**International Hospital Quality Control Competition – Problem Solving Type Score Sheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Review Item** | **Review Element** | **Score** | **Deduction Standard** | **Total Score** |
| 1 | Activity Characteristic (16%) | 1. Problem proposed has clear background;
2. Topic has depth and breadth and relevance;
3. Topic explained clearly with appropriate calculation formula;
4. Topic proposed with adequate reason;
5. Adequate literature analysis
 | 16 | 1. Background lack relevance with the theme

1-3 point deduction1. Topic lack of depth and breadth and relevance

1-3 point deduction1. Topic is not clearly explained (including measurement)

1-3 point deduction1. Reason for selecting the topic inadequate

1-3 point deduction1. Literature analysis lacks breadth and depth

1-3 point deduction |  |
| 2 | Planningand problem assessment(16%) | 1. The schedule of the activity planning is reasonable and achievable.
2. Complete survey of the status quo with baseline data
3. Flow chart is normative
4. Complete design of checklist
5. Pareto chart is normative
6. Target outcome is achievable
7. Charts appropriately applied
 | 16 | 1. Lack of schedule of activity plan (Gantt chart)

2 point deduction, and the chart designed not rational or with clear standards1 point deduction1. Incomplete survey of the status quo

1-2 point deduction1. Flowchart is not normative

1-2 point deduction1. Checking chart is not specific

1-3 point deduction1. Lack of Pareto-chart or it is not normative

1-2 point deduction1. Target outcome not achievable or CCC ability and improvement focus is false

1-2 point deduction1. Survey data sample size is too small

1-2 point deduction |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 | Reason Analysis (30%) | 1. Objective analysis of the problem cause
2. Accurate analysis of the main cause
3. Complete evaluation chart of the main cause
4. Checking chart is normative and attached with empirical raw data.
5. Real cause verification has foundation with strong logistic connection and embodied with “On-site” principle of the scene, the present, the reality.
6. Charts appropriately applied
 | 30 | 1. Cause analysis not sufficient, clear or appropriate

1-5 point deduction1. Lack of main cause evaluation chart or evaluation not accurate or method not rational

1-5 point deduction1. Lack of checklist chart

5 point deduction; the chart is not normative3 point deduction1. Lack of real cause verification

6 point deduction; verification method not rational or not accurate1-5 point deduction1. Tools or methods applied not accurate or rational, or chart applied not appropriate

1-2 point deduction1. Charts not appropriately applied

1-2 point deduction |  |
| 4 | Execution and Activities Results(35%) | 1. Process and outcome measures methods accurate
2. Proposed process and outcome measures is concrete and feasible
3. Process and outcome measures implementation effective and normative
4. Target aim scientific and rational
 | 35 | 1. Process and outcome measures inaccurate

1-3 point deduction1. Process and outcome measures not focused on cause

1-5 point deduction1. Proposed process and outcome measures not specific or lack off easibility

1-2 point deduction1. Process and outcome measures implementation plan and content should be specific, targeted and consistent, every defect will have a 1 point deduction

1-2 point deduction |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 1. Invisible results objective and normative.
2. Standardization normative and effective
3. Review of improvement is real and effective.
4. The chart is complete and applied rightly.
 |  | 1. Effectiveness or the evaluation of Process and outcome measures not accurate

1-2 point deduction for each one1. No comparative data or chart comparing before and after improvement

1-2 point deduction1. Target accomplishment rate is too high or too low

1-2 point deduction1. No radar chart and its numerical table

2 point deduction; not standardize1 point deduction1. No standardization

5 point deduction; standardization not in right way1-3 point deduction1. No review and improvement

3 point deduction; the content is not practical or unconstructive1-2 point deduction1. No theme for continual improvement

1 point deduction1. No improvement stabilization or effect maintenance
	1. point deduction
2. Tools or methods applied not accurate or rational, or chart applied not appropriate

1-2 point deduction |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5 | On-site present (3%) | 1. Enthusiastic, bright and powerful; language fluent and clear.
2. Coherent and with strong logic.
3. PPT well-done, with humanities, artistic connotation, and creativity
 | 3 | 1. Speech not enthusiastic, bright and powerful, fluent and charming 1-2 point deduction
2. Not of good logics

1-2 point deduction1. PPT production not of high level

1 point deduction1. Presenter appearance not tidy and clean, dress not normative

1-1 point deduction |  |
| 6 | Deduction Item: Time delay | Overall reporting time: 15 minutes. Every 1 minute delay will lead to 1 point deduction. Hospital and department introduction time is no more 1 minute  |  | Every 1 minute delay will lead to 1 point deduction. Hospital and department introduction delay is the same, as recorded by the scorekeeper. |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Judging rule:

1. Judges should avoid judging the team from the same country. Hospitals from the same country should not participate.