ABSTRACT

Meeting the government’s needs while realizing a profit requires a skilled and competent group of 1st Line Supervisors in the defense manufacturing industry, especially when there is ever increasing pressure on cost and improving quality. Their ability to lead is core to improving the defense industrial base’s business performance as we face ever more pressures to deliver our products more cost competitively while maintaining a reasonable profit. These leaders in their first management and leadership positions are the ones who are driving the defense manufacturing businesses everyday. With this in mind, it is not enough to have broad-based leadership training focused on the soft management skills but programs focused specifically on those hard core skills these new leaders must master to be successful. We will present proven methods to identify exactly what these first time leaders are required to do; actual high performance behaviors, and then methods on how to improve their skills through a focused behavior based development strategy.

U.S. defense manufacturing and services companies require this critical level of leaders to meet schedule, quality and cost goals profitably by having the right leaders with the right skill sets in the right places to execute their programs. This paper will present a Behavior Based 1st Line Leader Skills Development Program proven in two settings. The first a defense manufacturing corporation and the second a defense services provider. The paper will detail a behavior based leader assessment methodology, an analytical tool, a Performance Improvement Model codified in a Skills Development Strategy template, and the return on investment results of actual implementations with Lessons Learned to date.
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BOTTOM LINE UP FRONT: THE BUSINESS CASE

As defense industry leaders, we are maniacally focused on providing our products and services to the government within cost, on schedule, and with high quality. We are so focused on the government’s needs and meeting contract requirements that we sometimes ignore our own people who are providing those products and services. Because of continuing pressures on reducing cost while quality standards increase, we must better understand our internal operations and create systems that allow us to have the same visibility on our human capital assets, our people; that we have on our manufacturing processes. In many defense manufacturing businesses over 50% of the total cost of our products is in Labor. Our goal is to constantly reduce our headcount, thus reducing our costs while retaining product quality. That challenge is managed everyday by our 1st Line Supervisors who are essentially signing the paychecks for our production workforce every time they approve a time sheet. This seemingly simple daily accounting action is actually driving our businesses. Research has determined that these 1st Line Supervisors are the key element to overall business success, yet they have the least focus by our senior management as we focus on the governments needs and assume that the products will be delivered because the “schedule says so” and if not our answer is “work harder.” The purpose of this paper is to present research on the challenges facing these first time leaders so critical to our success, and illustrate a proven methodology to improve their performance today by developing and implementing a high performer behavior-based, skills improvement program. Bringing focus and clarity to our internal systems driven every day by these wonderful people who translate cost, schedule, and quality into daily workers action plans will allow the training system industry to better meet the government needs.

WHO IS A 1st LINE SUPERVISOR?

A 1st Line Supervisor, as applied in the Defense Manufacturing industry, is the individual who is responsible for ensuring that the direct production workforce has the tools, materials and skills to perform their job successfully. Frequently referred to as a “Foreman” or a “Project Lead”, in many cases, he or she is also directly responsible for ensuring that the production workforce has the proper skills to perform their job as well. They are usually the first salaried person who is responsible to manage the hourly workforce.

1st Line supervisors are generally personnel who have been promoted from the production workforce because of their outstanding performance on-the-job. He or she may be highly skilled at the production tasks required for the job, but may or may not have the skills or training required to be a leader of people and production. It may be the case that a person has shown extremely high proficiency for efficiency at the production level, but may have little or no innate leadership skills. Their challenge their new positions is that technical competence is quickly overshadowed as their role shifts from technician to leader.

THE IMPORTANCE OF 1st LINE SUPERVISORS

It can be argued that there is no more valuable employee in a production workforce than the 1st Line Supervisor. 1st Line Supervisors in a production workforce are frequently the people most directly responsible for production efficiency and quality. They are responsible for getting “8 for 8” or 8 hours work for 8 hours of pay.
Supervisors are a likely target when cutting costs

However, frequently their value is overlooked. The article “First-Line Supervisors Save Money” by Harvey Gittler from “R&D Innovator” describes how, “whenever a company wants to cut costs, these foremen are among the first to go.” Because 1st Line Supervisors are generally not considered “direct-labor”, from an accounting standpoint they are a part of the overall company “burden”.

Gittler explains that “Supervisors are considered burden, because… they produce nothing tangible.” Therefore, when the time comes to cut costs and overhead, they are likely targets. However intuitive this may be from an accounting / cost cutting standpoint, this approach is actually counter-productive. Unless it is found that there are currently too many 1st Line Supervisors in place, eliminating them can increase costs and reduce production efficiency.

Gittler explains that increasing the number of 1st Line Supervisors can be a more effective way to increase productivity and reduce costs because more 1st Line Supervisors can supervise the production staff more effectively, which can lead to increased efficiency and decreased labor costs.

The government recognizes the problem

Within the Government Itself, first line supervisors are being recognized as one of the most critical resources. A report from the National Academy of Public Administration from April 23rd 2003 puts forth that “the approximately 125,000 first-line supervisors represent the government's most significant corporate asset.” The three major findings of this report are:

1) First line supervisors… are not adequately prepared and supported…
2) Supervisory jobs are becoming increasingly difficult… (While) the number of supervisors and managers are declining.
3) With some exceptions, Federal agencies do a poor job of managing this corporate asset

THE TASK AT HAND

In many organizations, inadequate systems are in place to make effective leaders and supervisors out of their star performers. These organizations must recognize the problem at the First Line Supervisor level, and work to resolve it to increase productivity and efficiency. These unique individuals are those primarily responsible for translating the corporate goals, missions, culture, and goals to those who are actually doing the work in producing the products and services so key to our nations defense.

The core skill of these new leaders is as problem solvers. Simply put the ability to solve more production problems more accurately and faster will improve cost, schedule, quality, and safety performance regardless of the business environment. These problems arise due to the complex relationship between work, the workforce assigned to accomplish the work, and the materials, tools, and equipment required to complete the work.
The “Current State”
It is not uncommon to find leadership development for First Line Supervisors either neglected completely, or inadequately provided. Commonly, Leadership Development programs consist of the following inadequate “current state” features:

- Leader development is performed either informally, or not at all.
- Leader skills and experience are acquired over time in a “trial by fire” situation.
- Training courses are available, but not mapped to critical tasks.
- Programs are not systematic, and can vary by manager.
- On the job training is “ad hoc” with few training materials available at the job site.
- Generic training is provided that often has little relevance to actual behaviors required for success.
- Performance Review Systems “stand alone” as past performance evaluations.

The “Future State”
An organization that has recognized the criticality of developing and maintaining top notch First Line Leaders will have the following characteristics to guide their path from the current to the future state:

- A “Systematic” approach to Leader Development
- Production managers are the Primary Trainers with the right tool kit to develop supervisors
- Production managers are responsible for tailoring skill development to each production area.
- Modular training courseware is mapped directly to the high performance behaviors and available as training and performance support tools.
- Leader Skills are developed using “I Know”, “I Can Do”, “I Can Apply” blended learning strategy
- Leader Developmental Plans are mapped directly to the Performance Review System to focus on individual needs.

The Program to bridge the gap
In order to take an organization from an inadequate “Current State” to a successful “Future State”, where Leader Development is concerned, and production managers must be provided with the tools to:
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- Assess Supervisor Performance
- Identify Supervisor strengths and weaknesses by group and individual
- Develop and Implement Supervisor Developmental Plans to maintain strengths and improve weaknesses
- Integrate Performance Improvement Plans with Performance Review Process
- Provide a Tool to identify future Supervisors
- Better understand, define, and resolve Systemic Issues

The results of an effective First Line Supervisor program will lead to:

- Increased 1st Line Supervisor Problem Solving Efficiency (Solve more problems)
- Increased 1st Line Supervisor Problem Solving Effectiveness (Solve problems right the first time)
- Eliminated Wasted (Non-Value Added) Time
- Increased Production Skills of New Operators Faster
- Increased 1st Line Supervisor Planning Horizon

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESS

This Behavior Based 1st Line Leader Skills Development Program has been proven in two defense business environments. The first a large defense manufacturing corporation and the second a large defense services company. Northrop Grumman Newport News and Army Fleet Support are two examples of defense industry companies who are addressing this critical performance issue. Northrop Grumman Newport News’s Steel Production Division with over 75 1st Line Supervisors provides major assemblies for the construction of nuclear powered aircraft carriers and submarines. Army Fleet Support with over 150 1st Line Supervisors provides maintenance support services to the U.S. Army Aviation Warfighting Center at Fort Rucker, AL. These organizations not only recognize the importance of developing and maintaining quality 1st Line Supervisors, but also to a long term development and implementation of comprehensive programs to get to the desired “Future State”, and map the Return-On-Investment produced by the program along the way.

Northrop Grumman Newport News Steel Production Division

In 2003, the Senior Leadership at NGNN Steel Production Division began to experience performance issues attributed to a significant change in the Foreman demographics with the addition of many new Foremen combined with an increase in new and inexperienced workers. In order to understand the true performance issue a structured sample of 32 of the 75 Foremen were interviewed and their performance observed on the shop floor. The interviewed population was from all three shifts and all areas of the division to ensure a complete analytical baseline. The result was a comprehensive task list of over 300 individual Foreman tasks. Once the comprehensive list was identified, the Highest Performing Foremen were identified based upon operational results and personal knowledge. The High Performing Foremen were re-interviewed to discover what made them so good at their jobs. The result was a much smaller list of High Performance Activities. These Mission Essential Tasks were described in a detailed behavior description. From there a detailed behavior based assessment instrument was developed with medium and low behaviors identified from the robust data bank of interviews and activities accumulated during the continuous on the job site based data gathering. Once the assessment instrument was approved by the leadership the Manufacturing Process Leaders assessed all their assigned Foremen against High Performance Behaviors List.

Foreman
Mission Essential Tasks

1. Live the Values of the Company
2. Lead By Example
3. Technically Competent
4. Give Clear Directions to Subordinates
5. Innovate
6. Communicate Up the Chain
7. Communicate Laterally
8. Network with Key Players
9. Plan Work
10. Match Jobs to People
11. Ownership of the Work (Quality)
12. Understand Shipbuilding Process
13. Understand TAS
14. Understand Work Packages
15. Understand Blueprints
16. Understand Procedures
17. Understand Union Contracts
18. Use the Computer

The following is an excerpt of the Foreman Behavior Based Skills Assessment. As you will see this system clearly describes the behaviors required for high performance and allows the
assessor and assessed a clear understanding of the high performance behaviors required to reach full competency at that level of leadership—or the current behaviors and the future behaviors required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lead By Example</strong>: How does the Foreman spend his time?</th>
<th>On the job working the crew</th>
<th>Split between the computer and the crew</th>
<th>Tied to the information system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Demonstrate Technically Competence</strong>: When asked a question from his/her crew the foreman will:</th>
<th>Provide the answer immediately so the employee can continue to work</th>
<th>Provide them with an insufficient answer with a promise to get back to them delaying the work</th>
<th>Gives an incorrect answer causing a mistake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Give Clear Directions to Subordinates</strong>: Does Foreman ensure subordinates understand directions?</th>
<th>Subordinates have clear understanding of task, schedule, and standards</th>
<th>Subordinates routinely stop work to get more guidance</th>
<th>Subordinates are put on tasks without proper guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Innovate:**  
When faced with a problem how does the Foreman respond? | I have a problem and I’ll fix it | I have a problem and you need to fix it (internal to the crew) | I have a problem and someone else needs to fix it (external to the crew) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Communicate Up the Chain:**  
When faced with a problem how does the Foreman communicate it up the chain? | I have a problem and you need to know about it now | I have a problem but I’ll wait until I get a chance to tell you | I have a problem but I’ll wait until you ask me about it. |
| **Communicate Laterally:**  
How does the Foreman communicate with PC, Planning, Material, etc? | This is a team effort and I’m doing my part and I expect you to do your part | We may be on the same team but you’re not as important as I am | We can’t relate and I only talk to you when I absolutely have to |
| **Network with Key Players:**  
Does the Foreman have an informal network of key contacts? | I know who I need to keep in contact with and I talk to each of them on a regular basis | I know who to talk to and I call them when I need something | I don’t talk to anyone outside of my own work area unless I have to |
| **Plan Work:**  
Does the Foreman have the ability to get ahead of today’s tasks and prepare for future work? | I look at least 2-3 days out to plan my work | I’ll plan for tomorrow before I go home today | I come to work and react to the work that day |
| **Crew Development and Performance:**  
Does the Foreman develop the skills of his/her people? | I understand the capabilities and limitations of my people and allocate work to not only meet C,S,Q but to also develop their skills | I know who is good at certain tasks and leave them on that task whenever possible | I assign people to tasks as the tasks arise |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Demonstrate Ownership of the Work (Quality):</strong></th>
<th><strong>Integrate Job into Shipbuilding Process:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Administer (or use) TAS Correctly:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the Foreman’s attitude toward the Job?</td>
<td>Can the Foreman visualize where the job fits into the overall process?</td>
<td>Does the Foreman understand the Time Accounting System?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an agent of the company – I am doing this work because the company’s success is important to me</td>
<td>I think outside my workspace and can see the entire project</td>
<td>I use TAS as a management tool to track jobs and employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will do the best I can and will put up with the stuff “they” make me do</td>
<td>I work within the system but don’t pay attention to the other efforts</td>
<td>I input information into TAS and get my people paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a job. I put my time in and then go home</td>
<td>The system never gives me what I need and it’s a constant burden on me to figure out what’s wrong</td>
<td>TAS doesn’t work for me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interpret Work Packages:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interpret and Explain Blueprints:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recall/Refer to and Explain Procedures:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Foreman understand the Work Packages?</td>
<td>Does the Foreman understand the Blueprints?</td>
<td>Does the Foreman understand the Procedures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can look at a Work Package and understand everything that needs to be done</td>
<td>I can look at a Blueprints and Visualize how the job will go together</td>
<td>I know the procedures so well that I’m constantly trying to improve on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know when something is wrong and can make recommendations</td>
<td>I can get the general information I need off of the Blueprint</td>
<td>I know the procedures well enough to get the work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know when something is wrong</td>
<td>Blueprint reading is hard for me – I can’t relate the drawing to the work I need to do</td>
<td>I have a difficult time making sure my work is done in accordance with procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhere to the Spirit and Intent of Union Contracts: Does the Foreman understand the Union Contract?</th>
<th>I know what I can do and what my subordinates can do. It is not an issue in my work area</th>
<th>I am sometimes unclear on contract details and hold back when I know I should be doing something</th>
<th>I am unsure about the contract and what I can or can’t do with employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand How to Train: Does the foreman have the skills necessary to train his crew?</td>
<td>I continuously evaluate my crew’s capabilities and limitations and I have a systematic method to make sure their skills meet production needs.</td>
<td>I am able to track my crew’s skill set and train them when I have time</td>
<td>I expect people to come to my crew trained and when they need more training I will send them somewhere for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the Computer: Does the Foreman have the skills necessary to use the computer?</td>
<td>The computer is another tool for me and I use it to add value to my work. I am not tethered to it – I get on it then leave to get back to the floor</td>
<td>I am familiar with most of the programs but don’t use it for much else besides required reports</td>
<td>I have a hard time with the computer and it takes up a lot of my time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the assessments were completed an analysis was performed to determine Foreman strengths and weaknesses by tasks and by individual. The task analysis determined the strengths and weaknesses across the entire Foreman population. The individual analysis served to better understand the performance gap and relate that gap to other environmental factors such as location, complexity of the work, experience level of the crew, and the business metrics of cost, schedule, quality, and safety. Additionally, this information was cross referenced to the annual Performance Reviews results to determine patterns and to identify the truly high performers and those requiring a detailed performance improvement strategy based upon their individual situations.

Once complete the following performance improvement and skills development strategy was developed and tailored specifically for each individual Foreman.

- If the Foreman/Supervisor does not know how to do the task: Send to established Training Course to learn the basic skills.
- If the Foreman/Supervisor has an identified weakness, knows how to do the task but needs “on the job” application help: Coach using High Performing Supervisor, Manager or Support Staff person.
- If the Foreman/Supervisor knows the job but is having trouble putting it all together: Spend the day program with Subject Matter Expert at their job site or “See the situation from another perspective” and offer performance improvement alternatives.
- If the Foreman/Supervisor knows his area but needs to understand the value stream to reach full potential: Identify Developmental Positions either “up” or “down” stream in the flow line. (Permanent or Temporary/”Make Up”) Identify Support Shadowing Opportunity for extended periods (Logistics, Planning, Production Control, Quality)
The program was then Piloted, Tested, and Rolled Out to include the development of a specific developmental plan and a performance improvement plan for each Foreman.

The results were dramatic and immediate. The program goal was to improve the performance of Foreman today; Current Foreman – Current Position. Across the board every Foreman’s Skills improved resulting in a direct impact on cost, schedule, quality, and safety. Additionally, the establishment of a structured coaching program forced high performing Foreman to interact with other peers showing significantly increased sharing of lessons learned and systemic tips to be shared across the division. Currently, full documentation of the results is underway including volumes on:

a. High Performance Behaviors by task with “Best Practice” Tips;

b. Foreman Developmental Paths with strengths and weaknesses including performance review results, and a job experience history with training received and education levels.

c. Key Production Jobs with descriptions. These are critical jobs that only occur every year or so because of the production schedule. Also included here are the names of other Foreman and Key Mechanics who are experienced in these key jobs,

d. Metrics. Program performance metrics are tracked by task across the division, by individual Foreman, and by Manufacturing Process Leader.

**Army Fleet Support**

Army Fleet Support used the same process but with unique results. At NGNN, Foremen are hired almost exclusively from the hourly ranks and therefore have considerable technical shipbuilding experience. AFS on the other hand acquires their 1st Line Supervisors from either the retired military population with long Aviation Maintenance experience; the private aviation industry with a lot of aviation experience but little military experience, or from the hourly workforce usually with on 2-3 years experience only on what they did with AFS. Adding to the unique complexity of the leadership challenge is the services contract where over 95% of the contract cost is Direct Labor. The AFS situation of identifying, recruiting, orienting, training, and sustaining performance was a significant challenge requiring another detailed understanding of exactly what makes the best 1st Line Supervisors so good at their work. In this application the on the job site
interviews and “walk throughs” occurred with 75 production leaders at various levels of the organization. The resulting Behavior Based Leader Assessment shows the significant differences in this leader as compared to the NGNN Foreman or 1st Line Supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Demonstrates Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Others follow them everyday with no reservation. Seeks opportunities to be in charge in even the most stressful situations. Has manager’s complete confidence.</td>
<td>Others follow them in most conditions. Reactive in directing people as situations develop. Good leader but requires some coaching.</td>
<td>Others follow them only under certain conditions. Gets overcome by events and reacts poorly to stress. Requires continuous oversight by manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Understands Aviation Maintenance Process</strong></td>
<td>Looks at each task as a part of the continuum of the Maintenance process. Treats each procedure as a link in the overall chain of events. Concentrates on expediting Maintenance by using knowledge of the process to create efficiencies</td>
<td>Knows the overall process and is able to work within it. Uses knowledge of the system to make sure the “i’s” are dotted and the “t’s” are crossed so they don’t get in trouble.</td>
<td>Looks at each task separately. Is confused by the overall process and is unable to articulate any process flow. Doesn’t understand the maintenance language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Understands Logistics Operations</strong></td>
<td>Actively works Logistics issues – focuses on getting aircraft fixed rather than problems with support. Recognizes it as their personal responsibility to research and track all opportunities to obtain support. Does not quit until all options are exhausted.</td>
<td>Works the logistics system within their “box”. Spends enough time on solving the problem to keep from getting in trouble. Gathers “low hanging fruit”, taking credit for easy successes. Blames the system if the process gets too hard.</td>
<td>Uses logistics as a reason for not getting work done. The “system” is to blame for not getting the part or tool necessary to do the work. When pressed will say that they were ready to fix the aircraft but were held back by the support system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seeks Continuous Process Improvement</td>
<td>Everyday is willing to try something different to improve the process. Constantly asking WHY we do it that way and HOW can we do it better. Sees themselves as a change agent.</td>
<td>Looks at process improvement when they are forced to do something different or during a formal process improvement event. Reluctant to change.</td>
<td>Change is Bad - this is the way we’ve always done it. “We get better by working harder the way we do it now.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plans Work</td>
<td>Proactively assesses the job and work area, then determines what needs to be done (days ahead when possible). Matches job to who is best suited to do it. Consistently assigns lead/crew work in clear and concise terms every day. Always assigns follow-on work focused on increasing production. Clearly links planning to Contract requirements. Gets 8 hours work for 8 hours pay.</td>
<td>Assesses the job but is sometimes rushed and vague in making work assignments. Often activity is confused with productivity. Often workers come to him/her to ask what to do next. Sometimes becomes overcome by events and forgets to consider impact on Contract requirements.</td>
<td>Fails to assess the job. Is hit or miss, or reactive on job assignments. Assigns work on jobs that are not ready or prepared and may not consider current mechanic qualifications. Assigns follow-on work not focused on increasing production or meeting Contract requirements. Poor planning creates significant slack time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communicates up the Chain</td>
<td>Ability to decipher problems/issues and communicates solutions in short accurate bursts over 90% of the time both orally and written. Communicates with data rich problem definition and resolution recommendations. Demands resolution from Superiors based upon data driven communications.</td>
<td>Has ability to decipher problems/issues but is frustrated because people do not understand what he/she is telling them. Uses data to identify issues. Hopes superior will understand criticality of the issue and will act on it. Communicates well orally but has difficulty composing written communications.</td>
<td>Can’t sort the problem out of the background noise. Assumes that he/she communicated and others are at fault if they did not understand.Knows that they have a problem but does not have the ability to communicate either the problem or the solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Communicates to Subordinates</td>
<td>Listens as much as they speak. Encourages feedback. Sees subordinate feedback as a value added tool.</td>
<td>Communications tend to be one way – listening is not a priority. “When I want feedback I’ll ask for it.”</td>
<td>Avoids worker/crew communication by shying away from interaction. Feedback is insubordinate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Builds Teams

- Thinks outside of their workspace and can see the entire project. Knows who they need to keep in contact with and talks to each of them on a regular basis. Has an informal network of Subject Matter Experts that work together to proactively meet Contract requirements.
- Works within the system but doesn’t pay attention to the efforts of others. Knows who to talk to and calls them when something is needed. Uses the team to react to current issues.
- The system never gives them what they need and it’s a constant burden on them to figure out what’s wrong. They don’t talk to anyone outside of their own work area unless they are forced to. Constantly surprised.

### 9. Technically Competent

- Knows their job cold. When presented with a problem or a question is able to resolve it correctly and get the worker back on the job within minutes 90% of the time.
- Knows their job but lacks confidence in some areas. Responds to questions with, “I’ll get back to you on that” and sometimes fails to return. Knows enough not to give wrong answers.
- Does not know all details of their job. Lacks confidence in their own decisions. When asked a technical question they provide an immediate response even if it’s incorrect.

### 10. Knows the CBA

- They know what they can do within the CBA and what subordinates can do. The CBA is another tool for them to use in getting the work done. The CBA is not an issue in their work area.
- They are sometimes unclear on CBA details and have to ask for assistance. They react tentatively in some areas but in general are able to work within the CBA. They sometimes use the CBA as an excuse for poor performance.
- They are unsure about the contract and what they can or can’t do with employees so they sometimes hold back or do nothing in fear of doing something wrong. Their uncertainty in the CBA leads to productivity problems.

### 11. Uses Technology

- Technology is a tool for them and they use it to add value to their work. They are not tethered to it – they get on it then leave to get back to the floor.
- They are familiar with most of the technology but don’t use it for much else besides required reports.
- They have a hard time with technology and it consumes them. They spend a lot of time on the system with very little to show for it.
### 12. Crew Development

| Ensures their crew is trained. Sees Crew Development as an integral part of their job. Actively engaged in developing the entire crew. Challenges crew members by setting higher goals based on individual skills. | Tracks individual qualifications but does not actively engage in developing the entire crew. Ensures that there is a “go-to” element in the crew that can perform all the work. | Crew Development means managing certifications and qualifications. Individual development is not a supervisor responsibility. |

At AFS, the Pilot Program is currently underway. The initial results are promising. One of the key emerging insights at AFS, is that 1st Line Supervisor is really only ½ a word. Supervisors on the Flight Line have unique requirements as opposed to those in the Repair Parts Warehouse or those in the Test Pilot organization. The strategy here then is to identify those common behaviors and skills, design a program around those skill sets and then add on those particular skills required for those specific jobs. Leader Development at AFS will become similar to how they train pilots. Basic Pilot Training followed by specific airframe training with an embedded Training Skills Management System in order to better manage these leaders across the contract. Currently being developed is the first ever Leader Career Path describing how motivated leaders can obtain new skills to support promotions and increased levels of responsibility.

**CONCLUSION**

You can only develop Leaders in any organization 1 at a time. Further, these wonderful people who are in their first leadership positions ever require some very simple answers to the age old questions of, “What do I need to do to be successful?” In many organizations the answers to this question are very obscure like; be a better time manager, or be a good communicator, or work harder. These answers provide no real guidance thus causing frustration and tribal lore to take over with often very dysfunctional results—both for the individual and the organization from a personal and business perspective. Our research and practical experience has shown the Behavior Based Leader Development Program provides these 1st time leaders with actual behaviors they can model in order to be successful in their very unique jobs in their very unique organizations. Maybe more importantly it takes the tribal lore and turns information into explicit behaviors required for success. Explicit behaviors can be included in a Leader Development Program that gives these new leaders the right skills, at the right time, in the right place to meet and exceed their performance objectives from their 1st day on the job and not over a long period of adjustment. Good leaders and good organizations are not made by accident and it is the responsibility of the senior leadership to accept and understand that they are responsible to develop the policies, programs, and resources for these young leaders to succeed.

These First Line Supervisors are the ones who are the face of our businesses to the production workforce everyday and they need to know what to do, and who can help them be successful. This Behavior Based Leader Development Program gives them those skills, shows them what success looks like, and frees them to be successful…and it does it today!
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