



Securing a Strong Safety Culture Through Leadership

A Strong Safety Culture is achieved through leadership by:

- **Implementing clear management expectations appropriate for employee ability and tenure**
- **Communicating employee expectations allowing dialogue and acceptance**
- **Implementing performance management (e.g., frequent, prompt, consistent, clear, critical and factual employee feedback identifying behavioral gaps and reinforces good performance) against clear management performance standards.**

These critical organizational actions, effectively implemented, will increase accountability which results in an improved safety culture and a Safety Conscious Work Environment (SCWE). Accountability, Safety Culture, and SCWE will be negatively impacted if any of these three actions are ineffectively implemented. Employee trust is created over time by consistent behavior of management and effective implementation of these three actions.

Ultimately, the accountability desired is the acceptance of responsibility by the employee. The establishment and reinforcement of clear expectations consistently applied by management is critical to performance im-

provement. These expectations not only include what is expected of the employee but the management support required. If management creates an expectation for the employee but does not provide the required support to implement the expectation (e.g., adequate time, resources, acceptance of honest employee feedback, prompt management response to feedback, etc.) then the employee loses trust in the management which results in a reduction in accountability of the workforce and eventually will have a negative impact on Safety Culture and SCWE.

Effective communication of expectations allows the employee to provide feedback to the supervisor or manager on the expectation. This two-way communication is critical to the employee accepting and agreeing to the expectation. A lack of acceptance of the expectation by the employee creates a condition where the employee does not accept responsibility for the expectation and could “feel” violated. This lack of acceptance of responsibility results in a reduced accountability by the employee with a disrespect for the effectiveness of their “chain of command” that could have a negative impact on Safety Culture and SCWE. The implementation of performance management aligned with clear expectations allows supervisors and

Safety Culture

NW I

Inside this issue:

Securing a Strong Safety Culture	1-2
Mid Atlantic Nuclear Training Meeting	1
The Environment of Accountability	3
Professional Reactor Operator Society Meeting	2
NWI Supports INL	4
NWI News Board	5



MidAtlantic Nuclear Training Group Meeting Supported by NW I at Gettysburg, PA, June, 2010.

Securing a Strong Safety Culture Through Leadership

(Continued from Page 1)

managers to provide critical feedback to the employee performing assigned tasks. This feedback requires more than a periodic appraisal. Daily feedback and reinforcement at the job site is essential to maintaining this effort. This approach of a continuous feedback loop allows the employee to modify their performance to ensure compliance with the expectation. Lack of communication with employees can leave them believing they are performing satisfactorily and can be surprised discovering performance gaps during periodic appraisals. This can result in a loss of trust in management. This loss of trust results in a reduction of accountability by the employee and eventually can have a negative impact on Safety Culture and SCWE.

Performance management is defined as frequent, prompt, consistent, clear, critical and factual employee feedback identifying behavioral gaps and reinforces good performance. Periodic updates on employee performance is essential to build trust and fair play throughout the organization.

NWI offers services and time-proven methods (e.g., hands on specialized mentoring and training including role playing, case studies and dynamic evaluations) that systematically address gaps early, allowing intervention to change performance and improve accountability (See Systematic Management Development, NWI Leadership Assessment and Operational Focus & Leadership Support). These support methods like active listen-

ing, conflict management and critical conversations are capable of being implemented at any level or department in your organization (e.g., targeted site potential “hotbed” populations).

Challenges to the effective implementation of these attributes occur due to the preferences of individuals in supervisor and management positions. The identification and assistance in identifying these preferences and modifying the impact of these preferences allow us to assist in the resolution of challenges to create a highly accountable workforce with a strong operationally focused safety culture and SCWE. We provide targeted real time coaching (in Operations, Maintenance, CAP, Training, Work Management, Oversight, and Engineering), with feedback, and metrics to show

(Continued on Page 4)

PRO’s Meeting—Chicago— June, 2010 Brief

The Professional Reactor Operator Society Meeting was held in June in Chicago. This very well attended meeting whose key note speaker, Exelon Senior VP Tim Tulon, spoke on the impact of different energy fuels on the future of US Nuclear Power.

Other speakers included Paul Hipley of Westinghouse discussing the AP-1000 design, Pete Peterson, Region 3 NRC, and Frank Tsakeres speaking on ILT throughput. The meeting was a complete success with some input carrying forward as input for NEI’s initiatives. The next meeting is slated for Omaha, NE next year sponsored by OPPD and Fort Calhoun.



The Environment of Accountability

(by Tallman Whittler)

Organizations seem to be struggling with the concept of Accountability. Accountability is often interchanged with responsibility, but they are different. Responsibility is the end result of whatever effort is being put forth. Accountability is the willingness to accept responsibility. In business terms, when something goes wrong, the manager walks in and says, "Who is responsible for this mess?" Accountability is when someone steps up and says, "I am." Accountability is the acceptance of responsibility. There are a few tools that have to be in place in order to have accountability. The first tool is a clearly defined explanation and expectation of the **Roles and Responsibilities** of any position to which both manager and employee can commit to and agree on. Second, the employee has to have the **Resources**: training, tools/equipment, people, plan and funding to complete the task or goal. The third is the employee must be given the **Authority** to make the decisions and take appropriate actions, within the parameters of the roles and responsibilities, to complete the task. It really is as simple as that.

These three tools cover the different disciplines inside any organization. Roles and responsibilities are in the management skills discipline. Employees in the oversight role have to know all the aspects of what any job entails and be able to explain it to the workers (provide training). Resources fall under the business discipline. Management has to know they have provided what is needed to complete the task or goal and, if shortfalls exist, find what is missing and make it available. Authority falls under the behavioral discipline. Management has to know that everything needed to be done, as defined by the first two tools (e.g., roles & responsibilities and resources) has been done to set the organization up for success. Then, the manager needs to trust and support the people actually doing the task. All the disciplines must be in alignment and in use to create the atmosphere for accountability to exist.

Only after these tools are in place can you start to have accountability. Accountability is not just a discipline issue; it is a performance management issue. Fairness is at the heart of accountability. How the fairness issue is perceived by management and/or the line will determine the level of organizational accountability. Fairness includes not only the tools listed above but how fairly those tools are implemented by anyone in an oversight capacity. The use of these tools starts at the top of the organization and permeates all the way to the bottom of the organization. All management needs to accept accountability to the same standards and processes as are all employees. These tools are the technical aspects of accountability. If the tools are used correctly, you will have accountability and all that goes with it; trust, respect, good communication, engaged teamwork and satisfied employees. The problem is that not all managers have the management and/or behavioral skill sets to implement the tools listed above. Because of this fact, organizations have accountability problems.

In some organizations, accountability is usually misinterpreted by employees, by both management and line, as blame or punishment. Accountability usually lies dormant until something goes wrong and then senior leadership starts looking to find out who is responsible for the error because somebody has to be responsible. Accountability is usually directed at the last employee that had their hands on the actual work when a mistake was made. Employees working in that environment usually feel they may become the scapegoat. So, when the accountability talk starts to permeate an organization, what employees believe they are hearing is that management is looking to make an example of an individual employee. The reason for this thought process is because management does not often reinforce accountability in a positive light when people do their job right – "We're paying them to do the job, why do I have to reward them?" That is a behavioral and management skills issue with the people in leadership positions.

Inappropriate use of or not using all of the accountability tools has the potential to make employees, even management, feel as if they are being set up for failure. Individuals who do not feel they are being set up for success have a very difficult time with accountability because of perceived fairness issues. What normally leads to dysfunction in an organization is that roles and responsibilities have not been clearly defined throughout the various levels of an organization. Resources become limited to the site, usually relating to a lack of trained and experience people and/or lack of funding, to do proper maintenance. However, the real killer of the goose that laid the golden egg is that authority is retained by a select few at high or maybe various levels in an organization.

In organizations where employees in oversight positions hold employees responsible but do not give them the authority to control their own destiny or be allowed to make the decisions necessary to accomplish a goal, there will always be Accountability issues. Retention of authority by a select few has a negative impact in an organization. The impact may include lack of respect, little trust and little perceived employee empowerment or engagement. No amount of spin can convince employees that an environment of trust exists if any of the three tools of accountability are missing. Responsibility, authority and accountability are the trilogy of success for any organization. This trilogy of success can only be realized when supported by a manager's behavior. Trust is the by product of this trilogy and is the necessary ingredient for any organization to achieve true high performance. Trust only exists when there is consistency in a manager's behavior and enough time for employees to measure its dependability. Trust is a behavioral issue.

Congratulations Chief!



On July 24, 2010, Sandy Traylor married William Robert "Bill" Lindsey at First Presbyterian Church of Hartsville, SC. Bill, a long time friend and NWI senior consultant met Sandy on assignment working at Robinson Station supporting Operations Training accreditation renewal. After the wedding, Bill and Sandy spent the next several weeks traveling the country visiting family along the way and seeing a lot of the west. Congratulations and Best wishes to Bill and Sandy and may you have many prosperous years together!

Securing a Strong Safety Culture Through Leadership

(Continued from Page 3)

the trend of these leading indicators (management skills, effective communications, and performance management) as well as metrics for accountability, safety culture, and SCWE. These metrics (Management Effectiveness Indicators (MEI) are available exclusively through NWI.

NWI supports Idaho National Laboratory

Recently, Idaho National Laboratory (INL) sought out performance improvement expertise selecting NWI Consulting to compare the new issues management program (IMP) piloted at select INL facilities to corrective action programs (CAP) typically implemented at commercial nuclear power facilities. A 10 person assessment team, supported by six NWI professionals, provided a 10 day comprehensive review of the INL IMP identifying performance gaps and plausible actions to strategically improve IMP effectiveness. This low threshold/high volume CAP initiative was piloted at the MFC (Materials & Fuels Complex) and ATR (Advanced Test Reactor) facilities. This initiative was suggested by the Department of Energy Idaho Operations (DOE ID), the regulator and owner of INL. This program is similar to the program that the NRC and commercial nuclear power plant (NPP) industry implemented many years ago. The ultimate approach is hoped to parallel the current NPP CAP programs resulting in a transition from a DOE-enforced compliance system to continuous learning/improvement system controlled and strategically directed by INL. Once in place, DOE ID intends to take a greater monitoring role with INL personnel directing resources to those assets whose deficiencies are needing attention the most.

The INL is operated through contract by Battelle Energy Alliance (BEA) for the DOE.

Our program specialties include: Human Performance, Training and Accreditation, Simulator Instructor Training, Operations Training, Engineering Services, Corrective Actions Program Improvement, Root Cause Analysis and Self-Assessment, NRC Exam Writing, CBT for Dry Cask Storage/ RadWaste Training, and many Human Performance Trainers.

NWI Consulting, LLC, PO Box 33117, Knoxville, TN 37930 (865)385-6166 (Office)

Toll-Free Fax: (888) 817-8890 or (865) 769-5400

NWI News Board

- Bill Cheever, Dave Fann, Abdel Ragtab have been supporting EPU by providing engineering and project management support.
- Ernie Harkness has been supporting Entergy’s Nuclear Safety Review Board and INL.
- Chris Lindbeck, Keith Deck and Dr. Dick Cole are supporting PPL Susquehanna’s Operations training program enhancements.
- Roger Armitage, Bill Lindsey, Terry Williams, Frank Tsakeres and Bill McNeill have been supporting CENG’s Calvert Cliffs Maintenance & Technical Training Accreditation Renewal efforts.
- Terry Johnson, Bill McNeill, Marv Engen, John Hurtado, Ken Davidson, John Thomas, Dave Gordon, Clint Asher, Dave Knox, and Frank Tsakeres are assisting SONGS in Maintenance and Technical training improvement initiatives.
- Dave Hoffman and Paul Kirker have been assisting SONGS Operations in operations performance improvement and work execution. Dave has been working to provide insights to Indian Point’s Nuclear Oversight Program.
- Tim Bostwick continues to help SONGS in numerous performance improvement areas.
- Mike Gettle is supporting Ontario’s Bruce Power by providing training support and oversight.
- Steve Pettinger continues to support AEP’s DC Cook training in simulator testing and modeling.
- Tallman Whitler, Tim Bostwick, Ernie Harkness, Bruce MacKissock, Mike Gettle and Frank Tsakeres have been supporting the INL Issues Management project.
- Dan Slater is assisting APS’s Palo Verde (PVNGS) by providing XML technical support for the procedure upgrade project.
- David Hendrickson has been supporting administration and marketing improvement initiatives for NWI.

We wish to express special thanks to the following clients for recently making NWI a preferred full services company:

- | | |
|--|---|
| • AEP’s D.C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant | • CENGs Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant |
| • APS’s Palo Verde Nuclear Station | • Exelon’s New Reactor Development Group |
| • Bruce Power –Ontario, Canada | • Xcel Energy’s Monticello Plant |
| • Duke’s McGuire Station | • Idaho National Laboratory |
| • SCE’s San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station | |



Editor: Frank S. Tsakeres
NWI Director of Operations



Associate Editor: Kate Hendrickson
NWI Director, Marketing



Our program specialties include: Human Performance, Training and Accreditation, Simulator Instructor Training, Operations Training, Engineering Services, Corrective Actions Program Improvement, Root Cause Analysis and Self-Assessment, NRC Exam Writing, CBT for Dry Cask Storage/ RadWaste Training, and many Human Performance Trainers.

NWI Consulting, LLC, PO Box 33117, Knoxville, TN 37930 (865)385-6166 (Office)

Toll-Free Fax: (888) 817-8890 or (865) 769-5400