The 14th European Manning and Training Conference
Istanbul, Turkey
12th – 13th May 2011

STCW 2010: Leadership and Management

Chris Haughton, Consultant and Non-Executive Director, Videotel Marine International

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for inviting me to address this Manning and Training Conference. My aim is to bring the conference up to date with the latest developments in the IMO Model Course on leadership, which is being designed to meet the requirements of the Manila Amendments, or STCW 2010, and to present my thoughts on the efficacy, or otherwise, of a model course for this topic.

Just to be clear about my position - I'm attending today as a non-executive director of and consultant to, Videotel Marine International. However, may I please stress that any views I express are personal and may not necessarily be shared by my sponsor or by any other organisation, although they are based on conversations with many people.

My presentation will firstly refresh memories about the STCW 2010 requirements, before moving on to look at the process of model course development and the latest information from the IMO.

As my friend and colleague Rob Brindle will outline after coffee, at <u>operational</u> level the 2010 provisions call for 'application for leadership and teamworking' skills. Amongst some fundamental management tasks (for instance, planning and time management) there is also a requirement to be knowledgeable about effective communication, assertiveness, motivation and leadership. There is a bit more, but that's enough to be getting on with.

At <u>Management</u> level the provisions call for the 'use of leadership and managerial skill(s)'. Once again, there's a prescriptive list of management skills such as prioritisation, resource management, decision-making and the implementation of Standard Operating Procedures.

There's a fuller description of these provisions (taken from STCW A-II/1 and /2) in an Appendix at the end of this paper.

So far so good and, at least on one hand, I suppose we must congratulate ourselves in getting at least something into the convention…only thirty three years after it was first introduced.

But let's not get too euphoric over this: by any stretch of the imagination the descriptors in this amendment provide probably the thinnest description that could ever have been drafted. The fundamental underpinnings of effective leadership recognised the world over and, I suspect, in every other sector but ours, don't even get a mention.

For instance, where does the personal and self-development figure? Where is the encouragement to reflect? Where are the crucial issues of culture and gender? And, what about the supreme importance of understanding and respecting each others' values? You could just about argue that they're subsumed within 'consideration of team experiences', 'effective decisions' or perhaps they're buried somewhere in 'a manner appropriate to the individuals concerned' – all phrases that are taken from the Provisions.

Possibly so, though you may still be thinking that we've missed a trick in not explicitly introducing some of these higher order aspirations into the Convention.

But… there is an alternative and much more positive interpretation. By wording the Convention so loosely and non-prescriptively, it allows scope for the facilitators and deliverers to introduce those aspects of personal development, management and leadership where it is deemed appropriate. It would be a great disservice if this flexibility were lost. The downside is I suspect that that is what might be about to happen…

At the end of last year, 2010, the Global Maritime and Education Association, GlobalMET, submitted a proposal to the IMO to design a Model Course on Marine Resource Management.

For those unfamiliar with GlobalMET, it was founded at the Australian Maritime College 15 years ago as the Association of Maritime Education and Training in Asia Pacific. Over that time GlobalMET has grown to become a network with over 100 member institutions in 35 countries and with NGO consultancy status at IMO. Quite an achievement.

The offer was accepted and GlobalMET invited interested parties to engage in the design process. The slide shows the bodies who have been working on this and there's a list in an appendix to this paper. There is frequent communication between GlobalMET and the IMO Secretariat, including face-to-face meetings.

IMO indicated that the title of the course should be 'Leadership and Teamwork'. This has caused some anguish amongst members of the Working Group. It's not that we don't see the need for L&T of course, far from it…but arguably this is a subset of a much wider field encompassing the personal development I've already mentioned above.

That aside, there is some disquiet about the whole principal of a short model course in an area such as management. Management development is a dynamic field. Theories

that were uppermost twenty or thirty years ago are being superseded by new thinking and this dynamism is at risk of being lost if a prescriptive curriculum is imposed. As a management consultant I have my favourite theories and models. But then so does every other facilitator I know and we don't all want to have to follow the same prescription! And we have to be able to introduce new thinking and ideas as a continual process. Model courses constrain, control and ultimately dumb down the very thing we're passionate about. They are the antithesis of leadership development.

The concept of 'training' someone to manage, almost assumes that there are prescriptive and rigidly correct ways to do things; that people can be given so-called 'management tools' to pluck out of a box to fit any situation or circumstance. The flaw in this is that, of course, people don't always behave as the theory suggests they will. Sometimes, it seems as though only chaos theory can explain the vagaries of human behaviour.

So, for example, what happens when there are no tools in the box that fit the particular circumstance? Or when you're faced with a cultural, ethnic or gender issue that wasn't quite covered well enough on your 'course'? Under those circumstances it is quite likely that people will adopt the behaviours they have always used and it's doubtful the learning on a short course will have any effect.

Leadership and management development is intrinsically linked with personal development. That is a slow process and takes time. In fact of course it never ever stops. The notion that you can attend a five day course, or whatever, and emerge at the end an effective manager or leader is demonstrable nonsense.

The slide shows this concept of *investment* in process. There may even be a decline in performance in the early days as people come to terms with new mental maps and ideas. Quick fix remedy may give quick results – but these are normally always short-lived and not sustained.

So unless we give some thought to the way in which we *measure* the competence and ability of our embryonic leaders, any sense that a model course will achieve anything meaningful is wishful thinking at best, and dangerous at worst. Dangerous, because completing a course and passing a knowledge-based exam (for example) may give delegates the idea that somehow they're qualified to manage and lead. This is obviously untrue, as only observation back in the workplace can possibly attest to this belief.

And over-riding all this is the total absence of any mention of organisational development. The sole emphasis of the Convention is on the individual seafarer – as if he or she alone has the influence to bring about the cultural change required in so many of our organisations. It's plain that behavioural modification can only come about in a culture that supports change. Our industry, with its international focus, has many hurdles to overcome before it embraces organisational development. There are of course many exceptions and beacons of best practice. Rob Brindle's firm is one such

organisation who have made great strides, as we will hear shortly, in addressing some of these issues.

In general, the maritime sector is littered with quick fixes. The pattern over decades is clear to see. Disaster/inquiry/reaction/legislation/disaster. In management-speak it's known as a non-learning cycle and we're pretty good at it. The only thing that surprises me about this is why, when it's so predictable, people get surprised.

Whenever we have a perceived problem we rush to find a solution and address the symptoms, almost never the cause. This makes us look busy, justifies our jobs and keeps the legislators and lawyers in business.

I'm worried this initiative might be the same. A perceived lack of leadership, teamwork or management skills is to be fixed by inserting a few pages in the STCW Convention and creating a short course. Absolute nonsense of course and budget and training managers should ask some hard questions before buying into this particular fad.

So, where to now? Well, I'm aware my views aren't exactly shared by many others in this industry. After all, the development of a model course is cheap, straightforward, measureable, auditable and seemingly effective: it generates a feel-good factor and we're seduced by the thought that 'we're doing something about the problem!'

The fact that it's probably doing none of those things isn't going to get in the way of the Leadership Juggernaut and we'll undoubtedly get the Model Course we deserve. So, one pragmatic solution – for all of us - is to try and influence events in line with our beliefs and values.

One of the partners in the working group is the Nautical Institute. They carried out research some years ago which led to the development of a programme that seems to fit the IMO requirements quite closely. It is, of course, knowledge-based, but it does cover some relevant areas and will provide a starting point. It may be that the NI programme will inform the content of the IMO Course which is likely to follow the familiar format of:
- Foreword
- Introduction
- Part A Course framework
- Part B Course outline and timetable
- Part C Detailed teaching syllabus
- Part D Instructor manual
- Guidance on the implementation of IMO model courses.

The problem with this approach is that it makes the unrealistic assumption that all our problems are the same and that the model course will provide some sort of panacea in coping with them. You've only got to visualise the different scenarios faced by a Second Engineer Officer on a bulker discharging coal in China with, say a Master in command of a re-gas tanker in Houston to realise that our job is slightly more complex than this.

So the good companies will continue to devise, plan and implement their own development programmes tailor made for their people and their issues. Less responsible companies won't do this, say the supporters of model courses, so a prescriptive approach is a necessary evil which will bring these recalcitrant organisations into line. Whether, in doing so, we have to force everyone else to toe the line, I'm not so sure.

Unless you ask the right questions *before* starting the design process you can never achieve what you set out for. At the most basic level, these should start with:

- what do we want our officers to do tomorrow that they're not doing today? Why and how?
- much more importantly, what do the companies/flag states/industry want people to be doing?
- and most important of all, what do the officers themselves have to say on the issue?

All the evidence suggests that we must involve learners in their own learning if we're to achieve anything other than superficiality.
Looking to the future, things may get better. Cadets and officers will have some degree of leadership and management development blended into their qualification courses. This has been the case in other employment sector for decades and it's good that we're beginning to catch up. College and other shore-based programmes can be spread over time. Face –to-face modules can be linked by using e-learning, such as Videotel's Learning and Management programme. Coaching and mentoring can be introduced (where clients want it).
This allows participants to learn and experience the power of reflection, gives them the necessary breathing space for assimilation of their learning, provides opportunity to experiment with new behaviours and, crucially, offers realistic scenarios for assessment of behavioural and attitudinal changes.
Suddenly and effortlessly, blended learning becomes reality rather than rhetoric.

For those individuals still at sea and engaging in continuous professional development there are so many alternatives to explore. The following paragraphs may give pause for thought:

> '…six issues were consistently highlighted as problematic – transforming the ship's workforce, budgets, dealing with ineffective staff, managing the vessel, dealing with personal stresses and pressures, and managing their own time…So, programmes were designed to bring them progressively closer to the day-to-day work of ships' officers, making them more responsive, flexible and personalised and able to keep abreast of, and exploit, the emergence of new technologies. The constantly updated website provides officers with a personal profile and their CPD, and they have access to an online telephone service.

It is accepted that people need to plan their development along with busy working and personal lives. There are no artificial constraints like having to complete a set course. People want instant access to learning relevant to their immediate needs in an environment where those needs change weekly. Programmes with a fixed start, end dates, fixed timetables, linear syllabi, pressure on targets for completion of assignments, defined order of learning activities **were increasingly seen as inappropriate for many ships' officers** working in relentless, high pressure environments with workload and accountability constantly in the foreground of their concerns…' (adapted from MacBeath, 2011).

What a refreshing place this would be to work! Well, it's not the maritime sector at all I'm afraid. It's in fact an adapted extract from a paper on educational leadership (Macbeath, 2011: 110). I have replaced MacBeath's words with hypothetical maritime ones in order to make the point that other sectors appear to face similar problems but have developed very different solutions. The solutions themselves are dynamic and under constant scrutiny.

This sort of approach is more difficult (initially) than the design of a model course. It needs effort and understanding, not only of the industrial context in which we operate, but also a deep understanding of the educational and pedagogic issues that should underpin this work. Ultimately the process becomes easier as learners learn to take responsibility for their own learning. It's not something that we're doing to them – rather something that we're doing together.

The maritime industry has to be one of the most complex in the world – we all have our stories. I think it may be this very complexity that keeps us apart, strengthens our insularity and prevents us from seeing what's happening elsewhere. Model courses may still have a part to play in some areas of the curriculum but we really need to question their effectiveness on this occasion.

I hope we are able to make something of this and that we see some real improvement in the years to come.

Reference

Macbeath, J. (2011). *'No lack of principles: leadership development in England and Scotland'.* School Leadership and Management. Vol. 32 (2). pp 105-121. Adapted by Haughton, C. (2011).

Appendix A

STCW 2010 PROVISIONS

Table A-II/1 Operational Level

<u>Competence:</u> Application of leadership and teamworking skills

<u>KUP:</u> Working knowledge of shipboard personnel, management and training

A knowledge of related international maritime conventions and recommendations, and national legislation

Ability to apply task and workload management, including:
1. planning and co-ordination
2. personnel assignment
3. time and resource constraints
4. prioritization

Knowledge and ability to apply effective resource management:
1. allocation, assignment, and prioritization of resources
2. effective communication onboard and ashore
3. decisions reflect consideration of team experiences
4. assertiveness and leadership, including motivation
5. obtaining and maintaining situational awareness

Knowledge and ability to apply decision-making techniques:
1. situation and risk assessment
2. identify and consider generated options
3. selecting course of action
4. evaluation of outcome effectiveness

<u>Methods for demonstrating competence</u>

Assessment of evidence obtained from one or more of the following:
1. approved training
2. approved in-service experience
3. practical demonstration

<u>Criteria for evaluating competence</u>

The crew are allocated duties and informed of expected standards of work and behaviour in a manner appropriate to the individuals concerned

Training objectives and activities are based on assessment of current competence and capabilities and operational requirements.

Operations are demonstrated to be in accordance with applicable rules

Operations are planned and resources are allocated as needed in correct priority to perform necessary tasks

Communication is clearly and unambiguously given and received

Effective leadership behaviours are demonstrated

Necessary team member(s) share accurate understanding of current and predicted vessel and operational status and external environment

Decisions are most effective for the situation

Table A-II/2 Management Level

Competence: Use of leadership and managerial skill(s)

KUP: Use of leadership and managerial skill(s)

Knowledge of shipboard personnel management and training

A knowledge of related international maritime conventions and recommendations, and national legislation

Ability to apply task and workload management, including:
1. planning and co-ordination
2. personnel assignment
3. time and resource constraints
4. prioritization

Knowledge and ability to apply effective resource management:
1. allocation, assignment, and prioritization of resources
2. effective communication on board and ashore
3. decisions reflect consideration of team experiences
4. assertiveness and leadership, including motivation
5. obtaining and maintaining situation awareness

Knowledge and ability to apply decision making techniques:
1. situation and risk assessment
2. identify and consider generated options
3. selecting course of action
4. evaluation of outcome effectiveness

Development, implementation, and oversight of standard operating procedures

Methods for demonstrating competence

Assessment of evidence obtained from one or more of the following:
1. approved training
2. approved in-service experience
3. practical demonstration

Criteria for evaluating competence

The crew are allocated duties and informed of expected standards of work and behaviour in a manner appropriate to the individuals concerned

Training objectives and activities are based on assessment of current competence and capabilities and operational requirements

Operations are demonstrated to be in accordance with applicable rules

Operations are planned and resources are allocated as needed in correct priority to perform necessary tasks

Communication is clearly and unambiguously given and received

Effective leadership behaviours are demonstrated

Necessary team member(s) share accurate understanding of current and predicted vessel and operational status and external environment

Decisions are most effective for the situation

Operations are demonstrated to be effective and in accordance with applicable rules

Appendix B

Delphi Decision Making Technique

◦ Members are selected for the Delphi panel due to their expertise.
◦ They are kept separated and answer through open-ended questionnaires, surveys, etc. in order to solicit specific information about a subject or content area.
◦ Members are asked to share their assessment and explanation of a problem or predict a future state of affairs.
◦ The facilitator (panel director) controls the interactions among the participants by processing the information and filtering out irrelevant content.
◦ Replies are gathered, summarized, and then fed back to all the group members.
◦ Members then make another decision based upon the new information.
◦ The process is repeated until the responses converge satisfactory, that is, it yields consensus.

Appendix C

Members of the GlobalMET Working Group

- Anglo-Eastern Maritime Training Centre;
- Australian Maritime College (AMC);
- Haughton Maritime Limited;
- James MacDonald of the German Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency (BSH) (assisting on a personal basis);
- Malaysian Maritime Academy;
- Maritime Institute Willem Barentsz;
- Nautical Institute;
- New Zealand Maritime School;
- Richard Teo;
- Swedish Club Academy;
- WrightWay Training Ltd..