American Society for Quality
ASQ

Quality Connection

Official Newsletter of the Baltimore Section, ASQ
May / June 2003 Voice Mail: (410) 347-1453
E-mail: asq0502@yahoo.com
Internet: www.asqbaltimore.org

2002-2003 EXECUTIVE BOARD

Gil Cuffari **Chair**
410-203-2053 GCuffari@AOL.com

Scott Fairchild **Vice Chair / Program**
410-993-5432 (W) scott.fairchild@ngc.com

Mike Rothmeier **Treasurer**
410-357-5601 (W) 410-357-4946 (Fax)
Rothmeier@comcast.net

Terri Childs **Secretary**
410-277-1330 (W) tlchilds@mac.com

Sid Lewis **Tutorials**
410-879-0136 ssjmlewis@email.msn.com

Mel Alexander **Database / Home Page**
vze3gmwz@verizon.net

Lloyd Dixon **Education**
410-765-3153 (W) lloyd.dixon@ngc.com

Eric Whichard **Employment**
410-531-4632 Eric.Whichard@grace.com

Howard Swartz **Examining**
410-628-3278 W swartzhc@aaicorp.com

Jo McLaughlin **Arrangements**
410-465-9119 jmclaugh200@aol.com

Kevin Gilson **Koalaty Kid / NQM**
410-864-2428 kgilson@sierramilitary.com

Susan Spurgeon **Membership**
410-993-7288 (W)
susan.spurgeon@ngc.com

Jim Cooper **Newsletter**
410-765-2934 (W) 410-765-0165 (Fax)
je.cooper@ngc.com

Sara Parker **Publicity / AQP Liaison**
410-436-4737 410-436-3665 (Fax)
sara.parker@amedd.army.mil

Frank Vojik **Past Chair / Nominating**
410-761-6815 fvojik@yahoo.com

Kathy Free **SMP**
410-965-5008 Kathy.Free@ssa.gov

Joel Glazer **Software Quality**
410-765-4567 (W) joel.glazer@ngc.com

David Little **Regional Director**
717-653-3720 717-653-3718 (Fax)
dmlittle@tycoelectronics.com

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

From The Chair

Gil Cuffari

When I agreed to serve as this year's Section chair, I had little idea of what lay in store. Not so much in the way of ASQ work – after 11 years of membership, I felt familiar enough with the organization to work in this capacity. My job situation however changed – for the better, but in a very time-demanding way. The new position I accepted in manufacturing quality for a 24/7 operation has left me little free time over the past 10 months.

I am particularly indebted to Vice Chair **Scott Fairchild**, who often was left to preside over Board meetings on short notice due to my absences – he did so with grace, competence and skill. Scott has earned the respect of our Board members over the years for his capable planning of our dinner meetings and program. We are pleased to see him move up to Section Chair next year.

Section Dinner meetings were diverse in topics and well attended. Along with Scott**, Jo McLaughlin,** and **Alan Small** arranged these dinner meetings, which provided a diverse pallet of guest speakers. Duke Okes "Think like a CQM", Tom Redman "Data the Next Quality Disaster", Rick Brocato "Teaming for Quality", John McCool "Control Charts" as well as a meeting in Annapolis on State Legislation and one at Boordy Vinyards. We have had a lot of fun and learned on the way. These meeting included a "series on statistics" tutorial presentations by **Sid Lewis** and **Mel Alexander,** and a discussion and newsletter article by Jo McLaughlin on Use of the Internet for Research. Thanks also to **Sid Lewis** for arranging Tutorial Speakers and the Statistics Series.

Special thanks go to our Past Chair, **Frank Vojik**, who maintained a gracious and supportive presence and much in the way of guidance during Board Meetings. In April, the Board awarded Frank a Testimonial Award. This newly formed award recognizes members whose contributions to ASQ are exceptional. Having learned of this award, several members of the Board presented this suggestion to us, and it received unanimous approval.

Frank held several positions on the board, some several times. During the past seven years, his efforts shaped the policy of the Section, and he has repeatedly exhibited extraordinary leadership, such as assuming the Chair for a second year when there was no candidate available. Last year, he did double duty, serving as interim Treasurer, while also serving as Chair because then-Treasurer Bill Barton moved. We were proud to be able to give this first-of its-kind award to Frank in recognition of his outstanding service to the Baltimore Section. (My thanks for help and guidance when I called you those late nights and weekends.) *(Continued on Page 2)*

***From The Chair** (Continued)*

Our congratulations and thanks to you, Frank !

Terri Childs, new to the Board this year, has done superb work in the capacity of Secretary, one which demonstrated her ability to quickly capture and sort details from our often brisk discussions during Board meetings. Good job, Terri.

The Section's finances are in good health, assets having steadily grown during the past several years. Section income, which mainly comes from dues, is used mainly to underwrite the costs of printing and mailing the newsletters, meeting notices, and covering the costs of Dinner Meetings (the $18 charge often is not enough, your dues cover the rest). **Mike Rothmeier**, our intrepid Treasurer kept his green eyeshade focused on the balance, and did so with skill, diplomacy and a wonderful wit. He has agreed to continue in this capacity next year. "We are in your debt", Mike.

This year, the Section also implemented its plan to integrate the AQP Chesapeake Chapter. This long time partnership serving the needs of both organizations, evolved into a marriage. AQP had been unable to continue existence, yet the local organization was still "going strong". ASQ Baltimore experienced a decline in its membership, and was seeking new faces, ideas and directions. It was a meeting of the minds. The new arrangement brought several talented and hard-working people to our board, **Kathy Free, Jo McLaughlin** and **Sara Parker**.

Kathy Free served as the SMP Chair, responsible for managing the Section Goals – and holding us all to our plans. She served capably in this capacity, also improving and updating our direct mailing program for meeting announcements. We are proud to note that Kathy will be serving as Program Coordinator for the UM Center for Quality and Productivity Senate Quality Awards program during Karina Polun's maternity leave. Congratulations Kathy !

Sara Parker managed the Publicity function, placing meeting announcements in many local newspapers. She also supported arrangements for several Section meetings, and hosted several Section Board meetings. Sara is next term's Vice Chair and as such will be arranging program and guest speakers. She will be holding an important capacity, one which fits her talents, and we welcome her offer to serve.

Susan Spurgeon joined the board in the fall – and we immediately put her to work managing over the Membership function which **Bev Earman** had managed so capably for several terms. Each new member receives a personal letter of welcome to the Section, a ticket to a free Section dinner meeting and has their name presented to board members as they are added to the mailing list. When present at dinner meetings, we also make an effort to introduce the new members to those present. In December, Susan compiled a study of member demographics (did you know we have about 62 Section members who reside outside of Maryland ?) Such metrics help us address the needs of our membership, in terms of meeting location, topics of interest, and certification needs. Susan and Bev, thank you both.

Early this year, **Tom Steward** signed as our new Web page editor, supporting webmaster **Mel Alexander**. Tom has contributed substantially in redesigning the web page, acquiring a new address – one "we can remember" (visit us at ASQbaltimore.org) and in doing so, garnered compliments for the improvements. Our thanks to you, Tom for a job well done. Mel, as the founder of our web presence, has also served as liaison between the Section and ASQ.

Eric Whichard joined the board this year, and took over the Placement Chair responsibilities. He has added a new email posting function to the services we offer, whereby members wishing to may receive confidential emailed job announcements as soon as he receives them. Anyone who has been unemployed (as I have been) knows how much such a service helps when you need a job! Eric has also successfully arranged a partnership with a Loyola College graduate program who offered to provide a marketing plan for the Section, free of charge to us. More to come on this.

John Yeager has maintained his steady and important role as the "Section voice mail manager"; managing the call-in reservations system for our dinner meetings, which he has done for many years. His support in this capacity has been critical. John, thanks.

Kevin Gilson, best known for his efforts in managing the Section's judging team for the Greater Baltimore Science fair, often serves internally as facilitator at Board meetings, providing the concise statement of a problem at hand. He and Bev Earman (are currently working with Howard Swartz**,** Alan Small and Scott Fairchild to revise and update our Section Bylaws. We felt it was time to revisit our bylaws for two important reasons – 1) they are outdated and do not reflect current practice or ASQ's recommendations in several areas, and 2) we'd like to simplify our election process, so that an announced meeting can serve as an election meeting, and those who may choose to run for office have a better forum to do so.

Howard Swartz continued his efforts as Recertification Chair, contacting members whose certifications will lapse, providing the databased information he maintains on each member's meeting attendance (for certification credits) and supporting sponsorships for higher levels of standing (senior membership, fellow, etc).

Lloyd Dixon, our Education Chair scheduled and presented refresher courses in Quality Engineering, Quality Management, and planning of seminars. If you plan to sit for a Certification Exam, these courses are invaluable, as they are designed to prepare you for the exams, and Lloyd has had a good record of success with his "graduates" passing the tests.

Maria Burness, Chief Proctor for the past 3 years has organized and administered three Certification Exam sessions this year, recruiting proctors, arranging facilities and managing the examinations, generally on Saturday mornings. I've assisted Maria as a proctor and can witness to the fact that she runs a tight ship. Thank you, Maria for an outstanding job.

Joel Glazer, Software Chair has served as liaison with the ASQ Software Division which he helped to found. His partnerships with other Software organizations and the IEEE have helped us in bringing in some fine speakers and guests.

Beth Reigel has served as advisor and has facilitated and encouraged us forward so often, providing the energy and enthusiasm needed to launch a new initiative. Beth, you're amazing !

In addition, my thanks to **Craig Carpenter**, for supporting program and arrangements, providing speaker gifts, and hosting board meetings, **Bob Rayme** our Financial Auditor whose annual scrutiny of our finances earned us the respect of ASQ National, and **Pete Kosmides** our past chair and mentor who has continued to be a wise counsel to our Section.

Finally, we acknowledge the support of our Regional Director, **Dave Little**, who made the effort to attend both a Section Dinner and a Board Meeting. We thank him for that, and commend his efforts to be visible to and supportive of our Sections efforts to serve its membership.

I sincerely believe that the Baltimore Section is unique in having on its Board a remarkably dedicated, competent and collegial group of individuals. Past chairs (Howard Swartz, Lloyd Dixon, Frank Vojik, Beth Reigel, Jim Cooper) and past officers remain active on the Board, and continue to contribute mightily to the Section. Many hands do indeed make work light! Believe me when I tell you, many other ASQ Sections struggle from a lack of enough hands to carry the work load. We are fortunate indeed to enjoy this nexus of talented and dedicated individuals. We are truly in their debt.

Thank you for allowing me to serve you this year. May our future continue to be bright !

Frank Vojik Receives Testimonial Award

During the Spouses evening at Boordy Vineyards, past Chair **Frank Vojik** received a testimonial award from the Section. The citation read as follows:

Frank Vojik has been a devoted member of the Baltimore board since 1996. In that time he held all of the officer positions as well as membership chairman. In the last seven years, Frank has shaped policy in the section, has exhibited extraordinary leadership ability, and has helped recruit and keep new board members over that time. When there was no one to assume the Chairmanship after Frank's first year, he stayed on as Chairman.

Frank has meant a great deal to our ASQ Baltimore Executive Board and membership at large. He consistently participates in Board decisions and is always willing to help out with section activities, frequently filling in vacant board positions or running the meetings in the absence of the Board Chair. New Board members can count on Frank for leadership, mentoring and coaching.

Frank has 25+ years of experience in Quality management, manufacturing and customer service environments. His strong organizational and planning skills have been a great asset to his various quality-related employment positions held. Frank has extensive experience in the application of quality management, problem solving and statistical tools in manufacturing and laboratory environments, leading to ISO9002 certification. He has directed safety, environmental and regulatory programs to OSHA and EPA requirements, and managed reliability and auditing departments.

As a devoted career quality professional, Frank is a true champion for the support and promotion of ASQ, and we thank him for his distinguished service and contribution to furthering the knowledge and professional development of our ASQ - Baltimore Section members.

In sincere appreciation,, The Baltimore Section of ASQ

On behalf of the Section membership, we congratulate Frank on this recognition.

Mark Your Calendars:

13th International Conference on Software Quality (13ICSQ) Dallas, Texas October 6-9, 2003 Renaissance Dallas-Richardson

- Pre- and post conference tutorials on a broad array of software topics presented by experts in the field
- Four daily sessions with four tracks in each section to select from
- Keynote speakers begin and end each day's session. Jerry Weiberg (***Qualitry Alibis: Tools, Rules, Fools and Schools);*** James Bach ***(How Testers Think);*** Karl Wiegers ***(The Softer Side of Peer Reviews);*** Bill Curtis (Lunch time presentation October 8) ***We Need More Cowboy Programmers).***
- Early bird registration savings for non-Division member. Register before September 1, 2003 and save.
- On-site exhibitors.
- Special offering of the CSQE; CQA and CQ Manager exams on site prior to the beginning of the conference.
- Networking opportunities with others involved in Software Quality activity.

For further information on the 13th ICSQ, including conferences abstracts and speaker bios**;** tutorial abstracts, outlines and presenter's bios**;** registration information**;** and hotel and other travel information, visit the Web site at www.icsq.org

Quality in the Vineyard

By Sara Parker

No thing more excellent nor more valuable than wine was ever granted mankind by God. - Plato

On Tuesday, May 13th, the Baltimore Section of ASQ held it's annual Spouse/Significant Other Night. This year our event was a winery tour and wine tasting at Boordy Vineyards in Hydes, MD. Our event drew over 60 participants. Boordy Vineyards is Maryland's oldest family run winery. Established in 1945, Boordy is owned by the **R.B. Deford** family and is situated on their 230-acre farm in the Baltimore countryside. Boordy is only fifteen minutes north of the Baltimore beltway, yet it's setting in the gentle hills of the Long Green Valley seems a world apart. Rows of carefully tended vines, a cluster of charming 19th century farm buildings and shaded picnic grounds await the visitor. The winery's massive fieldstone walls provide an ideal environment for the production and aging of award-winning wines. Offerings include oak-aged cabernets, crisp chardonnays & seyval blancs, methode champenoise sparkling wine, a Maryland port, and other specialties. Premium varietals are grown in the estate vineyards which Boordy farms in the Long Green Valley and in the Catoctin Mountain region.

Our ASQ event included a very detailed tour of the facility by Ms. **JoAnn Geare**, a long-time Boordy employee. She explained Boordy's history, the specifics of their vineyard, and their winemaking processes. Boordy wines are given individual care from the hand-harvesting of the fruit, through the fermentation, aging and bottling. Boordy includes a program of testing and monitoring to ensure that their wines meet appropriate quality standards.

A wine tasting in their charming wine cellar followed our tour. The Boordy wine cellar is a unique room with fieldstone walls, oak barrels, and antique winemaking equipment. An enjoyable evening was had by all the attendees and after visiting Boordy; I think I speak for all of the participants in saying that we can now really appreciate the history and passion that goes into every bottle of wine.

Comments on the Certification Process

Eric Finegan - CQA-Biomedical: After many years as a quality manager for my company, I decided to become certified as a CQA to help improve my ability as an internal quality auditor and a GMP auditor. Studying for the CQA exam required me to find out what it means to be a good auditor, and I have incorporated what I have learned into my company's quality system. Since getting my CQA in December, I have decided to continue professional certification to enhance my knowledge and my career. I received CQA-Biomed after taking the exam in March. I intend to become an RAB certified auditor, and pursue RAC certification (Regulatory Affairs).

Initially, when studying for the CQA, I knew I was going to learn a great deal, as I had no formal auditing training. My study included the ASQ Foundations in Quality, the Quality Council of Indiana software exams, and a number of Auditing books (most notably, the Quality Audit Handbook and Quality Audits for Improved Performance). The CQA was a good learning experience and I have applied much of what I have learned to my job.

At first, when I began studying for the CQA-Biomed, I did not believe that I would learn much new information when studying for the exam, as I already work in that field. Following the Body of Knowledge, I was surprised to find out how much I did not know. I was forced to research and review areas in my field that I had not considered before or had the need to. The pursuit of the CQA-Biomed was definitely worthwhile and for auditors in the bio-medical field, I would recommend it.

Loyola Executive MBA Project Team Studies Baltimore-ASQ Section

By Sara Parker

Recently, the Loyola College of Maryland's Sellinger School of Business and Management, selected the Baltimore Section, ASQ for an Executive MBA Management Consulting Field Study Project. Management consulting assignments or field studies are used in the Loyola Executive MBA Program to provide opportunities for explorations beyond the classroom. The field study provides experiential learning through a hands-on consulting-like engagement with an organization within the region. The field study allows students to further develop their strategic analysis and other skills in problem identification, primary and secondary research, written and oral presentations, and project management. The aim is to provide a natural extension of readings and case studies from the MBA program in general and business strategy in particular, to develop general management skills, and to provide a real-world opportunity for application of strategic analysis and consulting knowledge.

The Field Study Team assigned to our organization included the following MBA students: **Jim Salsini**, Human Resource Manager, State Farm Insurance; **Brad Feldhaus**, Director, Strategic Initiatives, Arbitron, Inc.; **Bruno Grela-M'Poko**, Strategic Planning Manager, Intelsat; and **Darol Smith**, Branch Director Operations, Advo, Inc. **Eric Whichard**, Section Board Member, and Chair, Employment Committee, agreed to serve as the Baltimore-ASQ Project Coordinator. A small number of other ASQ Board members volunteered to serve on a workgroup overseeing this project. A formal Memorandum of Understanding was established for this project that defined the scope of the expectations of the study and spelled out mutually agreed upon responsibilities of the student-team and our organization. The timeframe for this study was February 28, 2003 to May 9, 2003.

The MBA Field Study Project Team objectives developed for our Section included: 1) Development of a Situation Analysis: Appropriate analysis techniques for assessing the environmental factors impacting the Section. 2) A Strategic Plan Analysis: Review the current strategic plans of the Section and suggest appropriate enhancements or modifications, including opportunities for additional growth. 3) Marketing Plan Development – Develop recommendations for a marketing plan utilizing findings and work products from the situation analysis and the strategic plan analysis. Numerous meetings were held between the Project Team and the ASQ workgroup to gather and discuss appropriate and relevant organizational data (financials, performance reports, research findings, etc.) necessary for a comprehensive analysis and understanding of the problem and the development of the team's study recommendations.

On Friday, May 9th, the Loyola Executive MBA Class presented their Field Study Findings and Recommendations to the class and the principals of the representative Field Study organizations. After the formal class presentation, the ASQ Field Study Team met with Mr. Whichard and myself to discuss in detail the study outcomes. A Baltimore-ASQ Strategic Analysis PowerPoint briefing and several copies of a large binder filled with analyses on our Section were presented to us. This information included an examination of trends in population and employment, and a historical look at ASQ both nationally and locally. In addition, it contained a detailed situational analysis for the Section and recommendations for membership retention and growth. Finally, a marketing plan framework was provided to assist the Section Board as it begins its Strategic Planning Process over the summer.

Baltimore Section is very appreciative of the efforts of the Loyola MBA Field Study Team and feels their efforts will prove extremely valuable as we work to develop a strategic focus and plan to actively engage all of our members. The Board plans to ask the Field Study Team to present their study findings as a Section Tutorial in the early Fall. Please stay tuned for additional information on the conclusions of this exciting study.

10 Business Decisions for Every Technology Project

By Hillel Glazer

©2003 Hillel Glazer, Entinex, Inc.

Your company may have little technology and is just starting to explore it. Your company may have an unhappy past with technology and is looking to finally get more from your technology investment. Whatever the case, there are a number of considerations to think through in order to make sure you get what you need -- and get your money's worth. Use these 10 critical considerations to guide your technology implementation decision-making.

1. First and foremost, what are you trying to accomplish with technology? Do you have a well-defined need for technology to do something you can't get done? Too many companies jump to the conclusion that technology will "solve their problems" but they haven't yet put their arms around exactly what problem technology will solve. Technology is like raw material which, when sitting on a shelf, doesn't do much. It needs to be fashioned into something that makes it into what we want it to be. For businesses, technology needs to be given a specific purpose and instruct-ions so that it can address the business' needs. Technology can't figure out what you need it to do for you simply because it's installed.

2. Are your current business processes effective/efficient? Technology can do great things, but if a business process doesn't work before you implement technology, automating your process won't fix it. Investigating the answer to this question is a good sanity-check of whether you've got the first question right. If we think of technology as synonymous with automation, automating a broken process will only make that broken process happen faster and/or more often. Make sure your business process would work equally correct whether it's done with computers or by passing index cards around.

3. Is your business ready for technology? If technology is going to solve specific business needs, are you ready for what will happen? If technology solves one problem, will it just create a bottleneck somewhere else? For example, if technology solves inefficiencies in the order taking process, could your business keep up with the increased orders? You may need to adjust how you do those things that provide input to or receive output from the newly technology-enabled part of your business --- or you might just find yourself abandoning your new investment because it's just an island of efficiency in a sea of molasses.

4. What will the role of technology be in your business? This is a business strategy question. Is technology going to let you do "more with less?" Will it reduce busy work? Improve quality? Will it add to your services and capabilities? Will the technology provide business intelligence to company leaders or does it make an admin's job easier? Will it do both? As simple as this seems, it's quite significant. The answer will (1) determine the scope and penetration that technology will have and (2) will divulge the complexity of the system and (3) will impose many of the requirements for a system. It will also indicate whether the system you are looking for can be pulled off the shelf or would need to be built from scratch.

5. Will the technology accurately reflect how work gets done? This consideration is about whether you've addressed the relationship between efficiency (does something for little time or money) and effectiveness (does something well). A business may have implemented technology that effectively accomplishes a task only to learn that it actually reduced the overall efficiency of the work. One case is of a company that added a system into which all orders were entered so they could later be tracked and referenced. But they didn't eliminate the need for orders to be written on a paper form first. Net result: before technology, one-step process; with technology, two-step process. The system was abandoned tens of thousands of dollars later and in the words of one executive, they haven't revisited it because they "tried technology before and it didn't work." Sure it didn't work! They didn't look at technology in the context of all the work being done on each order, they only looked to solve a narrow effectiveness need at the expense of efficiency.

6. Are you willing to change how you work in order to implement technology? Sometimes technology can solve problems only if you wrap your business around how the technology works. This can likely save you money if the alternative is a custom system. If you are not able/ready to alter work practices, the technology solution may be more complex and costly. Sometimes that's your only choice. A happy medium can also be worked out, but it is tricky and risky. At best, you'll have incurred a non-recurring cost to pay for it in work hours --- if not development hours --- and at worst, you'll incur recurring hours in every-day process "workarounds."

7. Will the technology solution scale with your business? If technology works well at your current level of activity, then you want it to work well at other levels of activity, whether higher *or* lower. A common mistake when specifying technology is to look at the constraints and limitations of your business as they are today and apply them to what technology will do. This will result in technology that is limited by design. The same mistake is made when only looking to solve business needs as the technology looks today. This would result in a business that is limited by technology. Either scenario stalls a business and causes your technology investment to be sunk.

8. How much and when do you expect a return on investment (ROI)? This is why so many IT departments work for corporate CFOs. Technology costs money. Usually, it costs A LOT of money. If there isn't a clear gain to the business (and in most cases that gain must be realized very soon!) then go back through the list and re-visit some of the earlier considerations. A business must be able to see something for having invested in technology. If the ROI is far away or hard to calculate, then more than likely, the need has not been clearly defined, the solution has not been cleanly integrated, or something else on this list is amiss.

9. Do you have the infrastructure to support the technology? All too often, companies think they can just wind technology up and let it go. But in truth, there are significant issues regarding what happens after the technology is delivered. Questions of maintenance, user support, upgrades, defect correction, new functionality, intellectual property and licenses. These considerations influence the solution in technical terms as well as financial. They influence the way in which technology will be used and the role it will play in the company. How reliant do you want the company to be on the technology or the vendor who provided it? How much responsibility do you want to assume and at what cost?

10. Finally, can you effectively articulate your business in technology terms? Can you describe what you want to get from a technology provider in terms that give you what you want, need, and will use? Does your description give the vendor enough information to accurately estimate when it will be delivered and how much it will cost? Are you ready to go directly to a specific technology vendor? Will you need a full-service IT firm to handle the entire project? Will you need to perform some internal process analysis before seeking a technology solution? Some vendors only provide product, some only consulting, others provide all of the above but at significant cost or other risks of involvement.

You'll want to move forward after considering the above list and those resulting from combining items. Cost-efficient and productive technology projects are those that keep a steady pace facilitated by allowing technology to make progress without languishing in protracted decision-making. It's best to have these decisions made before you begin.

*A member of the Baltimore Section ASQ, **Hillel Glazer** is the Principal of Entinex, Inc., The Technology Strategy Company. Experts in how software is developed. Improving technology developers' profitability and maximizing IT consumers' technology ROI. He can be reached at 877-ENTINEX, hillel@entinex.com , or at www.entinex.com*

Getting Your Team In Tune

By Stuart Atkins and Allan Katcher

Do unto others as you would have others do unto you. That's a great moral precept, but a bad theory of management. It presumes that everyone is the same and will respond to identical treatment - being treated the way you'd like to be. However, many of your people aren't like you. What's more they're not even like each other. And you have to help them relate to each other by teaching them to appreciate the other person's style, strengths and motivation.

To get the best performance from your executive team, you have to orchestrate them, getting each to give his/her best and helping members blend their strengths for peak performance as a group. To achieve this, you must analyze their different styles of operating. Everyone is a mixture of four basic behavior patterns, usually with one dominating. The others, less used, come into play when the situation calls for them. There are, however, no "good" or "bad" styles. There are only the individual ways each of us does things, and all are acceptable and can be effective in their own right.

A person whose dominant style is **Supporting-Giving** tends to be trusting, responsive, idealistic and loyal. He/she tries to do the very best possible whenever assigned a task and sets high standards for self and staff. Highly receptive to others' ideas, this person cooperates and is helpful, a natural team player.

When **Controlling-Taking** is the major style, a person is openly assertive and a go-getter. There is a preference for acting quickly, expressing ideas confidently, being persuasive and competitive. A take-charge individual, this person wants little, if any, regular supervision. He/she tells you what needs to be done.

Then there's the **Conserving-Holding** style of operating, in which a person is methodical and precise. Before acting, various ways of doing a job are analyzed, to find the best approach. This person is thorough and practical, no idle dreamer, making the most of existing resources. Often reserved and unenthusiastic, he/she nonetheless does a predictable, efficient job.

Finally, a person whose dominant style is **Adapting-Dealing** is flexible, enthusiastic and tactful. He/she never seems to make enemies, charming everyone. He/she is sensitive t what people want and feel and modifies approaches accordingly. Popularity and the spotlight are important but there is openness to new ideas and an interest in exciting fellow-workers and staff to do the job at hand.

Mix and Mesh

Each style has its role to play within any operating unit, providing its own unique way of performing tasks. You have to assess each employee's dominant and pervading style and gear your supervision of the person with this in mind. Then by explaining the different styles to staff members and showing how each can make its special, valid contribution, you encourage better teamwork. Under your guidance, your subordinates learn to appreciate one another's differences and to cash in on them by mixing and meshing their styles to achieve maximum performance overall.

So often, though, such differences are not appreciated because people exaggerate their style. They overdo a good thing, pressing a valid style across a threshold at which they key strengths become weaknesses. Thus, the worker whose usual Controlling-Taking style is characterized by initiative and confidence can become impulsive and arrogant. A careful, systematic and analytical person whose style is Conserving-Holding becomes plodding and nitpicking, involved in analysis-paralysis. The person with a Supporting-Giving Style can push trust to gullibility and extend excellence to impracticality. With the Adapting-Dealing style, the person can exaggerate flexibility into inconsistency and then turn tactfulness into over- agreeableness.

Frequently, people find themselves doing too much of their good thing simply because their style gives them satisfaction. Didn't it make them as successful as they are? So why not use more of it, even though the situation doesn't call for it? To everyone else, this excess seems unnecessary, self-serving and frustrating.

Excess can also result from stress in the working environment. Stress can occur if, for instance, objectives are vague. Let's say the goal is to improve profits but no one ever says how much or by when. This confusion breeds tension and employees strain their dominant style until it becomes counterproductive. Or perhaps the deadlines are unrealistic for the employees; they really can't be met.

Another possibility: Are there fuzzy lines of authority and responsibility? If so, no one's ever sure what they're supposed to be doing and for whom. Are there conflicting expectations? A division manager may ask his/her staff to be more expansive in their marketing efforts - but the financial manager wants them to watch their costs.

Overload is another factor. It occurs when the amount of work and responsibility are too much for too few. It also happens when an employee or whole group are over their heads because of inexperience. Check the work environment and its rules and regulations to see how they're affecting employees and make appropriate adjustments where necessary and possible.

Pushing the right button.

Next, analyze the styles of the individual workers and then influence them accordingly. This doesn't mean you have to change your own dominant style of managing, however. You don't have to become a compassionate father figure. What you have to do is find the right motivation and meaning for each person, honor it and relate to it.

Let's say you're trying to influence a person whose dominant style is Supporting-Giving. In your approach, stress worthwhile causes, appeal to his/her sense of excellence in asking for his/her help. Show personal concern for how things are going and emphasize that the person can have a chance to further his/her personal development. "Bill, I really need your help on this new project. It means a lot to the company and, frankly to our department. We can really show everyone just how sharp this department is by doing an outstanding job. It will also be a great experience for you too, getting into the thick of this new project."

As the person applies him/herself to the new task, work out the goals together, show your personal involvement and interest in the subsequent performance. Be accessible for any answers or advice needed, and provide trust and recognition.

If a person's key style is Controlling-Taking, appeals should be made to his/her competitive drive. Give lots of responsibility and authority, as well as the resources to achieve the goals. Let him/her show what can be done. Don't keep looking over this person's shoulder - keep out of the way. "Carol, this new project is really tough and every department's sure we'll foul up. I want you to take charge and show them it can be done. This is completely your project and I'm assigning you the people you want - but I expect you to give it the 'push'. If it can be done at all, I know you'll do it."

Of course, those results should be carefully spelled out so firm boundaries are set and the person knows precisely what you want. But let the manager know you're open to her ideas and appreciate any initiative on her part - and spare with her a little but to keep her on her toes.

In the case of the person in the following example whose major style is Conserving-Holding, aim at his methodical nature. He's not a gambler, so present ideas as low risk, the sort of thing that will be ideal for his analytical skills, where he can exercise his logic and fact-oriented approach. In launching him into the new area, accent its links to existing programs so that he feels a sense of familiarity with the job. "Ted, here's another project for us, like that job we handled last year. I'd like you to dig into it, to get together all the data we need to make it as effective as possible and to be sure its done right. We've been through this sort of exercise before and you know the kind of thing we need."

In dealing with him, you must show you are objective, fair and consistent in reviewing his performance and in guiding him. He doesn't like upsets or twists and turns, so set out the details clearly in an organized fashion. Systematically review progress him.

For the person in our final example, whose dominant style is Adapting-Dealing, it would be best to capitalize on the project's social elements. This will provide a great chance for her to do things with others and to gain high visibility. She is likely to prize her social skills and to emphasize the need for flexibility and diplomacy. "Jean, there's a project I need you to handle. The top brass are interested in this one and anyone involved is going to look like a winner when they bring it off. However, the other departments are touchy about it. Their ideas have to be incorporated into the final plan. They can't feel we're imposing out plans on them. We've got to be flexible."

Be informative and give her helpful feedback on how things are going. Make sure to keep the relationship friendly, relaxed and informal - keep her role central and give her credit for what she is able to accomplish.

Obviously, you don't need a special new project to motivate your employees to attack their work with renewed vigor. The same guidelines and options can be applied to ongoing work. People want more understanding from their boss and you can fill this need by relating to their individual styles.

Getting it all together

Having checked out the work environment for stresses, and having established your own, personalized guidelines for motivating each employee, you should next seek a way of bolstering the employees' interrelationship. Individually and then at group meetings, discuss the four style patterns and how they interact. Help each person to analyze his own style. Most people will readily recognize themselves in one of the patterns. Then, especially at the group meetings, show how the styles interrelate and supplement each other to create teamwork. Stress the fact that there are no good or bad styles. Once this is understood, the emotional aspect of misunderstandings among your staff is defused. Charley comes to realize, for instance, that Ted isn't a nit-picking nitwit. His dominant style is Conserving-Holding. Such abilities associated with this style make their own particular contribution to the overall success of the department.

If people understand their own dominant style and those of the people around them, they are halfway toward accommodating their behavior with the others' and blending styles with each other. Perhaps the mixing and meshing of styles can be aided by shifting department assignments. The person who hates planning and detail work but loves action could be given a troubleshooter's assignment. Maybe the person who thrives on procedural work should keep the departmental records.

Indeed, perhaps you as the boss, don't enjoy the whole coaching side of your responsibilities. Find a staffer whose major style is Supporting-Giving, make him/her your assistant and he/she can supplement you in dealing with the development of others. Similarly, use operating styles as a criterion when assigning employees to project teams. Thus, the person who is aggressive but sometimes rubs people the wrong way might be matched with a person whose dominant style is Adapting-Dealing.

Or the personable individual who is great at getting along with customers but isn't so hot at organizing his/her efforts could be teamed with someone whose major style is Conserving-Holding.

Above all, you have to keep in mind that this isn't a one-shot exercise. You should set up periodic meetings at which the basic agenda is to review how all your styles are meshing to achieve departmental objectives and to see what adjustments are needed. That doesn't mean aimless mutual analysis and name calling but goal-oriented reviews. Start with any problems that have been experienced. Have deadlines been met? Are defects down the way you'd all planned? What causes stress? Can we overcome it or do we have to learn to live with it. Begin with the work content this way, and as problems are discussed, gradually shade over into the stylistic aspects of the issues.

Some people object to the idea of discussing their associate's styles because they feel this entails playing amateur psychologist, as though this were some form of group therapy. But the fact is that we all do play amateur psychologist, analyzing why fellow workers and bosses do things.

What's really needed is to get this out in the open, with a mutually agreed-upon set of terms - those four style patterns - so everyone can benefit from shared insights. As long as its understood that there are no good or bad styles - that each person can make a special contribution, everyone should be able to view the subject objectively and positively. Therapy isn't needed because no one is being blamed and all approaches are valued. It's essentially a matter of you and the others coming to appreciate more deeply the fact that everyone behaves differently and that there are predictable guidelines for dealing with those differences. They all contribute to achieving the goal of making the beautiful music of peak performance.

Section Officers Elected for 2003-2004

The ballots have all been counted from the recent Section election and the following have been elected to fill the Section leadership positions for the ASQ year 2003-2004:

- Chair: **Scott Fairchild**
- Vice Chair: **Sara Parker**
- Treasurer: **Mike Rothmeier**
- Secretary: **Kathy Free**
- Advisors: **Mel Alexander, Terri Childs, Frank Vojik**

Our new Chair **Scott Fairchild** graduated from the University of Maryland, Baltimore County in 1985 with a BS in Chemistry. He worked in the chemical industry for 5 years as a Chemist and a Statistical Process Controller. Then he worked in the Industrial Minerals industry for 11 years as a Quality Control Laboratory Supervisor and a QA Manager. Scott is currently employed at Northrop Grumman located at the BWI Airport. He has been a member of ASQ since 1991 and is certified as a CQA and CQE. He joined the Section's Executive Board in 1998 and served as Arrangements Chair for three years before stepping into an elected position..

Sara Parker is our new Vice Chair. She is the Chief**,** Strategic Initiatives Office at the U.S. Army Center for Health Promotion and Preventive Medicine (USACHPPM). The Center's mission is to provide worldwide technical support for implementing preventive medicine, public health, and health promotion/wellness services into all aspects of America's Army and the Army Community. Sara's responsibilities include strategic planning, quality management systems, performance management, knowledge management, customer relations and marketing. She serves as an ISO 9000 Lead Auditor and was responsible for the implementation of ISO 9001 Quality Management System Standards at USACHPPM. Her federal career includes over 25 years of financial, manpower and program analysis experience.

Sara is currently serving a third term on the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Board of Examiners. She has served multiple terms as a Senior Team Leader for the President's Quality Award Program**;** Army Communities of Excellence Award**;** Maryland Governor's Quality Award**;** and the U.S.

Senate Productivity and Maryland Excellence Award programs.

For the past several years, Sara has served on the Baltimore Federal Executive Board, including Chair of the Management Improvement and Strategic Planning Committees. She has also served as Vice-President of the Chesapeake Chapter of the Association for Quality and Participation. She holds a Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Maryland University College.

Mike Rothmeier serves as our Treasurer. He operates his own consulting company, **Simple Solutions ➚**. He is a graduate of California Polytechnic State University. During his career, he has worked for Northrop Grumman, Baxter Medical, Square D and Allied Signal. Mike is a Professional Industrial Engineer in both Maryland and California. In addition to ASQ, he is a member of Institute of Industrial Engineers, National Society of Professional Engineers, Society of Manufacturing Engineers and AME.

Kathy Free, our new Secretary, has served over 23 years with the Social Security Administration, based in the Office of Systems, SSA's Information Technology component, as a management consultant, facilitator, trainer, and coach, and currently serves as Systems' Customer Service Coordinator. In addition to serving as a Section board member, Kathy held a number of offices in the Chesapeake Chapter for the Association for Quality and Participation, including several terms as president. She is a founding leader of the Baltimore-Washington-Northern VA Partnership for Learning and Cooperation, a consortium of our region's non-profit quality organizations, and currently serves as its chair.

Kathy has conducted over 60 organizational assessments as an examiner for the following Quality Programs: Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award, U.S. Senate Productivity Awards and Maryland Quality Awards, Department of Interior's Secretary's Performance Challenge, President's Quality Award Program; and Maryland Governor's Award Program. She is currently on loan from SSA, serving as the interim program administrator for the 2003 Senate Awards Program.

Since March 1992 Kathy has compiled and issued a monthly electronic newsletter alerting regional quality professionals to upcoming quality-related meetings and events in the region, (issued on behalf of the BWPLC since March 1996). Currently over 1,200 interested readers receive this newsletter via Upcominglist@aol.com (formerly AQPEmail@aol.com).

Kathy is a featured speaker for professional organizations, conferences, and colleges/universities on topics including the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award and Senate Award Programs, the teachings of W. Edwards Deming, and facilitation techniques. The "Team Start Up" approach Kathy developed is published on a variety of facilitator and team websites (such as www.teambuilding.com) and has been successfully used throughout the world. In January 2002, Federal Express added the "Team Start Up" to FedEx Quality University as part of its management training curriculum.

Kathy received dual Bachelor of Science degrees from Clarkson College (now University) and a Master of Administrative Science degree in Information Technology from The Johns Hopkins University School of Continuing Studies.

"The danger of communication is the illusion it has been achieved!" **Joe Ryan**.

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.***

Problem-Solving Success Tip

Jeanne Sawyer, Ph.D.

Measure. The first key question to answer in starting a problem-solving project is, "How will you know when the problem is solved?" Answer this question in measurable terms before you start trying to solve the problem. As you begin defining your problem, these success metrics help set clear expectations about what will be different when you finish. At the end of the project, the measurements will demonstrate that the difference has been achieved, i.e., the problem has been solved.

To be useful, success measurements must be simple in concept and connected so clearly to the problem that you can remember them easily. As with the description, somebody who doesn't already know about the problem should be able to read your success criteria and understand them.

The objective in setting success metrics for a problem-solving project is to define the *minimum* necessary to solve the problem. This is completely opposite to the way we usually set goals. In problem-solving, we want to do everything necessary to solve the problem, but nothing extra.

Once you decide what your success metrics will be, check them with real data. This not only verifies that you really can collect and report the measurements, but also lets you establish baselines. Measure exactly what your performance is before you start analyzing the problem and taking corrective action. The baseline measurements let you confirm that there really is a problem and sanity checks the performance levels you've defined as success. You can make corrections if necessary, before you start down a wrong path.

Measure to determine that the problem is solved, but also use measurements throughout the problem-solving process. Measurements can also help you test assumptions, verify root causes, assure tasks are completed properly and report progress.

Bottom line: if you don't measure, you won't know for sure. Use measurements to learn and portray the truth—the real truth, not what you wish were true.

Jeanne Sawyer is an author, consultant, trainer and coach who helps her clients solve expensive, chronic problems, such as those that cause operational disruptions and cause customers to take their business elsewhere. These tips are excerpted from her book, *When Stuff Happens: A Practical Guide to Solving Problems Permanently*. Find out about it, and get more free information on problem solving at her web site: www.sawyerpartnership.com.

Certification Exam Schedule

Examination	Application Date	Exam Date
CQT/CRE/CMI/ SSBB/HACCP/ Biomedical/ Quality Mgr.	August 22, 2003	October 18, 2003
CQE/CQA/ CSQE/CQIA/ CCT	October 3, 2003	December 6, 2003

Next Newsletter Due Date	July 15, 2003

American Society for Quality

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

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