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Hearts & Minds model: reliability culture ladder

1. Pathological
   Who cares as long as we’re not caught

2. Reactive
   Safety is important, we do a lot every time we have an accident

3. Calculative
   We have systems in place to manage all hazards

4. Proactive
   We work on problems that we still find

5. Generative
   HSE is how we do business round here

HRO Intervention strategies
chronic unease
safety seen as a profit centre
new ideas are welcomed

resources are available to fix things before an accident
management is open but still obsessed with statistics
procedures are “owned” by the workforce

we cracked it!
lots and lots of audits
HSE advisers chasing statistics

we are serious, but why don’t they do what they’re told?
endless discussions to re-classify accidents
Safety is high on the agenda after an accident

the lawyers said it was OK
of course we have accidents, it’s a dangerous business
sack the idiot who had the accident
Glass ceiling
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Time and Investment

HRO Intervention strategies

Investing in Systems Prevention and Discipline

Investing in People Anticipation and Resilience
The „glass ceiling“

„organizing to control expectable risks“
„foster systems and procedures“

„glass ceiling“

proactive
We proactively look for things that might go wrong.

calculative
We have systems in place to control expectable risks.

reactive
If something happens we get active.

pathological
Who cares as long as we don’t get caught?

generative
We embrace every day deviances to constantly learn about the systems state.

„organizing to manage high reliability“

„foster people for anticipation and resilience“
To go beyond the „glass ceiling“ we need to change our mind-sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Below the glass ceiling</th>
<th>Beyond the glass ceiling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizations as predictable, complicated systems: „With the right system in place we are save“</td>
<td>Organizations as unpredictable, complex systems: „The only thing that is for sure is uncertainty“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe in rational decision-taking: „How can we take the right decisions?“</td>
<td>Decisions as context-related sensemaking: „How can we make sense of what is going on right now?“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-oriented approach: „How can we control all expectable disturbances?“</td>
<td>Facing impermanence: „How can we manage events we cannot expect?“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce complexity: „single out, specialization, silos“</td>
<td>Raise awareness of complexity: „Generalists, networks, equivocality and contradictions“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual as a threat: „How can we avoid human failure?“</td>
<td>Individual as a resource: „How can we make use of the perception and knowledge of our staff?“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroic Leadership: „How can I do it right?“</td>
<td>Post-heroic Leadership: „How can I facilitate the available knowledge?“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Intervention strategies**

- **time out: reflection and learning**
- **pre-time: working on conditions**
- **real time: other way of working**
**Intervention strategies: in firsts instance**

- time out: reflection and learning
- pre-time: working on conditions
- real time: other way of working
Intervention strategies: desired situation

- **time out**: reflection and learning
- **pre-time**: working on conditions
- **real time**: other way of working
I. Setting

II. Intervention

III. Results/Learnings
Case 1. Situation ProRail

Challenge: how to develop HRO in multi actor systems?

Situation:
- ProRail: construction and maintenance, traffic control
- Project Amsterdam-Utrecht:
  - more 20 different parties involved
- major near accident
- blame free evaluation
Main findings of the blame free evaluation

Underlying patterns:
- Weak relationships between various team members and actor groups
- Mistrust between parties
- Fragmentation in the operational process
- Lack of ‘reserves’ (time, capacity, quality, fall back scenario’s)
- Every party has its own focus, no social cohesion of collective responsibility

H& M: level 2 and 3
Case 2. Situation at SABIC

Facts

• SABIC = Saudi Arabia based chemical/fertilizers/steel industry
• Employees = over 30,000 and turnover more than 50 billion
• SABIC in Europe = Innovative Plastics and Polyolefines
• Employees = over 4,000 in
• 12 sites Holland, Germany, UK, Spain, Italy, Austria, Belgium

Challenge

• All European sites should strengthen their Safety Culture
• All will start with an Assessment – where is everybody
• All have different interpretations what this means
I. Setting
II. Intervention
III. Results/Learnings
ProRail: intervention strategy Apollo13

1. Learning from mistakes, creating a burning platform and awareness about the actual situation
2. We worked on 3 HRO-conditions:
   - Thick relations and trust
   - Informed culture
   - Shared references
3. Two-day sessions with 70 key players (three times, 1 year)
4. In between:
   - Small multidisciplinary taskforces for specific subjects
   - Learn how to talk about weak signals
   - More informal exchange of information and ideas

**Intervention category: pre-time activities**
SABIC: intervention strategy

- Interventions that push people through the Glass Ceiling by developing Collective Mindful Organizing
- **Interactive assessment** = talk – walk – move = units of 70 to 150 employees that operate a plant or a process
- An assessment takes 20 to 30 man assessor days and involves all employees – process is guided by a ‘deep slice’ from the organization
- **Reporting** with suggestions for a Road map program
SABIC: Interactive assessment – main activities

- **Contracting** = meeting everybody – showing urgency
- **Talk** = H&M Workshops – people interactively discuss where the organization is on the H&M ladder – exchange of concrete examples and hidden assumptions
- **Walk** = Action Workshops – people rehearse or analyze a recent incident (gun drill or staff ride) – demonstration of behaviour and hidden conflicts and group think
- **Move** = Value Scan (Barrett) – people list their most important personal and organizational values – expression of potentially limiting values
- **Reporting back** = discussing results
I. Setting
II. Intervention
III. Results/Learnings
ProRail: Results and Lessons learned

Results:
• strong aligned team with common focus
• successful implementation

Conditions:
• Burning platform
• Committed and courageous leadership
• No major contractual disputes or heavy politicalised environment
• (financial) resources
• Creating early quick wins
Why is HRO development in a multi actor system even more complex?

Networks, strategic alliances, multidisciplinary project teams, etc:
• No clear line of command
• Political environment
• Temporary setting
• Different values and missions
• Loyalty to the parent organization
• Loyalty conflicts on a personal level
SABIC: results and lessons learned

• **Assessment + Road Map program** together:
  • Working with realistic incidents and situation from own organization that cannot be denied – escape from normalization of deviance
  • Making pro-active and generative behaviour explicit and connected to own work – stretching conceptual frames and exercising level 4 and 5 behaviour
  • Addressing dysfunctional organizational pattern and learning how to cope with that – Collecting material for further learning
  • First unit H&M 2.5 → 3.6