PUBLIC CASE STUDY | ANONYMIZED REGULATED MANUFACTURER

Building a Daily Management System around visible follow-through

How a tiered operating system connected daily visibility, escalation, ownership and verified closure in a regulated manufacturing environment.

75%	~98%	30%
STARTING DELIVERY	AFTER SIX MONTHS	TRACKED COST REDUCTION

Taylor Kwitny led this work in a prior manufacturing leadership role. This case study illustrates the operating-system experience and approach he now brings to Shadow Shift Operations.

Taylor Kwitny, MS, PMP, Six Sigma Black Belt
Founder, Shadow Shift Operations LLC

THE OPERATING PROBLEM

A measurable delivery gap with system-level causes

On-time delivery of finished goods had fallen to 75% in the prior quarter, below the operation's 95% target. The organization needed a management system that could surface abnormal conditions early, move issues to the right level and keep actions visible through closure.

75%	~98%	30%
STARTING ON-TIME DELIVERY	**ON-TIME DELIVERY**	**TRACKED COST REDUCTION**
Below the 95% target	After six months	Reported in the same period

Observed system gaps

- Fragmented communication between operating levels
- No consistent escalation structure
- Delayed response to emerging constraints
- Weak ownership and closure verification

Operational consequences

- Problems remained local longer than necessary
- Leaders lacked a shared view of abnormal conditions
- Teams spent time reacting instead of preventing recurrence
- Delivery commitments became harder to protect

Diagnosis

The assessment focused on the operating system rather than individual blame. It examined meeting routines, visual controls, escalation pathways, Leader Standard Work, action ownership and the discipline used to verify closure.

Core question: Could the operation quickly distinguish normal from abnormal, assign the next action and verify that the response worked?

THE SYSTEM RESPONSE

A connected execution loop

The response combined familiar Daily Management System practices into one operating rhythm. The value came from how the elements connected, how leaders used them and how the team reinforced the routine over time.

Visibility	Problem identification	Escalation	Action	Accountability	Learning

Tiered daily meetings

Move issues from the point of work to the leadership level able to remove the constraint.

Actionable visual controls

Show targets, current conditions and exceptions in a form the team can interpret quickly.

Leader Standard Work

Create a repeatable leadership routine for presence, coaching, escalation and follow-up.

Named ownership

Assign each action to an owner with a due date and a visible status.

Closure verification

Confirm that the action addressed the problem rather than simply marking the task complete.

Learning and reinforcement

Use retrospectives, recognition and repeated practice to strengthen the routine.

Implementation challenges and responses

Resistance to a new routine	Connect the routine to the problems employees already experienced
Inconsistent leadership follow-through	Use Leader Standard Work to reinforce expected behaviors
Too many metrics and logs	Prioritize measures that help the team decide and act
Risk of the system fading after launch	Use named ownership, recurring review and closure verification

This public summary intentionally omits the detailed tier design, board layouts, meeting scripts, assessment logic, internal data tables and implementation templates.

MEASURED RESULTS

Delivery moved above target within six months

75%	~98%	30%
STARTING ON-TIME DELIVERY	**ON-TIME DELIVERY**	**TRACKED COST REDUCTION**
Below the 95% target	After six months	Reported in the same period

The operation reported a 31% relative improvement in on-time delivery. Applied to the 75% starting point, that represents approximately 98% on-time delivery. Performance therefore moved from below the 95% target to above it. More than 25% improvement was sustained over the following year.

How to interpret these results

These figures come from internal operational records for one implementation. They were not independently audited. The Daily Management System formed part of a broader operating environment, so the case study does not claim that one intervention caused every observed change. Employee-satisfaction data were not available.

What carried forward

1	2	3
Make abnormal conditions visible	**Connect escalation to action**	**Verify closure and learning**

Is your Daily Management System producing visible follow-through?

Shadow Shift Operations helps manufacturing leaders assess and strengthen the routines connecting meetings, escalation, ownership and closure.

shadowshiftoperations.com

Prepared from Taylor Kwitny's project records and internal operational metrics. Former employer identity, internal artifacts and proprietary implementation details have been removed.