**Report on an Independent Review of the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC) Department and Site Safety Health and Environment (SHE) Committees.**

**Prepared by Allan Davies of AC Services (ACS)**

**1.0 *Introduction***

The safety committee structure within STFC has been in place and operating reasonably well since its inception. However a decision was taken by the STFC SHE committee to ‘undertake a review of the efficiency and effectiveness of the SHE committees. Furthermore the review was intended to be facilitative of the ongoing development of the Department and Site SHE committees (and where they exist, Environment Committees). The intention is to assist them in reviewing their own efficiency and effectiveness, seeking opportunities for streamlining, opportunities to share good practice between them and the interface between them and their key stakeholders.

Specific areas of interest to explore suggested included, and not limited to:

* Visibility and leadership provided by the SHE Committee within the Department;
* Delivery of functions detailed in the Department SHE Committee Terms of Reference (ToR);
* Relationship between Department SHE Committee and their respective Department Directors;
* Relationship between the Department SHE Committee and the Site SHE/H&S Committees (where they differ);
* Relationship between the Department SHE Committee and SHE Group, level of support provided, expected etc.; and
* Relationship between Department SHE Committee and relevant non-staff - tenants, contractors and facility users.

**2.0 *Process***:

* It was suggested that the process for undertaking the review would commence at the bottom and work upwards.
* Desktop exercise reviewing and gathering committee paperwork (STFC SHE Meeting Share Point Site)
* Discussion/engagement with a range of staff across departments/sites to understand how visible, communicated and understood the role of the SHE Committees are – this could be undertaken through the use of an on-line questionnaire (Survey Monkey or SHE Group have the capability to generate and deploy such through Totara – *not used because of the plethora of online surveys previously undertaken*).
* Discussion/engagement with the Department SHE Committees themselves, likely attending their meetings, which take place on a quarterly basis, generally the month after the quarter end, sharing staff feedback; and finally
* Discussion with Department Directors.
* Generation of conclusions/recommendations/report (SHE committee ToR update/self-assessment checklist), workshop for SHE Committee chairs to review report and share good practices and presentation to STFC SHE Committee
* It was suggested that the review will be conducted by an independent third party to a timetable that allows discussion with relevant staff and attendance of committees. The total elapsed time over which the review is taken is likely to be several months.

**3.0 *Executive Summary***

The review was conducted in line with the brief, which is incorporated into the body of this report and inevitably has taken some time in keeping with the quarterly timetabling of the SHE committee meetings. The cooperation shown by all who contributed a view or attended the relevant committee meetings was outstanding and demonstrates a commitment to ensuring the process is well recognised and works.

There are a number of recommendations which follow this summary, at section 5.0 but the process of safety committees monitoring health and safety is already quite robust in terms of ensuring safety issues are properly addressed, it appears less so for environment issues.

The general view expressed was that the committees were valuable and taken seriously; a good way to maintain a health and safety focus and a useful management tool for keeping up to date and helping to understand the health and safety issues within the individual departments.

A weakness within the present structure is the lack of a forum in line with guidance from the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) for consulting with employees on health and safety matters. Whilst the ToR for the Site Safety Committees establishes them as the forum through which such consultation takes place, reflecting the geographic structure of TU representation, the absence of significant numbers of TU H&S representatives diminishes their effectiveness and ability to meet the expectations of the HSE’s Approved Code of Practice for TU consultation.

Environmental management is beginning to follow in the wake of the safety and health committee structure and seems to be a good fit with the style of the work of the these committees. The question is whether environment is a matter purely for the Site safety committees fed directly by environment committee/s or part of the existing safety committee structure.

This report is based on:

* A combination of desk top research, face to face meetings with employees, which included SHE staff, managers, Departmental Safety Contacts (DSC), Trade Union (TU) representatives and directors were all undertaken to assist in arriving at a view about the operation of the committees. A summation of the general thoughts, views and comments from these individuals is contained within the body of the report;
* A total of twenty (20) interviews were carried out, mostly face to face at either the Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (RAL) or at the Daresbury Laboratory (DL) and a few by telephone or video conferencing; and
* In addition seven (7) of the Departmental Safety Committees and the Daresbury Site Safety Committee were attended and observed.

3.1 The Terms of Reference Site Safety Committees state:

* that Site Directors are appointed with responsibility to ‘monitor and overview safety performance at that site, to monitor the implementation of health and safety policy, including the effectiveness of local emergency procedures, and to bring to the Chief Executive’s attention the need for any action to improve health and safety performance.”
*– this seems to be working reasonably effectively, with some minor operational recommendations.*
* that ‘Laboratory/Site SHE Committees provide a means by which the STFC meets its responsibilities to consult freely with employee safety representatives.’
*– while this takes place the lack of TU H&S representatives and or employees safety representatives results in consultation being limited*.
* that the meetings ‘provide a forum for consultation and discussion of health and safety matters with employee safety representatives and representatives of employee safety.’
*– while this takes place the lack of TU H&S representatives and or employees safety representatives results in consultation being limited*.
* its purpose to promote co-operation and effective communication between employees, managers, facility users and tenants so that effective arrangements to protect their health, safety and welfare, and to support environmental sustainability, can be developed and implemented.
*- Communication beyond the committee to employees to promote co-operation does not appear to be strong*
* membership to include recognised trade union safety representatives and ‘representatives of employee safety.’
*– while this takes place the lack of TU H&S representatives and or employees safety representatives results in consultation being limited, typically this could be 1 or 2 representatives at each committee*.

3.3 The Terms of Reference Departmental Safety Committees state

* that committees provide a focus for the proactive management of Safety, Health and Environmental issues within a department.
*– this seems generally to be effective as a management ‘tool’ and as for the Site Safety Committees, with some recommendations*
* that committees be ‘chaired by the Director, or a senior manager/division head, membership should be representative of the area’s line management. Those parts of a department with significant SHE hazards in particular should be represented. Trade Union or employee safety representatives should be encouraged to attend.
*– none of the departmental committees attended were chaired by a Director and not all had TU/employee representation due to the limited number of TU H&S representatives*
* that a single SHE Committee is established to ensure that common approaches to SHE management are encouraged across sites, and that learning and good practise sharing between sites is encouraged
*- this is not the case for CSD and Technology which have separate RAL, DL and in the case of Technology ROE Departmental Safety Committees*
* The review was intended to look at opportunities for sharing best practice and streamline activity across the organisation. The ISIS/CLF (Central Laser Facility) partnership is a working example of where this happens.
*– this is not generally an area where other committees have a process for sharing good practice but may be worthy of further investigation.*

NB The ISIS and CLF committee is a single entity which crosses the discipline divide. However both Directors of ISIS and CLF as well as the Chair of the committee consider there are benefits in terms of sharing best practice, ways of working and experience that benefits both departments.

**4.0 *Approach by ACS***

4.1 Phase 1 - Research

* Attended Daresbury Laboratory with access to organisation information in relation to the SHE committees, their structures and ways of working.
* Met and interviewed relevant individuals who would support the committees.
* Attended the DL Site Safety Committee meeting and reviewed findings.
* Attended the ASTeC SHE departmental committee meeting at Daresbury Laboratory and reviewed findings.
* Attended the Technology SHE and PPD SHE departmental committees at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory and reviewed findings.
* Attended the CSD and Technology Committee at Daresbury Laboratory and reviewed findings.
* Identify initial key findings and generate an interim report which included proposals for further stages of the review in discussion between GF/AD.

4.2 Phase 2

* Attended the joint ISIS/CLF committee at Rutherford Appleton Laboratory and reviewed findings.
* Interviewed a number of Directors and the Chair of the ISIS/CLF committee, face to face.
* Interviewed a number of Trade Union representatives face to face.
* Telephone interviews with other Directors and senior managers.

**5.0 Recommendations**

R1. Consider the option of creating a Corporate H&S consultation committee that would meet annually and more frequently as needed on an ad hoc basis, to consider any issues that require consultation with all employees. The committee would follow the HSE guidance and be chaired by a senior manager with the relevant operation manager and safety/employee representatives. The site and departmental committees should continue to encourage TU safety representatives to attend as now.

R2. Arrange a meeting of all employee/TU safety reps to discuss the proposal in the above recommendation and agree on the most beneficial means of achieving the HSE expectations for employee consultation. Representatives, from both TU and employees should be encouraged to contribute to the proposal in order to achieve some common ownership.

R3. Produce a communication brief for the chairs of both site and departmental safety committees clarifying the role of the employee safety reps in the existing safety committees and also the intention to create a corporate consultation committee specifically for consultation with all employees.

R4. Consider the option of reducing the overall number of departmental committees by combining those that might be considered to have compatible H&S hazard profiles. These committees might operate on a similar basis to the current joint ISIS/CLF meeting and benefit by sharing good practice in terms of health and safety management..

R5. A system for encouraging committees to learn from each other should be established and opportunities for sharing best/good practice should be created. This could take the form of one committee member attending, once a year, another committee meeting to observe and share experiences from incidents and administrative practice.

R6. The departmental committees should have consistency in terms of the level of senior manager chairing the meeting and should be restricted to 2nd tier officers where Directors don’t undertake the role. In the latter case Directors should commit to attend one meeting a year for their area of responsibility to give a positive commitment to the importance of these meetings.

R7. Where departments are split across geographical areas there should be a combined operational committee, whether or not it is linked to another department as suggested in R4 above. The current situation with CSD for example does not engender consistency.

R8 There should be agreement that a common IT system, e.g. SHE Enterprise, or its replacement SHE Assure, is used for accurately recording all the activities of the safety committees and their actions, whether or not the information is also held at a local level.

R9 A review of what constitutes a valid recordable action and protocol for reporting and closing out should be developed. There should be a clear process for escalation To Director level where actions are repeatedly presented meeting after meeting.

R10 It would be more effective for reviewing actions corporately etc. to have a basic template, which each committee would use for agendas, minutes, action recording etc., to ensure essential information is captured and recorded in a consistent format. The template should ensure the record contains clear references – numbers/dates etc. so it is simple and effective to trace; consistent referencing would improve traceability; triggers for further action would help discipline.

R11 The SHE reports produced are comprehensive and important elements of the committee meetings; delivery of the information varies from line by line to just key issues. The report format should be reviewed to generate more dynamic reporting with clear priorities for action supported by information for members to note.

R12 ISIS safety managers and SHE managers operate in keeping with STFC health and safety policies and one of the ISIS managers is also the Departmental Safety Contact (DSC). There may be some benefit in occasional meetings involving SHE managers and ISIS Safety Managers to share information, learnings and best practice.

R13 the Departmental SHE committees work is dominated by H&S with little consideration of environmental management. A clear environmental performance plan with aims and objectives should be developed and managed by the STFC SHE Committee. The RAL Site Environment Committee should be re-established and departmental SHE committees should report on progress within their areas of responsibility in terms of achieving the utility utilisation and waste management objectives.

**6.0 Terms of reference for Department, Site and STFC SHE Committees**

**6.1 LABORATORY/SITE SAFETY COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The primary role of Laboratory/Site Safety Committees, as distinct from Departmental SHE Committees, is to provide an “independent” source of information and advice to the STFC Chief Executive Officer as to the effectiveness of the management of SHE in a specific geographic location.

The STFC Chief Executive has established and appointed Directors with oversight responsibility for SHE at RAL including The Cosener’s House, Chilbolton Observatory, and Boulby Mine facility, and DL including the Cockcroft Institute, ING, La Palma, JAC, Hawaii, and the ROE to: “…monitor and overview safety performance at that site, to monitor the implementation of health and safety policy, including the effectiveness of local emergency procedures, and to bring to the Chief Executive’s attention the need for any action to improve health and safety performance.” Laboratory/Site SHE Committees are one key route through which these Directors exercise this responsibility.

Laboratory/Site SHE Committees are not generally the route through which SHE is managed within the STFC except where the Laboratory or Site Safety Committee has the same scope/responsibility as the Departmental Safety Committee, for example on small sites.

Laboratory/Site SHE Committees provide a means by which the STFC meets its responsibilities to consult freely with employee safety representatives – the “Safety Committee” as defined in the ‘Safety Representatives and Safety Committee Regulations’ 1977 and the representatives of employee safety defined in the ‘Health and Safety (Consultation with employees) Regulations’ 1996.

**Purpose**

Reporting to the Directors with oversight responsibility for SHE, and therein the STFC Chief Executive, Laboratory SHE Committee’s provide an independent route through which SHE performance is monitored and reviewed.

To promote co-operation and effective communication between employees, managers, facility users and tenants so that effective arrangements to protect their health, safety and welfare, and to support environmental sustainability, can be developed and implemented.

**Scope**

While the current focus of the STFC is health and safety management, environmental management is included within the remit of this Committee to recognise the increasing importance of this issue and the inherent links between health and safety, and environmental management.

The RAL Laboratory SHE Committee encompasses those activities undertaken under the STFC SHE Management System at the RAL site, the Chilbolton Observatory, the Cosener’s House, and Boulby Mine. The DL Laboratory SHE Committee encompasses those activities undertaken under the STFC SHE Management System at the DL site, and Cockcroft Institute. In both instances this includes the activities of tenants located on these sites where they operate the STFC SHE Management System.

**Responsibilities**

1. To monitor and review the site safety, health and environmental performance, identifying issues of common concern for the Laboratory to be raised with Departmental SHE Committees, and the Chief Executive.

2. As appropriate to commission any site-wide SHE Management System compliance audits, and house-keeping tours etc., based upon reported SHE incidents the results of Directorate/Department safety tours, assessment of the major SHE hazards at the Site/Laboratory etc., and to review their outcome.

3. Provide a forum for consultation and discussion of health and safety matters with employee safety representatives and representatives of employee safety.

4. Consider reports from the Health and Safety Executive, Environment Agency and other regulatory bodies in respect of Site/Laboratory SHE matters and action as appropriate through Departmental SHE Committees, STFC SHE Committee and/or the Chief Executive.

5. Promote a positive safety, health and environmental culture in the Laboratory, enabling staff, users, tenants and managers, to contribute to the achievement of the STFC’s policy objective of continuous improvement in SHE performance.

6. Sharing good practices and learning with other STFC Laboratory/Site Safety Committees.

**Membership and operation**

Chaired by the Directors with oversight responsibility for Safety at each site/laboratory and meeting at least twice a year, membership should include:

Recognised TU safety representatives and ‘representatives of employee safety’;

Representation from the STFC SHE Group; and from each of the Departments based at the Site/Laboratory.

To promote communication between Departmental, Laboratory and STFC SHE Committees it is recommended that Department members are sourced from Departmental Safety Committees, and could include Departmental Safety Contacts.

Papers for discussion at meetings will be set up in the SHE Meeting SharePoint site at least one week prior to the meeting and shared between sites and departments.

**6.2 DIRECTORATE or DEPARTMENTAL SHE MANAGEMENT TEAMS, COMMITTEES TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Purpose**

Reporting as appropriate to the Directorate/Department Director the Department SHE Committee provides a focus for the proactive management of Safety, Health and Environmental issues within a department. As a key tool to implement the STFC’s SHE Management System it is the responsibility of Directors to determine how these are best structured.

**Scope**

While the current focus within the STFC is health and safety management, environmental management is included within the remit of these Committees to recognise the increasing importance of this issue and the inherent links between health and safety and environmental management.

**Responsibilities**

1. To coordinate SHE within the area, overseeing the deployment of the STFC SHE Management System, resolving issues that arise from its implementation, as appropriate establishing local systems, and providing the necessary assurance to the Director that the STFC SHE Management System is being effectively and efficiently implemented within the area.

2. To monitor and review the safety, health and environmental performance of the Department, promoting the accurate reporting of all SHE incidents and near misses.

3. To commission a coherent programme of SHE Management System Safety/SHE tours etc. for all areas under their responsibility, and to review their outcome, ensuring that follow up actions to address corrective or preventive actions are established and implemented.

4. Based upon the results of tours, audits and incident investigations, develop and review an annual plan to improve the SHE performance for the Department.

5. To identify and report issues of general STFC concern and interest to the STFC SHE Group, Laboratory/Site Safety Committees and STFC SHE committee.

**Membership and operation**

Chaired by the Director, or a senior manager/division head, membership should be representative of the area’s line management. Those parts of a department with significant SHE hazards in particular should be represented. Trade Union or employee safety representatives should be encouraged to attend.

The committee should meet at least quarterly.

The Departmental Safety Contact for an area and a representative of the STFC SHE Group should be members. Others may be co-opted onto the Committee as determined by the SHE challenges faced by a particular Department.

Where an area’s activities are geographically split between sites/laboratories SHE should not be differentiated from other management responsibilities in its coherent management. It is recommended that a single SHE Committee is established to ensure that common approaches to SHE management are encouraged across sites, and that learning and good practise sharing between sites is encouraged.

The sourcing of Safety/SHE tour members should include staff from outside an area being visited, to bring fresh eyes and perspectives, agreed on a swop basis between areas.

**6.3 STFC SHE COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**Purpose**

Reporting to the STFC Executive Board the STFC SHE Committee is responsible for monitoring the capability and performance of the SHE Management System in fulfilling the aims set out in the Health and Safety and Environmental policies, and its objective of continuous improvement in SHE performance. Approving all changes to the STFC SHE policies and SHE codes the committee maintains close links with the STFC Operations Board.

**Membership**

* Chair: an Executive Board Director of the STFC
* Director with oversight responsibility for SHE at RAL including The Cosener’s House (TCH), Chilbolton Observatory and the STFC’s underground experimental facility within Cleveland Potash Limited’s Boulby Mine, or their nominee
* Director with oversight responsibility for SHE at DL including the Cockcroft Institute, or their nominee
* Director with oversight responsibility for SHE at the ROE, or their nominee
* Management representation for Swindon Office (and the STFC site at La Palma)
* Director Corporate Services, or their nominee
* Director National Laboratories
* On a staggered rotating basis, unless otherwise agreed, two National Laboratories Directors or their nominees (from the following high hazard profile Departments: ISIS; CLF; Technology; ASTeC, BID and RAL Space) and a representative from CSD.
* Head Safety, Health and Environment Group

A Director and a minimum of 3 senior members are required for quorum.

Specialist input and attendance will be sought as determined by Committee’s agenda.

**Responsibilities**

* To monitor the capability and performance of the SHE Management System in fulfilling the aims set out in this SHE Policy and its objective of continuous improvement in SHE performance;
* To approve all changes to the STFC SHE policy and SHE codes on behalf of the STFC, including amendments to and withdrawal of existing codes and launch of new codes;
* To regularly review the STFC input and output SHE performance at least annually, reviewing injuries/incidents/near misses, audit findings etc;
* To recommend a corporate H&S and Environmental improvement objectives to Executive board for approval, reviewing its implementation.
* To consider and review the SHE culture of the STFC ensuring it is consistent with the objective of continuous improvement in SHE performance;
* Commission, approve and review the findings of a rolling programme of SHE Code Compliance audits, and periodic STFC SHE System audits, ensuring that sufficient resources are made available for their efficient, effective and timely completion; and
* To review and approve SHE submissions to the STFC Corporate Risk Register.

**Method of Working**

* SHE Committee meetings, typically of 2 hours’ duration, shall be timetabled annually in advance on a quarterly basis although further and/or longer meetings may be required depending on the committee’s work programme and agenda.
* The SHE Committee secretary shall circulate the meeting’s agenda to members a week prior to each meeting and circulate actions agreed immediately after meetings followed by meeting minutes within two weeks. Papers for discussion at meetings will be set up in the SHE Meeting SharePoint site at least one week prior to the meeting.
* The Committee’s terms of reference and membership shall be reviewed annually by the SHE committee.

**7.0 Extent of ACS engagement**

* Desktop research to understand scope and role of site and departmental safety committee
* Attendance at safety committees both at Daresbury Laboratory (DL) and Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (RAL)
* Interviews with SHE, Directors, departmental SC Chairs and Trade Union Reps.
* Initial findings
* Attendance at more committees
* Meetings with Directors, Senior managers and Trade Union representatives

 7.1 Safety Committees attended at DL and RAL

* + - ASTeC (DL) 24th July 2017
		- Technology (RAL) 18th August 2017 (cancelled)(discussion with Chris Pulker acting chair)
		- PPD (RAL) 18th August 2017
		- CSD (DL) 14th November 2017
		- DL SSC (DL) 28th November 2017
		- Technology (DL) 4th December 2017
		- ISIS/CLF (RAL) 5th/6th February 2018

7.2 SHE employees interviewed

* June Preston (RAL) 18th August 2017
* Jan Cairns (RAL) 18th August 2017
* Garth Baker (RAL) 18th August 2017
* Gareth Walker (DL) 17th October 2017
* Christine Mills (DL) 17th October 2017
* Colin Brown (DL) 17th October 2017

7.3 Department Chairs interviewed –

* Chris Pulker (Technology RAL) 18th August 2017
* John Williams (CSD DL) 14th November 2017
* Phil Atkinson (Technology DL) 4th December 2017
* Xavier Queralt (ISIS/CLF) 5th February 2018
* Brian Landowski (Technology) 5th February 2018

7.4 Directors Interviewed

* Chris Mutlow 5th February 2018
* Robert McGreavy 5th February 2018
* David Wark 15th February 2018
* Tim Bestwick 12th March 2018
* Neil Phimister 12th March 2018
* John Collier 20th March 2018

7.5 Trade Union Representatives interviewed

* Steve Crothers (RAL) 6th February 2018
* Charles Ballard (RAL) 6th February 2018
* Ian Johnson (RAL) 6th February 2018
* Christine Mills (DL) 25th April 2018

**8.0 General Findings**

8.1 Information is held across the organisation for individual departments that are not scrutinised corporately but used to update corporate databases such as SHE Enterprise. A random sample from a SC action sheet showed an item still in progress, in fact not started, yet on the SHE Enterprise database it was recorded as 100% complete.

This is a single example albeit chosen at random that perhaps highlights a need to review the updating of the SHE Enterprise database to ensure that all actions from SC are accurately recorded.  The issue is how much trust can be placed in the action reports and should there be a requirement to maintain full and accurate information on the database. The action was marked on SHE Enterprise as 100% complete, perhaps because there was no function available to defer the action to a later date. ®

8.2 The committees operate administratively to a template which is variable in design and information recorded but this doesn’t appear to impact on the work of the committees. However it would make sense to review the basic template to ensure essential information is captured. ®

8.3 Some records don’t give clear references – numbers/dates etc so it is difficult to trace – varying references across committees whereas consistent referencing would improve traceability. ®

8.4 Some actions are repeatedly presented meeting after meeting – there should be a clear protocol for escalation. ®

8.5 The terms of reference for departmental safety committees references single committees across sites. This is not always the case eg CSD; back office services don’t appear to be included and consequently some departmental safety committees have limited opportunity to share best practice or develop consistent working arrangements. ®

8.6 The SHE reports produced are comprehensive and important elements of the committee meetings; delivery of the information varies from line by line to just key issues. The report format should be reviewed to generate more dynamic reporting with clear priorities for action supported by information for members to note. The time taken to deliver the report affects the time available for relevant discussion and much of the detail is information for managers, which is critical but for them to consider away from the meeting. Key issues need to be highlighted for managers to note or to debate at the meeting. ®

8.7 Department reporting results in a lot of actions which are often allocated or adopted by the Chair. Action recording differs from one committee to the next and whilst it doesn’t impair the individual committees it might be worth looking at consistency. A review of what constitutes a valid recordable action should be developed. ®

8.8 The amount of information generally discussed may mask the importance of more critical reports. There should be a review of reporting protocols for discussing issues versus information sharing, including closing out actions. This would help to reduce the time and focus the meetings. (as for 8.7 above) ®

NB ® indicates that the item has been incorporated into a relevant recommendation in section 5.

**9.0 Interview responses**

NB the responses recorded below are literal comments from individuals which were not contested or debated, neither were they generated by the interviewer. They are therefore a perception from those who responded.

9.1 Below are the general questions but not exclusively, that were the basis of each interview.

* Key purpose of SCs
* Expectations from participants/report submissions
* Frequency of meetings
* Key benefits of SC meetings
* Importance/validity of meetings
* Committee participants and their commitment
* Actions of a good Chair
* Strengths
* Weaknesses
* Alternative to SCs/Removal of SCs
* H&S culture
* Senior management commitment

9.2 **Interview responses from SHE personnel**

9.2.1 Key learnings from incidents and plans

Gains commitment for H&S

Pushing out information, possibly encouraging participation

Committee effectiveness depends on the Chair

Senior personnel Band F and above essential

Some disciplines are note fully engaged

9.2.2 Committees are driven by individual departmental participants

A focus on getting actions completed and a useful tool to help departments which are strategic or operational

SCs don’t necessarily influence across all departments

Feels like a lot of meetings culminating in the SC

Helps to drive standards through SHE involvement

SC workings/discussions not widely known or understood

TU involvement is challenging management as a duty rather than from a safety culture perspective

Participation depends on the department eg CSD in RAL have no SC

Good focus for disseminating information

Complacency is the enemy

9.2.3 Historically commitment from top of organisation was dubious

 SC good communication tool

 SC should focus on key issues/objectives

 Previously they have been ‘talking shops’ with TU having little input

 Environment committee had no steer but should focus on waste and environmental improvements

9.2.4 Provides TU with a forum to express concerns

 Should be able to influence and be a place to discuss best practice, common issues and policies

 TU sometimes feel hijacked before meetings

 TU members don’t realise SCs are safety forums and are not always considered to be consultation forums

 Some managers are not committed and see SCs as a management tool

 Frequency about right

 Good place to raise issues of common concern

 SCs should be chaired by Directors to show importance and give authority

 TUs not involved sufficiently and are concerned that H&S is not managed properly, looking through organisation wide perspective

 Representation is not always appropriate and some not aware of the reason for their attendance

 Good for information dissemination

 Actions not always completed

 Generally thought of as a useful forum by managers

**9.3 Interview responses from Departmental SC Chairs**

9.3.1 Brings the department’s voice together regarding incidents/accidents and allows cascade of information/reports

 Helps awareness of local issues

 Encourages implementation of safety codes

 Helps to ensure records/training are undertaken

 Meetings valuable in bringing issue to the fore

 Some complacency but most engaged

 SCs need to ensure sharing of information and expertise

 Frequency of meetings about right

 Maybe introduce department H&S champions

9.3.2 Helps raise H&S profile

 Wouldn’t change the SC approach, it is a critical forum

 Maybe a need to reinvigorate members who have lost a little impetus

 Maybe a need to review priorities on the agenda

 The right people are around the table

 CEO committed to H&S and a strong H&S culture throughout the organisation

 There doesn’t seem to be a mechanism to involve all employees

9.3.3 Purpose is about communications/roles and responsibilities

 Good at getting safety information out

 Circles are not always completed

 Question the authority of the SCs

 Normally Band F or above as participants

 Cross auditing might reduce SC workload

 Directors should manage/chair the meetings

 Marketing information to grass roots

 Safety tours are seen as a mechanism for Directors

 **9.4. Interview responses from Directors**

9.4.1 Essential meetings to help keep the workforce safe

 Engages senior managers from the department and in the case of ISIS/CLF shared between two departments

 Some difference in risk between different departments and functions

 Seen as a regulatory forum to share good practice within departments

 Considered to be management meetings not information dissemination or Trade Union consultation

9.4.2 Those attending the SC consider it is a valuable forum and take their role seriously

 Opportunity to raise issues and helps to develop a common approach within the departments and with senior managers

 ISIS is the largest department and has other safety controls in tandem with SHE

 Quarterly meetings are about the right frequency might consider something less as an overview of department safety controls

 Joint committee for ISIS/CLF works well and helps share good practice

9.4.3 Considers there is a strong health and safety culture in the organisation helped by these committees

 Opportunity to learn from experts and good practice across the organisation

 Health and safety information dissemination should be a departmental management function supported by SHE

 Opportunity to discuss and share experience from safety tours

 No role for Trade Unions which tend to be a relationship of conflict

 Senior staff need to maintain their involvement in order to be aware of what’s happening within the department and also to show staff they are active whilst keeping Directors fully briefed

 Attendance should continue to be good representation of the functions of the department

**9.5. Interview responses from Trade Union Safety Reps**

9.5.1 Challenge management to ensure health and safety is not over ridden by work that hasn’t considered health and safety issues first

 Two way communications on safety matters should deliver better outcomes

 Safety Reps are in low numbers and there doesn’t appear to be nominated employee representation hence the workforce is not adequately represented in health and safety matters

 Trade Union reps are not always acknowledged or listened to

 There is an expectation and desire to be more involved in health and safety management

9.5.2 TU Reps consider that there is a health and safety culture and the departmental safety committees take safety issues seriously. There is less understanding of the work of the Site Committees

9.5.3 The Research Complex uses a forum to manage health and safety contributed to by the various representatives from tenants and as such doesn’t seem to be as involved with the safety committees as other departments.

 Health and safety practice and policies seem to be adopted by the contributing tenant companies eg Diamond Lasers which are not considered to be the responsibility of STFC.

9.5.4 SHE Enterprise appears to be open to all but there have been examples of individuals being named when they should have been anonymised.

 Not all the information from the meetings is published eg the minutes!

9.5.5 Concern that the committees could be better at communication and information dissemination

**10.0 Conclusions**

10.1Overall the safety committee structures are seen by managers as essential and helpful in delivering health and safety obligations. However below 2nd/3rd tier managers there is little knowledge or awareness of the work of the committees.

10.2 The work of the Site H&S Committees is seen as complimentary to the Departmental SHE Committees and also as an essential part of the process.

10.3 The views of the range of managers is mixed in terms of the precise work of the departmental SHE committees but this doesn’t not seem to impede the main focus which is about managing safety.

10.4 The departmental committees all operate with differences and consistency is an obvious casualty which might lose some benefits in terms of traceability, actions and other protocols that would help the organisation to more easily measure its health and safety performance.

10.5 There are a number of minor protocol changes needed to equip managers attending the departmental safety committees to be better organised in managing the process.

10.6 The Trade Union Reps do not feel any ‘ownership’ of the safety committees, site or departmental and see them falling short of their expectations, with insufficient representation for the workforce.

10.7 One area of confusion is about the role of the Site Safety Committees in terms of employee consultation and compliance with HSE guidance and the Approved Code of Practice.

10.8 There are management appointed representatives on the committees from each department (DSC - Departmental Safety Contacts) but there appears to be no group of elected/nominated employee representatives as would be envisioned of an organisation of this size with a low Trade Union presence.

10.9 SHE personnel are seen as a critical, helpful and knowledgeable resource and a ‘go to’ place when health and safety issues arise whether or not they may require investigation.

I am very grateful for the opportunity to have undertaken this project and hope that it meets with your expectations.

Best Regards

AJDavies

Allan Davies

AC Services (ACS)

Caveat

This report has been prepared following broad consultation but has not have been able to comprehensively cover all safety committees or personnel engaged in such committees. The commentary and recommendations produced following the review period will need to be considered as matters that were highlighted during discussions, committee attendance or through observation. They may not always be typical and because the existing protocols and processes have been operating for a considerable period of time there is likely to be some corporate knowledge and memory that would not have been revealed during this exercise.

The details of reviewing protocols, creating or re-structuring committees or their work, which have been suggested in the recommendations are not part of this exercise and would be matters to consider further should they be adopted by the STFC organisation. The size and complexity of STFC together with the impending changes proposed in April 2018 means that any review conducted externally may only be seen as a ‘snapshot’ of the function and workings of the organisation.