Developing a Leadership Toolbox for Aviation Security Field Management

The Case for Objective Measures of Performance at the Checkpoint

Dr. Dale Palmer

Program Analyst – Performance Metrics
Transportation Security Administration
Greater Pennsylvania Area – Pittsburgh International Airport

Leadership in Homeland Security

Recently Publicized Performance Concerns within TSA

➢ 2008 – 2009   U.S. Government Accountability Office Report
  ➢ Inadequate data collection and documentation
  ➢ Inability to record and analyze test results
  ➢ No meaningful identification of areas for improvement

➢ 2015   Dept. of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General
  ➢ Red Team test failures (67 of 70 tests, 95% fail rate)

➢ 2011 – 2014   Office of Personnel Management
                    Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey
  ➢ Lowest job satisfaction in Federal Government
  ➢ Disconnect between TSA management and screeners

TSA Screeners Speak Out - Anecdotal Evidence

➢ Poor management oversight of security screening activities

➢ Lack of fairness and transparency in performance ratings

➢ Lack of mentoring and promotion opportunities

➢ Lack of performance-related feedback to foster growth

➢ Leadership disengagement of everything performance-related

➢ Confusion in defining/identifying security screening goals

➢ Uncertainty and mistrust in management

➢ Lack of morale

Identifiable Problems – Root Causes?

➢ No true performance management system to guide/correct work behaviors and reward "good" performance

➢ History of a "Pay for Performance Organization"?

> ➢ Performance Accountability and Standards System (PASS) and Annual Proficiency Reviews (APR)
>
>> ➢ Artificial Environment, Predetermined Test Procedures, Practice
>> ➢ Once Per Year
>> ➢ Tests of "Certification" and not of Performance
>> ➢ No correlation with On-The-Job (OTJ) Performance and/or covert tests
>
> ➢ Transportation Officer Performance System (TOPS)
>
>> ➢ Perceived subjectivity of measures
>> ➢ Rater lack of understanding, poor training
>> ➢ No standardization of ratings, systemic operational problems
>> ➢ Rater/ratee disconnect
>> ➢ Inconsistent, vague and/or disconnected feedback, if any at all

Core Competency 2: INTEGRITY/HONESTY

Behaves in an honest, fair and ethical manner; shows consistency in words and actions; models high standards of ethics.

Performance Standards

- **Achieved Expectations** Respects and maintains confidentiality. Tells the truth and is consistently honest in dealings with internal and external parties and stakeholders (i.e., anyone who has an interest in transportation security, including but not limited to the traveling public, all TSA staff and management, local law enforcement, the local airport authority, and air carrier personnel.)Keeps promises and commitments made to others. Does the right thing even when it is difficult. Does not yield to pressure to show bias or to manipulate others. Does not misrepresent self or use position or authority for personal gain. Meets expectations for adhering to ethical standards in the workplace, as defined by the *TSA Guide to Major Ethics Rules 2014*.

- **Achieved Excellence** Respects and maintains confidentiality. Tells the truth and is consistently honest in dealings with internal and external parties and stakeholders (i.e., anyone who has an interest in transportation security, including but not limited to the traveling public, all TSA staff and management, local law enforcement, the local airport authority, and air carrier personnel.) Keeps promises and commitments made to others. Does the right thing even when it is difficult. Does not yield to pressure to show bias or to manipulate others. Does not misrepresent self or use position or authority for personal gain. Meets expectations for adhering to ethical standards in the workplace, as defined by the *TSA Guide to Major Ethics Rules 2014*. By example and role-modeling, encourages co-workers and others to earn trust and respect through consistent honesty in interactions with internal and external parties and stakeholders(i.e., anyone who has an interest in transportation security, including but not limited to the traveling public, all TSA staff and management, local law enforcement, the local airport authority, and air carrier personnel.)

Identifiable Problems – Root Causes (continued)?

➢ STSO/LTSO OTJ Leadership Roles not well-defined, followed

➢ Rewards system for OTJ Performance virtually nonexistent

➢ Punishment (disciplinary actions) and remediation in place of rewards

➢ No performance data in order to "drive" performance improvement

➢ No "Transfer of Training" evaluation of the training programs

    ➢ Training goals accurately defined?

    ➢ Training program objectives being met?

    ➢ Behaviors changed/developed? Performance improved?

How Can We Correct These Problems?

- ➢ **Develop a Leadership Culture**
    - ➢ Tools needed

- ➢ **Develop a well-defined Performance Management Program**
    - ➢ Define work expectations and communicate set standards of performance
    - ➢ Continuously monitor OTJ performance
    - ➢ Summarize performance data and provide feedback
    - ➢ Set goals for improvement
    - ➢ Hold individuals accountable for meeting standards and improving
    - ➢ Reward good performance

Research Study – Proving the Concept

- ➤ **2009 Pittsburgh International Airport (PIT) Research Study**
  - ➤ Is OTJ performance different from annual certification exam performance? How is it different?
  - ➤ Does management/supervisor "interaction" change OTJ work behavior and performance?

- ➤ **Control Group** – annual certification test results
- ➤ **Comparison Group** – covert observation OTJ performance results
- ➤ **Experimental Group** – overt observation OTJ performance results

- ➤ **Measure of Performance** – skill evaluation checklist "dings"

Research Study – Proving the Concept

➢ Results

Table 1. Results of the SEC Study (Means for Each Group on Two Measures of Performance)

GROUP	N (HHMD)	Mean HHMD "Number of Errors"	N (FBPD)	Mean FBPD "Number of Errors"
CONTROL GROUP (2009 PSEs)	44	1.30	27	1.52
COMPARISON GROUP (covert floor observation)	31	5.90	10	3.60
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (overt floor observation)	25	2.96	21	1.67

Research Study – Proving the Concept

- **Reasons for Results**

- Artificial versus "real" environment?
- No incentives to "do well"? Lack of Motivation?
- Complacency?
- Disinterest in performance? Management doesn't care?

➢ **Building a Leadership Toolbox**

 ➢ **The PIT Performance Management Program (PPMP)**

  ➢ Communicate set standards/expectations for performance

  ➢ Develop a "culture" of accountability and responsibility

  ➢ Provide supportive feedback to help officer "grow"

  ➢ Align developmental/remedial opportunities with resources

  ➢ Reward officers for consistently good performance

➢ Increase Effectiveness and Engagement within the workforce

➢ More STSO and TSM involvement and interaction with officers

> # How does the PPMP work?

> # Measures of Performance
>> - Threat Image Projection (TIP) scores
>> - Reliability – instances of tardiness/unscheduled leave
>> - Training Completion rates
>> - Quality Assurance measures
>> - Aviation Screening Assessment Program (ASAP) covert test results

> # Data collection and Analysis

> # Reporting
>> - STSO tracking and feedback
>> - Mentoring for Improvement

> ## Reporting
>> Team Rankings – to develop comradery and friendly competition

Current Position	Team	JULY 2014 PPMP TEAM Score
1	TEAM	97.25
2	TEAM	93.75
3	TEAM	92.63
4	TEAM	92.11
5	TE	
6	TE	
7	TE	
8	TE	
9	TE	
10	TE	

19	TEAM		86.10
20	TEAM		84.83
21	TEAM		84.57
22	TEAM		81.71
	TOTAL for TEAM PIT		89.21

> ## Reporting
>> **Team Report** – individual officer feedback for STSO "action"

SENSITIVE SECURITY INFORMATION

PPMP Team Report July 2014 — Team Score 92.11

	Score	TIP	Reliability	QA_PSE	IEDDrill	SOP	OLC	ASAP
STSO	100.00		100.00				100.00	
TSO	91.05	76.20	100.00	100.00			88.00	
TSO	87.67	75.00	100.00				88.00	
LTSO	96.03	88.10	100.00				100.00	
TSO	85.80	82.40	75.00				100.00	
TSO	80.25	81.50	100.00	92.50			47.00	
TSO	100.00		100.00				100.00	
TSO	93.17	79.50	100.00				100.00	
LTSO	94.80	84.40	100.00				100.00	
TSO	94.43	83.30	100.00				100.00	
TSO	82.17	76.50	75.00				95.00	
TSO	100.00		100.00				100.00	

Reporting

- Quality Assurance – measure of operational "strengths" and "weaknesses"

➤ Reporting
  ➤ Quality Assurance (continued)

July 2014 - PMP ENTRY DATA

	100%	NOT 100%	TOTAL
Threat Area Search			20
Standard Pat Down			17
Modified SPD			0
PWD SPD			2
Pre ✓ Modified SPD			1
L3 / DO			7
L3 / SO			33
TDC			16
OVERSIZE BAG			9
OSARP			2

16

- **Linking the Chain**
  - **PIT STSO Performance Management Plan**

  - **Critical Performance Area 1 – Supervising Operations**
    - Screening Efficiency
      - Throughput, AIT Usage, PreCheck and Managed Inclusion, OSARP
    - Leadership – Performance Oversight
      - PPMP Data
      - QA Data

  - **Critical Performance Area 2 – Operational Knowledge**
    - Training Completion
    - Knowledge of Standard Operating Procedures (SOP)
    - Intelligence Briefings

  - **Critical Performance Area 3 – Communication**
    - Conducting Shift Briefings
    - Handling Disciplinary Actions
    - Email Management