Minutes

12:00 – 12:10  LUNCH – Provided by Rig QA International

Welcome & Call to Order
Facility Orientation/Safety Briefing & IADC Antitrust Policy
Pamela Wakefield, Patterson-UTI, Committee Chairperson

12:10 – 12:45  Leadership KSA Subcommittee Update
Sherree Ahart-Noble Drilling

Sherree Ahart (Noble’s Leadership Development) provided an update on Leadership KSA Subcommittee activities. The subcommittee will be sending out a survey to solicit ideas about how to identify potential and develop great leaders.

Ahart then shared the KSA Leadership Subcommittee’s proposed model for leadership and discussed the two Leadership courses that have become popular at the company.

Companies spend $130 billion worldwide on corporate training on an annual basis and leadership development training accounts for 35% of the spend, which is $45.5 Billion Annually. (Bersin, 2014)

What kind of leader would you want to follow? The meeting participants brainstormed the ideal qualities for leaders and discovered that only one of the traits (“competent”) involved technical expertise.

Power of Focus and Context Matters

Context:
- Increasing Regulatory Requirements
- Advances in Technology
- The Talent Gap
- Evolving Customer Needs
- Volatility of the Market

The Vision:
We provide a framework for the advancement of leaders within the oil and gas industry to strengthen the culture of safety, talent development, environmental stewardship, social responsibility, performance and reliability.
KSA Leadership Subcommittee proposed model: Micro, Mezzo, Macro levels. The committee is using a top-down approach, addressing Individual Leadership, Team Leadership, and Organizational Leadership.

KSAs to focus on Leaders:
Interpersonal Engagement (with examples at each level):
- Receive ideas and feedback from peers and supervisors.
- Recognize and respect differences of others.
- Communicate clearly by checking for understanding.
- Demonstrate assertiveness to improve interactions and outcomes.

Talent Development
Performance Ownership
Professionalism

The answer to “so what?”
- Clear Expectations
- A Common Language
- Meaning and Purpose
- Support

Question: How do you manage the system for developing leaders? Noble has software that they use to help manage their system. “People don’t leave companies; they leave bad bosses.” The Subcommittee’s goal is to finish their work on KSAs for Leadership by February 2016.

IADC Updates
IADC Staff

Patty Tydings provided an update on the new Crane-Rigger Accreditation Program. By the end of 2015, all but the Crane Inspector content will be ready for committee feedback.

Brooke Polk presented on the history of the WellSharp development. WellSharp is now based on the trainee’s job position. There are five levels: Awareness, Introductory, Driller, Supervisor, and Engineer. WellSharp currently covers only the Drilling Operations side, and the Well Servicing side will be rolled into WellSharp in 2016. The new Well Control Knowledge Database allows us to monitor passing rates, instructor effectiveness, and other metrics that allow us to continually improve. Trainees can now take their Assessment Report back to their company and further develop in areas where they had knowledge gaps.

The Panel members will share their lessons learned and the challenges they are still having.

Questions:
Is there a deadline for the online testing? Yes. On 1 November 2015, WellCAP will cease to exist for Drilling Operations. Those courses will no longer be offered. Companies may request an exemption for a variety of reasons, and then they may be
approved for the exemption (e.g., to give a paper test). By December 2015, all providers must be using the online test.

**Question:** How do you monitor the questions and make changes to them if a problem is reported?

**Answer:** IADC has a workgroup that meets weekly to look at questions that have been for review. The questions is “turned off” in the system until the workgroup can identify any potential problems with a question.

**Question:** Will any of the questions that have been altered be communicated to the trainees?

**Answer:** The trainees can immediately review their results and the specific questions missed, but after that review they cannot take those specific questions with them.

IADC is not allowing questions to be copied and distributed. There is an appeal process and a review process for exam questions. The full review of these questions will be complete by November.

Instructors are able to read a question that a student doesn’t understand and then interpret for the student what the question is asking, if necessary. This is happening less and less because the questions that had issues have been removed or rephrased.

To appeal a question, a student and/or instructor may submit the question to IADC. Then, the Appeals Panel reviews the question and votes on whether or not it should be addressed further. If the majority of panel members believe the question should be reviewed, then it is added to the list for the next Panel meeting, and the question is turned off in the database. The form for appealing a question can be found on the secure WellSharp page.

Marcus Mason explained the process further and how it is intended to work. Training providers can see the topics students are missing, but the actual questions are available only for a short period of time immediately after the students submits the test and gets his or her score. Even if a student and instructor disagree about a question, the student can still submit a question for review.

**Question:** How can the instructors submit proctor issues?

**Answer:** Email Patty Tydings the name of the proctor, date of the exam, and describe the issue. Ms. Tydings will address it with Lloyd’s Register.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13:15 – 13:20</th>
<th>BREAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13:20 – 14:50</th>
<th>PANEL: WellSharp Lessons Learned: Effective Training Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mark Venettozzi-Lead Well Control Instructor, BP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Marcus Mason-CEO, Smith Mason Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kevin Fitzgerald-Business Development Manager, Intertek Industry Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roger Sanchez -Well Control Training Instructor, Rig QA International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frank Klepper-President, Petroleum College International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mark Venetozzi** presented WellSharp’s challenges, advantages, and other observations from the perspective of BP. BP’s Petrotechnical Academy currently provides Supervisory Level, Drilling-only Combined BOP well control training in-
They began WellSharp classes May 18th, 2015, and employ a DS5000 Rig Floor Simulator. They have conducted 10 courses and certified 58 individuals, which includes 1 class in Alaska. Existing classes will be supplemented by addition of Workover and Completions soon.

The initial challenges BP had with implementing the new WellSharp standard were as follows:

- Incorrect computer browsers for testing (internal BP problem)
- Proctor codes and availability (Lloyd’s Register)
- Poorly worded test questions
- Vast majority of problems have now been resolved:
  - Browsers updated
  - Communications with Lloyd’s established
  - Test questions reviewed by committee

BP has identified the following advantages of WellSharp:

- Standardization of training and testing, both in skills and knowledge
- Centralized records
  - Certificates and scores
  - Data analysis now possible
- Immediate student feedback
- Excellent and immediate support from IADC
- All electronic - no paper!

Topics for Discussion:

Avoid teaching to the test: He suggests retirement of questions. He fears teaching to the test will become more common as the test questions are copied and distributed. IADC’s goal is to do everything they can to prevent cheating. IADC is investigating every situation that is reported. Mr. Venatozzi recommends that we periodically retire questions and replace them with new questions and that we add multiple variations of questions requiring calculations. If we keep the correctly worded question, we can change the variables and answer choices and have new questions. He also recommends revisions of the formula sheets. He doesn’t like the way the formula sheets are written because the current one makes it too easy for trainees to apply the calculation without really understanding the concept behind the calculation. He also recommends “proctor shuffling.” Lloyd’s goal is to shuffle the provokers, so provokers should not see the same proctor every time. He recommends that we simplify the test question appeal/review process. Can we create a button for a trainee to click during the test and then provide his reasoning for appealing the test question? Then, if the instructor agrees that the question needs to be appealed, he or she can submit his or her support of appealing the question for review.

Question: If you have a student who passes with a 75 on the knowledge test but that student onlymarginally passes the skills assessment, do you attempt to provide some remediation for that individual?

Answer: The student’s supervisor gets the report and can send that student back for some additional training.

Marcus Mason presented on Smith-Mason’s perspective of the new WellSharp training and assessment standard. Mr. Mason pointed out that he is not a well control
instructor. He is a former mud engineer.

Differences between WellCAP and WellSharp: When taught as intended, WellCAP was a good program, but WellSharp has more credibility because of the proctors and the online, standardized testing. People who pass the WellSharp test have pride for doing so. They feel that they have accomplished something. That transfers to the instructors. They take great pride in getting each student to pass the test. WellSharp is also a better program because it ensures comprehensive well control teaching and provides immediate feedback to students, so they know exactly what they need to focus on going forward. The value all comes down to accountability on the part of the training providers and the industry.

Smith-Mason’s issues essentially had to do with their not being ready for the database. Students now have to deal with the pressure of time limits and proctors. The instructors have had to rethink how they teach. They had to adjust their course scheduling and are having to improve their communication with clients.

Mr. Mason says there is no one best way to teach the content. You may have six people in the room and six different learning styles. Instructors have to be ready to adjust their teaching strategies.

What went right? Smith-Mason had buy-in at all levels. They had to fight misconceptions to students and employees. They had to provide instructors with some development to prepare them for the changes. They have been updating their classroom techniques and increase interactivity among students in small groups (which comes down to homework). Smith-Mason sends their students back to their rooms with an additional 2 or 3 hours of homework every night. They can work together, and they can stay and work through homework with instructors. Smith-Mason’s results are driven by customer service, customization, etc.

“If you just want to memorize questions, that’s not what we’re here for. You have to understand the principles.” –Randy Smith

Question: A participant asked what is really different about WellSharp, aside from the testing.

Answer: Frank Klepper explained that simulator requirements are very different, and they are the key to understanding the principles behind well control. In the past, there were some schools that said they provided hands-on learning, but they really did not. The number of trainees allowed on a simulator at a time is different, and the amount of time required for simulation is increased. Every trainee now has an opportunity to practice on and be assessed on the simulator individually.

Question: What can we do about individuals who are very hands on and talented but do not test well?

Answer: Mr. Mason said Smith-Mason instructors put their trainees in front of a computer all week long, so the test day is not the first time they have had to use the computer. Mr. Klepper provided an example about a Driller who was going through his class and had to be retested on the simulator because he froze on the simulator. The second time he tested, he was focused only on what had happened in the previous simulation and froze up again. That student had to retake the whole class, but it was worth it because these trainees are authentically tested and needs to get past the freezing up issue before being responsible for shutting in a real well. Usually, the
students freeze up on the online knowledge test, so they must be introduced to using the computer before the exam. IADC now has sample assessments available on the WellSharp webpage, so the students can practice taking the test on the computer before the real test.

The group discussed the fact that companies should prepare their employees before sending them to well control training.

**Michael Arnold** (Intertek) presented next. He has been a well control instructor for many years and for several different companies. He was very happy when IADC implemented the changes through WellSharp. Intertek has been providing WellSharp since July. Mr. Arnold offered to send the committee his answers to all the questions. The only thing he believes IADC and IWCF have missed in the IOGP recommendations is the need to improve adult learning strategies, to incorporate adult learning theory into their training. We cannot teach adults the same way we teach 5th graders. Intertek has incorporated these strategies, and it’s working very well. No more “Sage on the Stage.” Now have the “Guide on the Side.” They have moved away from 500 PPTs. Now, they allow students to control their learning environment more. They do more facilitating than they do traditional lecturing. Adults do not like to sit in one spot for so long. They also focus on test-taking strategies because many of the trainees have not taken an online test. We have to teach them about time-management and reading the questions very carefully to make sure they understand what is being asked.

What has not worked well? Traditional lecturing doesn’t work.

Lessons learned? It’s important to address the timing and pacing of content delivery in order to get through all the content in the time allotted.

They had to buy 55 laptops and get them all set up on the internet. They have had the internet connectivity drop only twice so far during a test.

Modifications: They have added a great deal more homework. They have added topics that were not previously covered (e.g., barrier management).

To ensure student success, they have to make sure the instructor can deliver the content in ways the students need to learn it. They are more learner-centered. The instructors provide a great deal of extra help and all want their students to pass the test, so they make themselves available to the students.

It was a big help when the definitions and acronyms were provided.

They have had some challenges with students who do not speak English as their first language. That challenge on top of all the other challenges is often too much. They also sometimes get non-drilling personnel, and those trainees struggle because of their lack of experience.

Mr. Arnold invites us all to visit one of their training centers to see how they are teaching WellSharp.

**Question:** Are additional personnel being trained?

**Answer:** There is not a change in the student profile, but because WellSharp is more rigorous, the non-drilling personnel are more challenged to pass the test and understand the concepts.
Question: Can students go back to previous questions later in the test.

Answer: Yes. They can skip questions or go back to questions, and the system also helps by allowing the students to see questions that were missed.

Discussion: Can we require someone to sit in class for 9 hours and then go and do 3 hours of homework every day? Do we have to pay them for the homework hours? Will we get in trouble from the Labor Board for that? Adults learn better when they participate in class and then take that new knowledge back to work through on their own.

Note: The homework is voluntary, but everyone does it because it will help them pass the test and understand the concepts better.

Mr. Klepper says PCI has set up an online portal with the homework, so they can see exactly how far each student got and how many hours they spent on the homework; then, they can correlate this back to success on the test.

Before WellSharp, trainees knew which training providers to go to if they didn’t want to have to work for their certificate.

Roger Sanchez (RigQA) presented. Mr. Sanchez focused on human factors. RigQA limits their courses to 8 students, so the instructors have more time to interact with each student. Their simulations are saved at critical points, so each skill can be practiced until the trainee is competent.

Mr. Sanchez said it is time for adult learning to come to the forefront in our discussions. Adults want to know the value of their learning; how does it apply to their job? They focus on problem-solving and ensure that the problems they are solving are real-life problems. RigQA does not want students to memorize a procedure, but rather use critical thinking to solve authentic problems. The metrics provided by the new database allows training providers to see where they are and where they can improve. RigQA would like to see us add analytics into the system for the simulator skills assessments. Adults learn best when then subject is of immediate use.


In WellCAP, with the absence of a standardized test, there was no way to know who was doing what was required and who was not. WellSharp has also brought to us some good curriculum changes. The curriculum workgroups worked to align the curriculum to actual job responsibilities. Like children, adults still want to know what is going to be on the test. Therefore, the workgroups have ensured that the learning objectives are tied to test questions. PCI shows the learning objectives to students, so they know exactly what they are supposed to be taught and, therefore, what is on the test.

In 2013, PCI knew well control training was going to change and had a good idea of how it would change, and Mr. Klepper agreed that it needed to change. Without the standardized exam, there was no way to really improve the training. Now, trainers are forced to teach the curriculum. Mr. Klepper was concerned primarily for his south Texas workforce and their ability to pass an online standardized exam because of language issues, differences in terminology, lack of experience with online tests, etc. Mr. Klepper says about 40% of the trainees who come through his class still don’t have a computer in their home. They know how to do their job and are hard workers, but they are not familiar with computers. Now, however, these guys are going to either have to learn how to use computers, or retire. Computers are used more and more on
today’s rigs.

Additional important differences between children and adults and their learning is the pressures, motivations, and time constraints on the adults. The new WellSharp curriculum shows these adults exactly what is going to be on the test. If these learning objectives can be met and the trainee can become familiar with online testing, then they should be able to pass the test.

14:50 – 15:20 Panel Discussion Questions

WellSharp Progress  
_Brenda Kelly, IADC_

Brenda Kelly reported that there are now 111 providers converted to WellSharp and that the program is operating globally.

The following deadlines have been set for converting to WellSharp:
- 15 October 2015 – Accreditation closed for non-responsive providers
- 1 November 2015 – Delivery of WellCAP for Drilling Operations well control courses will cease
- 1 January 2016 – Accreditation closed for all providers of WellCAP for Drilling Operations well control courses not converted to WellSharp

WellSharp Database metrics indicate the following:
- Supervisor courses are 77% of the courses taken.
- Driller courses are 12% of the courses taken.
- Introductory courses are 11% of the courses taken.

The passing rate is averaging 80%.

IADC has the ability to compare performance among training providers and individual instructors and to see which questions the students are struggling with. Monitoring of test questions is ongoing. Here the performance on Driller-Surface Stack test questions are reported. The lowest performance is seen on the topic of connection gas. Questions have not been answered correctly any time the question appeared on an exam.

The proctoring program is now global and employs more than 100 Wounded Warriors in the US.

E-Learning requirements have been implemented.
Online Sample Exams are available.
Instructor Probation & Revocation of Approval has occurred as the result of reported cheating.

IADC encourages your feedback on test questions regardless of student test score. Using the test question review form, users of the testing database are able to submit any question he or she would like reviewed by the question review team for potential editing. It is important to include the grey test code number found at the end of each question along with a detailed explanation of why you are requesting the review.

IADC has a question review panel, separate from the appeals panel, that consist of Operators, Drilling Contractors (onshore and offshore), and training providers. The
International Association of Drilling Contractors

review team is in the process of reviewing every question in the database as well as reviewing any questions that come in based on user feedback provided to IADC. Your feedback is both welcomed and seen as an asset to the success of the WellSharp test and testing process.

The WellCAP Plus Facilitator course will satisfy the new train-the-trainer requirement for WellSharp instructors. Dates have been scheduled through 2016 for the course. Contact Patty Tydings to register: pattty.tydings@iadc.org

A new Remote Offline Assessment Device (ROADe) has been created. This system will allow the online assessment to be administered in remote locations that have little or no internet.

What’s Next:
Test Translations
- Spanish & Portuguese in 2015
- 4 languages in 2016

Courses development
- Engineering course
- Human Factors module
- Supplements for MPD and Supervisory responsibilities of Onshore Drillers

Instructor Knowledge Assessment
Train-the-Trainer requirements
Curricula revisions
Completion and Workover
Coiled Tubing
Snubbing
Wireline
WellCAP Plus
WellSharp Audits

16:00 – 16:10 Future Meeting Topics
- HSE&T Joint Committee Meeting-February 2016
- Co-Chairman Nominations for 2016

16:10 ADJOURNMENT

Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ludmila</td>
<td>ATLANTICA MANAGEMENT (USA) INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mark</td>
<td>Venetozzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Janssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Erwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret</td>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All meetings must have a written agenda that is circulated prior to the meeting. Attendees must strictly follow the agenda. Topics not on the agenda must be deferred until a later meeting.

Meeting minutes will be posted on the Committee’s website following endorsement by Committee leadership and meeting attendees. Attendees should be aware that: 1. There may be audio recordings of meetings, for purposes of facilitating capture of meeting minutes; and 2. The final published minutes will include a record of who attended the meeting. The audio recordings shall be destroyed immediately following endorsement of the minutes.

IADC Committee activities are governed by IADC’s Antitrust Policy and Guidelines. Click here for information on the policy and guidelines.