Cycle Plan Template

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Name | Web-Development | | |
| Developed by | Tony White | Sponsor | SW Board |
| DMAIC Phase(s) | Measure | **Cycle No:** | 3 |

1. Plan

|  |
| --- |
| Objective |
| Understand if the process is stable or unstable  Understand the capability of the system |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Questions | Predictions |
| 1. What is the magnitude of the issue around non-return of animal fates? 2. Are the non-fate returns consistent? 3. How much “cause” detail is available on the animals rescued? | 1. 50% unknown 2. Yes, predict consistent over last few years |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Who | By When |
| Graph previous year’s performance for fate type returns |  |  |
| Graph performance of animal successfully released |  |  |
| Stability analysis on non-closed records |  |  |
| Capability of non-closed records |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Reflections / Learning**

1. Do

|  |
| --- |
| Observations in carrying out plan (park it notes) |
| Took while in devising how to measure 120,000 records. Used sub-groups to manage the data, in excel added year, month and week columns for calls dates and fate returned (closed record) dates. Pivoted data then summed the weeks and turned into a % of non-closed within 45 days |

1. Study

|  |
| --- |
| Analysis of data |
| 1. **Overview of Current Data – Records (Animals) with Unknown Fates**   Data has been collected in MS Access since 2003 and graphed only for calls that a rescuer was sent out to with the definitions:   * Unknown Fates were made up of: **Unknown Fates, Animals In Care** * Released consists of; **Released, Relocated, Observed and left on-site, Reunited with parents** * Excluded from the data were; **Enquiries only, Transferred to another organisation**     For the last 5yrs of data, an average of:   * 12,500 called to the office per annum, resulting in; * 7,700 rescues are undertaken per annum * 49% of animal outcomes, records unreported or unknown each year (~3800 animals per annum) * 26% (~2015 per annum) are reported to be successfully released back into the wild   The volumes of calls are shown in the next 2 stacked bar graphs as record/call numbers showing by year. The numbers are fairly consistent year upon year with call numbers and proportions of fate types.  This graph shows the number of animals per year stacked into fate groups.  “Enquiries” and “another organisation” are generally phone queries or the call was transferred to another organisation. They do not generally require a rescuer to visit the call location.  This leaves “in-care” as a stand-out with ~16,000 records. The vast majority of these are due to not having a fate recorded or defined as **“non-closed”** for the purposes of this project.  The stability and capability analysis covers these as “non-closed” records greater than 45 days.   1. **How good are we at reporting and completing our Animal Records:**   **Stability of the System**  A control chart shown below was developed with all the dataset and sub-grouped by year to calculate annual means:    A review of the 3 special causes last 2 years (2011 and 2012) saw a high number of records for the period with a corresponding high number of “non-closed”. This follows the expected trend of lower numbers of calls in the winter months with a flurry of calls in the spring where native animals are naturally more active and are in breeding season.  The graph also shows that the trend over time, the system is getting worse, with currently ~34% of records are “non-closed” after 45 days.  In terms of numbers this relates to on average around:   * 73 records per week not being resolved * Equivalent to 11 per day * Less in Winter, more in Summer.   After reviewing the results it is concluded that the data is stable but not very good.  **Capability of the System**    A target of only 10% of records should fall outside the upper limit, meaning 90% of all records should be completed and closed (fate identified) within 45 days  Currently the system is only 10.2% capable of meeting this requirement.  Process capability six-packs were completed with a Johnsons Transformation carried out to normalise the data – these can be seen in the MiniTab attachment. They were not included here as the above 2 analyses adequately cover off the statistical detail.  **Summary**  The understanding of the existing data confirms that our records keeping is poor with “non-closed” records a significant issue. In fact it shows that we are getting worse at managing our animal records.  It further confirms that a paradigm shift is required to improve to levels that is required by legislation.  This further provides evidence that moving to a web-based system is the right approach to resolve the issues and we can use these results as a benchmark to review whether improvements are made moving to a web solution. |

1. Act

|  |
| --- |
| Recommendations |
| Not to proceed with trying to improve the current paper system.  Continue the process of developing a web solution and put effort into this instead.  Define the requirements of what the web needs to manage and/or replace in terms of our current systems |

**Checklist for Plan**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| No rhetorical questions  No questions restated  Questions useful for learning (clear, concise)  No obvious missing questions  All questions related and relevant | Predictions are specific, not general  Predictions include why they believe these predictions (personal experience, data available)  PDSA seems reasonable in size – achievable in a reasonable timeframe |