Proposal of

Resolution Dynamics, Inc.

# BEST AND FINAL OFFER

to

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Division of Contracts & Property Management
Contract Negotiation Branch No. 2; P-1042
Washington, D.C. 20555

NRC Supervisory, Managerial and
Organizational Development Programs

September 5, 1990

Solicitation No. RS-PER-90-329

9/2

We are hereby submitting our "best and final" proposal to provide services for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Supervisory, Managerial and Organizational Development Program. This submission is in accordance with instructions received in our "best-and-final" conference on August 21, 1990 (plus telephonic and written correspondence).

Our format follows that prescribed at the conference, answering each question on the list of 15 which were attached to NRC's August 20th notification to RDI. For each question we have written a specific narrative response or provided an information table to address each concern. For cost questions (#8 - 15) we have also submitted an entire revised contract pricing proposal cover sheet (OMB for 3090-0116), section B - supplies or Services and Price/Costs (SF 36), and RDI's detailed breakdown sheets for each deliverable.

# QUESTION 1

*Concerning RDI's Qualifications
in Human Factors Subjects*

1. "Please describe the qualifications of your employee(s) to design and teach courses in human factors subjects.

Due to our long association with the NRC, RDI is familiar with the evolution of the agency's human factors program. We have trained various personnel from units with human factors research responsibility. We know there has been on-going effort to understand those supervisory and managerial processes which contribute to safe operation of a nuclear power plant, as well as those processes which detract from safe operation. One of the primary agents of this activity has been the Division of Human Factors Safety in NRR which was established in 1980. Other activities, such as those of the Reliability and Human Factors Branch of RES, have been functioning since the April, 1987, NRC reorganization.

The agency has developed a model which presents a picture of the human dynamics within a nuclear plant. This nuclear organization and management analysis model (NOMAM) provides a framework for understanding interactive and behavioral factors as well as functional relationships between plant units. One of the theoretical underpinnings of NOMAM is Henry Mintzberg's concept of the "safety bureaucracy." The program has striven to understand forces which influence safe operations in order to develop ways to strengthen safety systems. RDI would draw on these sources in the design and conduct of training in human factors subjects.

One of our key staff for this contract, William King, has worked as a research scientist at URS/Matrix Corporation. As such, he was part of a project team developing new methods of training and testing combat infantrymen and armor crewmen for the military. Human factors research was paramount in this effort. The project was called SCOPES (Squad Combat Operational Exercise, Simulated), and was the forerunner of the MILES system (Multiple Integrated Laser Exercise, Simulated) currently used by the US Armed Forces. The project's purpose was to develop realistic methods of training and testing individual and organizational skills required for an effective combat force. Units opposed each other in free-play combat exercises employing simulated weapons fire. Much of the research effort went into devising simulation techniques that matched the effects and signatures of various weapons. A major task was to create scoring procedures that accurately reflected the exigencies of combat and that could be implemented without compromising realism. Human factors were the major determinant in all these efforts.

RDI's experience with the United States Department of Agriculture's "Peanut Buying Point Automation Project" provided valuable experience in human factors analysis. This training program served two purposes: that of preparing participants to function in their roles, and that of providing a final field test for the system. It demanded that trainers closely observe, analyze, and record participants' responses to features of the system. Based on trainers' feedback, programmers changed or added features, de-bugged the system, and modified hardware configurations. In some cases, trainers had to devise specific tests, working in close collaboration with participants who had experience in the field. Trainers also made recommendations for changes in government policies and SOPs based on participants' responses.

As described elsewhere in our original proposal, RDI will use the ISD approach to designing new courses, which might include a two-day program entitled, "Human Performance in Power Plants." This is similar to the approach we used most recently in the agency when we designed the "Gathering Inspection Information" course.

Our in-depth experience with NRC personnel and issues, our familiarity with the agency's human factors programs, our experience with course design including data gathering and analysis, Mr. King's experience in human factors research, and RDI's human factors experience on the USDA project will all provide RDI with the necessary background and know-how to effectively develop courses on human factors subjects.

# QUESTION 2

*Concerning RDI Staff Time
on Other Projects*

2.    "Proposal describes delineation of functions and time to be devoted to
      the project; however, it is not known what percentage of employees'
      time is already committed to other projects."

It is our understanding that the intent of this question is to ensure tha' RDI staff will be available
as needed to perform on this contract. Our response is in two pe.ts. In this section we will
answer the question as it pertains to delivery and revision of curre i; courses and to delivery of
organizational development services. In a later section of this propo sal, where we answer NRC's
question #7, we will specifically deal with assignments for new ourse design.

## Workload Distribution Table

| Name | Average NRC Billables Per Month | Average Other Billables | Total Days Billable/Month | Average Non-Billables (Used for corporate admin; marketing & additional peak load assignments) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| N. Mani | 2.5 days (approx monthly av)<br><br>Based on 28 days per year:<br>(a) SHR = 3 x 7 days<br>(b) Appraising Perf = 2 x 3 days | 7.5 days | 10 days | NRC Project Management = 4 days<br><br>plus<br>6 days |
| D. Spears | 2.5 days (approx monthly av)<br><br>Based on 27 days per year:<br>(a) Conflict Res = 2 x 4.5 days<br>(b) Small Gp Dyn = 2 x 4.5 days<br>(c) Wk Tm Coord = 2 x 4.5 days | 9.5 days | 12 days | 8 days |
| Karen Gaskins Jones | 2 days (approx monthly average)<br><br>Based on 22.5 days per year:<br>(a) PreSOP = 1 x 3 days<br>(b) Time Mgt = 1 x 3 days<br>(c) Plan/Cope = 1 x 3 days<br>(d) Com for Insp = 3 x 4.5 days | 8 days | 10 days | 10 days |
| William King | 2.5 days (approx monthly av)<br><br>Based on 27 days per year:<br>(a) Int Skills = 2 x 4.5 days<br>(b) Meetings = 2 x 4.5 days<br>(c) Gath Info = 2 x 4.5 days | 6.5 days | 9 days | 11 days |
| Sephena Jordan | 3.5 days (approx monthly av)<br><br>Based on 39.5 days per year:<br>(a) Managing Change = 2 x 3 days<br>(b) Performance Mgt = 2 x 3 days<br>(c) Stress Mgt = 1 x 3 days<br>(d) Selection Int = 1 x 4.5 days<br>(e) OD = 2 x 10 days | 7 days | 10.5 | 9.5 days |
| Robert Maddox | 1 day (approx monthly average)<br><br>Based on 13.5 Consulting Days<br>(a) Mgt Wkshp = 3 x 4.5 days | N/A | N/A | N/A |

# QUESTION 3

*Concerning Custom OD Experience*

3. "Please explain your experience in customizing programs in the organizational development area."

RDI is offering a highly experienced staff of organizational development consultants to the NRC. The primary OD consultant will be Sephena Jordan. Should the demand for organizational development services exceed the limit of Ms. Jordan's capabilities, Nicholas Mann, Donald Spears, and Casey Mann will all be available as backups.

Ms. Jordan has more than ten years experience providing organizational development services at a professional level. This experience was gained in internal positions with Tennessee Valley Authority and the U.S. Department of Energy, and continues through her current external consulting practice (see resume in CP section 1.2.1). Two case studies are presented here as evidence of this experience.

Case One

Work with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency spanned the period of October, 1989 through April, 1990 with approximately three days per month on-site.

Ms. Jordan was asked to work with two branches to help improve their mutually dependent work efforts and communication processes, and to encourage development of a team-like atmosphere.

Each branch was responsible for different, yet vital aspects of the al superfund clean-up project. Although they were located in two separate divisions and in different buildings, they needed to work together in order to successfully accomplish their hazardous waste clean up mission.

Entry was through exploratory interviews with both branch chiefs. Through direct contact with the consultant they were able to personally assess her competence, neutrality and objectivity and to develop a working rapport. With their approval of a formal contract, work was initiated. Subsequently, both these branch chiefs were viewed as clients, distinct from one another. Both were established as points of contact for communication, progress reports, planning, recommendations, and feedback.

The next step involved conducting face-to-face interviews with section chiefs and approximately 15 percent of the non-managerial personnel in each branch. The purpose of the interviews was to identify areas of concern as well as the staff members' perceptions of current inter-branch relations. Each interview lasted one and one-half hours and focused on how the work was currently being done, potential areas for improvement, things that were working well, and criteria for successful interventions.

Upon completing the interviews, the consultant summarized the data and discussed it with the two branch chiefs. At this meeting, she also recommended a strategy for the first group meeting and subsequent steps.

Part of this strategy included: a) Feeding the data summary back to other branch members expeditiously; b) Separating the managerial and non-managerial branch members for the sake of processing the issues identified in the interviews.

The rationale for this managerial/non-managerial division came from the apparent friction, verbalized difficulties in interacting, and a lack of trust at the managerial levels (branch chiefs and section chiefs). There was also some concern over the fact that each branch had different goals and over whether this actually impeded efforts to work interdependently. At the non-managerial level, the data suggested different types of issues -- basically a lack of information from the managers and unclear performance expectations.

Before proceeding too far, the managers expressed their desire to "get their acts together first and so that they could appear to be singing from the same sheet of music." They wanted to accomplish this before bringing the rest of their branches too far into the process. The exception was that the data summary would be shared with the other branch members, by the branch chiefs -- with consultant guidance, during separate branch meetings.

Next, group activities were initiated so that managers from both branches could rank, analyze and solve problems which were identified during data gathering. The consultant added team building and communication skill drills into these activities, in order to bring about increased organizational health. The LIFO Communication Orientation inventory was used during the first meeting to provide a tool for recognizing and improving individual communication tendencies and preferences. Other small group exercises demonstrating the importance of perception, trust, conflict resolution, collaborative problem solving and group decision making were employed over this six month period.

Staff members who had not yet been involved were then brought into the process. Quarterly scheduling and problem anticipation meetings were initiated with the non-managerial members from each staff. Branch chiefs and section chiefs met and planned the agenda for the first quarterly meeting with the consultant guidance.

During this big meeting, the branch chiefs and section chiefs shared their learnings and actions, solicited input on what others considered to be important issues, and identified goals for the next six months. By this time, the following processes had already been initiated: a) branch chiefs were meeting weekly; b) branch chiefs and section chiefs met every other Tuesday to continue working on their interaction; c) quarterly meetings continued with non-managerial staff; and d) joint policy and procedure statements and memoranda, with signatures of both branch chiefs, had been put out.

The branch chiefs and the division directors have verbalized their satisfaction with the improved interaction between these two groups. The atmosphere appears to be more open, candid and productive. There even seems to be a modicum of risk taking and the development of trust among staff members.

## Case Two

This was an organization-wide OD effort for the U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Operations Office. This multi-faceted effort spanned eighteen months and began with a request from the Operations Office Manager to help "change the culture." In his opinion, the organization had ceased to produce and was basically living on past laurels. There was concern with the lack of momentum in business operations which was resulting in increasing scrutiny by DOE, EPA and other regulatory agencies.

The Operations Office Manager had been brought in to "clean up the image" and make the organization productive again. Ms. Jordan's intervention was initiated approximately two years into his tenure. There was a tremendous amount of caution initially from the Operations Manager. He warned that both he and the consultant would continue to face resistance and some hostility, due to being viewed as "outsiders."

The elements of this assignment included:

1)    The development of an internal facilitator program that would g    the office capability to improve communication, build teamwork, and resol conflicts.

2)    The design, development and implementation of selection and training processes for these internal facilitator.

3)    On-going facilitation and consultation with the Operations Manager and other DOE managers.

4)    The making of additional recommendations for organizational improvement.

The primary client was the Operations Manager of this 600-employee operation. These employees were located in three geographic regions (Ohio, Louisiana and Tennessee).

As the assignment began, the consultant researched the organization's history, purpose and mode of operation, while interviewing 26 percent of the employee population (both managerial and non-managerial). The summary of the organizational assessment interview data was shared with the Operation's Manager and his deputy.

At the suggestion of employees throughout the organization, five people were selected and trained to function as a facilitator selection panel. These panelists' involvement included developing the criteria for facilitator behaviors, agreeing on the facilitator selection interview questions, developing the "paper screening" part of the process, as well as observing interpersonal facilitation skills during the final selection interviews. This panel also gave feedback to the individual applicants and to the consultant regarding their observations and recommendations. This process was lauded throughout the office because it was seen as "fairly and objectively selecting" the facilitator group.

The consultant next made recommendations about the deployment of the facilitator, who were allowed to spend no more than ten percent of their time on facilitator duties. These were in addition to their full-time DOE jobs in various areas throughout the organization.

Facilitator training was spread over a four-month period, with two to three days in class per month, and practice activities between the classroom sessions. During the fifth month, the consultant began to work with each of them during their first actual assignments. She gradually increased their share of the load until they began to function confidently as facilitator. This turned out to be a cohesive, supportive group of "quick studies" who were ready within fifteen months.

Throughout this total process, the consultant advised the Operations Manager and his deputy on highly sensitive issues, team building and planning efforts with DOE and with DOE contractors.

The following recommendations were actually implemented prior to disengagement: a) the organization was restructured; b) monthly employee question-and-answer meetings were held with the deputy manager; c) the employee suggestion program was re-vamped and re-activated; d) team-building efforts were initiated in various parts of the organization; e) the performance appraisal process was reviewed and revised; f) employee orientation sessions were initiated; and g) additional training needs were identified.

This organization is, to this day, continuing many of these processes. The internal facilitator group remains the pivotal part of the continuing OD program at the Oak Ridge Operations Office. Also, a managerial training program has been implemented to respond to the training needs previously identified

# QUESTION 4

*Concerning Handling Diverse
Participant Groups*

IV.  "How would the firm design and instruct courses in order to accommodate the highly diverse backgrounds (Grade level and technical level) of NRC employees.'

RDI has handled diverse NRC groups for up to ten years.  We have seen diversity increase in the agency, and have been increasing attention being placed on diversity.  Courses in which we have handled diverse groups include "Supervising Human Resources," "Leading NRC Work Teams," and "Gathering Inspection Information Through Interviews."

Much of the training conducted by RDI involves working with diverse groups.  In working with such organizations as the Peace Corps, the Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Agency for International Development, the Smithsonian Institution, and Howard University, highly diverse groups have been the norm rather than the exception. In addition, we have been notified (on August 31, 1990) that we are a finalist in a competitive bid process with Old Dominion University, to be the vendor for designing diversity training for University faculty.

In the Peace Corps "CREST" training, groups ranged in age from early twenties to mid-sixties. Their backgrounds ranged from highly technical professional to blue collar to rural agricultural.

With the Smithsonian, RDI has trained museum curators in the arts, sciences, or history, along with horticultural supervisors, plant managers, guard force sergeants and lieutenants, print shop and cabinet shop foremen, building maintenance supervisors, accounting or payroll supervisors, and senior executives -- all in the same course.

In the USDA's "Peanut Buy   ; Point Automation Project," RDI trainers had to anticipate and deal with a wide range of skill levels, experience, and attitudes.  Some were completely new to the complicated business of peanut farming and marketing, while others belonged to families that had been in the business for generations.  Some participants had no computer experience while others had worked with computers for years.  Some were vitally interested in the success of the peanut business; others were functionaries putting in their time until retirement.

As a result of the experiences of our consulting practice in which the norm involves great diversity among participant groups, we have evolved the following principles and procedures:

1.   Course designers and instructors must have total familiarity with the course material and be able to effectively link all content to specific objectives.  Without complete comfort with course material, an instructor is not confident enough to be flexible and spontaneous in responding to the emerging needs of a diverse group.

2. Instructors should solicit early participation from all participants. ?   not only performs an "ice breaking" function, but also gives           ion of the interests and expectations of various    ticipants.

3. The diversity of the group should be used as a resource. Participants' varied experiences, training, and viewpoints can greatly enhance the course content. During the introductory portion the instructor assesses the range of experiences brought by individual participants. Having thereby established the group as a reservoir of expertise, the instructor makes adjustments by on-the-spot tailoring and by allowing ample time for discussion and cross-fertilization of ideas.

4. Instructors should lay out ground rules which establish a norm of respect for the opinions of others, cooperation with the instructor and with each other, and giving frequent feedback on whether information is clear and relevant.

5. Instructors should have well-developed group process skills. These include sharpened listening ability and perceptiveness about participants' non-verbal cues, which often signal their real responses to training content or process.

6. Course design should include illustrative examples carefully selected for universal meaning. Additional examples should be drawn out of the experiences of the group. Instructors should challenge participants to produce examples as a way of making course material directly relevant to their individual circumstances.

7. Course material should be presented through multiple media and delivery techniques. This means that information is presented in written materials, highlighted in instructor presentations, explored through class discussion, illustrated on charts or other visual aids, further clarified or elaborated in films or exercises, and then summarized periodically (allowing time for further questioning and exploration).

8. All course material and trainer's presentations should be carefully screened to eliminate biases, cultural orientations, sexist language, and stereotypes. Screening should focus not only on removing offensive material, but also on ensuring that all material will be readily comprehensible to every participant.

# QUESTION 5

*Concerning Maintaining
Currency of Knowledge*

V. "Explain how instructor/designer will maintain currency of knowledge."

A.   There are two elements to the requirement for maintaining currency of knowledge while performing on the NRC Supervisory, Managerial and Organizational Development Programs contract. The first pertains to currency of knowledge as professional consultants and trainers, and in the subject matter of organizational management. This we will maintain in the following ways:

1.   Our practice at RDI is to act as resources and trainers of each other. In this way we regularly share knowledge of emerging trends, research discoveries, and organizational situations which are encountered during the course of our consulting practices.

2.   RDI's professional staff members maintain membership and involvement in relevant professional organizations. These include the following:

a. Organizational Development Network

b. American Society for Training and Development

c. Black Human Resource Network

d. Leadership Washington

e. American Society for Public Administration

f. American Management Association

g. National Management Association

h. American Institute of Certified Planners

i. American Planning Association

j. Deming User's Group

k. American Society for Quality Control

3. Our staff resource library contains numerous journals and films, plus over five hundred volumes on subjects ranging from general management, to communication, planning, ethics, case studies and various related other subjects. RDI invests in additions to it's resource library at an average rate of five books per month.

4. RDI staff regularly undertake training and other professional development activities for themselves.

B. The other element of maintaining currency of knowledge while performing this contract involves knowledge of current agency issues, problems and programs. RDI will maintain this type of currency through:

1. Regular contact with participants in our workshops, who are an excellent source of information about on-going agency affairs.

2. Regular monthly meetings between the NRC Contract Officer (CO) and the RDI Project Manager (PM) for the purpose of evaluating current activities, planning, sharing and gathering information.

3. Periodic briefings by the RDI PM to the entire project cadre or to select members, depending upon the type of information involved

4. Systematic project documentation, which will include project requirements, plans and time tables, background and resource material. Examples of agency background material already available in RDI's staff resource library include NUREG/BR-0086, Revision 2 on "The IDP Process;" NRC Manual, Chapter 4151 on "Non-SES Performance Appraisal System;" or NUREG-1306 on "NRC Safety Significance Assessment Team Report On Allegations Related To the South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2;" etc.

5.  Participation, where possible, of RDI staff members in NRC activities which provide both general background experience and specific knowledge related to courses. In the past, our staff have enthusiastically adopted this practice. Examples have included a field trip to a nuclear power plant (Calvert Cliffs), and attendance at a Pressure Water Reactor course. In addition, we already have multiple experiences training in each of the agency's five regions as well as at virtually all sites within the Washington, D.C., headquarters area.

# QUESTION 6

*Concerning Quality Control Procedur ;*

VI. "Please discuss your quality control procedures as specified in the RFP."

The information presented in this section specifically speaks to quality control. We have also, in Enclosure 2, addressed program management more broadly. This is in response to conversation at the August 21 "best-and-final conference." The material in Enclosure 2 enhances Section 4.0 of our original proposal.

RDI will use a systematic set of review and control procedures for quality assurance:

Step One:   Establish definitions of acceptable and measurable standards for each item to be monitored under quality control procedures.

Step Two:   Determine the most advantageous points in the process to obtain feedback on the above quality standards.

Step Three: Act on those items falling below acceptable standards.

In implementing these three quality assurance steps, our specific approach will depend on the particular deliverable involved. The table on the following page shows this process:

# RDI's QUALITY CONTROL PROCESS

| Design and development of new training courses | Delivery and revision of current training courses | Organizational development services |
|---|---|---|
| **Step One: Establish Standards**<br><br>a. Adherence to ISD approach.<br><br>b. Adherence to negotiated milestones and course objectives. | **Step One: Establish Standards**<br><br>a. Appropriate preparation (review of instructor guide & participant notebook, arrangements for production and shipping of materials, rehearsals of new or problem course segments)<br><br>b. Course delivery meets stated course objectives | **Step One: Establish Standards**<br><br>a. State-of-the-art OD Principles (see list below table).<br><br>b. Client consultant consensus as to boundaries and ground rules for intervention.<br><br>c. Intervention schedule. |
| **Step Two: Take Feedback**<br><br>a. Progress meetings between Project Manager and Designers.<br><br>b. Monthly progress meetings with NRC CO to get agency feedback.<br><br>c. Evaluative feedback taken from participants in pilot testing. | **Step Two: Take Feedback**<br><br>a. RDI PM and trainer meet to review preparation checklist and discuss final issues.<br><br>b. Analyze participant evaluation forms, plus direct observation by NRC CO and RDI PM. | **Step Two: Take Feedback**<br><br>Periodic progress meetings between OD consultant and RDI PM, including review of case documentation. |
| **Step 3: Correct Based on Feedback**<br><br>a. If below standard process elements, correct based on ISD principles.<br><br>b. If below standard content elements, correct based on negotiated course objectives.<br><br>c. If below standard pilot feedback, revise design accordingly. | **Step 3: Correct Based on Feedback**<br><br>a. If below standard preparation, give specific instructions and recheck prior to session<br><br>b. If below standard delivery, propose revisions and check by modifying preparation checklist for next session. | **Step 3: Correct Based on Feedback**<br><br>If below standard execution of OD intervention, refocus based on appropriate OD principle, review boundaries and ground rules, and realign activities with schedule. |

## Core Organizational Development Principles

As indicated on the above table, organizational development services should be evaluated against proven and accepted organizational development principles. These principles serve as a code of discipline for organizational development practitioners. Therefore the appropriate top manager's commitment to these principles will be sought during the building of a consensus on boundaries and ground rules for an OD intervention. Principles include:

1.  The OD effort must be planned and proactive. This begins with systematic diagnosis by the consultant.

2.  The OD effort should involve the <u>total system</u> in which the need for development or change exists.

3.  The OD effort should be supported <u>from the top</u>, which includes a commitment to active participation by top unit managers.

4.  The OD effort must be aimed at <u>increasing health</u> in the system, as opposed to simply responding to short-term problems.

5.  The OD effort must rest on the application of <u>accepted behavioral science knowledge</u>.

# QUESTION 7

*Concerning New Course
Design Assignments*

VII. "Please identify those individuals who will be responsible for designing new courses."

## Examples of Design Team Assignments

It is our understanding that NRC may order new courses to be developed from the list in solicitation # RS-PER-90-329. Exact assignments of new course designs will depend on which new courses are ordered by the NRC Contract Officer. If, for instance, the one-day course entitled "Diagnosing Management of Power Plants" (see the Original Proposal section 3.2.19) is ordered, the design team would consist of William King and Casey Mann (see additional resume submission which is enclosure 1). If the "Middle Manager Management" course is ordered (see OP section 3.2.20), the design team would be Donald Spears and Casey Mann or consultant Marjorie Schiller. If the "Managing Diversity" course is ordered, the designers would be Karen Gaskins Jones and Donald Spears. If the "Managing in a High Technology Environment" course is ordered, Sephena Jordan and Casey Mann would be assigned the design responsibilities. Other design consultants are available such as Robert Maddox, Deborah Bloom, Susan Weeks and Jawara Lumumba. As Project Manager, Nicholas Mann would oversee all new course design activities.

## Staff Availability For New Course Design

Note the table in the Question 2 section of this best and final document. The last column is entitled "Average Non-Billables ..." It shows forty-five and one-half (45.5) days per month of average non-billable (flexible use) time. This gives us the capability to accommodate peak work periods (when the staff's monthly billables are above the average) and still take on additional assignments such as new course designs.

# ENCLOSURE ONE

*Additional Staff Resume:*
*Casey Mann, II*

Resume

## CASEY MANN, II

PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

- o Total Quality Management Consultation and Training
- o Supervisory Skills Training
- o Meeting Methodologies Including Automated Enhancement Techniques

WORK EXPERIENCE

1990 - present:  Senior Associate, Resolution Dynamics, Inc.

o    Working on establishment of a Total Quality
     Management Institute.  Also involved in
     various consultation projects with other
     staff consultants within the firm.

1987 - 1989    U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of
               Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization,
               Associate Director

o    Was responsible for departmental leadership
     of   activities designed to improve the
     competitiveness of small, minority, and
     women-owned businesses through their
     equitable participation in the U.S.D.A.'s
     procurement opportunities.  Supervised staff
     of up to eight.  Achieved a level of $1.7
     billion in participation by small, minority
     and women-owned businesses in contracts with
     the U.S.D.A.

1981 - 1985    U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
               Development, Office of Small and
               Disadvantaged Business Utilization,
               Special Assistant

o    Was responsible for U.S. Department of
     Housing and Urban Development's overall
     operational compliance with Federal business
     development program policy.  Supervised staff
     of 6.  Established aggressive nation wide
     advertising program targeted to minority and
     community oriented print media; increased
     accuracy of procurement goal and achievement
     data; coordinated multi-agency task force
     evaluation, approval and implementation of
     subcontracting plan.

1976 - 1981    Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation,
               Planning Expert

o    Provided long term support to increasing the
     diversity of firms providing architectural
     and engineering design and construction
     management services in the redevelopment of
     Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C.

1969 - 1976    University of the District of Columbia,
               Department of Community Planning and
               Development,
               Chairperson and Associate Professor

EDUCATION AND ADDITIONAL TRAINING

o    New York University (Post Masters Degree Studies)

o    Howard University, MCP, 1972

o    Howard University, B.Arch, 1967

o    Second Annual Federal Conference on Quality
     Improvement, Office of Management and the Budget, 1989

o    Senior Executive Briefing: Total Quality
     Management in the Federal Government, Federal
     Quality Institute, 1988

o    Application of Deming's Methods to Service
     Organizations, George Washington University, 1988

o    Dr. W. Edwards Deming's Methods for Management of
     Productivity and Quality, George Washington,
     University, 1988

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND CERTIFICATIONS

o    American Institute of Certified Planners

o    American Planning Association

o    Deming User's Group

o    American Society for Quality Control

# ENCLOSURE TWO

*Proposal Section 4.0 (Revised)*

This material supersedes section 4.0 in RDI's original proposal, and is included in response to discussion at the August 21st "best-and-final" conference.

4.0    Program Management

The RDI services under the Supervisory and Management Training and Organizational Development Project will be managed in accordance with the principles and techniques of quality improvement and control increasingly utilized by government and private industry throughout the world. The primary focus will be on meeting the expectations of the client by providing services deemed valuable by the client. To assure this focus, RDI will monitor key points in the service delivery process not only to maintain present value but also to continuously seek opportunities to increase the value of our services to our client, NRC.

RDI is a small firm by design. The size permits top management to give each project personal attention. The Project Manager (also President of the firm), Nicholas Mann, will be the primary liaison with the NRC Project Officer and will be ultimately accountable for the effective performance of all personnel utilized by the firm to deliver services on this project.

The logical framework matrix on the following page in section 4.1 (next page) shows the broad strategy that will guide RDI's project management. Our narrative discussion of this project design introduces section 4.1.

4.1    RDI's project design for NRC Supervisory, Managerial and Organizational Development Programs.

## OVERALL GOAL

NRC must have highly effective supervisors, managers and units in order to meet its critical mission.

## PURPOSE

The program will deliver state-of-the-art training and organizational development services (specifically identified in 21 separate areas) to the staff and various units of the NRC.

## PROJECT OUTPUTS

These are the necessary and sufficient conditions that must be brought about in order to meet the higher level purpose of the project.

I. Management and Administrative Outputs

A.    RDI Staff work has been coordinated, and individual and group performance has met or exceeded clear and measurable standards needed in order for achievement of higher-level project goal.

# LOGICAL FRAMEWORK PLANNING
## MATRIX
### (NRC Supervisory, Managerial & OD Programs - Project)

| Narrative Summary (NS) | Measureable Indicators (OVI) | Means of Verification (MOV) | Important Assumptions |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Goal:**<br>1 Highly effective managers and supervisors in the NRC. | 1.1 | 1.1 | (goal to supergoal)<br>1.1 A well led & managed agency, with effectively supervised people will meet its mission. |
| **Purpose:**<br>1 Effective delivery of 17 current courses, design of additional new courses, and offering of organizational development services to the NRC. | 1.1 All legal and contractual requirements stipulated in RFP and formalized in NRC/RDI contract are met. | 1.1 Monthly contract review by NRC CO and RDI PO. | (purpose to goal)<br>1.1 Target trainees & units enroll and proactively participate and receive support after training by units and managers. |
| **Outputs:**<br>1 Project effectively managed & administered. | 1.1 Service timeline met and RDI staff as well as agency CO satisfied. | 1.1 Document weekly project reviews, plus minimum monthly NRC CO/ RDI PO meeting conclusions | (output to purpose)<br>1.1 Agency requirements remain consistent with RFP, plus no crisis outside of control of NRC/RDI (such as AOG) precludes performance. |
| 2 Materials have met identified participant and agency needs. | 2.1 Agency CO, program participants and managers satisfied. | 2.1 Direct CO feedback, in class participant feedback & written evaluations. | 2.1 Needs have been accurately diagnosed & expressed. |
| 3 Instructional presentations and facilitation of learning has been effective. | 3.1 Participant feedback indicates understanding, appropriate mastery & satisfaction. | 3.1 Direct in class observation of participant responses, professional judgement, plus written evaluations. | 3.1 Participant groups are reasonably cooperative with instructor & each other. |
| 4 OD interventions have provided means for internal problems solving & growth in NRC units. | 4.1 Unit satisfaction with process by point of disengagement; plus follow-through. | 4.1 Unit manager response, unit staff response, feedback from manager of unit manager. | 4.1 Participating units proactively take responsibility for commitment & follow-through. |
| 5 New course design have met agency needs. | 5.1 Course content & delivery is substantial and relevant to objectives and needs. | 5.1 Pilot feedback & professional judgement. | 5.1 Diagnosis verifies agency expressed needs. |
| **Activities:**<br>1.1 Develop and institute systems for products, personnel, process & paper. Establish and institute OC through standard setting, monitoring & feedback, and corrective measures. | **Inputs/Resources:**<br>Prompt payment of funds as stipulated in RDI/NRC contract.<br><br>Professional and admin staff as identified in proposal delivering not less than _____ staff days. | 1.1 | (activity to output)<br>1.1 PM time allocation of 4 day average per month is adequate. |
| 2.1 Assess all current materials against course objectives. Adjust based on knowledge of state-of-art principles. Further adjust after use, based on participant and agency feedback. | NRC training facilities.<br><br>RDI administrative facilities and infrastructure. | 2.1 | 2.1 No sessions offered for courses requiring more than minor revision, prior to contracting for and completion of necessary major revisions. |
| 3.1 Prep for conduct of each session by insuring readiness of materials; review of instructor guide and notes; rehearsal of identified trouble spots and revised segments; and on the spot adjustments based on in class dynamics. | | 3.1 | 3.1 Scheduling of sessions will be negotiated between agency and RDI so that staff have reasonable & adequate notice, and time for prep. |
| 4.1 Execute diagnosis, choice of interventions, prep and delivery of interventions, support during follow-through & then disengage contact (include measuring results). | | 4.1 | 4.1 Top people in units requesting OD services will support and actively participate. RDI consultant role will be understood by all involved as facilitative and not assuming authority for making management choices. |
| 5.1 Execute ISD design process, culminating with pilot testing of new designs and appropriate revision. | | 5.1 | 5.1 NRC resources (people, access to relevant documentation or sites, etc) will be readily available to RDI design team in support of new course development process. |

B. All systems and processes (such as communication with agency PO, RDI cadre team meetings, financial and accounting processes, materials preparation and delivery, etc.) have been managed and coordinated and are smoothly operating.

C. Programmatic data (including course materials and references, contract performance measurement information, records of important communications with agency staff, and business and contracting information) have all been maintained so that it is readily available and retrievable.

II. Service and Product Outputs

A. Quality training and revision of current courses.

B. Quality organizational development services and products.

C. Quality new course design and development.

## INPUTS

These are the things that we need (either to have -- or to do) in order to cause the outputs to happen. Inputs are broken into three categories: money, personnel and activities by the project staff. For discussion of money inputs, see cost proposal. Activities are depicted, in sequence on the project schedule in section 4.2. Personnel (staff) resources are as follows:

| Project Mgt. & Administration | Design and Redesign | Trainers | Organizational Development Consultants |
|---|---|---|---|
| Full Time: Nicholas Mann & Betty Burke | Nicholas Mann, William King, Karen Gaskins Jones, Donald Spears, Sephena Jordan, and Casey Mann | Primary on at least one course: Nicholas Mann, William King, Karen Gaskins Jones, Donald Spears, Sephena Jordan & Robert Maddox | Lead Consultants: Sephena Jordan, Nicholas Mann, Donald Spears & Casey Mann |
| Part Time: Frances Richmann & Mary Stojiic | | | Backups: Chuck Phillips, Susan Clark & Marjorie Schiller |
| | | Backups: Marjorie Schiller, Casey Mann, Susan Weeks, Jawara Lumumba & Deborah Bloom | |

4.2    A sample one-year schedule for delivery of services to NRC

RDI has a proven ability to meet project schedules and to utilize personnel with the necessary expertise to complete projects such as the NRC Supervisory, Managerial and Organizational Development Program.

The GANTT chart on the following page shows such a proposed schedule with assignments for the first contract year. This chart indicates how we will achieve the desired results on a reasonable schedule within the contract period of performance.

# First Year Projected Schedule of Activities

Resolution Dynamics, Inc.                                   for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commision

| ACTIVITIES | TIMES/YR | ASSIGNED | OCT | NOV | DEC | JAN | FEB | MAR | APR | MAY | JUN | JUL | AUG | SEP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Management & Admin. | On-going | NM/BB/WK/etc. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – SHR | 3 | NM | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Mgt. Wkshp. | 3 | BM | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Change | 2 | SJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Conflict Res. | 2 | DS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Int. Skills | 2 | WK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – PreSOP | 1 | KJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Perf. Mgt. | 2 | SJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Small Gp. Dyn. | 2 | DS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Time | 1 | KJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Stress | 1 | SJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Meetings | 2 | WK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Select Int. | 1 | SJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Appraisal | 2 | NM | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Plan/Cope | 1 | KJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct/Follow OD | 2 | SJ/NM/DS/CM | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Com. for Insp. | 3 | KJ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Wk. Tm. Coord. | 2 | DS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prep/Conduct – Infog. | 2 | WK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assume 1-Day Design Not Ordered | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Two Day New Design | assume 2 | To be assigned | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assume 3-Day Design Not Ordered | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## 4.3 Project Management Experience

The management and logistical features resulting from the size of this project are similar to our work with the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) of the Department of Agriculture. The content features are similar to many projects we have conducted for organizations such as Smithsonian Institution, Howard University, Arlington County Virginia Government, and the District of Columbia Government, as well as our many projects for the NRC.

Regarding our ability to effectively manage a project of this nature and size, we were the training sub-contractor for two years on a multi-million dollar project funded by ASCS. In the first year of this project we managed and coordinated the activities of a staff of eight trainers and four support personnel. Four courses in a new automated technology were developed using ISD principles.

A crucial management feature was the selection of staff with the requisite training credentials, as well as with sensitivity to people issues such as resistance to new technology. This training cadre was then trained to administer the new curricula.

In executing the training, we went to 19 different counties in six different states across the country. A total of 48 workshops were conducted in the summer of 1987, with 950 participants. In 1988 there were 39 workshops and a total of 650 participants.

The task involved establishing training sites, coordinating time schedules, and shipping written training materials, computers and peripherals to all training sites. The responsibility for this coordination fell on our staff, principally on William King. Five of the eight staff used on this project (King, Mann, Spears, Jones and Weeks) are involved in the RDI cadre for the NRC Supervisory, Managerial and Organizational Development Programs project.

Quoting from the summary evaluation report for the first year (1987), the following captures the level of quality resulting from RDI's management and execution of this project:

*"Overall, the buying point and county trainees gave the workshops high marks for the quality of the trainers, the content of training, and the level of preparedness of the trainees at the end of the training ... positive contributions to training objectives were:*

- *Experienced professional trainers with excellent communication/teaching skills ...*

- *The presentation format of training curriculum with a mix of lectures, audio-visual aides, group exercises and individually-based work ...*

> • *Emphasis on training attitudes as well as skills so*
> *trainees would develop a feeling of confidence and*
> *a positive attitude toward the project."*

In summarizing the training session of the evaluation, the report said that our trainers' skill:

> *"was considered by trainees and government/industry*
> *observers as a significant factor in the overall success of the*
> *government-sponsored training."*

## 4.4 Assignment of Experienced Staff

As previously stated, the content features requiring subject matter expertise are similar to many projects that we have worked on for organizations such as Smithsonian Institution, Howard University, Arlington County Virginia Government, and the District of Columbia Government, as well as our many projects for the NRC.

The table which follows summarizes the experiences of key staff which prepare them for their assignments in the NRC Supervisory, Managerial and Organizational Development program.

## Experience Summary

| Name | Deliverable Number | Course Title or Service | Experience |
|---|---|---|---|
| N. Mann | 1 | SHR | Designed course, instructed 8 years, NRC |
| | 13 | Appraising Emp | Designed and taught 3 years, NRC |
| R. Maddox | 2 | Management Workshop | Instructed approx 5 years, NRC |
| S. Jordan | 3 | Managing Change | Approx 5 years exp, TVA -- Exec Sem Ctr -- DOE |
| | 7 | Performance Management | Same as above |
| | 10 | Managing Stress | Same as above |
| | 12 | Selection Interviewing | Same as above |
| | 15 | OD | Approx 10 years exp, DOE & EPA |
| D. Spears | 4 | Conflict Res | Apx 5 yrs exp, Smithsonian & NRC |
| | 8 | Small Group Dynamics | AK Rice Trained, 15 yrs exp, State Dept, Peace Corp, USAID |
| | 17 | Work Team Coordinator Workshop | Approx 1.5 yrs exp, NRC |
| K. Jones | 6 | PreSOP | Approx 5 yrs exp, Wash Int Ctr, Dept of State |
| | 9 | Managing Mgt Time | Approx 3 yrs exp, Boston Co. |
| | 14 | PlanCope | Approx 3 yrs exp, NYNEX, NE Tel Co & Picatinny Arsenal |
| W. King | 5 | Interviewing Skills | Current course is RDI design |
| | 11 | Conducting Mtg | Same as above |
| | 18 | Gath Info for Inspectors | Approx 1.5 yrs exp, NRC |

4.5     Structure of the organization, areas of responsibility for general and project management

**RDI has demonstrated the effectiveness of its organizational structure to accomplish the tasks involved with the NRC Supervisory, Managerial and Organizational Development Programs project.**

RDI's president is charged by the corporate board of directors to manage the business and programmatic affairs of the company. The chart on the next page represents the formal structure of the corporation.

**CONTACT FOR CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION**

M. Nicholas Mann
Resolution Dynamics, Inc.
1777 T Street NW
Washington, D.C.  20009

(202) 483-7550

Contractor's Payment Address:

Resolution Dynamics, Inc.
1777 T Street NW
Washington, D.C.  20009

# RDI Organizational Chart

```
                    ┌─────────────────────┐
                    │  Board of Directors │
                    └─────────────────────┘
                               │
                    ┌─────────────────────┐
                    │     President       │
                    └─────────────────────┘
                               │
        ┌──────────────────────┼──────────────────────┐
┌───────────────┐      ┌──────────────┐        ┌──────────────┐
│ Executive V.P │      │  Designated  │        │    Office    │
│               │      │Project Officer│       │   Manager    │
│ V.P. Finance  │      └──────────────┘        └──────────────┘
│               │       ┌──────┬──────┐               │
│ V.P Business  │   ┌────────┐ ┌──────────┐    ┌──────────────┐
│ Development   │   │Program │ │Consultants│   │   Admin.     │
└───────────────┘   │Support │ └──────────┘    │   Support    │
                    │ Staff  │                 │    Staff     │
                    └────────┘                 └──────────────┘
```

**Board of Directors**

**President**

**Executive V.P**

**V.P. Finance**

**V.P Business Development**

**Designated Project Officer**

**Program Support Staff**

**Consultants**

**Office Manager**

**Admin. Support Staff**