International Association of Drilling Contractors

Workforce Development Committee Meeting

15 October 2014

1:00 – 4:30 pm

IADC
10370 Richmond Ave., Suite 760
Houston, TX 77042

Minutes

13:00 – 13:05	Welcome & Call to Order *Victor Fleming, Rowan* Victor Fleming called the meeting to order. Facility Orientation/Safety Briefing & IADC Antitrust Policy *Brenda Kelly, IADC* Brenda Kelly provided the facility orientation and safety information.
13:05 – 13:15	Attendees' Introductions *Victor Fleming* All attendees introduced themselves.
13:15 – 13:45	WADI Update *Brenda Kelly, IADC (on behalf of JP Mook, Rowan)* Dr. Kelly provided an update on the Workforce Attraction & Development Initiative (WADI Program). The primary goal of the WADI Program is to attract and prepare new-hire candidates for the industry. Approximately 50 community colleges from across the country have been working with IADC and our member companies to develop a program that fits the needs of the industry. This effort is not meant to replace current individual company recruiting and onboarding training but to enhance it by providing a pool of new-hire candidates who have been vetted and trained per the guidelines that are set by the joint college and industry work group. The training will be mapped to the KSAs and is expected to expand to career-pathway training in a future phase of development. Some colleges will take existing training and adjust to the new curriculum, and other colleges are creating entirely new programs. Question: Can IADC list the participating colleges? Dr. Kelly will provide participants with further information if they want it. Mr. Fleming urges interested parties to attend the industry meetings for WADI. Questions were asked about international involvement and apprenticeships. Dr. Kelly explained that there are already some international college locations involved in the program and that some programs may have apprenticeships. She also mentioned discussions about career mapping (e.g., mapping the experience/training of military vets to the WADI requirements). She explained the use of the KSAs in WADI. Questions about credit for the course work, times offered, percentage of hands-on learning, etc. Some of these details are still being discussed; however, there will be significant hands-on learning, and the colleges are planning to offer noncredit course work initially because there are

	fewer hurdles to overcome through that option.
13:45 – 14:45	Panel Discussion: Structured Mentoring Programs, The Missing Piece
	The Great Crew Change is pushing the oil and gas industry to develop programs, such as Mentorship, that can expedite people development. However, very few companies seem to have succeeded in building a meaningful program for mentoring employees, a program that is structured and measurable. One hindrance may simply be a lack of understanding about the true nature of mentorship. The members of our panel have experienced the challenges of building and implementing such a program and are willing to share what they have learned.
	Moderator: Patty Tydings, IADC
	Panel Participants: • Meta Rousseau, Director Training & Leader Development at Blackhawk Specialty Tools • Brooke Westall, Talent Director and HRBP Manager, Newfield Exploration Co. • Brett Blackman, Drilling Superintendent, Noble Drilling • Sharon Benson, Learning & Technical Development Manager, Marathon Oil Contributors to Panel preparation: • Jim Metcalf, Consultant for Newfield Exploration Co. • Eddy Biehl, Founder and CEO of Stonebridge Oilfield Services
	Mrs. Tydings presented results from a recent IADC survey regarding mentoring programs. About 46% would like to set up a mentorship program at their company, and 54% would like to find out more information before deciding about setting up a mentorship program. IADC is considering a future accreditation programs for structured mentoring.
	Brett Blackman expressed that mentoring programs are largely rig-based where captains and rig managers choose mentors for new employees. Some criteria must be met to be a mentor. Mentors are more of an "arranger of experiences" than an "imparter of knowledge.
	Meta Rousseau said that, out at the worksite, nobody knows everything. In the industry, we need to identify the differences between mentoring and coaching. There is a big hole in the area of mentoring. Mentoring can help with time management, knowledge-capturing, and knowledge-sharing on rigs and in the shops. Mentoring is a learning experience. Not a lot of people know what instructional design is. There is no consistency across the board from instructors. Courses need to be planned carefully; the same is true for reliable mentors. They need to have goals, objectives, schedules, and guidelines. Repeatable curriculum is missing.
	Brooke Westall said that her company has put together a framework for mentoring. It involves senior leadership support and cultural matching to the company. Allowing others in the program to lead the program, rather than having a very strict structure.
	Sharon Benson said the amount of structure in a mentoring program needs to match the culture of the organization. Her company's 2020 mentoring program focuses on which generation will be the majority of oilfield workers in the year 2020.
	Question: How important is competency evaluation in verifying mentoring programs? Do you worry about dilution of standards/policies from the mentor and down?
	Ms. Benson: finding regarding field requirements and what success looks like (skilled or not skilled), the field structure will be very simple, but proficiency description will describe specifics.
	Mr. Blackman: how to prevent people from taking shortcuts – should come down from senior

leadership on-site to get involved without simply managing "from behind a desk."

Ms. Rousseau: Mentoring programs need to have a curriculum with strict mentorship standards. Resources need to be applied to mentoring in order to have consistency and coordination to prevent small mistakes from happening between to mentor and mentee. All of that starts with competency and ends with competency with workplace assessments.

Ms. Westall's company found in skills assessments that there was a blurry line between mentors and leadership positions. Accountability was placed on the wrong positions in certain instances because of this.

Question: Are personality traits taken into consideration when mentors and mentees are matched up?

Ms. Westall: Not at that point yet. Focusing on defined mentorship programs. Suggested attendees contact Jim Metcalf for more information on this topic. Their company focuses more on passion for mentoring in their mentors.

Mentoring cannot be forced upon an individual. Not everyone is comfortable with filling that position.

Question: Will there be competencies mapped to define mentors?

Ms. Rousseau: yes. Also turning mentees into coaches and/or mentors to encourage brotherhood on a rig. Knowledge sharing and strengthening skills.

Ms. Westall: Newfield attempted it, but it had very little take. Recently the advisors from the entire company were brought together to collaborate about what mentorship is and what their roles are. This group was very powerful and interacted well with their campus-hires. There were cases of reverse mentoring in that setting.

Question: what's the best way to get buy-in from management to create a mentoring program?

Ms. Rousseau: explained some of Bloom's Taxonomy from the bottom up. How do you get there? It's difficult in a classroom setting because a lot of value is lost. Hands-on trainings and simulators are vital, however it is not enough. There needs to be actual rig experience to teach things that cannot be learned in a classroom setting. This needs to be explained and demonstrated so that the executives understand that.

Question: what are the different types of mentoring programs that companies could have?

Ms. Rousseau: role transitioning mentorships, a person moving into a new position mentors the person taking over their old position. Includes weekly follow-ups until independence is reached. Touch points are noted for the next time.

Technical mentorships, transfer critical business knowledge and skills.

Leadership mentoring, they outsource so there is privacy and confidentiality.

Question: do some roles require more mentoring than others?

Mr. Blackman: new-hires with no rig experience need exposure in the presence of someone who has experience who can point out risks/consequences/etc.

Question: what's the difference between a coach and mentor?

Mr. Blackman: coach is more of a supervisory, ensuring there is progress. Mentor is the person who is more of an experienced colleague.

Ms. Rousseau: coaching is short term, focused on more specific skills. Mentoring is broad and focuses on everything. Mentors facilitate relationships that can serve as a retention tool to hold on to new hires.

Ms. Westall: mentors are also more engaged, inspired, and satisfied, serving as a tool for retention

and drawing more value from the mentors themselves.

Question: what are the thoughts on supervisors mentoring their direct reports?

Ms. Rousseau: it can work, depending on the quality of the person. As a rule of thumb, managers/supervisors do not mentor their direct reports. Managers and mentors do need a certain level of communication.

Personable, Passionate, Patient. Three important qualities for a mentor.

Summarized information from Panel Planning Session:

1. **Definition of mentoring**
   - Opportunity to share in a developmental relationship, to learn from one another's insights and experience, and to offer and benefit from robust feedback. Mentoring is knowledge- and skills-based.
2. **Mentoring vs. coaching**
   - Coaching is task-related and, once the person has mastered the skill, the goal has been achieved. Mentoring is ongoing.
   - Coaching tends to be performance-based while mentoring is more focused on knowledge.
   - Coaching is more formal while mentoring is flexible and personalized.
3. **Description of existing mentoring programs**
   - Important is the expectations to have some structure in place so that everyone would understand the objectives and the expected outcome – but this does not rule out flexibility and the ability to personalize and customize the mentoring experience
   - Metrics is important to provide reports/outcomes to senior leadership – show reliable outcomes
   - Important to the organization, had to get it right, no choice
   - With growth, the program gets diluted, so consistency becomes more important to ensure reliable results
   - Matching mentors with mentees to ensure that personalities work out well
   - Clearly stated objectives, clearly stated outcomes
   - Attention to relationships
   - We do things more alike than different.
   - The program must be supported by senior leadership.
   - Mentor-protégé framework package developed by Brooke and Sharon at Newfield
   - Protégé reaches out to mentor…
   - Stonebridge historically much distinction between mentoring and coaching but would like to bring a bit more structure into our efforts, especially to capitalize on the reverse mentoring role – trying to transfer 20+ years of experience to new hires and have young employees refresh the technical/IT skills of the older personnel.
   - Knowledge/confidence and assurance of less-frequently encountered experiences must also be transferred. Give shorter-term employees the knowledge that they would have had if they had 20+ years of experience.
   - One of the primary factors in preventing learning transfer to the workplace is lack of support and a strong and structured mentoring program would aid learners to practically apply newly acquired knowledge and skills.
   - Technology allows us to be more effective in mentoring – and even mentor virtually / from afar. Experienced employees can support less experienced

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>colleagues across a distance.</td></tr>
</table>

	colleagues across a distance. • Be careful not to take mentoring outside of our immediate focus. We need to be clear on boundaries. **3. What is working?** • Structured programs that have clear, measurable objectives. • Long-term, carefully chosen mentor/mentee relationships. • Customized, flexible goals. • A framework for supporting and guiding the participants. • A realization that both parties can benefit from participation. • Support from top leadership. • Clearly communicated benefits. **4. What has not worked?** • Programs that are not structured, not supported by leadership, have mismatched personalities, and don't have clear objectives. **5. Why might management be reluctant to support mentoring programs/efforts?** • They don't fully understand it. • They view it as "soft skills." • They have tried it before, and it didn't work because it had no structure. **6. The value of creating a structured mentoring accreditation program** • Out in "the field," they are experiencing high turnover rates and structured mentoring programs are one way of addressing this issue. • They are also relying heavily on contractors. Some consistency in mentoring programs would be helpful so all parties know what to expect and understand the benefits and objectives. The industry needs a best practices for mentoring. Companies would benefit from consistency in mentoring programs because we all work together out on the rig. • Knowledge and skills need to be imparted to new employees more quickly than it has been in the past, and these employees need support during this process. • Mentoring promotes training transfer. Mentoring programs may be the "missing piece" in ensuring competence; companies may have training and competence programs but not successful, structured mentoring programs that can support and reinforce what the employees have learned in their training.
14:45 – 15:00	**BREAK**
15:00 – 15:30	Well Control Training Standard--Status Brenda Kelly, IADC WellCAP is back in IADC's control, mainly because IWCF did not want to join the effort. Question: Will BSEE be on board with this? Answer: BSEE is excited about the changes to the standards, but they don't necessarily care where it resides. BSEE recognizes WellCAP as the standard. There is a process now to determine a new name for the program because it is radically different from the previous standard. Note: The foundation of the training is the same, but the standard will be aligning with the OGP recommendations to have five levels of role-specific training. IADC differs slightly in how the content is divided between the Driller and Supervisory levels, but is very similar. The standard recommends the positions that takes each level. The new standard improves the training piece also in that there are more simulator exercises required (e.g., shutting in the well) at the Driller and

International Association of Drilling Contractors

	Supervisory level. The curricula at these levels will be released Friday 17 October 2014. The target timeline is to be in the new curricula by April at the Awareness, Introductory, Driller, and Supervisory levels. The Engineering course will be developed later. The standard that governs WellCAP is expected to be released by the end of October. Instructor qualifications have changed rather significantly. The assessment will now be a standardized knowledge test. The test questions are now being written. This is expected to launch in April 2015. There has been a strong request that the test be proctored, which we realize will be a challenge because it will require a global network of independent proctors; therefore, requirements like this will be phased in. The test will include safety-critical questions that are immediately pass-fail (at least for the Driller and Supervisory level). The courses are designed to be progressive, built on each other, so there is foundational knowledge in each course that leads to the next. We have established optional pathways for getting/proving the foundational knowledge is there before taking a higher-level course, at least at this stage of the rollout. The Driller course, however, must be taken before the Supervisory course. The participants asked about the level at which certain positions must certify and what the requirements will be for recertification. The group discussed use of eLearning. Trainees can take the Introductory course through eLearning (CBT), but not the Driller and Supervisory course; however, these courses can use some CBT material in a course with limits on the types of content and percentage of delivery. At the Intro level, simulation is optional but there is a knowledge test. The group discussed the content at each level and if there is any overlap. There is not much overlap. Question about employees who go back and forth at Driller and Supervisory positions. This depends on the requirements of the Operator for whom you are working. There will be an opportunity to retest immediately. Trainees can review the missed assessment material with the instructor and then retake the test. The simulator assessment is separate and is also pass/fail. There is a phased in approach for new instructors and for trainees who are recertifying.
15:30 – 15:45	Subcommittee Reports • Competence Guidance Document—Brooke Polk, IADC • Crane-Rigger Program update—Patty Tydings, IADC
15:45 – 16:00	IADC News • India Competence Workshops • Petrobras requirement for IADC Competence Accreditation Dr. Kelly presented a brief update on the Competence Guidelines document. One participant asked about considerations given to COS requirements for Competence Assurance Programs. Dr.

	Kelly will find out if there is anything from COS that needs to be included in the document. Patty Tydings presented an update on the Crane-Rigger Accreditation Workgroup and the vote on the DIT changes. About 10-12 members regularly contribute; they are very experienced and a lot has been achieved in this group so far. They have restructured the previous group's work to better reflect API/RP2D and the training being done now. The Rigger Curriculum has been revised first, and the criteria for accreditation will be revised in Q1 2015. It will be sent out to reviewers once it is finished. Early in 2015, the crane operator curriculum will be revised. Then, the crane inspector curriculum will be further developed. There had been interest from several operators to resurrect the work that was done previously, and to expand upon it. The changes to the DIT program were voted in and will be communicated through bulletins in Q1 2015. Dr. Kelly provided additional IADC news: IADC has formed a new committee on Quality led by Elfriede Neidert. IADC is venturing into human factors, which many believe is our next direction for training. It hasn't been determined yet whether this effort needs a new committee of its own, or whether it will be a subcommittee of this WDC. It is expected to have an operational and rig-based focus / program/issue. There are plans for a conference next year to address human factors. That conference planning committee is being built now, so let Dr. Kelly know if you want to be involved. IADC held a Competence Workshop in India (requested by IADC's Indian Chapter). Dr. Kelly and Brooke Polk, IADC, presented this workshop, which was a huge success and had 100 – 150 people at each workshop. As a result of the success of these workshops, Brazil's Chapter requested a workshop. There is more work this WDC can do to help with these efforts. Petrobras is pushing for their contractors to have in-house competence programs by January, so we are debating how to best help them in accomplishing this. We may decide the best approach is to assist company-by-company. Dr. Kelly will determine how WDC members who are interested can best help. Contact Dr. Kelly if you are interested, so she can send you information. Also, encourage your contacts in Brazil to get involved with that Chapter. Information about the Brazil Chapter is available on the IADC website. FYI: DNV has produced some recommended practices for jacking gears. IADC does have a Jack Up Committee, which will be looking at this. If anyone at your organization wants to participate in this, have them contact that committee, which has info available on the IADC website.
16:00 – 16:30	OPEN DISCUSSIONS & FUTURE MEETING TOPICS The next meeting of the WDC is a joint meeting with the HSE Committee in February at the HSE Conference. One topic that has been suggested to be a theme for that joint meeting is Fatigue Management. Mrs. Tydings will contact the woman who spoke at the STEPS Network meeting recently. Bob Stout (Moxie) will send Dr. Kelly the name of a woman he knows who may be a good speaker on that topic. We should also talk with the HSE Committee about the Mentorship topic

International Association of Drilling Contractors

		and how it can be used to improve the safety culture. Mr. Fleming's term ends officially today, but he will still be participating in the committee going forward. The vice chairman (Pamela Wakefield) will now step up to take over the chairmanship of this committee. We will accept nominations for the vice chair at the next meeting. The nominations will need to be for offshore drilling contractor who can step up to replace Pamela Wakefield, who represents the onshore drilling contractors.
	16:30	ADJOURNMENT

Attendees:

Name		Company Name
Ludmila	Paul	**ATLANTICA MANAGEMENT (USA) INC**
Meta	Rousseau	**BLACKHAWK SPECIALTY TOOLS**
Rod	Thomas	**BLINN COLLEGE**
Bret	Parks	**HELMERICH & PAYNE INTERNATIONAL DRILLING CO.**
Elfriede	Neidert	**IADC**
Brenda	Kelly	**IADC**
Kristyna	Hulsey	**IADC**
Laurie	Hotard	**INTERTEK**
Ruchir	Shah	**LEARN TO DRILL**
Robert	Stout	**MOXIE MEDIA**
Jeremy	Tortorice	**NATIONAL OILWELL VARCO**
Valerie	Walker	**NEWFIELD EXPLORATION COMPANY**
Brooke	Westall	**NEWFIELD EXPLORATION COMPANY**
Matthew	Nihiser	**NOBLE DRILLING**
Brett	Blackman	**NOBLE DRILLING**
Matthew	Berry	**PARAGON OFFSHORE**
Sean	Pendleton	**PARAGON OFFSHORE**
Richard	Johnston	**RIG QA INTERNATIONAL INC**
Victor	Fleming	**ROWAN COMPANIES PLC**