

HPI Integration for Organizational Effectiveness
EFCOG ISM Working Group
Las Vegas
November 10, 2011

Morning Session

Chuck Ramsey, Co-Chair, facilitating. Kim Leffew could not attend.

EFCOG HPI Tools.

Several tools on the web page, some of them may be out of date and need of updating. The task team will be looking for volunteers to review/update these in the upcoming months.

Spring Meeting Recap

Chuck discussed the results of the spring meeting and recapped some of the talking points.

Earl Carnes' Message

Chuck read a note from Earl Carnes who was working on a safety culture concern. Earl noted that we (DOE) are having an impact on others across the world as a result of efforts to achieve better human performance and high reliability.

Earl's email mentioned "Management 2.0" Gary Hamel. Building an organization that is oriented toward facilitating human performance, adaptability, and innovation. "Management is the technology of human accomplishment." A webinar with Mr. Hamel can be listened to at:

<http://stream.krm.com/Mediasite5/Viewer/?peid=fb8de4b3be1f4bc2b963828e10afb13e>

A short video on his work can be watched at <http://www.amazon.com/Future-Management-Gary-Hamel/dp/1422102505>

Organizational Effectiveness

"How do we use HPI to enhance our organizational effectiveness?"

In a pre-meeting email, Earl Carnes responded, *"To me the excellent organization, the high performing organization, thinks differently; the people think differently about their purpose, their relationships, their value to society and in turn their self value. This is what makes excellent organizations unique, this shift in consciousness, and at the most fundamental level this is what HPI and all our other related efforts are about. And until we truly understand this, all we're doing is just playing with different tools, wondering why the results never change. How we think and what we value determines how we relate, what we do, and what we produce."*

Closing question was "What Characteristics does an effective organization have?"

The group provided these examples:

- Jiffy Lube: verification tools
- Alignment of beliefs, values, behaviors and consequences of a negative delta
- Engaged management and leadership
- Communication with dialog between upper and lower organizations
- First line supervisor involvement
- Senior management in the field observing
- Consistent priorities

- HPI part of management strategy for facilitating worker success
- Training supports the strategy
- Consistency
- When a company's walk matches its talk
- Communication throughout the organization
- Engaged management and leadership: Frustration point - senior management does not stay behind the program
- Management Observations - get the senior management engaged in performance.

Presentation: Learning Team approach – Tom Courtney, LANL

Tom Courtney discussed having a strategy for what we want out of a fact finding before we have the fact finding - what we really need to understand is the event and its ramifications - need to understand the issue before we start looking for causes and fixes.

Brought us through an exercise on an LP explosion and posed three questions:

- What do you need to know?
- How was risk managed?
- What improvement opportunities exist?

This third question had a long term tone to it but the intent was immediate, not long term. Team-based learning can be used to observe essentially any process (corrective action, causal analysis, work control, field work, etc.) to look for gaps in performance. A shared vision plus use of team-based learning leads to success. Additional helpful information can be found at www.teambasedlearning.org. Tom's presentation will be available on the HPI website.

Tom will be teaching with Todd Conklin at [SeminarFest 2012](#) this January on integrating HPI into work planning for error-reduction and accident prevention.

HPI and INPO workshops

The Co-chairs attended the INPO HU Lead workshop in Atlanta in August and the Human Performance and Engaged Thinking HPI workshop in October (INPO & Entergy). Both of these gatherings focused on applying human performance to foster engaged thinking organizations. It was noted that DOE is advocating use of the same tools that the power industry is using and we are having similar issues with getting people to consistently use the tools. Much focus was placed on field observations - couple a senior manager with a line manager/supervisor and do a joint review. As future workshops become available, the information will be provided to offer the opportunity to others attend if space is available for DOE personnel. Attendance at INPO events must be coordinated through Earl Carnes and George Mortensen and preferably through the HPI co-chairs for best processing and communication.

HPI small working groups - reviewed the four working groups and QA interface ,

Mike Gaden provided a presentation on HPI and communications Charter (draft). Some of the talking points included Skill vs. knowledge Proposed strategic objectives:

- identify best practices
- select a small number of to perform pilot

- Perform a test at these sites using different communication tools to see which ones have a positive effect on culture.

Mike outlined the tactical objectives of the above and closed with recommendations/deliverables based on the results of the pilot. Closed with the question of whether or not this was worth doing; generally positive response but concern that this really felt more like safety culture

Putting Spokes in the Wheel: Understanding Feedback and Improvement

Vince Tisdale, Y-12 Operational Performance Improvement Manager

A very good presentation giving a somewhat new viewpoint of the ISMS core functions. Here the ISM function of Feedback and Improvement is the hub of a wheel with spokes between it and the other four core functions. The main point is that feedback and improvement occurs continually through each phase of accomplishing work, not just following job completion. Organizations can improve the implementation of each ISM function (including feedback and improvement) by giving/receiving feedback and taking action as appropriate. This presentation will be available on the HPI website.

Working group out-briefs:

Causal Analysis – Kim Leffew. Kim submitted a draft charter prior to the meeting. She was unable to attend.

HPI / Work Control - Tom Courtney -. Wants to know how HPI tools are being applied in work control, such as checklists. Recommended reading - Checklist Manifesto - provides information on the formation and use of checklists. Tom's work planning group did a self-assessment at LANL looking at use of HPI tools. He has developed a training module for error reduction in work control with Todd Conklin.

HPI / Engineering - Tom Helms discussed status of the tasks. Noted that, as engineers, we believe we are always right and discussed application of Meyers-Briggs personality trait in communicating and applying HPI tools and concepts. Feels the next step is to pulse the various sites to see how it's working in their engineering organizations.

HPI / Researchers – Will Brocker could not attend. Lillian Ruscic discussed why researchers are included as part of HPI, to help ensure they accomplish their goals. We have to communicate to them in the context of their science. There are some differences between staff scientists and visiting scientists. LANL uses checklists. Y-12 chemical development lab has a process implemented that we will get more information from. Howard Nekimken (LANL) expressed interest in joining this group.

Afternoon Session – approximately 16 members remained for this part of the day.

Dynamic Learning Activity: World Café

Very good participation and discussion about the human performance and process-related issues associated with the following questions:

Accountability/culpability

Using the Taproot definitions of accountability and culpability, accountability is when a person has complete control of a situation. This happens very rarely. Then you can hold them culpable if they don't pass the sub test or they have a history of unsafe acts. Where do the principles of human performance apply to ensuring a consistent and just causal analysis process to determining these two qualities?

It was noted by most that this question's wording was confusing.

- Look systemically
- First look at as an isolated incident for culpability
- The corrective action process involves HPI; accountability and culpability are looked at separately
- Be consistent and objective
- Use a consistent performance management process.

•
Beyond this, the appropriate use of culpability models was discussed at length. In particular, when is it appropriate to continue pursuing culpability if the person passes the substitution test?

HPI & Procedure Use

Safety surveys often reveal one or two people who indicate that deviation from a procedure is an acceptable alternative for getting the job done. Failure to follow established lock-out tag-out procedures continues to be a staple in lessons-learned documentation. While there is context behind most all events, what are some possible reasons that HPI implementation efforts in procedure use and adherence continue to struggle and what are some possible solutions?

- Operators may feel insulted and don't want to follow a procedure step-by-step
- Procedures could be poorly written/confusing to follow. Discussed field-change process for procedures.
- Haven't involved end-users in the development, review, and implementation process.
- Procedures too complicated; they don't emphasize important or critical steps
- Consequences not stressed. Workers don't understand why they must follow the procedures.
- Confusion about expectations between direct-use, verbatim compliance, continuous-use and reference-use procedure
- Inappropriate controls within procedure. Put controls in place to guide outcome of actions, but don't put unnecessary controls in; be sure they are appropriate to the hazard and possible consequences.

HPI & Strengthening Defenses

Defenses against the consequences of human error include Engineered Controls (equipment), Administrative Controls (procedures), Cultural Controls (leadership), Management and Oversight Controls (accountability). How does your organization manage these defenses to keep them current, usable, and valid?

- Admin controls: Designate a manager-in-the-field for an oversight role in observing daily activity. Must not be seen as a baby-sitter. Also, supervisory assessment and strong periodic review
- Cultural Controls: Management walk-throughs, brown-bag sessions, leadership training
- Configuration control process
- Reinforce expectations
- Following an event, implement a Sr. Supervisory Watch until the shift demonstrates effective control implementation to prevent recurrence.
- Use feedback from external organizations (e.g., contractor assurance, ISO certification measures, NQA-type assessment).

Dynamic Learning Activity: Group Uncertainty

Due to limited remaining participants and time, Chuck described this DLA which was given by Todd Conklin at the INPO/Entergy workshop in October. Contact Todd or Chuck for more information.

Reading Recommendations:

["It's Your Ship: Management Techniques from the Best Damn Ship in the Navy"](#) by Michael Abrashoff

[“Safe by Accident?”](#) by Judy Agnew and Aubrey Daniels

“Antecedents prompt behavior; consequences drive behavior.” “Some people will never learn anything for this reason; because they understand everything too soon.” “To be good is noble; but to show others how to be good is nobler and no trouble at all” - Twain