut down on the side conversations and tangential discussions. With a room full of potential parliamentarians and sergeants-at-arms in attendance, this should prove interesting!

This is as good a lead-in as any to my final comments. As always, we crave feedback on how we're doing. If you have any ideas or comments on how we can better serve you, our ultimate customer, please let us know. And if you wish to serve on the board in any capacity please contact one of the board members and become part of the team that manages the Baltimore Section.

I look forward to meeting you at an ASQ function during the coming year!

### *Surveys as Supplier Relationship Tool*

*Patricia C. La Londe*

*ALARIS Medical Systems, San Diego, CA 92121*

#### **Summary**

Surveys are traditionally used to assess supplier abilities or to collect information from customers on their satisfaction levels. Using surveys as a tool to create a supplier program or give your existing program a fresh coat of paint is a hidden treasure. Existing tools can be used with a different focus to bring new and different results. A supplier survey is a tool to obtain feedback from suppliers on how you are doing as the customer. It identifies areas that can improve both processes and relationships.

#### **Introduction**

To build a house, many tools are used to excavate the foundation, construct the frame, assemble the plumbing, and wire the electrical system. With only a few tools you can only build parts of a house. With only a few customer-supplier tools, you can only build parts of a relationship. The more tools in your toolbox, the better equipped you are to lead the change from supplier management to relationship management.

#### **Supplier Surveys**

In the business world we are all customers and suppliers. However, the majority of the time, we are sensitive to our needs as a customer, rather than being sensitive to the needs of our suppliers. I propose obtaining information from your suppliers on how good you are as a customer. In our businesses we spend time and money determining the needs of the customers in the hopes of meeting those needs and growing our business. The effort spent up front with our suppliers to identify their needs and prepare our business processes to meet their needs and ours has a high payoff.

**Tool used:** Supplier survey with quantitative and qualitative questions.

**Purpose:** To obtain feedback from the suppliers on how you are doing as the customer. To determine areas to deploy resources for improving the business process/relationship with suppliers.

**Process:** Written survey sent to multiple contacts within each supplier.

#### **Payoff:**

- Clearer understanding of product specifications.
- Reduced rejects, rework, and returns.
- On-time delivery.
- Improved customer-supplier relationships.

Suppliers are sometimes, more often than not, blamed for problems that occur in providing the product or service to the customer. Based on feedback received from several companies, it is not always the

supplier that needs to be ‘fixed.’ Many suppliers feel the customer-supplier relationship is one-sided. The customer talks, the supplier listens, the customer gets upset, and so the supplier changes. The changes are not always in the best interest of the final product or service for the end user.

Typically, in a customer-supplier relationship, emphasis is placed on whether or not a supplier meets the customer’s standards. If the supplier doesn’t meet expectations, the customer is inclined to “fix” the supplier.

I’d like to suggest that the suppliers might feel differently. The supplier has at least 50% vested interest in the relationship. The concept of a customer-supplier relationship is to share ideas, to both listen, and to both be willing to take the steps necessary to satisfy the needs of the relationship. Suppliers don’t always have the courage to talk back. It is the customer that must create an atmosphere that allows the supplier to speak freely.

Don’t wait for your supplier to tell you . . . **ASK!** Some of the benefits you might realize include:

1. Smoother relationships without stress.
2. Suppliers more willing to work with you to handle irregular situations.
3. Products/parts/assemblies/services that are easier to manufacture or provide.
4. Improved communication.
5. Cost reductions.
6. Improved quality and reliability.
7. Reduced lead times or cycle times.
8. Requirements being met every time.
9. Reduced or eliminated rework, returns, or scrap costs.
10. Exposure to new technologies.
11. Faster to market on new products.

Using a survey can help you create a supplier program, kick an existing program in the pants to make it more effective, or as a routine continuous improvement tool. Process maturity comes from cycles of improvement on your process. The supplier survey can assist you in determining where improvements are needed.

The first step is to create the questions. Be sure the questions are asked to direct you to results that drive action. Questions should be in the format of a rating and open-ended. The rating questions allow you to track and trend over time to determine if you are effective in your actions to improve. The open-ended questions provide you with specific data that can be used for improvements but it is difficult to trend the responses. Leave out words such as reasonable, as it is biased to the person who is answering the survey

question. In hindsight, I would ask some overall type questions, for example, “Overall, how would you rate the experience of working with (customer’s company name)?” Take caution on having a survey that is too long that no one will take the time to complete it. Don’t add waste to the process by asking too many questions or by asking questions that don’t give you actionable data. By using surveys, expectations are set that someone will use the data collected to make the process better. Be sure you are ready to act upon the data. Make sure the actions speak for themselves so the next time you need to collect data you will have more willing participants.

The questions I have used include (with some minor changes for each company):

1. What expectations do you have of (customer’s company name) that are not being met?
2. What information do you need before Request for Quote (RFQ)?
3. Do you like to have participation in the design process with customers?
4. If yes to #3, what ideally does that participation look like to you?
5. What type of technical assistance would you like from (customer’s company name)?
6. What type of feedback would you like from (customer’s company name)?
7. How frequently would you like to receive feedback?
8. What does Supplier-Customer Partnership mean to you?
9. What benefits are you looking for in a partnership?
10. Please rate (customer’s company name) on a scale of 1 to 5 on the following, with one being poor and five being excellent:
  - Provides clear technical information
  - Provides accurate forecasts
  - Professional manner
  - Responsiveness

And then I had a “Comments” section for anybody who wanted to make additional statements.

The data from Question 1 indicates what the supplier feels they are not getting and usually it will be something important to them, otherwise they would not take the time to answer. This helps align the supplier program to meet the needs of the supplier. Question 2 helps identify what the supplier needs to provide a quote that will be accurate the first time. Questions 3, 4, and 5 indicate the level of participation the supplier desires in the design process and the level of technical involvement they would expect from us, the customer. This is critical for us to understand the expertise needed on staff if the suppliers can not and chooses not

to supply that expertise. Questions 6 and 7 will indicate what data are important to the supplier and how often they need data for their process improvements. Questions 8 and 9 allow the supplier to define what partnership means to them, which allows us to design our program for partnership in alignment with what they need. Question 10 provides a baseline measure and allows us to track future improvement when the survey is administered again.

I also requested the individual to record what her or his Job Function/Title was, as we expected the information would be sorted by job function. The person who receives the order may not rate the same as the people who create the product documentation to make the product. Each functional area within your company will want to get action-able data, so structure the data so they can be sorted by functional groups. The surveys were dated and we provide spaces for the company name and the individual's name but made the individual's name an optional field.

Each survey was sent out with a letter that states the following: "Our ability to establish and build strong relationships with our suppliers is a critical factor in improving competitiveness. To strengthen our customer-supplier relationship, we have created a short survey that we are sending to a select group of suppliers. Please help us better serve you by asking key personnel in your company to complete this survey. This will give us feedback from departments that normally interface with (customer's company name) i.e., sales, engineering, quality, and manufacturing. Information collected from this survey will be kept confidential, so please be candid. The data will be the basis by which we enhance our supplier program."

To make it easy for them to respond we provide them with a fax number and a stamped, return-addressed envelope. My company has just completed one that we sent via e-mail and I'm sure you could do it via the Internet.

Create cross-functional teams to work with and include your suppliers. This will help create a good atmosphere for mutual trust and sharing of ideas. I know it is a difficult concept to sell to management. If you don't already have Supplier teams, then I suspect the survey results will reflect that you have room for improvement. These results can be used to justify the need for teaming with your suppliers. At a minimum, the survey results can help you understand what your suppliers are thinking and allow you the opportunity to improve.

Apply the 1-10-100 rule: Catch a problem in design and it costs you very little. Catch it during manufacturing and the cost will be ten times more. If

the problem is not caught until it reaches the customer, the cost is 100 times more than if it were caught in the design phase. What you spend up front with your suppliers is realized though the elimination of costs later in the process.

### **Conclusion**

Strengthening the links in supply chain management is critical to any company. Today, we look at the entire supply chain to deliver high-value products and services to our customers. The key to building excellent customer-supplier relationships is communication. Communication can't be one-way, it must be a 360 degree exchange of information.

*Patricia La Londe is a Fellow of ASQ; is the Chair of the Certification Board and Vice Chair of Technology for the Customer Supplier Division. She is the Sr. Manager of Corporate Supplier Quality at ALARIS Medical Systems in San Diego, CA. Paper reprinted from the 54<sup>th</sup> AQC Transactions with the author's permission.*

### **MBNQA For Education**

Robert S. Henry and Louis P. Geoffrion, P.E.

The requirement of new and existing accountability systems to perform whole school and district assessments creates many challenges for the majority of schools and districts.

- Educators and administrators frequently lack the resources and the training to perform comprehensive assessments quickly and effectively.
- Time constraints, the difficulty in managing data and evidence, and the lack of trained analysts make performing a comprehensive assessment a potentially daunting task.
- Educators and administrators are already overtaxed and have little time to take on the additional load of performing any assessment.
- Due to time constraints many schools and districts will not be able to perform comprehensive assessments. This will ultimately impede these schools and districts from achieving sustained improvement.
- Other schools and districts that do perform assessments will sacrifice valuable teaching and preparation time to perform the assessment effectively while others will only perform the assessment with minimal involvement and reflection. Both of these outcomes are unacceptable and will adversely impact the quality of not only the teaching but also of the assessment.

Using the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award Education Criteria for Performance criteria in an assessment complicates this matter further despite its inherent advantages and improved results.

- The Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award Education Criteria for Performance Excellence is aptly suited to assess the performance of an entire school or district and to promote accountability.
- The MBNQA criteria, effectively incorporates into a holistic picture, many of the assessments (Standardized tests, portfolios, etc.) already performed by schools and districts.
- Assessments based on the criteria are often more comprehensive and nuanced than assessments based on other criteria due to the natural linkages of the MBNQA criteria and its systems perspective. Performing an assessment based on the MBNQA criteria however has many of the same challenges as other whole school and district assessments.

Managing assessment data and evidence is a familiar challenge to anyone who has performed a comprehensive assessment. Managing data and evidence requires a significant amount of time and computer resources to effectively utilize the information collected. Educators and administrators rarely have the time and often do not have the computer training to tackle this task.

In addition to time constraints and the challenges of managing assessment data and evidence, the vast majority of educators and administrators have little or no data analysis training. This is a critical shortcoming when performing a data intensive assessment like the Baldrige. The lack of trained analysts in schools and districts creates two risks: that the data analysis will be performed incorrectly or the data and analysis will be misinterpreted. The time consuming nature of data analysis and interpretation is also a serious impediment for schools and districts attempting to perform comprehensive assessments.

Finally the concepts and language of the Baldrige Education criteria are not readily familiar to the great majority of educators and administrators. These professionals often have not been trained to approach education activities from a systems perspective, are relatively unfamiliar with standards based education, and have not been exposed to the current concept of continuous assessment and improvement that drives United States business today. This creates a steep learning curve when attempting to perform a Baldrige assessment. The language of the

Baldrige Criteria also hinders educators engaged in a Baldrige assessment. The frequent use of business terms in the criteria makes its acceptance and understanding among many educators and administrators more difficult.

In order to communicate quality concepts and principles and the requirements of the Baldrige criteria to schools and districts, training and support materials need to be utilized in a comprehensive familiarization and training process to insure effective use of the MBNQA criteria. To effectively communicate the concepts of the criteria we believe that the use of terms that educators can readily comprehend is particularly important. The use of additional materials (Scoring rubrics, questions to consider, etc.) especially prepared by educators, for educators and administrators performing the assessment is also quite important.

Even though the most current edition of the NIST produced Education criteria has been extensively reworked, it is our experience that there are still some gaps in ready understanding by many educators. These materials are incorporated into the Summit Software to assist educators and administrators in the process.

## Conclusion

Many people and organizations have determined that assessing educational processes is vital in order to improve our schools. Nevertheless educators and administrators must not be overburdened performing assessments and should focus their time on implementing improvement plans and educating our children. Accountability systems will only work if comprehensive assessments can be performed quickly and produce quality results. Ultimately assessments based on the MBNQA and other quality criteria will produce self-aware schools and districts that are more responsive to the needs of their students and stakeholders. Assessments are important, but cannot overshadow the fact that teachers should primarily do what they do best, TEACH!

*Louis P. Geoffrion, P.E. is a Fellow of the ASQ and a former Baldrige examiner. Robert S. Henry is a systems analyst, educator, and ASQ member. Both authors are members of the ASQ Education Division*

### ***Certified Quality Improvement Associate***

ASQ will sponsor a new certification exam, the Certified Quality Improvement Associate (CQIA). This exam is designed to assess basic knowledge of quality tools and their uses by individuals who are involved in quality improvement projects, but do not necessarily come from traditional quality areas.

The four-hour, 100 multiple-choice exam will be piloted on January 27, 2001. The experience needed to ***Certified Quality Improvement Associate***(Continued) take this exam is two years of GENERAL work experience **or** at least an Associates Degree from a post-secondary school. The Body of Knowledge for this exam is as follows:

**I. Quality Basics 27 Questions**

**A. Terms, Concepts and Principles (12 questions)**

1. Quality
2. Systems and processes
3. The importance of employees
4. Quality planning
5. Variation

**B. Benefits of Quality (5 questions)**

**C. Quality Philosophies (10 questions)**

1. Deming (14 points)
2. Juran (Trilogy)
3. Crosby (Zero defects)

**II. Teams 23 Questions**

**A. Types of Teams (4 questions)**

1. Improvement teams
2. Cross-functional teams
3. Project teams
4. Self-directed teams

**B. Roles and Responsibilities (5 questions)**

**C. Team Formation and Group Dynamics (14 questions)**

1. Initialing teams
2. Selecting team members
3. Group-think
4. Team stages

**III. Continuous Improvement 50 Questions**

**A. Incremental and Breakthrough Improvement (4 questions)**

**B. Improvement Cycles (4 questions)**

**C. Quality Improvement Tools (30 questions)**

**D. Customer-Supplier Relationships (12 questions)**

1. Internal and external customers
2. Customer feedback
3. Internal and external suppliers
4. Supplier feedback

For more information and a brochure, contact ASQ at 800-248-1946 and ask for item **B1158**.

***Newly Certified Quality Personnel***

The Baltimore Section recognizes the following newly certified individuals who have passed the June 2000 ASQ examinations.

**Certified Quality Auditor**

Steven E. Allison	Ciena Corporation
Joan S. Boyd	Johns Hopkins Hospital
Sinclair R. Douglas	Unisys

Charles J. Meyer	Northrop Grumman
Anwar H. Qureshi	
James D. Reedy	Defense Contract Management Agency
Martin J. Schneider, Jr.	US Can Company

**Certified Quality Engineer**

Ronald J. Angle	Saft America
Tanjanika D. Fishburne	General Motors
Susan N. Keinath	
David M. Schuster	General Motors

**Certified Software Quality Engineer**

Robert R. Brewer	Northrop Grumman
Harriet Feldman	
Joyce N. Levinson	M/A-Com
Jeffrey R. Lyons	M/A-Com
Jeffrey A. Sinden	

We commend each of these individuals that have met ASQ on the Certification battlefield and emerged victorious. They have reached a new level in their professional growth.

***Section Pass Rates - June, 2000***

For the recent round of certification exams, the Section had the following pass rates:

<b>Exam</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Pass</b>	<b>Per Cent</b>
CQA	16	9	56.3 %
CQE	11	4	36.4 %
CSQE	9	7	77.8 %

***Comments on the Certification Process***

**Bob Brewer**, a Software Quality Engineer with Northrop Grumman stated "I thought the exam was fair and the questions were better than I thought they would be. The questions were less related to the Body of Knowledge than I thought they would be. After taking the exam, I was wondering how you would tell someone to prepare for it without having to read every reference on the subject in existence. I had wanted to take a course in studying for the exam, but every time (over the last two years) when I tried to register for the course it was dropped because of low enrollment. So I ended up just studying for six days (cramming) before the exam. I only studied the Body of Knowledge and I took perhaps half of the sample exam. I learned quite a bit from my studies and the sample exam was very helpful. I am happy and relieved. I seem to know more than I thought I did. I did learn from the preparation and from the exam itself. When I was studying, I kept thinking that, in spite of the help it was giving me, the Body of Knowledge is written and organized very poorly. It needs to be totally revamped to make it more useful.

**Jim Reedy**, CQA from DCMA stated, "I prepared for the examination extensively on my own for about three months prior to the exam. I used the latest ASQ preparation material plus the CQA Primer and Dennis Arter's book. In addition I read three other books that deal specifically with Quality auditing." CQE **Ron Angle** offers these thoughts, "I took the review class run by the Section. I really found the review class helpful, especially when dealing with Advanced Statistics. Since I am one of only two quality engineers at my site, the access to other experts was very helpful. Preparation mostly consisted of attending class and studying the materials, reviewing especially hard during the last two weeks. Again, the class offered a "mock exam" which helped in developing a strategy for taking the exam."

Per **Joan Boyd**, CQA from Johns Hopkins Hospital, "I found the CQA Primer by Pam Anderson and Bill Wortman to be very helpful. The study questions at the end of each section were good practice for the exam."

***Creating a Useful and Reliable Organization: The Quality Professional's Role***

***Philip B. Crosby***

*Chairman and CEO, Philip Crosby Associates II, Inc.*

**Summary**

The most important job facing top management is to create an organization that is both useful and reliable. The reliable organization is one where work is performed correctly each time and relationships with employees, suppliers, and customers are successful. The useful organization provides a product or service that customers are happy and willing to pay to receive. The quality professional role is to define and then lead the process that helps management create the "reliable" part of this equation. The task needs to be the center of their work life. Results are easy to measure and the worth of the effort is quite visible. This paper shows how to create the culture that produces the reliable organization. It is concentrated in four areas: policy, education, requirements, and insistence. We are not talking here about quality assurance (QA) and another gathering of procedures. This is about creating a culture and nurturing it. That requires an understanding of management and hard work.

**Introduction**

In this multi-trillion dollar world economy organizations have the opportunity to do business in hundreds of nations. Six billion people live

somewhere besides our city. Even a small company will have suppliers and customers from other countries. Each customer has many choices of whom to use to supply his or her needs. They make these decisions based on the reputation of the potential suppliers as well as any experience they or their friends may have had with that company. They are searching for an organization that has proven itself to be useful and reliable.

When I travel internationally I usually use one of two hotel chains. This is because they have never disappointed me. They always have my reservation, they give me the kind of room I requested, their employees are courteous and efficient, and their location is convenient. The facilities satisfy my needs, the bath towels absorb water, and the food is varied and well prepared. In short, the hotels are useful and reliable. This is not an accident; they work hard at it.

"Useful" is the result of many functions from those who determine the products and services of the organization to those who produce and deliver it. Whether we are talking about software, widgets, insurance, healthcare, automobiles or anything else the output of the organization has to help the customer be successful. Satisfied customers may not come back for more, but successful ones will. The quality professional is involved in this area by measuring results and reporting them to those who take corrective and preventative actions.

"Reliable" is the result of the culture deliberately established by management with the help of the quality professionals. Everyone in the organization has to have a common language of quality, has to know the requirements and transactions of their job, and has to understand what management expects in terms of performance. Bringing that about is a concentrated effort. When transactions are routinely completed correctly and relationships are successful, then we have a reliable organization.

**First Essential: Policy**

If management does not clearly spell out a policy, everyone will make up their own based on past experience. This inevitably leads to some sort permission to do things wrong now and then because "that is the way the world is." Those who want a reliable organization have to say loud and clear that they want work done correctly.

"We will make certain to deliver defect free products and services to our customers and coworkers on time." "Make Certain" is the action phrase and can be used in all the information materials. It means leaving nothing to chance, planning ahead to make it

right. Management has to make it very clear that this is how we do things around here.

## **Second Essential: Education**

The purpose of education is to give everyone a common language of quality, and introduce them to some tools that will help them in their jobs. In PCA IIs Quality College, we have taught thousands of people how to understand this. We teach the management and we supply the materials and instruction so the organization can teach all the folks inside the organization.

We learned early that executives cannot be taught by those inside the company, they have to be instructed by those whom they consider objective and knowledgeable. That is why we set up the Executive College, a two day session, to show management that they are the problem and the solution. No one inside the company can do that. Then we bring operating management to a longer class called the Management College. These classes serve about 3% of the company's population. We then teach facilitators from the client company to lead the courses for knowledge and skilled workers. These are built around videos and workbooks supported by examples from that organization's business.

The philosophy taught by this education concept is built around what I call "the absolutes of quality management":

1. *Definition.* Conformance to requirements, not goodness.

The main problem with causing quality has always been that it is considered quantifiable, so we hear "good quality" and "bad quality." All of that is unmeasurable and filled with opinion. We have to be specific. So quality is doing what we said we would do.

2. *System.* Prevention, not detection.  
Quality is not produced by detection and correction or procedures like ISO alone. It has to come from an organizational culture of prevention.

3. *Performance standard.* Make certain (zero defects), not acceptable quality levels.

Giving people permission to drive through a few stop signs now and then destroys the integrity of that system. The same is true with a performance standard that allows a bit of error; it reduces the attention people pay to getting transactions done correctly. It creates a leaky boat.

4. *Measurement.* Price of nonconformance (PONC), not indexes.

Every other function or action in the organization is measured financially. We have learned that the PONC of the typical company is more than 20% of

revenue. This is the way to get management's attention. The PONC can be cut in half in a year with a proper education process.

## **Third Essential: Requirements**

The organization's product, what they sell to customers, is based on meeting the *need* of that customer. To define the need clearly, it is necessary to create *requirements*. For instance if we are to supply a hotel room for our customer, we have to have a door, bed, TV, bathroom, towels, sheets, carpets, phone, and many other requirements including the registration and cashier.

Serving the customer requires *transactions*; forms have to be filled out, towels replaced, beds made, omelets created, newspapers delivered, and dozens of other transactions completed correctly to make the customer's stay successful.

Management has the responsibility to establish a system of documenting and teaching the requirements and transactions so that the employees can perform them. They also have to work on continually improving the requirements in order to be more efficient while preventing errors.

## **Fourth Essential: Insistence**

The quality professional must help management demonstrate their personal commitment to creating a reliable organization by the way they conduct themselves. They must insist on integrity in everything. The Titanic went down because management ignored those who said sulfur-based steel would become brittle in the cold waters of the North Atlantic Ocean. They also encouraged cost cutting in the purchase of rivets. Quality is in the details if anything ever was.

I always supplied management with opportunities to show their dedication by insisting that something is done correctly. I gave them paragraphs to insert in their speeches. But they need little encouraging. There is more profit potential contained in reducing PONC than in opening a dozen branch offices, or coming up with a new product.

## **The Reliable Organization Grid**

The measurement grid shown in Table 1 lets anyone familiar with an organization determine where they stand. It cuts out a lot of arguments.

## **Conclusion**

The quality professional who wants to have a successful career in this new high tech century has to contribute more to their organization than getting them certified to some quality assurance program or getting good at corrective action. The future is in preventing, not in protecting. Study management so you will know



what your customer (senior management) thinks about and considers important; take the education program seriously including an orientation for new employees; and don't let your peers consider that the quality department is responsible for quality. The comptroller is not responsible for profit.

*Philip Crosby is Chairman and CEO of Philip Crosby Associates II in Winter Haven, FL. He is a past President and Chairman of the Board of ASQ. He has authored numerous books on quality. Paper reprinted from the 54<sup>th</sup> AQC Transactions with the author's permission.*

**Table 1.** Philip Crosby's reliable organization grid.

	<i>Unreliable</i>	<i>Flickering</i>	<i>Traditional</i>	<i>Contemporary</i>	<i>Reliable</i>
<b>Policy</b>	We have no policy on quality	We talk about quality now and then	We use acceptable quality levels of not too many defects	We expect some defects	We require zero defects and successful relationships
<b>Education</b>	We leave that up to the public schools	We bought some videos on quality	We teach statistical and variation analysis and control	We use self-taught teams	We live to the absolutes of quality management
<b>Requirements</b>	We have nothing in writing	We ask the veteran workers what to do	We are writing some procedures	We are involved with ISO	We define clear solutions to needs
<b>Insistence</b>	We need to get the works out the door	We believe in "that's close enough"	We benchmark others and do what they do	We expect good performance	We expect transactions to be right the first time every time

***Divisions Corner***

Divisions are groups established and run by ASQ members who share a common interest. They provide focused information on quality issues and processes that affect their area of specialty.

The mission of the **Service Quality Division** is to advance service quality globally by providing a body of knowledge to the members and the public through the creation, accumulation and exchange of information.

Chartered in 1991, the Division already serves over 5,000 members. Most members come from organizations or functional areas that primarily are service oriented or service focused. Most members are interested in better ways to deploy and integrate quality systems, principles and techniques into their organizations. The Division is comprised of and supports a diverse base of members such as:

- Financial Services
- Hospitality and Travel
- Professional Services
- Regulated Industries
- Not for Profit Sectors
- Retail Business
- Members of support service functions
- Anyone interested in learning more about service quality or sharing their experiences and knowledge in service quality.

Services offered by the Division include:

- ***Competitive Advantage Newsletter*** - Through communication, we provide a platform for debating service quality management methods and

philosophies. We share vital information about events taking place in the services industries.

- ***Survey*** - Two surveys are conducted annually. A member survey measures the overall satisfaction with division products and services. A second survey is conducted at the Division annual conference to measure satisfaction of attendees and to help continuously improve and plan for future conferences. Survey results are communicated to members in the division newsletter and web site.

*(Continued on page 12)*

**American Society for Quality  
Washington DC Section 0509  
QUALITY COURSES – FALL 2000**

<i>Course</i>		<b>CRN</b>	<b>Schedule</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location*</b>	<b>Room #</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Certified Auditor	Quality MCCC: Course CPA038	23941	<b>Tuesdays</b> 10/3/2000 – 11/28/2000 (no class 11/21)	6:30 PM – 9:00 PM	Rockville Campus of MCCC	216 TC	\$180+ \$40 Fee  Non-residents must add \$80.00
	PGCC: Course QCM300	0644	<b>Tuesdays</b> 10/3/2000 – 11/28/2000 (no class 11/21)	6:30 PM – 9:00 PM	Largo Campus of PGCC	TBD	\$220 + \$5 Registration Fee
<b>Certified Software Quality Engineer</b>	MCCC: Course CPA037	23939	<b>Wednesdays</b> 10/4/2000– 11/29/2000 (no class 11/22)	6:30 PM – 9:00 PM	Rockville Campus of MCCC	125 HU	\$180+ \$40 Fee  Non-residents must add \$80.00
	PGCC: Course QCM306	0645	<b>Wednesdays</b> 10/4/2000– 11/29/2000 (no class 11/22)	6:30 PM – 9:00 PM	Largo Campus of PGCC	TBD	\$220 + \$5 Registration Fee
<b>Fundamentals of Quality Assurance</b>	MCCC: Course CPA043	23938	<b>Saturdays</b> 10/7/2000- 10/28/2000	9:00 AM – 1:30 PM	Rockville Campus of MCCC	116 HU	\$150+ \$40 Fee  Non-residents must add \$40.00
	PGCC: Course QCM307	0646	<b>Mondays</b> 10/16/2000- 11/20/2000	6:00 PM- 9:00 PM	Largo Campus of PGCC	TBD	\$200 + \$5 Registration Fee
<b>7 Quality Tools</b>	PGCC: Course QCM308	0647	<b>Saturdays</b> 10/28/2000- 11/18/2000	9:00 AM- 1:00 PM	Largo Campus of PGCC	TBD	\$180 + \$5 Registration Fee
<b>N E W</b>	<b>Software Quality Assurance</b>	MCCC: Course CPA046	23936	<b>Saturdays</b> 9/30/2000- 10/28/2000	9:00 AM- Noon	Rockville Campus of MCCC	115 HU  \$150+ \$40 Fee  Non-residents must add \$40.00

Registration Information:

<b>*MCCC = Montgomery Country Community College</b> Call 301-738-1750 if you have taken a Continuing Education class at MCCC before. Call 301-279-5045 if you have questions about registration.	<b>*PGCC = Prince George's Community College</b> Beginning 10 days prior to class start, call 301-322-0998 between the hours of 9:00AM - 7:00 PM Monday through Thursday and 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM on Friday.
---	--

**Course Descriptions:**

**Certified Quality Auditor (CQA)**

The Certified Quality Auditor (CQA) is a professional who understands the standards and principles of auditing and the auditing techniques of examining, questioning, evaluating, and reporting to determine a quality system's adequacy and deficiencies. This review course will prepare you for the CQA examination offered by the American Society for Quality (1-800-248-1946). Textbook required at first class; please call Quality Council of Indiana at 812-533-4215 to order.

**Certified Software Quality Engineer (CSQE)**

The Software Quality Engineer Certification is intended for professionals who have a comprehensive understanding of software quality development and implementation and a thorough understanding of software inspection, testing, verification, and validation. This review course will prepare you for the CSQE examination. Textbook required at first class; please call Quality Council of Indiana at 812-533-4215 to order

**Fundamentals of Quality Assurance**

This course introduces the role played by the modern quality function within a business organization. You will also be introduced to inspection and test principles, basics of metrology, and auditing. Workbook required at first class is available at Rockville Campus Bookstore.

**7 Quality Tools (for Problem Solving)**

This course explores the seven basic quality tools of problem identification and analysis. The concept behind the seven basic tools came from Kaoro Ishikawa, a renowned quality expert from Japan. The tools studied include Check Sheets, Histograms, Pareto Diagrams, Flow Charts, Scatter Diagrams, Cause & Effect Diagrams (Fish bones) and Control Charts. Text available at the campus bookstore.

**Software Quality Assurance (NEW !!)**

*Examine the emerging role of the SQA professional as a key element in an organization's defect prevention program. Fundamental concepts of defect prevention will be presented as well as the role of the SQA professional in the development of project documents, preparation of SQA plans, effectively performing and using the results from reviews and audits, and employing best practices to improve the development environment. Textbook required at first class is available at the Rockville Campus Bookstore.*

**Divisions Corner (Continued)**

- **Web site** - asq-sqd.com is yet another means of providing information.
- **Annual Service Quality Conference** - We network. We work hard. We learn. We have fun. We focus on leading trends in approaches and deployment of service quality management tools and techniques.

**New Fees Announced for Certifications**

After benchmarking other certifying associations, and in order to stay in line with current practices, ASQ finds it necessary to increase the examination fees for both initial and retake candidates. Effective September 1, 2000 the following will be the fee schedule for the ASQ Certification examinations.

<b>Exam and Application Fees</b>		
	<b>Member</b>	<b>Nonmember</b>
Quality Manager	\$235.00	\$340.00
CQA/CQE/CRE/ CSQE/HACCP	\$180.00	\$285.00
CQT/CMI/CQIA	\$155.00	\$260.00

**\*PLEASE NOTE:** A portion of the above fees (\$50.00) is an application fee and is nonrefundable

<b>Retake Fee</b>	
Quality Manager	\$185.00
CQA/CQE/CRE CSQE/HACCP	\$130.00
CQT/CMI/CQIA	\$105.00

**Our Thanks to Our Proctors**

The ASQ Baltimore Section and **Maria Burness** (Lead Proctor) express their gratitude to **Jim Elliott**, **Glenn Hollenbeck**, and **Jina Robbins** for their assistance with the CQA/CQE/CSQE certification exams that were held in June. Their assistance helps ensure the certification exam process is professional and efficient.



**American Society for Quality  
Baltimore Section - 0502  
2716 Baldwin Mill Road  
Baldwin, MD 21013-9140**

If you are interested in helping with the certification exams, can spare 4 to 5 hours on exam day morning, maintain at least one ASQ certification, and would like to earn recertification points, or want further information on this subject, please contact Maria Burness at 410/771-8600 x265.

*Quality can't be inspected in; it has to be built in.*

**ASQ - Baltimore Section 0502**

**THE VISION:**

*To be the Baltimore Metropolitan Area recognized resource on issues related to Quality.*

**OUR MISSION:**

*To create value for our members and business professionals at large by providing opportunities for professional development, serving as a resource for managing quality in the Maryland community.*

**Certification Exam Schedule**

<b>Examination</b>	<b>Application Date</b>	<b>Exam Date</b>
HACCP Pilot Exam	Sep. 15, 2000	Sep. 30, 2000
CRE / CQT / CMI / Quality Manager	August 25, 2000	Oct. 21, 2000
CQE / CQA / CSQE	October 13, 2000	Dec. 02, 2000
CQIA Pilot Exam	January 5, 2001	Jan. 27, 2001
CQT/CRE/CMI/ HACCP/ Quality Manager	January 12, 2001	March 3, 2001
CQE/CQA/ CSQE/CQIA	April 6, 2001	June 2, 2001

**Next Newsletter Due Date September 15, 2000**

Nonprofit  
Organization  
U.S. Postal Permit  
Cockeysville, MD 21030  
Permit No. 5419