

# Quality Workshop Summary



**ERIC JABS**  
**QUALITY PROGRAM MEETING**  
**MARCH 20-21, 2012**



# Overview



- **March 7-8**
- **48 attendees**
  - 20 official agencies with 28 attendees
  - FGIS headquarters, field office, and NGC employees
- **Presentations**
  - History of the Quality Program
  - Elements of an Effective Quality Program
  - Current Quality Program
  - Quality Assessment Results
  - Overview of QAC Reports and Results
- **Small Group Discussions (8 Groups)**
  - Supervision and Monitoring
  - Performance Criteria, Measurement, and Incentives
  - Quality Program Tools
  - FGIS*online*



# Presentations



- **History of the Quality Program**
  - Provided a timeline of FGIS quality improvements since 1994
  - FGIS roles and responsibilities
  - QAC structure
- **Elements of an Effective Quality Program**
  - 8 quality management principles
  - Anheuser- Busch quality program elements
- **Current Quality Program**
  - FGIS quality program structure and tools
  - Case study on corn damage
    - ✦ Targeted monitoring
  - Program statistics



# Presentations



- **Quality Assessment Results**
  - Summarized 60 responses to the quality assessment
  - Presented major themes
- **Overview of QAC Reports and Results**
  - QAC performance and ability tools
  - QAC report examples
  - QAC report status



# Small Group Discussion 1: Summary



## **Supervision & Monitoring**

- Keep monitoring sublots and single lots
- Target monitoring based on statistical measurement and/or factor levels
- Continue to look at file samples versus separations
- Increase supervision at the local level due to timeliness of information
- Use local monitoring on OCIS
- Mixed responses on individual rail/container monitoring loaded under cu-sum or average grade booking
- Limited discussion of roundlots,
  - ✦ Monitor as is practical or 5%.



# Small Group Discussion 1: Questions



- What should be covered and the appropriate level?
  - **Official Samples**
    - ✦ Monitor by Sublot (8)
      - 2-5% (1)
    - ✦ Monitor by Single lot (8)
      - Target based on factor results (e.g., DKT >3%) (1)
    - ✦ Round lot (2)
      - As much as practical (1)
      - 5% (1)
    - ✦ Support for SIMS/STEPS/Referees, current tools



# Small Group Discussion 1: Questions



- **Monitor OCIS**
  - ✦ No (3)
  - ✦ Local with framework (2)
  - ✦ Yes, at 1% (1)
- **Monitor individual rail cars from unit trains loaded under Cu-Sum**
  - ✦ No (4)
  - ✦ Yes, at 1% (1)
  - ✦ Local with framework (1)
- **Monitor individual containers from an average grade booking**
  - ✦ No (4)
  - ✦ Local with framework (1)



# Small Group Discussion 1: Questions



- How should samples be monitored?
  - **Statistical Measurement?**
    - ✦ Use statistics to vary monitoring percentage (2)
    - ✦ Keep existing (1)
    - ✦ No Stratification (1)
      - More U.S. #1/#2
    - ✦ Segmented (1)
      - U.S. #1/#2-Learning about equipment
      - U.S. #3/#4-Individual inspector issues
  - **Based on unworked file samples or separations?**
    - ✦ Unworked (4)
    - ✦ Separations (0)
      - Separations useful (3)
    - ✦ Both (SIMS/STEPS) (2)



# Small Group Discussion 1: Questions



- Who should do the monitoring and what is the appropriate role of the OSP and 2<sup>nd</sup> level of supervision?
  - **Role of OSP for monitoring?**
    - ✦ Official Service Provider conducts monitoring (6)
      - More timely (2)
      - Based on sliding scale (1)
      - FGIS involvement is still needed (1)
      - Standards are minimum-objective is to exceed (1)
  - **Role of 2<sup>nd</sup> level of monitoring?**
    - ✦ Anchor Agreements (1)
    - ✦ GSL (1)



# Small Group Discussion 2: Summary



## **Performance Criteria, Measurement, and Incentives**

- Performance Criteria
  - ✦ Current to increased percentages
- Performance Measurement
  - ✦ All levels (agency, service point, inspector, and grain)
  - ✦ Agencies
  - ✦ Focus on low performers.
- Performance Incentives
  - ✦ Reward high performance with incentives
    - Reduced monitoring,
    - Self-licensing
    - Reduced fees,
    - Recognition (Awards, etc.)



# Small Group Discussion 2: Questions



- What are the key organizational performance measures/criteria that we need to use systematically to evaluate and improve performance?
  - **What do you want on your dashboard?**
    - ✦ Reports (2)
    - ✦ Status of draws (1)
    - ✦ Internal only (1)



# Small Group Discussion 2: Questions



- **What metrics could be used for individual performance?**
  - ✦ Interpretative Factors, (2)
    - 90% (1)
    - +5/-5 (1)
  - ✦ Inspector accuracy for all individual factors, STEPS, Opinions, and SIMS in tolerance (2)
  - ✦ Subject to interpretation (1)
  - ✦ 80% + (1)
  - ✦ Current percentages (1)
  - ✦ Base on select factor levels (e.g., > 2% DKT) (1)
  - ✦ Something other than pass/fail (1)
  - ✦ Evaluate over the course of a year (1)



# Small Group Discussion 2: Questions



- **What metrics could be used for organizational performance?**
  - ✦ Checklist including SIMS, STEPS, and PAS (3)
  - ✦ Base on select factor levels (e.g., >2% DKT, Mary Vick's program) (2)
  - ✦ Variance from trend (1)
  - ✦ 80% + (1)
  - ✦ Something other than pass/fail (1)
  - ✦ Current percentages (1)
  - ✦ Combined individual and service point accuracy (1)
  - ✦ Random STEPS on export samples (1)
  - ✦ Evaluate over the course of a year (1)



# Small Group Discussion 2: Questions



- **How should OSP performance be evaluated?**
  - ✦ Focus on low performers-best use of resources (2)
  - ✦ Overall agency, then service point, inspector, and grain (2)
  - ✦ Variance from trend (1)
  - ✦ Grading accuracy (1)
  - ✦ Certificate accuracy (# of errors)(1)
  - ✦ Customer service/feedback (1)
  - ✦ Overall agency (1)
  - ✦ Service point and then overall agency (1)
  - ✦ Must consider volume (1)
  - ✦ QMP (1)
  - ✦ SIMS (1)
  - ✦ Compliance (1)
  - ✦ No ranking vs. other OSPS's (1)
  - ✦ No performance appraisal samples (1)
  - ✦ Weighted samples to look at more interesting samples (1)



# Small Group Discussion 2: Questions



- **What performance incentives to reward high performance?**
  - ✦ No incentives (1)
  - ✦ Incentives for high performance (6)
    - Reduce monitoring (5)
    - Self-licensing (2)
    - Reduce user fees (2)
    - Additional BAR/GSL visits (1)
    - Cost incentive for testing in-house (1)
    - Recognition of excellent work (1)



# Small Group Discussion 2: Questions



- **What is the appropriate score for performance?**
  - 80% (3)
  - 85% (2)
  - 90% (3)
- **What is the appropriate score for licensing?**
  - 70% (1)
  - 75% (2)
  - 80% (6)



# Small Group Discussion 3: Summary



## Quality Program Tools

- The current quality tools such as SIMS, STEPS, Referees, Opinions, OTS and others are working and should largely remain intact with supplemental training.



# Small Group Discussion 3: Questions



- What are the most valuable and least valuable supervision tools?
  - **Most Valuable**
    - ✦ STEPS (8)
    - ✦ SIMS (7)
    - ✦ Over the Shoulder (7)
    - ✦ Opinions (6)
    - ✦ Referees (6)
    - ✦ Training (3)
    - ✦ Anchor Agreements (2)
    - ✦ Site Visits (2)
    - ✦ Reinspection (1)
    - ✦ QA/QC (1)
    - ✦ Early Alerts (1)



# Small Group Discussion 3: Questions



## ○ **Least Valuable**

- ✦ Anchor Agreement (3)
- ✦ Quality Management Program (1)
- ✦ Blind sample (1)
- ✦ Referee (1)
- ✦ Agency Over the Shoulder (1)
- ✦ Crop Quality Surveys (1)
- ✦ FOM Selects (1)
- ✦ Performance Appraisal Samples (1)
- ✦ SIMS (1)
- ✦ Quality Assurance Reports/Corrective Actions (1)
- ✦ Equipment (1)



# Small Group Discussion 3: Questions



- Are there ways that the tool(s) can be efficiently enhanced to assist OSP's in their quality program?
  - Training/Webinars (4)
  - Online Reports (3)
  - On-site visits (QAS, FO, and/or BAR) (3)
  - Anchor agreements (2)
    - ✦ More clearly defined scope, definition, and integration with QMP
  - SIMS (2)
    - ✦ Stratify by subjective factors (1)
    - ✦ Submits selected in accordance with retention time (1)
  - Communication between FGIS*online* programs (1)
  - Work with BAR (1)
  - Roundlot (1)
    - ✦ Select sublots daily



# Small Group Discussion 4: Summary



## **FGISonline**

- The official system needs increased training, webinars, tutorials, practice modules, and user-friendly handbooks to navigate *FGISonline* applications.
- Increased speed
- Easy navigation
- Reduction in errors.



# Small Group Discussion 4: Questions



- **What other program changes in any *FGISonline* application would facilitate your quality program?**
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> party interface (1)
    - ✦ Less errors between 3<sup>rd</sup> party and *FGISonline*
  - *FGISonline* (5)
    - ✦ Increase compatibility with Firefox/Chrome internet browsers
    - ✦ Shortcuts
      - Grain grading information
    - ✦ Protein information
    - ✦ Customizable queries
    - ✦ Easier way to correct rejected certificate from IDW



# Small Group Discussion 4: Questions



- **What other program changes in any *FGISonline* application would facilitate your quality program?**
  - FOL (Licensing) (5)
    - ✦ Reduce timeouts
    - ✦ Tab button
    - ✦ Questions & Answers
    - ✦ Allow agencies to select questions applicable to job function
    - ✦ One report to show every employee who is licensed for which grains



# Small Group Discussion 4: Questions



- **What other program changes in any *FGISonline* application would facilitate your quality program?**
  - ECT (Equipment) (4)
    - ✦ Easier access
    - ✦ User friendly
    - ✦ Individual service point equipment
    - ✦ Take out email address for every DT
  - Select samples with more value (1)
  - Live feed to Cusum logs remotely (1)
  - CRT (Certificate program) (1)
    - ✦ Error check



# Small Group Discussion 4: Questions



- **What information do you need from other FGIS*online* applications to manage quality?**
  - Reports
    - ✦ QAC
    - ✦ ECT
    - ✦ FOL
    - ✦ User friendly
    - ✦ Snapshot of data
  - Training



# Questions

