Assessment Tool for a Problem-Solving (Proposal) A3

Directions

Items Assessed by Direct Review of the Proposal A3

Items numbered 1 – 23 can be assessed without knowing the actual situation. Most items reflect descriptive content suggested in the accompanying A3 template.

Rating these items. For each item, review the A3 and assess the item using one of the four rating options. *Include information in adjacent sections when assessing items – information on the left side or on the right side may be in a different order/location on a specific A3.* Record the "points" (0 to 3) associated with the rating option to the right under "Item Rating."

Overall mean rating for these items. At the end, add the item "points" to calculate the overall total rating "points." Calculate the overall mean item rating by dividing the total rating points by 23, the total number of items. *(If completed on a computer, calculations are performed automatically – see below.)*

Items That Require Knowledge of the Actual Situation

Unnumbered items (noted with "➤") address how well an A3 reflects the actual situation. Only individuals who are somewhat familiar with the specific context (beyond description in the A3) can assess these ten items. When these items can be rated, they assess the A3's accuracy in representing the actual situation.

Rating these items. For each item, review the A3 and:
- If you have adequate knowledge of the actual situation, assess the item using one of the four rating options.
- If you are not familiar (or not adequately familiar) with the current situation, indicate "Cannot assess."

These items are not included in aggregated mean ratings because not all raters will be familiar with the problem.

Providing Feedback

Provide feedback to A3 authors using the item ratings, comment box for each section, and overall ratings. For "Problem Solving" A3s in development, feedback provides important formative assessments. For finished A3s, feedback explains summative/final assessments.

Functions When Completing on a Computer

The assessment tool is a PDF fillable form that performs two functions when completed on a computer.

"Hover" for rating explanations. "Hover" your pointer over a rating option and a more detailed explanation will appear.

Entering ratings and calculating scores. Use the dropdown menu for each answer box to enter the score. For the numbered items, the total and the mean for the 23 numbered items will be calculated and appear at the end. *(If numbered items are not answered, they are scored as zero in calculating the total and mean scores.)*

Assessment Tool for a Problem-Solving (Proposal) A3

A3 Title: _____

Author: _____ **Reviewer:** _____ **Date:** _____

Items (based on A3 Template) and Rating Scale	**Rating**

Background *Why is the problem important?*

1. **Negative consequences** (e.g., harm, frustration, waste): how specific is the clearest statement of a negative consequence of the problem?
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. Unclear
   - 2. General (eg, "harm," "difficulties," "waste")
   - 3. Specific type of consequence

2. **Individuals/groups** impacted by the negative consequences (e.g., harm, frustration, waste): how specific is the clearest statement identifying an impacted individual, group/unit, or organization?
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. Unclear
   - 2. General (eg, "staff," or "patients," but not which)
   - 3. Specific individual, group, or organizational unit

3. **Severity** of the negative consequences (e.g., harm, frustration, waste): how specific is the clearest statement of the severity (e.g., extent/amount) of at least one negative consequence?
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. Unclear
   - 2. General (eg, significant harm)
   - 3. Specific extent/amount

4. **Frequency** of the negative consequences (e.g., harm, frustration, waste): how specific is clearest statement of the frequency (# events/unit of time) of at least one negative consequence?
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. Unclear
   - 2. General (eg, rare, often)
   - 3. Specific frequency (eg, events per unit of time)

➢ Extent to which important negative consequences (e.g., harm, frustration, waste) are identified?
   - None
   - Inadequate
   - Adequate
   - Thorough
   - Cannot assess

Background – reviewer comments:

Current Situation *What is actually happening?*

5. Current level of performance
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. General words, but no data
   - 2. Some data
   - 3. Thorough and robust data

6. How is work done (process/workflow)?
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. Addressed, but unclear
   - 2. Illustration/ description somewhat clear
   - 3. Illustration/ description very clear

7. Clear identification of who is involved in performing the work?
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. Unclear
   - 2. Somewhat clear
   - 3. Very clear

8. Performance problem/gap?
   - 0. Not addressed
   - 1. Unclear
   - 2. Partially specified
   - 3. Clearly specified/quantified

➢ Extent to which the A3 author demonstrates direct observation of the work process?
   - Not observed
   - A little
   - Some
   - All
   - Cannot assess

➢ Extent of demonstration of learning from the people involved in the process?
   - None
   - A little
   - Some
   - All
   - Cannot assess

Current Situation – reviewer comments:

Goal   *What target condition or specific performance is desired? By when?*

9. <u>How specific is the goal?</u>

| 0. Not addressed | 1. Vague | 2. Somewhat specific | 3. Very specific |

10. <u>Is the goal measurable?</u>

| 0. Not addressed | 1. Not measurable | 2. May be measurable | 3. Clearly measurable |

➢ <u>How achievable is the goal?</u>

| Not achievable | Unlikely | Possibly | Probably | Cannot assess |

11. <u>How relevant is the goal to addressing the problem?</u>

| 0. Not addressed | 1. Not relevant | 2. Somewhat relevant | 3. Very relevant |

12. <u>How time-bound (clear timeframe for accomplishment) is the goal?</u>

| 0. Not addressed | 1. Unclear | 2. Somewhat clear (eg, relative timeframe) | 3. Very clear (eg, date specified) |

Goal – reviewer comments:

Analysis   *What is contributing to the problem? What are its root causes?*

13. <u>Is the display of method(s) for analyzing root causes easy to understand?</u> (E.g., fishbone diagram, "5-whys"/root cause tree diagram, Pareto chart)

| 0. Not displayed | 1. Not understandable | 2. Partially understandable | 3. Easy to understand |

14. <u>How clear are the identified root causes?</u>

| 0. Not addressed | 1. Unclear | 2. Somewhat clear | 3. Very clear |

➢ <u>Extent to which important root causes are identified?</u>

| None | Inadequate | Adequate | Thorough | Cannot assess |

Analysis – reviewer comments:

Countermeasures   *What options/alternatives were considered? What countermeasures/strategies are proposed?*

15. <u>How many options for countermeasures were considered?</u>

| 0. None | 1. One | 2. Two | 3. Three or more |

16. <u>Identify the strongest countermeasure considered. How strong is it?</u>

| 0. No counter-measures | 1. Weak (e.g., policy change, education and training) | 2. Intermediate (e.g., standard work/roles, just-in-time reminders, or visual/cognitive aids) | 3. Strong (e.g., "forcing function" that ensures work done right way) |

17. <u>How many of the proposed countermeasures are linked to identified root causes?</u> *(Review each countermeasure and see if it addresses a root cause identified in the Analysis Section.)*

| 0. None linked to causes | 1. Minority linked to causes | 2. Majority linked to causes | 3. All linked to causes |

➢ <u>To what extent are countermeasures feasible to carry out?</u>

| Not feasible | Unlikely | Possibly | Highly likely | Cannot assess |

➢ <u>How likely will countermeasures result in achieving the goal?</u>

| Not possible | Unlikely | Possibly | Highly likely | Cannot assess |

Countermeasures – reviewer comments:

> [blank comment box]

Action Plan   *To pilot & implement the selected countermeasures: what, who, when?*

18. <u>For the action plan on the A3, how clearly are activities described (i.e. "what" is to be done)?</u>   [ ]
    0. Not addressed   1. Unclear   2. Somewhat clear   3. Very clear

19. <u>Are individuals identified to be responsible for each action item to be carried out (i.e. "who")?</u>   [ ]
    0. Not addressed   1. For the minority   2. For the majority   3. For all

20. <u>Are estimated completion dates identified for each action item (i.e. "when")?</u>   [ ]
    0. Not addressed   1. For the minority   2. For the majority   3. For all

21. <u>How clear</u> is the plan for monitoring the implementation of actions in 18-20 above (what will be monitored, by whom, when)?   [ ]

0. Not addressed	1. Plan unclear (no or minority of actions monitored – what, who, when)	2. Plan partially clear (majority of actions monitored – what, who, when)	3. Plan clear (all actions monitored – what, who, when")

➤ <u>How adequate is the action plan?</u>   [ ]
    Not adequate   Possibly   Probably   Very likely   Cannot assess

Action plan – reviewer comments:

> [blank comment box]

Follow-up Plans   *Checking whether desired goal(s) was achieved?*

22. <u>Is follow-up planned to measure achievement of the desired goal(s) (what will be measured, by whom, when)?</u>   [ ]

0. Not addressed	1. Plan unclear (no more than one of "what, who, when")	2. Plan partially clear (two of "what, who, when")	3. Plan clear "(what, who, when")

Across A3 Sections

23. <u>How clearly does the title identify the problem to be addressed?</u>   [ ]
    0. No title   1. Unclear   2. Somewhat clear   3. Very clear

➤ <u>How often does the logic flow clearly from one section of the A3 to the next section?</u>   [ ]
    Not at all   Occasionally   Majority   Always   Cannot assess

➤ <u>In general, how informative are the visual illustrations?</u>   [ ]
    None used or not informative   Not very informative   Somewhat informative   Very informative   Cannot assess

Across A3 Sections – reviewer comments:

> [blank comment box]

OVERALL RATING (items 1 – 23)

Total points (max = 69)   [ ]

Mean (divide total by 23 items)   [ ]
   Note: check that all 23 numbered items have been answered. Missing answers are coded "0."