

Meeting Date:	19 June 2002	Open Gov. Status:	Open
Type of Paper:	Above the line	Paper File Ref:	
Exemptions:	None		

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE

HSE Board

Minutes of a meeting of the HSE Board held on Wednesday 19 June 2002 at 9.30 am in the Fortune Room, Rose Court

Present

Sandra Caldwell
 Richard Clifton
 Paul Davies
 Robert Humm
 Peter Graham
 Richard Hillier
 Nick Starling
 Kate Timms
 Laurence Williams
 Timothy Walker
 Justin McCracken
 Sian Lewis

Also attending

Jane Willis Item 4
 Pat Williams "
 Colleen Bowen "
 Gordon MacDonald Item 5
 Steve Woolley "
 Ian Greenwood "
 Sue Viner "
 Allan Sefton Item 6
 Avril Adams "
 John Gould Item 7

Mark Dempsey - Secretariat
 Apologies - Adrian Ellis

1 Minutes of the HSE Board meeting held on Wednesday 1 May (B/02/M05), and matters arising

- 1.1 The minutes, including open government status, were agreed.
- 1.2 It was noted that guidance of the treatment of near miss reports was being developed; and that Alun Williams was leading the project on civil contingencies.
- 2 Health and Safety:** Oral report by Justin McCracken. A written statistical report was issued at the meeting. This was intended to show trends as well as current performance in the rates of accidents and reported instances of ill health.

- 2.1 Injuries were broken down into a number of categories. It was noted that DSE related incidents were consistently high and that management attention was needed beyond initial DSE assessments. One of the RIDDOR reportable incidents had been to a contractor working on HSE premises.
- 2.2 The Board agreed:
- a That it would be helpful to disaggregate the “other” category where noteworthy issues occurred;
 - b That it would be useful to identify any emerging issues such as assaults on staff.
 - c It would be helpful to show targets on the charts and segment the ill-health chart in the same way as the accident one.

Action: Justin McCracken agreed to follow up on the points made and to circulate statistics in advance of Board meetings where possible.

3 Addressing Work Related Stress in HSE (B/02/28)

- 3.1 This paper had been prepared by Elizabeth Gyngell on behalf of the H&S Committee subgroup and was presented by Justin McCracken. 20% of all days lost in HSE were on grounds of stress/anxiety/depression and the costs could be estimated at almost £2million.
- 3.2 The paper proposed three priority action areas: risk assessments based on HSE’s guidance to duty holders (HSG 218); raising the priority of reviewing the procedures for managing attendance; and looking positively at recommendations of the current review of the health and safety aspects of IT provision being conducted by REFIT.
- 3.3 The cost of these measures had been estimated at £120k, mostly in management time. The overall plan was set out in an Annex to the paper and it was proposed to adopt targets in line with Revitalising once baselines could be established.
- 3.4 The Board noted that the costs of remedial action could be higher than those mentioned in the paper. Attention might need to be given to workloads, prioritization, and IT support. It would be important to look at groups of jobs which were similar in nature and to understand the underlying causes of stress.

- 3.5 Some additional work had been done in Directorates such as SASD and this would be shared with the working group. While work to identify underlying causes would be useful, management action then would be needed to address these. There was a danger that the impact on reported stress levels or days lost would be minimal if the issue was seen as a general “catchall” ailment.
- 3.6 Following HSE’s own guidance on stress management would help to identify the issues and demonstrate that HSE could act as an exemplar. However, risk assessments needed to be fit for purpose.
- 3.7 The Board agreed:
- a That a three stage management process should consist of risk assessments, feedback from divisional steering groups and reporting findings;
 - b That D/Ds should contribute best practice examples to Elizabeth Gyngell’s team, who would disseminate them as appropriate;
 - c That HSE should aim to have completed risk assessments and, if possible, reporting by October to link with European Health and Safety Week;
 - d That the proposals should be communicated through an article in Express and a note in Management Briefing.

Action: Board members to feed in information to Elizabeth Gyngell’s team. Justin McCracken to arrange articles for Express and Management Briefing.

4 HSC/E Monthly Finance: presented by Jane Willis, Colleen Bowen and Pat Williams (B/02/002)

- 4.1 Decreases in payroll forecasts had not materialised, and increasing pressures on the budget were set out in paragraph 2 of the paper. Further detail had been sought from Directors and Finance Managers, and some “hot running” had been identified that had not been agreed. Some cover was available from EYF, but the level might not be sufficient if current trends continued.
- 4.2 Timothy Walker noted that the Department has agreed to provide funding for Cullen implementation, although the details were yet to be agreed. The £4 million EYF needed to be reserved for real emerging pressures.

4.3 Richard Hillier commented that the EYF amount needed to be treated as an essential part of financial planning rather than a reserve. The agreement on hot running had been set out in his note of 6 March and it was important to adhere to the agreement that had been reached. He would write separately to Directors about the use of resources for posts which had not been agreed.

4.4 In discussion the following points were made:

- a Clarity was needed on the agreement on hot running;
- b Urgent decisions were needed on the impact on the recruitment of Band 4 inspectors in FOD, the numbers needed to maintain the current position and funding for these posts;
- c A separate discussion was needed on Band 4 recruitment for policy posts given the shortfalls following the DRP staffing exercise;
- d The resource implications of Board decisions, for example on new work associated with stress, needed to be considered.

Action: i) Richard Hillier to write round to individual Directors to clarify their positions on hot running;

ii) Justin McCracken to take an overview on inspector recruitment an the minimum numbers needed, through a modeling exercise;

iii) PEFD team to hold bilaterals with Directors to establish clarity regarding the October allocations.

5 Progress on the Change Programme (B/02/029)

5.1 Gordon MacDonald introduced this item. The business case had been developed including the risk register. Some further work on benefits was in hand. Project team leaders has been identified and membership of teams was being firmed up. SKAI were to run a workshop for team leaders on 25 and 26 June.

5.2 Ian Greenwood summarised the results of two surveys of staff to provide feedback on the communications programme. Whilst the response was poor there was consistency in the responses and this reinforced the need to redouble efforts.

5.3 In discussion, the Board noted that it was necessary to involve a wider range of staff, especially the SCS, in the communication process. Messages needed to be more direct and tailored to groups of staff. The business case was welcomed.

- Action:**
- a Board members actively to seek opportunities to sell the messages as part of other discussions and communications;**
 - b SCS members to be involved as advocates - an item for the SCS conference;**
 - c Board members to assess the extent to which decisions support or cut across the programme and act out the values;**
 - d The programme team to seek to involve a wider range of staff in providing comments and feedback using Board members to support the process as necessary.**
 - e Express article following the HSC/E awayday to ensure that the decisions on future working arrangements are in the context of the overall change programme.**

6 Rail presentation.

- 6.1 Richard Clifton introduced this item. It followed the rapid change that had faced railway safety policy and operational staff since the responsibilities had moved to HSE and included lessons for the wider change programme.
- 6.2 Avril Adams summarised the programme. There were key challenges on programme management, the balance of priorities for resource allocation, leadership, stakeholder engagement and changing behaviours. Allan Sefton added that there was some resistance to change and that new competencies were needed.
- 6.3 The Board noted the points raised and agreed that the team should maintain contact with the change programme team to share experiences.

7 Evaluation of Training and Development (B/02/022)

- 7.1 John Gould introduced the paper. HSE evaluated training and development activities but the Board had not had the opportunity to take an overview of the benefits from the investment made, or the contribution that training made to the achievement of strategic objectives. The paper sought views on the issues that the Board would wish to consider as it reviewed its training and development strategy in the Autumn.

7.2 In discussion, the Board noted that the evaluation of individual interventions was a matter for D/Ds, but that an overview of whether the strategy was being delivered would be useful. This would help to assess whether the right priorities had been selected and whether changes were needed in the light of new developments. To help with this overview, the DG asked D/Ds to copy their training and evaluation reports to John Gould in Personnel. The balanced scorecard could be used to identify specific new requirements.

7.3 The Board agreed:

- a That it needed a view at the strategic and corporate level, but that individual managers would continue to evaluate specific interventions;
- b That the Director General would discuss the links with the balanced scorecard with Tony Mulhall.
- c That D/Ds copy their training and evaluation reports to John Gould in Personnel.

8 Other business

8.1 The Director General reported on the meeting between the new Secretary of State, the Chair and himself. In short, the Secretary of State had some sympathy with the points that had been made to him on the choice of sponsoring department for HSC/E, and the options had been discussed.

8.2 No wide ranging review was anticipated in the near future. Rachel Lomax would be writing to Sir Andrew Turnbull to initiate a meeting with other interested Permanent Secretaries and the DG.